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ABSTRACT

This study addresses the issue of language teaching, specifically the use of reading strategies for comprehension in secondary schools in Kenya at a time when concern is being expressed about declining reading habits in the institutions of learning. It investigates language teachers perceptions about teaching the use of reading strategies, the perceived reading strategies and how these are reflected in their classroom practices. This was done to establish the consistence in practice or any inconsistencies and the reasons for the disparities. The study was a descriptive survey and the sample was randomly selected using stratifies random sampling from two counties: Nairobi and Kitui. Data was collected from 18 public secondary schools using questionnaire which was responded to by 36 teachers of English teaching Form 3 in the 18 secondary schools. Eighteen (18) classroom observations were made, 18 semi-structured interviews were conducted with same teachers and 18 FGDs with learners was done. Analysis of data was done using descriptive statistics such as frequency tables and percentages and Chi-square tests were done to establish the significance between the variables using SPSS. The analysed data revealed individual variations across the teachers theoretical perceptions about teaching use of strategies in reading and their classroom practices. Teachers perceptions revealed that teachers were knowledgeable about the importance and necessity of reading strategies. However, these stated perceptions were inconsistent with their classroom instructional practices. Their knowledge was not reflected in their practice. There was a tendency of language teachers to rush learners in to reading exercises without adequate preparation. The choice of reading materials was not varied. Teachers tended to rigidly use the prescribed text-books to teach reading. Enrichment forums were few and learners practice of learnt strategies was not encouraged. Although teachers faced many challenges when planning to teach reading strategies, there is need for updating teachers classroom practice in order to match theory and practice.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides the background and statement of the problem. It also presents the purpose of the study, the study objectives and research questions used to guide the development of research instruments and analysis of the findings. The significance, limitations, delimitations and assumptions of the study are also explained. In addition, theoretical and conceptual framework for the study have been summarized in this chapter.

1.1 Background of the Study

Teachers perceptions regarding reading instruction is one of the most influential on what is done in classrooms and ultimately on what students learn. There is now agreement in general education studies that teaching is a cognitive activity and that teachers’ beliefs greatly impact their instructional decisions in the classroom (Harmer, 2001; Richards and Lockhart, 1997). Within second language education, teaching reading is also now viewed as a complex cognitive activity (Borg, 2003). Borg, suggests that “teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs” (p, 81). Indeed, research has indicated that teachers possess a vast array of complex beliefs about pedagogical issues including beliefs about students thought processes and classroom practices (Berliner, 1987; Borg, 2003; Burns, 1992; Richards and Rodgera, 2001).
These beliefs are said to form a structured set of principles and are derived from a teacher’s prior experiences, school practices, and a teacher’s individual personality. Furthermore, Hall, (2005) points out that what teachers do in the classroom is governed by what they perceive to work best and these perceptions often serve to act as filters through which instructional judgments and decisions are made. Borg (2003), Grabe, (2004), Singhall (2001), Farrell (2001), Breen and Thwaite (2001) point out that there is need to understand, and account for the underlying belief systems of language teachers and the impact these have on their classroom practices in order to improve educational practice.

Every nation today, including Kenya, pursues technological advancement. This means there is need for exposing learners to appropriate reading practices in order to facilitate their development of reading expertise expected of them as they build their professional career. This is so because the more complex and technological societies become, the more important it is for their population to develop reading competencies in order to cope and adapt to technological changes of their day-to-day lives.

In Kenya, English is used in many areas such as politics, economics, tourism, electronics, culture and science and technology. English is the language used to achieve better academic results as well as accessing the latest achievements of science and technology. Therefore, it is necessary for all literate Kenyans to
have a good command of English language to satisfy the growing needs of their developing country.

Among the basic skills of the English language learning, reading has been the second most emphasized skill in English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching and it is also the main skill of instruction in English as a second language (ESL) in many countries (Susser and Rob (1999) Brown (2001)). Besides, Levine, et al. (2000), Smith, (1995) and Hall, (2005) emphasize that in the ESL setting, reading skill represents an essential approach to learn the language since most learners of English might only need to talk or listen just a little to speakers of English but they do need to read a great deal in that language for different reasons. Undeniably, for many ESL learners, reading is the most important skill to master. Therefore, knowing how to read effectively in the target language, though not an easy task, certainly represents an opportunity for ESL students to learn and use language realistically.

In Kenya, English is taught to learners whose L1 is not English and in most cases the learners do not use it outside the classroom. In countries where English is the language of instruction, a proficiency in reading is not only a crucial means to gain knowledge but also a means by which advanced studies are taken. In support of this position, Carrell, et al. (1998) and Dwyer, (1983) contend that reading is by far the most important of the four macro skills particularly in situations where English is learnt as a second or foreign language. This is true to students in Kenya since the reading skill gives them a
wide range of interesting and valuable information as well as a variety of language structures which give them a command in the use of the language and which also help them succeed in their educational pursuit.

In understanding the language teacher by studying teachers’ perceptions about reading instruction, Allen and Bruton, (1998) and Macaro (2006), reveal the knowledge that reading cannot be regarded as a set of mechanical skills to be learnt. They point out that reading is a complex process of making meaning from a text for a variety of purposes and in a wide range of contexts. To a large extent in Kenya, reading in English is essential for learners’ academic success because English is the medium of instruction in all formal settings save for other languages. However, in many situations where English is learnt as a second language (L2), learners usually experience the lack of reading strategies which are essential for them to read competently and overcome the challenges in the classroom when dealing with a reading exercises, Pressley, (2006), Beard, K. (1988), and Block & Pressley, (2002). Reading strategies may be defined as techniques employed in order to construct meaning from a reading selection. Barnett, (1988) used the term strategy to refer to a tactic or a tool, or a procedure, or a set of steps used by readers when they purposefully approach a text to make sense of what they read.

Teachers perceptions about what works best in language education according to Farrell (2001), Richards and Farrell (2005) and Tillema (2006) include knowledge of subject matter, appropriate instructional methods and knowledge of the curriculum. A balanced interaction of these three elements provides the
teacher with expert teaching knowledge. This expert knowledge of teaching English and specifically reading enables the teacher to facilitate students reading comprehension by way of defining and refining student reading processes. Teachers’ perceptions about instruction of reading comprehension strategies influence their classroom actions. To effectively facilitate reading, teachers need to know students difficulties when reading different genres and provide appropriate step by step guided practice to improve their reading proficiency. Language teachers need to be flexible when students give alternative ideas since they (students) may have some prior knowledge about the concepts discussed in the reading text.

Given this state of affairs, it is necessary that teachers give attention to understanding the factors affecting success in reading (Kamhi-Stein, 2003). This is should be the case because the main goal of reading is comprehension and without comprehension, reading would be a meaningless exercise. To facilitate comprehension, English language teachers should aid learners’ understanding by equipping them with reading techniques that would help them read efficiently (Yigiter, et al., 2005). When learners are taught reading strategies, they are equipped with the tactics to reflect, analyse, clarify the meaning of what they read and determine what is relevant to the assignment from what is irrelevant. Further, they are able to critically evaluate, compare and contrast new learning with old knowledge and support it and appropriately apply the lessons learnt. The ability to do all this increases their motivation to
read and the role of the teacher remains that of a facilitator and guide, (Macaro, 2001).

In support of motivation to read, Birch, (2007), Jagar, (2002) and Oxford, (2001) point out that effective readers are aware of the reading strategies they use and at the same time they use these strategies flexibly and efficiently and this ability creates a love for reading. Research findings have shown that reading strategies can be taught to struggling learners so that they can become more successful in language learning and use. Pan (2004:11) states reading strategies “… are especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed progress, which is essential for developing reading proficiency.” Therefore teachers should consider assisting learners in using effective reading strategies and more important showing them how to utilize the techniques and prior knowledge that they bring into a reading exercise in order to cope with reading in ESL situations. Readers may typically make use of background knowledge, vocabulary, grammatical knowledge, experience with the text and other strategies to help them understand a written text (Pang, et al., 2003).

Additionally, in the reading process, readers may use their background knowledge about the text’s topic and structure along with their linguistic knowledge to achieve their purpose for reading (Peregoy and Boyle, 2001). Oxford, (1999) points out that during the reading process, the brain seeks to maximize the information it acquires, and minimize effort and energy used to
acquire it. In this regard therefore, reading techniques are extremely vital and indispensable tools for helping one to achieve reading proficiency. Marshall, et al. (2003) point out that reading is a subject that is so crucial and important for ones success in school and also in adult life. In the light of this, in countries where English is taught as a L2, the less competitive reader is maladjusted, the illiterate frequently so. Considering the complexity of reading, there is need for teachers of English language to guide students in understanding the nature of reading as a process and adopting strategies that will make it easy for them to read with ease.

In the academic life of students, there are many types of texts to be read. Reading is, therefore, an adaptive, active and flexible process. Reading strategies/tactics change to meet the demands of the text and the purpose of the reader. The competent reader constructs meaning for himself / herself as eyes move over the page, forms hypotheses about what is to follow, and pauses for a fixation occasionally, to confirm what he has been predicting. The importance of reading for comprehension in people’s lives is indisputable. Wallace, (1992) argues that technologically advanced societies operate on the belief that their members can read. For the individual to achieve self-fulfillment, satisfaction and to participate fully in exercising their democratic rights, reading proficiency is a necessary pre-requisite.

Reading instruction is a set of procedures that aim to raise student awareness of reading strategies and provide learners with systematic practice, reinforcement
and self – monitoring of their reading ability while attending to reading tasks. When students are exposed to strategy use, opportunities to use them availed, learners improve in their ability to process information which in turn leads to improved learning.

On emphasis to importance of reading strategies, Said (1993), Cohen (1989) point out that, when learners lack the skills to unpack a text when reading in English they have problems. In many instances, they shy away from purposeful participation in class and out of class activities and tasks and their reading competence is impaired. Grunewald (1999), Ikeda, and Takeuchi, (2003) , and Oxford (1999) agree that the main emphasis for teaching reading should be focused on attainment of reading proficiency in the target language. Thus, to be successful in one’s studies, one will need to enhance the reading strategies so that one can tackle the different types of reading required in one’s course.

As already mentioned, reading is a major skill of the learning process as well as a major tool in everyday life. Through reading, the reader draws vicariously upon the experience of others. Through the use of effective reading strategies, the teacher helps the student to gain access to areas of knowledge and experience beyond his own particular areas of expertise. This is so because the written word, like the other media, provides part of a great and irreplaceable store of human culture. It links the past, present and the future. Unlike the other media, it can be drawn upon without being depleted. Being drawn upon, it enhances human experience and culture and so provides a major educational
resource. Reading provides the ability to access this resource responsibly and competently, and therefore, it is the key to that particular store and so, undeniably, a valuable skill of the educational process.

Traditionally, English language teaching has been described in terms of what teachers do; that is, in terms of their actions and their behaviors which teachers carry out in the classroom and the effect of these on learners (Hall, (2005), Birch, (2007)). Teachers’ tacit perceptions about English language teaching and learning constitute the main component of the knowledge base of teaching reading in ESL, (El-Okda, 2005). Reading a text selection with comprehension should be the ultimate goal of reading instruction. In order to achieve this, English language teachers should present opportunities that all students can use to learn and by use of appropriate scaffolding, and the ability to motivate, teachers can encourage all students to believe in themselves and reach their full potential in achieving reading proficiency. The manner of presenting the opportunities should build self-esteem in students.

Experienced teachers draw from a variety of literacy perspectives and teaching techniques that support students in all content areas and make a clear connection between reading experiences and the real world. This is possible if students are taught explicitly how to use the techniques when they read (Pressley in Jagar, (2002), Long (2000) and Macaro (2001)). It is not satisfactory that students answer comprehension questions and teachers supervise. Further, the best instructional approach is based on modelling,
demonstration, and mentoring as opposed to telling or giving information to others. Teachers give students opportunities to become problem solvers who take responsibility for their own thinking. They should explain to the students how expert readers make sense of text; teachers have to identify and expose students to a variety of ways that help them tackle, interpret and give meaning to presentations of information in order to make reading an interesting and fulfilling exercise. Besides these, students need to learn how, when and where to use reading strategies. With respect to reading instruction, it is the teachers’ responsibility to introduce and provide practice in useful reading strategies.

Despite the fact that reading proficiency is crucial in people’s daily lives both in and out of school, many educationists, researchers and media in Kenya have reported a worrying state of affairs in reading competencies of many of the citizens, (Glewwe, 2002, Nganyi, 2006, Konrad, 2008, Gathumbi, et. al. 2008). Nationally performance at Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination is below expectation, that is, below 50% on the average. Table 1.1 below illustrates this.

Table 1.1 National Performance of English subject (2006---2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidature</th>
<th>Mean Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>242,040</td>
<td>39.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>270,629</td>
<td>39.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>278,750</td>
<td>39.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>336,156</td>
<td>39.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>357,789</td>
<td>38.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>413,622</td>
<td>36.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistics from the above table show that performance in English for the last seven years has been below average and declines each respective year. This is the more reason why various areas of language learning need to be investigated to find out what causes this dismal performance each passing year. One area of concern is whether learners attain competent reading. Competency in reading provides the learner with opportunities to build a firm foundation for further education; it forms a basis for developing the ability for enquiry, critical thinking and informed rational judgment.

Many scholars (Nganyi, 2006, Kachala, 2007, and Silulu, 2004) show concern that many people in Africa are less competent in reading than they should be. Conley (1992) observed that when learners lack the ability to read competently, there may be serious academic problems. Additionally, Karlin, (1985:5) points out that:

…achievement in reading proficiency in English language is a necessity to achievement in school and when there is no provision made for improvement by the poor reader, that student is eventually frustrated into a miserable state of failure.

Karlin meant that the ability to read fluently and efficiently is vital both in school and in adult life. Good reading skills will improve performance in all school subjects. Through reading we get knowledge of all ages which helps us improve our lives.

In Kenya, the language policy stipulates that English is the language of instruction in all formal school settings from standard 4 onwards. This being the case, it is expected, therefore, that by the time the learner enters Form 1, one
should have a command of comprehension abilities. However, the case is different. Muthwii’s (2002) study on language policy found that English is rarely used by students outside of class time. Occasionally, even the teacher uses mother tongue and / or Kiswahili to explain challenging concepts. Further she noted that when learners converse with each other both in class and outside instructional times, they rarely use English and by extension, it is possible that learners have little interest to read in English. In addition, Ndethiu (2007) noted that lecture method of teaching is common during instruction. She also established that assessment modes encouraged rote-memorization of lecture notes. This approach to instruction, denies the student the opportunity to engage in authentic reading. This supports Inyega, et al. (2007) views that Kenya’s education system is examination-oriented.

It was hoped that with the integrated English language syllabus, the teacher would be equipped with a variety of reading materials to choose from. Based on this thinking, therefore, reading instruction is made easy so the teacher needs to plan how to encourage and facilitate students’ comprehension of the texts in and out of school. Besides developing reading proficiency for students, teachers who train learners’ to use reading strategies can also help them become autonomous language learners. As a result, teaching students reading strategies is an important duty of the language teachers since reading strategies can help monitor and take charge of their own learning. Helping students understand good language learning strategies and training them to develop and use such
good learning strategies can be considered to be the appreciated characteristics of a good language teacher (Harmer, 2005).

Research into teachers perceptions generally shows that teachers have their own perceptions and theories about teaching and learning which might have been influenced by their training, established practice, experience on what works best, personality factors, principles derived from method or approach and the nature of learners. However, teachers are not passive recipients of theories, they do construct their own theories in the course of practice (Gardener, and Miller, 2002; Farrell, 2001).

In the light of this therefore, it is necessary to investigate Kenyan ESL secondary school teachers’ perceptions about reading instruction and strategy use in their ESL classes. This would make it possible to recognize the relationship between teachers’ perceptions and practices in enhancing students reading performance. Moreover, teachers perceptions are related to student learning through some event or sequence of events as coordinated by the teachers. These actions cause student learning in the sense that the events in the classroom lead, in the case of effective teaching, to student learning.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Reading is the skill mostly used by teachers and learners in school to access information from various sources. Through reading, the learner is exposed to rich new vocabulary, new sentence structures and it also acquaints the learner
with good models of language use. Learners’ reading ability depends on language teachers reading instruction practices in the classroom. Currently there is scarcity of research investigating the Kenyan ESL teachers’ perceptions about reading instruction and how these perceptions are reflected in their classroom practices. Due to this lack of empirical data, teachers perceptions, the extent to which a teacher is able to demonstrate how learners develop, learn and think about the content of a reading selection or even the level of competence to which the teacher demonstrates his/her responsibility that reflect high expectations for student achievement of reading proficiency is unknown. Lack of an articulate reading instruction procedure costs learners development of confidence in independent reading. Besides, how teachers avail a variety of enrichment reading forums to help students practice and extend what they have learnt as well as how teachers use the results to improve the quality of instruction is still unknown.

A number of factors may influence the teaching of reading but teachers’ perceptions play an important role in the teaching process since they are the ones who make decisions in the classroom and beyond. Studies suggest that to facilitate students reading competency, teachers require a balanced blend of their perceptions and classroom practice. However, research to establish how language teachers in Kenya are able to integrate these two paradigms during instruction is lacking. Lack of information on how to teach reading efficiently makes it difficult to make necessary improvements in the learning of English and this consequently impacts performance since reading is the mainstay of
learning. There is need for research to be carried out to determine how teachers and students understand the concept of reading and instruction and use reading comprehension strategies.

During pre-service course of study for teachers of English, two key areas are emphasized; subject matter knowledge and curricular knowledge. However, there is no empirical data on the integration of these two areas with classroom practice. Instead there is emphasis on generalized knowledge on how to teach reading and the other skills. The lack of emphasis due to the assumption that teachers will develop specialized instructional knowledge during their experience in the field warrants a need to carry out research to establish how teachers perceptions relate to or from their classroom practices in reading instruction.

As noted above, since previous studies have investigated teachers’ classroom practices in primary schools in Kenya, there is no research that has been documented about ESL teachers’ perceptions and practices about reading instruction in Kenya secondary schools.

The rationale of this research is therefore to explore the perceptions held by teachers of English and how they integrate them in their classroom practices in reading instruction and use of reading strategies in secondary schools in Kenya. Areas where practices converged with or diverged from perceptions related to
the teaching of reading were examined and discussed as well as other factors that may have influenced the teachers’ actual classroom practices.

1.2.1 Purpose

The principal purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of language teachers perceptions with regard to reading instruction and use of reading strategies. Additionally, an examination of their classroom practices was carried out to provide insights on how teachers integrate their perceptions with classroom practice in efforts to improve students reading proficiency. Research in teachers translation of held perceptions in respect of their instructional practices in language education can help in the establishment of a reservoir of knowledge useful for teaching reading skill effectively and efficiently. Currently, that store is not available for accessibility by teachers of English in Kenya. This study found it necessary to carry out an in-depth investigation of the perceptions and practices in order to have empirical data on what and how reading strategies are taught within classroom settings. Besides, an exploration to the level to which enrichment reading forums were availed to the learner to enrich the build up in reading competence was analysed.

The overall goal of this study was to examine how language teachers perceptions are reflected in their classroom instructional practices in the context of teaching use of reading comprehension strategies in efforts to improve development of students reading proficiency. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to establish the challenges teachers face when teaching
use of reading strategies in order to come up with ways to solve them and improve reading instruction in our secondary schools in Kenya.

1.2.2 Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers’ of English perceptions about teaching reading strategies in relation to their classroom instructional practices. The study was guided by the following five objectives:

1. Investigate language teachers’ perceptions about reading instruction and use of strategies in reading.

2. Examine how teachers’ tacit perceptions about use of strategies in reading are reflected in their classroom practices.

3. Establish the factors that influence teachers’ choice of reading texts.

4. Find out the reading enrichment forums for the learners to practice use of reading strategies.

5. Find out the challenges that teachers’ face when teaching reading and use of reading strategies.

1.2.3 Research Questions

In respect of the above objectives, the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What perceptions do teachers of English hold about teaching reading and use of reading strategies?

2. How are teachers perceptions reflected in their classroom practices regarding reading instruction and use of reading strategies?

3. What influences teachers’ choice of reading texts for their English lessons?
4. What reading enrichment forums do teachers engage learners in to practice strategy use?

5. What challenges do teachers of English face when teaching use of reading strategies?

1.3 Significance of the Study

The study highlights the important role of teachers' perceptions and their responsibility of teaching reading strategies to students in general and in particular learners in Kenya secondary schools. It offers the theoretical basis of reading techniques in the classroom. Studying teachers’ perceptions about teaching reading will add value to understanding teachers' classroom acts. This will be a significant input for the design of instructional programmes that reflect the needs for teaching reading effectively.

With respect to learning, this study will provide invaluable information that can help teachers to refine and restructure students’ reflective, analytic and critical thinking which contribute to a deeper understanding of reading texts and in the process increase their proficiency in reading and comprehension. The study has educational significance as it provides English language teachers with the opportunity for instructional reflection and professional growth. It is expected that teachers of English will benefit from this study, especially in their choice and design of practice activities and tasks for teaching reading and assessing their learners’ reading proficiency, needs and interests for reading.
Findings and recommendations of the study also add to the increasing knowledge on classroom research and provides a basis for further research on other related aspects of the reading skill. Curriculum developers also benefit from such a research as they could include in the syllabus sections on how to handle reading comprehension effectively. Writers of English language course books will also see what is missing in the current texts and so make attempts to improve them.

1.4 Scope and Limitations

1.4.1 Scope

The study was therefore delimited to the following:

(i) Teaching of reading and use of reading strategies for comprehension as an attempt to achieve reading proficiency

(ii) Only 18 secondary schools in two counties: Nairobi and Kitui, participated

Thirty six (36) teachers of English who taught Form 3 at the time of study and their Form 3 classes formed the study sample.

1.4.2 Limitations

The study covered a sample of 18 selected secondary schools. Nine (9) of these were in Kitui Central sub-county, Kitui county and 9 from three sub-counties namely Kamukunji, Starehe and Makadara) in Nairobi County. From each sampled sub-county in Nairobi three schools were selected. The main focus was on teachers of English and their form three students in the sampled schools. Form three class was selected because it was assumed that their stock
of English was adequate and that the requisite skills had been taught. However, other teachers’ who do not teach English were exempted.

Moreover, the study faced the following constraints:

1. Teachers abrupt official engagements during the week which made the researcher and the teacher to reschedule the classroom observation and interview guides.

2. Limited time during data collection as the researcher also faced abrupt official engagements

1.5 Assumptions

The study was based on the following assumptions,

1. Reading proficiency is largely affected by teachers’ perceptions of reading instruction.

2. Teachers’ choice of reading materials affects reading

3. Teachers plan and describe to learners reading strategies during reading lessons and demonstrate how to use them.

4. All the teachers in the sample are trained and use a variety of reading methods.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

In this section, a theoretical framework was adopted to help build systematic theory and form a frame from which observations and inferences regarding effective instruction and use of reading strategies were based. The Schema Theory as proposed by Rumelhart (1982) was adopted to guide the study.
Moreover, Carrell, et. al. (1988b) and Conley (1992) were used for additional information in regard to reading comprehension.

It is recognized that there are other theories on reading strategy instruction, for example, Robinson–Gray model (1967), Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivist theory and the socio-cognitive perspective but Schema Theory is comprehensively applied. The proponents of this theory view use of prior knowledge as necessary. They maintain the view that reading comprehension is fostered by prior knowledge.

**The Schema Theory**

Any moment of assigning meaning to presentations of information depends on a excellently-balanced pattern between the familiar concepts in one’s mind, in other words known as prior knowledge, and the unique characteristics of the selected piece for reading. Rumelhart (1982), points out that a reader comprehends a message when one is able to bring to mind an outline that gives a good account of the objects and events in the message.

Rumelhart, (1982), Block and Pressley (2002) stated that, “Schema theory explains how knowledge is structured in memory and how these structures affect incoming information” (p. 49). Anderson, et. al. (1987) and Chou (2008) indicated that schema theory explains how people’s existing knowledge affects comprehension of incoming information. In the event in which there is need to reconstruct meaning by contrasting ideas, existing schema plays a major role in
aiding comprehension. This schema is either activated and if non-existent it is created. Moreover, Asselin (2002) counts inference-making as a way to activate schemata in terms of filling in the missing connections between the surface structure fragments of the text by recourse to content and knowledge about the world. Further, Marshall, and Rowland (2003) assert that schema theory has special relevance for teachers teaching reading in that it questions the traditional view that students should learn to reproduce the statements being read in the text.

In contrast to this orderly view of reading comprehension, schema theory stresses an interactive approach that views teaching reading comprehension as a process that involves awareness, monitoring and development of repair techniques to prevent failure in comprehension, (Pani, (2004), Smith,(1995) and Grabe,(2009)). Additionally, Pearson and Hamm (2005) point out that schema theory has the major influence on new views of reading and reading comprehension. They posit that:

...new views have forced us to rethink the act of reading. For a long time we thought reading was the reproduction of the ideas on the page; our goal was to have students produce a “photocopy” of the page. Schema theory has moved us away from a reproductive view to a constructive view. In that view, the reader, rather than the text moves to the center of the construction process (p.3).

According to schema theory, there are no definitive or final conclusions that can be reached for the text (Lowe and Lumley, (2005), Widdowson, (1983) and Thornbury, (2005). That is, this theory deals with the reading comprehension as an interactive process between reader aided by his/her prior knowledge and the
text being read. Sometimes a reader may end up with a different understanding, based on his or her total previous experiences, their richness or paucity. Therefore, a reader with a rich background will comprehend better than one who has a poorer background. In short, schema theory believes in open text or context; the interpretation is relative (McCarthy and Carter, 2004).

According to Palinscar, et al. (1984), the hallmark of schema theory with regard to reading is that a text does not by itself carry meaning. A text can only lead directions for readers, but how they ought to retrieve or build up meaning depends on the previously acquired knowledge called background knowledge. The reader brings information, knowledge, emotion and culture to the printed word. Palinscar’s strong assertion is that more information is contributed by the reader than by the print on the page. This would all point to the fact that our understanding of a text depends on how much related schema we, as readers, possess while reading. Consequently, a reader’s failure or confusion to make sense of a text is caused by their lack of relevant schema that can easily fit with the content of the text selection. By guiding learners through the pre-reading schemata activating activities, the teacher can prevent students from activating the wrong schema which leads them to wrong interpretations of the text.

Application of schema theory in teaching reading has revealed that comprehension relies significantly on readers’ successful activation of their prior knowledge (schemata). Psycholinguists conducting research on reading
also encourage teachers to help students construct more schemata in their memory to achieve better comprehension when reading.

The Schema theory provides powerful rationales for making links between students’ individual backgrounds, specific subject area knowledge, and critical thinking (Harvey and Goudvis, 2000), Hosenfield, (1999) and Grisham, (2000). According to Anderson, (2000), there are six ways in which schemata functions in thinking and in remembering text information. These six ways and which were relevant to the study point out to the fact that, 1) most new knowledge is gained by assimilating new information into existing structure; therefore, subject matter learning should be build on prior knowledge whenever possible, (2) a learners’ existing schema helps to allocate attention by focusing on what is pertinent and important in newly presented materials, (3) schema allows and directs the inferential elaboration of incoming information and experience, (4) schema allows orderly searches of memory by providing learners with a guide to the types of information that should be recalled, (5) schema facilitates the thinking skills of summarizing and editing and finally (6) Schema permits inferential reconstruction when there are gaps in memory, which means that they help the learner generate hypotheses about missing information.

Schema theory is an interactive model where readers are usually expected to go through both bottom-up and top-down processing before eventually settling upon an interpretation of a text. In other words, this interactive model involves both a collection of lower-level comprehension skills and an array of higher-
level comprehension skills. The interactive model takes into account the continuous interaction between bottom-up and top-down processing in the construction of the meaning of a text.

Schema theory is the result of the search for making out the correlation between background knowledge and comprehension. It tries to describe and help us to understand the process of cognition, and it puts heavy emphasis on the importance of the readers' background knowledge. The readers get to direct their bottom-up processing skills and top-down processing skills at the same time. This is so because efficient and effective reading entails both processes interacting simultaneously. It is, therefore, important that teachers should use a balanced approach to teaching reading involving both top-down and bottom-up processes in choosing the reading text.

From the foregoing, this theory was relevant to this study in that it helped in investigating Kenyan ESL secondary school teachers’ perceptions about reading instruction and their effects on teachers’ classroom practice in their attempts to improve learners reading proficiency. The theory was adopted as it fits adequately within the holistic and interactive view of reading, the base of this study.
1.7 Conceptual Framework

The underlying assumption of this study was that English language teachers' perceptions about teaching reading influence their classroom instructional practices and that these impact on learners' reading proficiency. This study was concerned with investigating teachers’ perceptions and practices to inform instruction. The study was, therefore, conceptualized as an examination of the variables that interact to influence the teaching of reading for comprehension and the consequent outcome.

In this framework, therefore, it was implied that the combination of teachers’ perceptions about reading instruction, their choice of reading strategies, choice of reading materials, type of instruction, knowledge of student abilities and teacher’s experience influence learners’ reading proficiency. Figure 1.1 below summarizes this information.
Figure 1.1 Conceptual framework

Figure 1.1 above shows that improved reading proficiency is the outcome of three pillars: teachers’ perceptions, teachers’ classroom actions and student characteristics. The reasoning behind this framework is that teaching is a process within which new knowledge is created and/or advanced. Alfassi (2004) notes that the blame for the failure of learners rests on poor classroom practices and not the inability of the students to learn. Wallace (1992) further notes that instruction that is not meaningful, relevant or at the readers instructional level causes failure.
From these observations, it is arguable that reading proficiency can lead to effective learning if instruction is improved and directed. Instruction of reading for comprehension is responsible for how learners’ think as they read. Reading strategies instruction includes understanding the skills that the student will use for effectively interacting with the text and the likely difficulties that students might encounter. It also includes the efforts made to overcome the challenges.

1.8 Operational Definition of terms

Ability - Power or skills to undertake, or to do something.

Basic reading skills - Lower level skills used in responding to reading material, for example, sound and word recognition and comprehension of simple facts and ideas.

Perception - A sum of a person’s general mental ideas concerning something that encompass knowledge, beliefs, opinions, understanding, preferences and views.

Competence - Used in relation to the dictionary meaning: having the skill or power to do what is needed. It is used synonymously with ability in this paper.

critical reading - The ability to apply knowledge of facts and ideas to novel situations and problem solving, to organize, interpret, analyze, synthesize and evaluate information from books and other sources. It includes logical reasoning.

Proficiency - Learner’s general ability in language, that is, learnt and attained skills in reading necessary for comprehension.

Reading - All activities that learners use in selecting, comprehending and responding to written information.
Reading process - The continuous process of related and interdependent mental and physical activities such as looking, recognizing, constructing meaning, determining a purpose for reading and relating authors words and ideas to past experiences and future goals and needs.

Reading texts - passages / materials for reading

Reading strategies - consciously selected techniques for effective construction of meaning from texts.

Strategy - A tactic or a conscious plan or a set of steps for accomplishing a task.

Schema - refers to knowledge already stored in memory that serves as a bridge in connecting old learning with new learning; it provides the mental categories and framework necessary for processing and integrating new knowledge.

1.9 Chapter Summary

It has been ascertained from the background of the study that use of reading strategies influence development of reading proficiency in students. It was also found out that prior knowledge helps in comprehending reading genres that learners encounter in their academic as well as adult lives. Further, it was noted that language teachers perceptions and reflections of these in their classroom practices play a very important role in improving learners competence in reading. From these research findings the statement of the study problem was developed and objectives for guiding the study generated. The purpose was explained and theoretical and conceptual frameworks were also discussed. In this manner, the necessity of carrying out research is outlined in this chapter.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

The review of related literature on integration of perceptions in classroom instructional practices in English language among secondary school teachers has been extensively obtained from studies outside Kenya. Related local studies are scarce. Nevertheless, attempts were made to underline notable findings in some studies carried out locally which were found to be relevant to this study.

This literature review was broken down into sub-headings and organized along the objective(s) of the study. The literature reviewed helped to form a basis for the study. It also helped to establish and show a case for the purpose and importance of the study which was to try to fill in gaps that the study had pointed out. It also guided in methodology. The related literature to the was reviewed under the following sub-headings: background to reading instruction and use of reading strategies, the reading process and reading models, reading instruction and reading strategies, integration and use of reading strategies in ESL lessons, teachers’ perceptions and classroom practices, research into teachers’ perceptions and practices and related local literature.
2.1 Background to Reading Instruction and use of Reading Strategies

Research has moved away from seeing reading as a simple skill of decoding written marks on a page to a view of reading as a complex process of information processing (Day and Bamford, 2003). Meaning is no longer something to be extracted from a text, but it is the result of each reader's interaction with the text. In other words, readers draw on their own knowledge of the subject and knowledge on how information in texts tends to be structured to construct meaning. In the light of this therefore, reading is construed as a process of sampling the text in order to confirm or revise the predictions suggested by one’s schema (Birch 2002).

Grabe (1991) argues that reading instruction is not about getting learners to behave as expert readers as quickly as possible but rather a process in which learners need first to go through a transitional phase where they are given a chance to develop automaticity in letter recognition and word identification. Only when a basic level of reading fluency is achieved is a reader’s attention free for comprehension which is the real purpose for reading. However, the question arises: why do many ESL learners struggle with reading?

In response to this question, Birch (2002: 147) argues;

..... to show progress in L2 reading, we often rush students into texts that are too difficult, without allowing them the time to acquire automaticity with English graphemes and common spelling patterns. We will rush our students if we overlook or minimize the complex task of switching from their L1 orthography to English.
According to Grabe (2000), reading is an interaction between the reader and the text. Grabe points out that reading requires efficient knowledge of word and a given topic and also an efficient knowledge of the language. As it is stated, reading requires a rich background and also some ability to comprehend the text. On the other hand, Rebecca and Singhall (2001) claim that reading is related to a language and it requires being efficient in L2.

Good or efficient reading requires that in order to comprehend a text, a reader should connect new text with past experiences in order to interpret, evaluate, synthesize and consider alternative interpretations (Presley and Afflerbach, 1995). While doing this task, students need some strategies to help them make their reading comprehension easy. This study sought to establish whether teachers of English help learners to activate or create relevant schema to connect new experience to old experience through use of appropriate reading strategies.

2.2 The Reading Process and Reading Models

2.2.1 The Reading Process

Research has demonstrated repeatedly how teachers expectations make a big difference in a student’s success or failure (Farrell, 2001). Based on this little information, some teachers assume that certain students are hopelessly weak in reading, without first, seeking a self evaluation on how best reading can be taught in the classroom. Besides, these students are rarely challenged to excel academically. For learners reading abilities to be
promoted, teachers must know as much as they can about students existing knowledge. Teachers also need to acquire a clear understanding of what students may or may not know about the reading process.

Proficient reading is interactive. Good readers combine the knowledge they already possess with information in texts and with features of the context in order to arrive at a meaning. An understanding of these factors: the reader, the text and the context and how they interact is very essential for knowing how students use reading techniques to learn and reading to communicate.

Good readers draw on resources inside them such as prior knowledge and metacognition. A student’s prior knowledge will include one’s knowledge about a topic, familiarity with the language used in a text and understanding how to think about and discuss concepts under study. A student’s prior knowledge is important in the process of teaching and learning. In writing about comprehension in reading, Pearson, et. al. (1998) argue that good teachers help students appreciate the text through their own (student) past experiences. Prior knowledge is critically an important component in all learning.

2.2.2 Reading Models

Reading is a completely individual experience which takes place in different ways such as reading newspapers, magazines, written texts, labels on medicine, and other materials. The ability to read is such a natural part of
human beings that they seldom try to define reading. However, there are still different points of view on what reading is and how it should be taught. Being aware of how vital reading is for the students, the job of language teachers is to develop and improve their ability in reading comprehension. To be able to reach this goal, language teachers should always try to make their reading lessons effective by applying the most suitable method and techniques in accordance with the theories.

In order to promote reading at any level of education, one has first to understand the reading process. There are many views of reading and depending on one’s situation, the approach adopted in developing reading skills depends on the specific view from which one is looking at it. These views are often grouped under three different reading models: the bottom - up, the top - down and the interactive model.

**The Bottom - up model**

In regard to bottom - up model, reading is viewed as “the process of interpreting meaning” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). It is conceived as the process of recognizing the printed letters and words and building up a meaning from the smallest textual units at the bottom to larger units at the top (Hall (2005), Harmer, (2001)). In this model, the reader begins with decoding the written text (the bottom) and constructs meaning from letters, words and sentences that are found within, then processes the text in a linear fashion. Clearly, the reader using this model seems to be playing a
passive role because the basis of bottom – up model is the linguistic knowledge of the reader. Additionally, it is not possible to account for the role played by prior knowledge of text topic as a variable in facilitating comprehension. These shortcomings make bottom – up model unfavourable with language educationists. However, this model is still useful for learners with limited reading comprehension.

The Top–down model

In this model reading was seen as the process in which readers move from the top, the higher level of mental stages down to the text itself. This approach emphasizes the reconstruction of meaning rather than the decoding of form, the interaction between the reader and the text rather than the graphic forms of the printed pages.

In the reading process, the reader proves his active role by bringing to the interaction his/her available knowledge of and expectations about how language works, motivation, interest and attitudes towards the content of the text. This is so because according to Paran (1996:138) “reading means reading and understanding.” Anderson (1999) supports Paran’s sentiments by pointing out that “reading is not a passive process but an active fluent process which involves the reader and the reading material in building meaning.” What Paran (1996) and Anderson (1999) put forward is that meaning of the reading material is not on the printed page only nor is only it in the head of the reader; but rather a synergy occurs in reading which is the
combination of the words on the printed page with the reader’s background knowledge and experiences.

Apparently the strong points of top-down models out-number those of bottom-up as the reader, who is the centre of the reading process, proves his active role. This model would not work for beginners who should start by recognizing sounds of letters. However, for some researchers, these models still reveal some shortcomings. Stanovich, (1988) and Eskey, (1988) stated that these models deemphasize the perceptual and decoding dimension of the reading process.

**The Interactive model**

Due to the limitations of the above models, a new and more insightful reading process, the interactive model has been proposed. In the interactive approach, Grabe, (1991) and Hayes, (1991) argue that reading comprehension is a combination of different processes that are thought to be responsible for providing information that is shared with other processes. The information obtained from each type of processing is combined to determine the most appropriate interpretation of the selected reading.

In academic contexts reading is the most important skill in English as a Second Language (SL). Borg, (2006) and Smith, (1982) observe that reading is a highly active and selective process for searching meaning. It is not possible that good readers have time to read all the words and do so at a
reasonably good speed, it makes sense that good readers use knowledge that they bring to the reading and read by predicting information, sampling the text and confirming the prediction. This makes the sense that the reader contributes more than the written words on the page.

Examined within a contemporary perspective interactive reading involves the reader, the text and the context, (Beard, 1988, Flower, 1989, Hayes, 1991, and Bloody, 2001). Reading is about people, intentions, reactions or events accompanied by thinking in the context of that print; thinking which may not only reactive and meaning-taking but also creative and meaning-making. To sum up, the popularity of interactive models show that interactive models can maximize the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of both bottom-up and top-down models.

Research has demonstrated repeatedly how a teacher’s expectations make a big difference in a student’s success or failure (Brophy, 1985). It is likely that, some teachers assume that certain students are hopelessly weak in reading, without first doing a self-evaluation on their instructional practices regarding teaching of reading in the classroom. However, these students are rarely challenged to excel academically. For learners reading abilities to be promoted, teachers must know as much as they can about student existing knowledge. Teachers need also to acquire a clear understanding of what students may or may not know about the reading process through learner analysis.
Proficient reading is interactive as good readers combine knowledge they already possess with information in texts and with features of the context in order to arrive at a meaning. An understanding of these factors – the reader, the text, and the context—and how they interact is very essential for knowing how students use reading strategies to learn and reading to communicate. Good readers draw on resources inside them such as prior knowledge and metacognition. A student’s prior knowledge will include one’s knowledge about a topic, familiarity with the language used in a text and understanding of how to think about and discuss concepts under study. A student’s prior knowledge is important in the process of teaching and learning.

In writing about comprehension in reading, Pani, (2004) argues that good teachers help students appreciate the text through their own past experiences. Prior knowledge is critically an important component in all learning in general and reading in particular. This view informed the study in that it is the teachers’ instructional actions during reading lessons in class that guide the learner into constructing meaning in what they read.

2.2.3 Reading Culture

Konrad, (2008:78) pointed out that schools actively contribute to the decline of reading. Specifically, Konrad contends that the standard of instructional practices used in most schools are killing reading through a number of ways; through valuing the development of test-takers over the development
of life-long readers, mandating breadth over depth in instruction, requiring students to read difficult texts without proper instructional support, insisting that students focus solely on academic texts/set books, drowning great books with sticky and shallow notes, ignoring the importance of developing recreational reading, losing sight of authentic instruction in the shadow of political pressures. Therefore, one may argue that, for many students reading is just another pressure--packed opportunity to be assessed. Essentially, this means we are preparing a nation of non-readers in a world where reading is the key to continued success.

In support of Konrad, (2008) findings, Ismail, (2005) points out that there are specific indirect actions that teachers unconsciously engage learners in and which kill reading in the classrooms. Ismael points out that there is a tendency to overteach set books in an attempt to ensure that every learner is on the same level which is an impossible intellectual reality that prevents learners from finding the flow that defines our best readers. This kills the motivation of learners to form productive reading habits.

Besides, on the argument of a declining reading culture Birch, (2002), Grabe, (1991) posit that students might enjoy greatly while playing video games, listening to music or watching a movie. However, there is not a whole lot of mental exhaustion and fun happening when the teacher asks the students to read books for knowledge and information. Asselin, (2002) argues that when teachers overteach the syllabus content, it might help the
learners pass their examinations, but several issues arise here: will this approach make our students avid readers? Will it prepare them for life beyond examinations? Should our students be spending all their time cramming the novel? Or would their time be better spent developing reading flow, the kind of reading behaviour we want them to adopt after graduation? Should they focus solely on the book or use it as a springboard to understand the world they are about to inherit? Adams, (2002) findings corroborate Konrad (2008) and Asselin, (2002) views by pointing out that teachers spend the bulk of instructional time, resources and energy producing good test-takers who leave school not only ignorant but also hating reading. Adams, (2002) further adds that we teach students to flog literature instead of giving them reading strategies to enjoy reading experiences.

The pressure to perform well, when performance is solely defined by measurable scores on end of KCSE examinations, has ruined reading for many students and this is a reality (Gallagher, 2007). Adams further maintains that teachers teaching reading must take action to rescue and encourage the reading culture of learners today. Adams (2002) further points out that this position begins with responsible instructional practices that balance the need for guided teaching with extensive opportunities for individual exploration and practice.
Learners, asserts Lyon, (2006), should spend at least 50% of their school based language time engaging with self-selected texts. The remaining 50% of the time should be filled with carefully selected and structured learning experiences. Gallagher, (2007) noted that most students detest and resent their English lessons. He found out that, the reason for this was the accumulated result of the pure artificiality of how reading and literature were taught combined with a few instances of under-teaching.

Considering that education is a life-long phenomenon, distortion or misdirection of reading under whatever guise or circumstance robs our students of great opportunities inherent in human potentialities. This distortion or misdirection of education objective, especially in Kenya today, implies in reality, a negation of the process of developing the best of individuals for the collective well-being of society. This study investigated the perceptions that teachers hold and established how they are integrated in their practices in teaching reading comprehension strategies to Form 3 students.

2.3 Reading and use of Reading Strategies Instruction

The teaching of second language reading around the world includes approaches such as grammar-translation, comprehension questions, skills and strategies and extensive reading (Wassman and Rinsky, 1997, Bamford and Day, 1998). These findings point out that in grammar-translation approach, students are taught to read texts in the target language and
translate them into a native language. Teachers who use this method help students to only see meaning at the sentence level and less attention is paid to the meaning of the whole text. Comprehension questioning approach focuses on teaching using short passages that demonstrate second language points of grammar.

These texts are structured purposely to encourage students to read and are followed by comprehension questions and exercises. To teach use of reading strategies, the teacher has to prepare students to read a one or two-page passages from a textbook by providing or activating any background knowledge related to the subject which is needed for comprehension. This preparation includes pre-teaching vocabulary that appears in the reading passage. Learners then read the passage silently while keeping in mind two or three while-reading questions. Language teachers’ instruction to extensive reading is meant to encourage students to become willing and competent readers in a second or even a foreign language. Students individually read books and other materials at their own speed mainly for homework or pleasure. These findings are relevant to this study in making a clarification as to whether teachers teach learners what reading strategies and how they are used to facilitate comprehension.
2.3.1 Importance and Necessity of Reading Strategies in the Learning Process

Knowledge of strategies is important because if one is conscious of the processes underlying the learning that s/he is involved in, then the learning will be more effective. This arises from the fact that reading is central to learning in school, in the work place and in our everyday life. How well learners learn to read sets the foundation for their future success.

The specific purpose for reading is to construct meaning from a written text. Without comprehension, reading is a frustrating, pointless exercise in word calling. Learners who are taught reading strategies are more highly motivated than those who are not. It is no exaggeration to say that how well students develop the ability to comprehend what they read has a profound effect on their entire lives.

As students move up through the academic grades, the academic demands on them increase and a great many of those demands come in the form of reading. Reading for comprehension is the essence of the reading process. Smith (1995) asserts that reading and learning is one and the same process – and that this process is one in which new experiences are associated with what one already knows or believes. The reader comprehends by relating the unfamiliar to the already known. However, not all learners automatically know which strategies work best for them. For example, students taught through a text-book driven approach tend to have difficulty
understanding concepts. Adopting this approach, used by many high school teachers, would result in failure of students to understand variables, perform proportional thinking, recognize knowledge gaps, distinguish between observations and inferences, reason hypothetically, and attain Metacognitive awareness (Ismael, 2005).

For this reason, explicit strategy training, coupled with thinking about how one goes about learning and experimenting with different reading strategies, can lead to more effective construction of meaning. This is more necessary because many high school learners need to comprehend the demanding and required English material used in the secondary school. This study sought to investigate language teachers views and practices in regard to reading instruction and use of reading strategies and to establish the challenges that teachers face when teaching reading and reading strategies.

2.3.2 The Need for Instruction on use of Reading Strategies

Reading is a complex skill that requires a teacher to have a deep understanding of content and well co-ordinated instructional practices. The ability to comprehend written text is one of the most complex but critical tasks students must perform every day. Therefore, students at all grade levels need both breadth and depth in reading experiences. Instruction on why, how and when to use reading strategies will, therefore, enable students become successful readers, thinkers and communicators about what they read.
The meaning of any written text is derived from the integration of information contained in the text with the readers’ prior knowledge (Kintsch, 1998). However, comprehension can fail at any stage of the reading process. That is, it is possible that many people can adequately decode but are poor at understanding the gist.

Pressley, (2000), points out that in such cases it would be useful that English language teachers’ teach reading comprehension strategies and guide students when reading so as to help them comprehend a text selection. Oxford, (1990: 12) argues that strategies are important for two main reasons. In the first place, strategies “…are tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative competence.” Secondly, learners who have developed and internalized appropriate reading strategies have greater self-confidence and learn more effectively. Both of these points expand the role of the teacher as a facilitator in the learning process.

In this light, reading comprehension strategies are seen as comprehension techniques that enable readers to construct meaning from the printed page most effectively. In other words, those strategies show how readers tackle a reading task, how they interpret their reading and what they do not comprehend (Anderson 1999, Almasi 2003, Brantmeier 2002, Sugirin 1999). Besides, reading strategies can consist of evaluating content, such as agreeing or disagreeing, making an association with prior knowledge or
experience, asking and answering questions, looking at the key words, using sentence structure analysis such as determining the subject, verb or object of the sentence, skimming and rereading. However, not all strategies are of equal effectiveness due to the different types of reading texts and tasks, and reading strategy use by each reader.

2.3.3 The Necessity for Development of Reading Strategies

One of the most valuable skills to develop as a result of learning a second language (L2) is learning to read proficiently in the L2. However, many Foreign Language (FL) educators agree that it appears to be one of the most elusively taught skill in the L2 classroom. Moreover, Breen, et al. (2001) described the practice of reading in L2 classrooms as consisting primarily of,

…..simplified, structurally graded texts, using controlled vocabulary, constructed specifically for classroom instructors. Students engage in word-by-word decoding and translation, followed by comprehension questions—who, what, when, where and how. Such decoding developed and practiced in elementary language courses often becomes the only strategy with which the learner approaches an L2 text, (p.26).

(2004:195) aggressively points out, “it behooves us to begin to teach reading strategies actively and not assume that it will just happen.” Additionally, Pressley (2000) points out that reading may need to be developed via overt training in reading strategies which focus on comprehension processes. Pressley (ibid) contends that teachers need to realize that their job as L2 teachers is to encourage students to discover textual messages and not to identify what the teacher or test writer thinks the text is about.

From these views, a well intended reading instruction should motivate learners to preview a text, predict, guess from context, summarize, clarify, criticize, paraphrase, making inferences, discuss issues raised and ask questions for sections of the text. The summarizing strategy in reading is seen as effective strategy for evaluating learners’ comprehension, (Pressley, 2006). The implication is that learners will develop as interested readers on their own if the teacher gives them explicit mental tools for unpacking a text. Comprehension through discussion involves lessons that are “instructional conversations” that create higher level thinking opportunities for learners. Discussions usually promote critical and aesthetic thinking about text and encourage full class involvement.

Strategy instruction involves teaching students about strategies, teaching them how and when to use them, helping students identify personally effective strategies, and encouraging them to make strategic behaviors part
of their learning schema. When precise strategy instruction is provided, students are equipped with the ability to generate ideas. One important approach to strategy use in reading is activation and use of prior knowledge. Presumably, it can be argued that all knowledge results from questions—which is another way of saying that asking questions is our most important intellectual tool for discovering information along a certain continuum.

According to Grabe, (1988) reading is a complex and active process of constructing meaning – but not merely skill application. Grabe posits that the act of constructing meaning is interactive, that is, it involves not just the reader but also the text and the context in which reading takes place, it is strategic—readers have purposes for their reading and use a variety of strategies as they construct meaning and it is also adaptive in that readers change the strategies they use as they read different kinds of texts or as they read for different purposes. Reading, therefore, requires a rich background, and also some ability to comprehend the text.

Efficient reading requires that, in order to comprehend a text, a reader should connect new text with past experiences, that is, background knowledge, interpret, evaluate, synthesize and consider alternative interpretations (Pressley and Afflerbach, 1995, Lowe, et al., 2005). While doing these tasks, students need some strategies to help them make their reading easy and a pleasurable activity.
This study concerned itself with reading instruction and specifically teaching the use of reading strategies. To teach reading strategies effectively, the language teacher has to consider some issues to execute the lesson diligently; that the teacher should anticipate learners’ needs, that self-direction need to be determined by the learner, that strategies should be taught in a meaningful context but not in isolation, that strategies are learner-centred rather than teacher-centred, that activities should be purposeful, interactive and independent and that continual practice is necessary for evaluation of what is needed. This makes knowledge and use of reading strategies very necessary. When a student consciously chooses strategies that fit his/her reading task, the strategies become a useful toolkit for active, conscious and purposeful self-regulation for effective reading. Therefore, teaching the use of reading strategies is useful if learners are to achieve reading proficiency with maximum comprehension and enjoyment.

In support of the necessity to teach reading strategies, Lowe, et. Al. (2005:127) point out that, for students to read well, one must be taught how to effectively interact with the text at hand. This training helps in search for connections between what they know and what is new information in the text selection. Additionally, it would help them fix faulty comprehension when they know it has occurred as well as decide on the important from less important information in the text. Then finally, search for connections within text and across text by using prior knowledge to help integrate information and understanding. The process of seeking for understanding
involves learners ability to question themselves, the author, and the text as they read, and then respond to text both orally and in written forms.

In Kenya, there is need for improving reading comprehension among students in secondary classes so that deteriorating performance of English language is addressed and students cultivate a desire for lifelong reading in school and later in their profession.

2.4 Integrating Use of Reading Strategies in ESL Lessons

Reading strategies are used by learners to complete reading activities presented in language lessons. Recognizing that there is a reading task to complete, a language learner will use whatever strategies they possess to attend to the reading activity (Cohen, 1989, Johnson, 1999). One way to direct learners towards efficient use of reading strategies is to integrate strategy use into regular language lessons.

Besides, in support of integration of strategy use during language lessons Grunewald, (1999) argues that strategy use in ESL classrooms is an “instructional paradigm” that should be integrated in every teacher’s language teaching pedagogy. In view of the above, this study was organized by addressing one key question; “is reading instruction and reading strategy use a common practice during English lessons?
The underlying assumption in exposing learners to strategy use is, if students explore how, when and why to use reading strategies, and evaluate and monitor their own reading (Cohen, 1989, Gardner and Miller, 1999). When learners become competent, they begin to take a more active role in language learning, thereby becoming proficient readers. To help students learn better, McDonough, (1999) points out that teaching agenda should have to focus systematically on raising students’ awareness of the benefits of using reading strategies, to highlight the relationship between strategy use and reading competence, and to methodically increase students existing repertoire of reading strategies. This study sought to establish whether or not English language teachers integrated reading strategies in ESL reading lessons with a view to improving learners’ reading proficiency. The study was also to survey the extensive reading activities that teachers initiate in order to give the ESL learners more practice in use of the strategies for comprehension.

2.5 Teachers’ perceptions and classroom practices

2.5.1 Teachers’ perceptions

People use the word ‘perception’ in a variety of ways. Perceptions are often known as a person’s beliefs, attitudes, values systems, opinions or conceptions. In an effort to define perceptions, Parajes, (1992:14) puts it thus:
“…defining perceptions is at best a game of player’s choice. They travel in disguise and often under alias – attitudes, value systems, judgements, ideology, conceptions, preconceptions, beliefs, personal theories, practical principles, repertoires of knowledge, rules of practice to name but a few that can be found in the literature.”

Perceptions affect not only how people behave but also what they perceive (or pay attention to) in their environment. Contrary to the old saying “seeing is believing,” it is more likely that “believing is seeing.” When people are convinced something is true, they perceive information supporting that conviction. However, values held as true alter expectations. People perceive what they expect to perceive, (Tara, 1996). Value systems organize and guide the decisions and actions of teachers (Parajes, 1992, Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding, & Cuthbert, 1988).

These systems serve as a contextual filter (Kinzer, 1988), or intuitive screen (Goodman, 1988) through which teacher’s processing information from their experience in the classroom, make sense of them, and modify or adapt subsequent actions (Parajes, 1992) as they implement instruction. Yamashita (2004) observes that most working people have to make use of their repertoire of knowledge in English mostly for reading at their current jobs. Therefore, knowing how to read effectively in the target language, though not an easy task certainly represents an opportunity for ESL learners’ to learn and use the language realistically.
In order to read effectively in a second language (L2), students need the guidance of their teachers. In fact, Nuttal, (1996) pointed out that there is plenty of work for the language teacher to do; for instance, one could make use of appropriate texts and activities that focus the learners’ attention on the text itself. She also stressed the fact that learners should be given the techniques so that reading becomes accessible. Thus the teacher’s job signifies providing learners with the applicable mental tools in their potential reading situations in and out of L2 classrooms. The teacher needs to be a reading guide in the learners’ process of becoming thriving independent readers.

Despite the fact that students need guidance in L2 reading, Hall, (2005) points out that students are often left alone in the reading process due to teachers’ avoidance of reading. Even when there is some teaching of reading activity in class, Koda, (2005) observed that it does not take more than 10 minutes. It is very brief and never occurs as the main focus. Koda further points out that textbooks are predominantly used and stated that information was the focus of reading. Both Hall (2005) and Koda, (2005) in their separate researches on reading found that there was absence of planning for reading instruction and strategy use. Hence reading was inhibited by not spending quality time on the skill.

Studies on reading enrichment forums in schools show a number of short-comings. Jackson, (1989) examined the question as to whether high school
teachers in USA were teaching reading. Citing an earlier study by Dunn, (2000) which was carried out in Southern Illinois, Jackson concluded that very few teachers were actually teaching reading skills. He observed that only 15% of the 397 teachers in the study had few reading enrichment activities and no planned specific reading strategies. Gardner, (1986: 186) made an assessment of secondary school reading enrichment forums and noted that:

"...where reading activities outside the class work are in effect, the majority of them are narrow in scope, rigidly administered, and quite limiting as to the amount of knowledge learners acquired."

On a similar observation, Harste and Burke (1991) in discussing the theory and practice of teaching English cites improver emphasis on particular reading skills as one of the major factors causing poor reading achievement in schools. Yamashita (2004) found that teaching reading in the content area was important but points out that language teachers argue that the learners lacked reading skills. Besides, they are lazy and also blamed it on other teachers who give notes in their subjects. Teachers also argued that learners lacked interest in reading. This meant that there is a variety of teachers ‘opinions and perceptions along with reading practices in ESL classroom that need investigation. This study purposed to identify and analyze ESL teachers’ perceptions regarding reading instruction. The study assumed the view that teachers’ perceptions greatly influence their teaching approach/methodology."
2.5.2 The role of teachers’ perceptions in teaching reading

As a matter of fact, the way teachers’ think about, understand, and value instruction influences their practice. According to Johnson (1994:139), research on teachers perceptions consist of three basic assumptions: that, (1) teachers’ perceptions influence their decisions and judgment, (2) teachers’ perceptions play a role on how information on teaching is translated into classroom practices, (3) understanding teachers’ perceptions is essential to improving teaching practices and other education practices. Since teachers’ are the critical factor in the implementation of appropriate instructional methods, their values, attitudes, and perceptions about classroom practices are important. Classroom practices are based on a logical system of opinions, however, past research on teacher practices in regard to strategy use in reading has given little attention on the thoughts and perceptions teachers hold about their practice (Erickson, 1986, Garner, 1987).

Since teachers’ perceptions are central to the instructional strategies they implement, these perceptions become one of foremost important factors in driving their actions in class and contributing to the effectiveness of teaching and learning (Johnson, (1999); Grisham, (2000); Garner, (1997). It is important, therefore, to have an understanding of teachers belief systems, in order to identify and understand the variables that mediate the difference between teachers’ thinking and practices (Abelson, 1979, Garner, 1997).
2.5.3 The role of teachers’ perceptions in teaching use of reading strategies

The relationship between teachers’ perceptions and their classroom practices is that the teachers’ actions can cause students to learn. Teacher perceptions are related to students’ learning through something that the teacher does in the classroom. According to Borg (2006), teachers’ decisions in teaching are influenced by a set of complex and conflicting cognitions about language, learning in general, L2 learning and learners current behaviour, attitudes towards the language and their motivation to read. Figure 2.1 below presents the relationship between teachers’ perceptions and other factors involved.

Figure 2.1: The relationship between teachers’ conceptions and classroom practice
Figure 2.1 represents a schematic conceptualization of teaching within which teacher cognition plays an essential role. Teacher cognition includes their beliefs, knowledge, theories, attitudes, images and has a close relationship with teacher learning (both schooling and professional education) and classroom practice.

Undeniably, it is clear that teacher cognition and practice are mutually informing with contextual factors playing an important role in determining the extent to which teachers are able to implement classroom instruction congruent with their beliefs.

2.6 Research into teachers’ perceptions and practices in Reading Instruction.

The impact of teacher cognition in terms of reading strategies has been recognized significantly by many educational researchers. Grenfell and Harris, (1999) collected the qualitative data from a local evaluative study about teachers’ beliefs about reading and reading instruction. The participants in his study were teachers from primary school to middle school level. He found out some concerns of elementary teachers. These elementary teachers in his study believed that they should emphasize decoding within the context of a story. In middle school level, the teachers believed that good readers had many different strategies and were able to monitor their own comprehension, and no single approach works for everyone so students should be able to respond personally and critically and make connections with a variety of texts.
Lowe, et al. (2005) carried out a study on reading problems and strategies from teachers’ perspective. Their study aimed to find out what one experienced teacher thought were the main reading problems among her learners and how she helped them cope with their reading problems. It was an initial study to find out whether the in-service teacher was aware of the types of reading strategies one could use to resolve her learners’ reading problems and the reasons why she employed certain approaches and strategies to tackle the problems she had identified. Liang, et al. also point out that there appeared to be a link between one’s background (both academic and social) and the strategies employed to teach and handle reading in the classroom. This study was based on one case study and it was far-fetched to make any generalization about reading problems and associated strategies for other teachers. Nevertheless the initial findings might still be useful for both teacher trainers and curriculum designers in order to provide the potential of teacher training for ESL in institutions of higher learning.

Richards, et al. (1997) studied the relationship between teachers perceptions and practices in reading instruction. The study, dealt with teachers teaching grade 8, 9 and 10. They used a beliefs interview guide. Predictions about teaching practices were made from the beliefs interview of 36 teachers and were related to practices observed in their classrooms. The study demonstrated that in most cases, the beliefs of teachers in this sample related to their classroom practices in the teaching of reading comprehension.
However, this study explored a situation in which the teachers’ perceptions did not relate to their practices. They also suggested that the teacher was in the process of changing perceptions and practices, but that the change in beliefs were preceding changes in practices. Anderson (1999) exchanged anecdotes of personal life experiences that had influenced his thinking about teaching, learning and reading in a L2. Additionally, his teacher-colleagues and their students explained their experiences, attitudes and beliefs about teaching reading to learners in academic focus programmes.

This study provides us the opportunities to explore our own beliefs through reflecting, experimenting and learners’ responses to the teaching strategies offered. Anderson outlined the theoretical underpinnings of teaching strategy use in reading and its importance in a reading programmes for L2 learners. He added a treasure trove of teaching suggestions and activities for each of recommended strategies. These were detailed guidelines for teaching sequences that scaffold learners’ development of effective reading skills and strategies for both academic and professional life.

The teacher instructed learners quite explicitly on the purpose and value of the reading strategy, supported learners as they applied it and helped them to evaluate its effectiveness for themselves. Anderson’s teacher-colleagues commented candidly on the effectiveness of these reading strategies for their own learners.
In Kenya, some research on reading comprehension has been done. However, research on reading instruction and strategy use has been minimal and ESL teachers may not be aware of the findings that could be useful in the teaching of reading comprehension in the L2 classroom. In this section, a review of related studies, which would provide guidelines and inform this study, was presented.

Obuya-Deya (1980) did a research to find out the appropriateness of reading comprehension passages through analysis of content and genres of these passages. The study specifically sought to find out whether there was a relationship between certificate of primary education (CPE) English comprehension examinations and classroom English comprehension testing practices. The study established that CPE English passages were not related to the expected readability level of standard 7 pupils. He also observed that the passages used were inappropriate. He recommended testing of constructions and remedial action. While Obuya-Deya’s research focused on comprehension in English in general, and addressed the primary school pupil; this study will focus on the secondary school teachers of English conceptions and practices on teaching reading comprehension.

Karanga (1984) carried out a research on the problem of teaching oral English in Form 1 classes in Kenya and found out that the syllabus of oral English was vague and that there was lack of a national standard of English pronunciation in Kenya which would act as a guide. Karanga researched on the speaking skill.
the current study looked into reading skill and especially the micro-skills. More specifically, the study investigated how conceptions that teachers of English have influence their classroom practices. Wegesa’s (1985) study on teachers’ attitudes on teaching English found out that teachers were aware of the importance of teaching reading comprehension but attributed poor performance to students’ low motivation and lack of co-operation from other subject teachers.

This study looks at language teacher’s preparedness and commitment to teaching reading and strategy use in reading which would enhance comprehension and cultivate a life-long passion/habit for reading. Omollo (1990) investigated the techniques and problems in integrating English language and literature in secondary schools. It was found out that teachers’ still relied heavily on teacher-centred techniques for teaching. The teachers attitudes towards the integrated English syllabus was not accommodated well as majority of them were still teaching according to the old syllabus. Teachers complained of a lack of time as the syllabus was over-loaded. In a similar study, Namach (1990) investigated the factors that affected the implementation of the 8.4.4 syllabus in secondary schools. He found out that teachers of English were not adequately prepared to teach the new integrated programme. It was also found that textbooks used in class were shallow and teachers had to look for other books to teach effectively. Omollo’s and Namach’s studies are in many ways related to the current study in that the study investigated the
strategies teachers use in the teaching of the reading skill to enhance learners competence.

Kirigia (1991) assessed English reading comprehension of pupils completing primary education. The study revealed that the pupils in the lower half of the score grade in a reading test he gave to standard 8, found it difficult to understand general statements when used in particular contexts. Although Kirigia’s study focused on reading comprehension generally, the results inform this study in that they show learners’ lack understanding of general statements when used in particular contexts and therefore this inhibits reading comprehension.

Similarly, Mogaka’s (2001) study aimed at determining classroom interaction patterns in English language classrooms and to identify which teaching techniques encouraged learner participation. He found that teachers dominated classroom interaction with teaching methods like lecturing and question and answer. This left no room for students’ resourcefulness, creativity and innovativeness. Mogaka recommended for in-service teacher training to equip English language teachers with appropriate teaching techniques.

The findings of these studies help shed light on the current study regarding the nature of classroom interaction in Kenya secondary schools and the possible implications of teachers’ practices and strategy instruction in reading. Although the studies focused on verbal interaction, their findings are significant
considering that teachers’ perceptions determine the method to use for instruction.

Otieno’s, (1996) study aimed at examining whether teachers questions during English lessons promoted oral language learning by giving students a lot of opportunities to express themselves in the language. He found out that teachers asked more closed-ended questions where learners cannot use language expressively. He recommended that teachers of English should skillfully use questions in the classroom to provide learners with the much needed oral practice opportunities. The findings regarding use of questions in learning and production are useful in informing on the importance of questioning; before-reading, during-reading and post-reading phases.

Glewwe (2002) carried out a study on learners’ ability in understanding written instructions and found that most learners leave primary school before having acquired a language competence. Glewwe’s study sheds light on this study in that the reading inadequacies experienced by the secondary school learners may be an extension of the primary school challenges.

On another note, Muthwii, (2002) did a study to examine the extent to which language policies and concomitant practices on language of instruction (LOI) encouraged or hindered acquisition of desirable learning competencies. One of the findings was that many standard 6 pupils, mostly those in rural areas experienced problems in communicating; they were unable to express their
ideas well in English and participation was minimal. However, pupils pointed out that the teacher talked too fast and they were not able to cope with the speed. This study revealed that learners had problems in listening.

Ndethiu, (2007) carried out a research on reading habits of undergraduate university students. It was found that reading habits were poor. Students read lecture notes to pass their examinations and did not read beyond the term papers given as assignments. The lecturers, too, did not give orchestrated opportunities to encourage reading for life and not for passing examinations only. One question implores here: “what happens such that even university students are not interested in forming life-long habits of reading?” The above finding informs the current study in that the study attempts to examine how reading is taught in the secondary school classroom. In doing so it attempts to investigate whether teachers perceptions on reading instruction and strategy use match their classroom practices.

Nganyi, (2006) carried out a research on reading culture in a sample of East Africa secondary schools and found that it was poor. He established that students do not like reading even with the provision of reading materials. He recommended that teaching reading should start at basic grades right through secondary, if the reading culture is to be established effectively.

Gathumbi in Groenewegen, (2008) carried out a research which sought to determine the competence in reading of the primary school learners. This was
done using a criterion referenced test (CRT) on class 3 and 6 pupils across the country. The study established that many primary class 6 pupils had not attained basic reading abilities. The findings of this study are very important to the current study in that, after these learners take their Kenya Certificate of Primary Examination (KCPE), they go to secondary school where a command in reading competence helps them do better in all the subjects in the curriculum. It was, therefore, deemed necessary to examine the factors that promote and/or hinder their achievement of reading proficiency from the teacher’s perspective.

Inyega, et al. (2007) did a research on reading competence of the primary classes 4--6. The research sought to establish the teaching of reading as a skill. The findings showed that, teaching was tailored toward passing examinations and this has been the trend since independence. The learner was therefore left with the knowledge that reading should be done for the sake of passing examinations. This perception leaves the learner devoid of the ability to form good reading habits and consequently, a reading culture. Although Inyega’s et. al. study focused on the primary school learner, this study looked at how reading is taught at the secondary school level.

From the above researches, it is clear that learners at both primary and secondary schools have reading problems. It is also evident that teaching methods are mainly teacher – centred and classroom interaction is teacher dominated. It is apparent that much of the research attention has been paid to the primary school learner and not the secondary school. Moreover, little
research, if any, on the teaching of reading and specifically training on use of reading strategies has been done in Kenya, and yet reading competence is very important for educational success.

Overall, there have been a number of studies into teachers’ practices about reading as shown in this chapter. However, there is scarcity of research into teachers’ perceptions about teaching use of strategies in reading at a time when performance of English at national level is falling. This is the gap that this study tried to bridge. This study intends to provide valuable data on reading instruction and strategy instruction in Kenyan ESL classrooms.

2.7 Chapter summary

This chapter highlighted the importance of reading instruction and reading strategies in achievement of reading proficiency. The study shows that reading instruction can significantly benefit the secondary school learner and, therefore, there is need for language teachers to incorporate their perceptions into classroom practices. The reading culture in Kenya is wanting. Some investigation into teaching methods in relation to what the teachers treasure as workable under given classroom conditions and in corroboration with current generation of learners whose interests, priorities and value systems have changed was necessary.

Teaching of reading needs to be explicitly, directly and comprehensibly taught in the Kenya secondary school classroom. Some researches done in Kenya have
been on teaching of reading, specifically on the ability to decode print well. From the many researches done, none has addressed use of strategies in reading vis a vis teachers knowledge and experience on how to do it. This is the gap that this study set out to fill.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter outlines and discusses the procedures and the methodology that was used in the study. It focuses on the study design, study variables, the study area, the target population, sample size and sampling procedures. The chapter also describes research instruments, piloting procedure, reliability and validity of the instruments and data collection procedure and analysis. Ethical and logistical considerations are highlighted.

The respondents in this study were 36 teachers of English and 810 form 3 students from sampled secondary schools in Kenya. These teachers and students were drawn from schools on the basis of the category and type of the school. All the teachers were full time classroom language teachers who had been fully prepared for teaching the subject at higher institutions of learning and had also been exposed to courses in instructional methods and subject methods.

3.1 Research Design

According to Lokesh (1997), choice of research design depends on the research problem to be investigated. Each design would be appropriate for certain sources of data from which valid and reliable information may be obtained and effectively used. This study utilized a descriptive survey research design.
Descriptive research was used to obtain information concerning the teaching of strategies in reading. It was also used to describe what existed with respect to variables in the study (Kombo and Tromp 2006). The subjects in this study were observed in a completely natural and unchanged natural environment. The design helped in collecting a complete and possibly accurate data from the research subjects which was used for the detailed analysis and which led to the important recommendations that were made.

Data collection was guided by the objectives of the study. The research was supplemented by views of qualitative data in the form of selected respondents’ opinions and comments on the various themes the study had raised. It also used descriptive statistical methods to analyse and present quantitative data.

The study used qualitative method because it involves analysis and presentation of data in forms of descriptive nature (data obtained are expressed in words). For qualitative data, the researcher used classroom observation, semi-structured interviews for teachers and focus group discussions with students. Quantitative method of data collection was employed because it used descriptive statistical methods to present and analyse data in frequencies and percentages. For quantitative data, the researcher used structured and open ended questionnaire with language teachers the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection helped to determine the extent to which teachers’ perceptions were reflected in their classroom practices.
3.2 Study Variables

A variable is explained as a concept that varies in amount or kind, (Nachmias and Nachmias, (1990), and Bouma and Atkinson, (1995)). Nachmias and Nachmias further state that the variable that the variable expected to explain change in the dependent variable is the independent variable. In this study, the independent variables include the teachers’ perceptions which act as a prerequisite to guide their choice of classroom instructional practices. According to Johnson (1992), perceptions are said to guide one’s thoughts and consequent actions. Teachers’ perceptions have a filtering effect on everything that they think about, say and do in classrooms.

Learner’s achievement of reading proficiency formed the dependent variable, the expected output being efficient reading proficiency. Learners’ attitudes, working knowledge and their varied levels of reading abilities were aspects of interest since these aspects can be changed when reading instruction is given.

3.3 Location of the study

The study was carried out in two counties in Kenya: Kitui and Nairobi. Kitui county, located in lower eastern Kenya consisted of two categories of secondary schools: provincial (now county schools) and district (now sub-county) schools. There were no national secondary schools in Kitui by 2012. Nairobi County has two categories of schools: national and county schools. There were no sub-county secondary schools in Nairobi.
By 2012, Nairobi County had nine (9) districts (now sub-counties) and Kitui had also nine districts also. From these two counties, four sub-counties were sampled conveniently for ease of classroom observation and learners’ FGD meetings. These were Kitui central sub-county in Kitui, and Makadara, Starehe and Kamukunji sub-counties in Nairobi. The locales were chosen because the researcher wanted to include all the categories of public secondary schools in the study: national, county and sub-county schools. The secondary schools formed the data collection points.

This being a survey, the aim of covering all the three categories of secondary schools was to obtain information that would be inclusive to elicit the actual classroom experiences. This was so because each category of learning institutions had learners with different entry behaviour and this was thought of as a factor likely to influence the way teachers conduct teaching.

### 3.4 Target Population

The target population consisted of the teachers of English in the public secondary schools in Kenya. This study focused on secondary schools in Nairobi and Kitui counties. According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), target population refers to the population from which a sample is taken. At the time of study, Nairobi County which is a cosmopolitan urban setting had 67 public secondary schools; seven (7) were national and the other 60 were now county schools. Kitui that has a rural setting had 164 public county secondary schools; Twenty two (22) county and 142 sub-county schools.
The study targeted the teachers who have gone through the teacher education programmes in higher institutions of learning and those who teach English using the 8.4.4 secondary school curriculum. The sample also included Form 3 learners who were being taught by the sampled teachers.

In Nairobi there were 89 teachers of English in the 28 public secondary schools from the three sub-counties: Makadara, Kamukunji and Starehe. In Kitui Central sub-county, there were 67 teachers of English in the 26 public secondary schools. Classes that participated were only Form 3’s with two or more streams and whose teachers practised vertical teaching. Therefore, the primary target population was 156 teachers in 54 public secondary schools in Nairobi and Kitui. Teachers and learners in these four districts provided viable study data.

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample size

3.5.1 Sampling Techniques

To get the school sample, stratified sampling was used. Each school was assigned to one category (national, county or sub-county school) and one type (boys, girls or mixed school). It was advantageous to sample each sub-group or stratum independently. This enabled mutual exclusiveness of every element in the population being assigned to only one stratum and it was also collectively exhaustive, that is, every population element was included. Then systematic sampling was applied within each stratum. Finally to get one class for
observation and another for group discussion simple random sampling was used. This helped improve the representativeness of the sample. The target population is presented in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 Target population of Schools by Category and Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>girls</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>2 (3.70%)</td>
<td>1 (1.85%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (14.81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitui</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of target</td>
<td>2 (3.70%)</td>
<td>1 (1.85%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (20.37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kitui Central sub-county and three sub-counties in Nairobi County were selected as their accessibility worked to ease the interruption that might have been caused by delays by the researcher in terms of time of the class observation and learners’ FGD. These schools were staffed with qualified teachers of English.

Table 3.1 shows that from the 28 secondary schools in the three districts in Nairobi county, 3 schools (2 boys’ and 1 girls’) were in the national category and there were no national mixed secondary schools. The other 25 schools (8 boys’, 7 girls’ and 10 mixed) were county schools. Nairobi county had no sub-county schools then. In Kitui Central sub-county in Kitui county, there were 5 (9.26%) county schools; 3 boys’ and 2 girls’ schools and 21 (38.89%) sub-
county schools; 1 girls’ and 20 mixed schools. The target population consisted of 3 (5.55%) national, 30 (55.55%) county and 21 (38.89%) sub-county schools.

3.5.2 Sample size

The target population for the study was English language teachers teaching Form 3 and their Form 3 students who had one year to go before they took their KCSE examinations. The Form 3 students were assumed to have higher linguistic levels needed for reading than Form 2, and they were assumed to have acquired the reading competence as stipulated in the Kenya secondary school syllabus.

A sample of 18 schools out of 54 schools in the target population of Nairobi and Kitui counties was obtained for the study (Table 3.2 below). This formed 18 classes for observation with the respective English language teachers for each sampled class. An additional 18 teachers of English who also taught Form 3 were randomly sampled from the same study schools in order to form a representative sample (23%) from the total teacher population of 156 in the two study areas. However, the additional teachers were not observed in class teaching but were interviewed and their Form 3 class participated in the FGD. All the sampled 36 teachers responded to the teachers’ questionnaire. The teacher teaching the sampled class was observed when teaching the reading lesson and by responding to the questionnaire. It was important to have a representative sample of teachers because they were the ones who taught and
interpreted reading behaviour of learners in the classroom. The target population is presented in Table 3.1. above and the sample in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Sample unit grid for schools by category and type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents in</th>
<th>Boys'</th>
<th>Girls'</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>sample percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National schools</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitui</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County schools</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitui</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county schools</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitui</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of sample</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unequal representation was realized as a result of Nairobi having national schools and Kitui had none. In the county category sample, Nairobi had 2 (11.11%) each for both boys’ and girls’ and 3 (16.7%) mixed provincial schools while Kitui had 1 (5.6%) each for boys’ and girls’ representation and no mixed county schools. While Nairobi had no sub-county schools, Kitui had 7 (38.9%) representation of sub-county mixed schools. In combination of the categories, Nairobi had 3 (16.7%) boys’, 3 (16.7%) girls’ and 3 (16.7%) mixed schools in the sample. Kitui had 1 (5.6%) county boys’ and 1 (5.6%) girls’ county and 7 (38.9%) mixed sub-county schools in the sample.

3.6 Research instruments

The primary data were collected from teachers of English who taught in the selected secondary schools in Nairobi and Kitui, Kenya. Their Form 3 learners
also participated. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the descriptive survey design used the following data collection instruments: a questionnaire and observation schedules. To get more in-depth information, a semi-structured interview schedule and a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide were used in each sampled school. The details of how the data were collected is given below.

### 3.6.1 Observation Schedule

A classroom observation schedule (Appendix 1) was prepared to collect data on teachers’ practices in regard to teaching of reading and reading strategies. To capture first-hand information, the researcher attended 18 face-to-face sessions in all, between May and July 2012, to collect information on how reading lessons were conducted. Each class in the sample was observed once. Observation was mostly focused on reading instruction stages; before reading (pre-reading strategies), during the lesson (while-reading strategies) and after the lesson (post-reading strategies). According to Enon, (1998), observation uses a few subjects and can be used in all studies. He pointed out that the researcher must know what to look for, what to monitor keenly and record it for future analysis. The researcher used this tool to find out teachers’ integration of their perceptions about teaching of reading and reading strategies in their classroom practices and the factors that could impede the effectiveness of teaching reading strategies.

To make this possible, a prior visit to make consultations with the concerned teacher on when s/he would be teaching reading was made. Then meeting time
between the teacher, the researcher and the class was arranged. This was done to make the participants at ease during classroom attendance by researcher. During observation, the researcher filled in the prepared observation checklist the major events of the lesson. The observation technique was designed to provide adequate analysis of classroom teaching on factual description. The researcher then analyzed the information in the observation checklist.

3.6.2 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed with the objectives of the study in focus. It was detailed enough to cover all the objectives. It comprised both closed-ended and open-ended items. It was divided into two: questions that sought general information and those that sought after information on the teaching of reading and reading strategies. This instrument was administered to all the sampled 36 teachers at an agreed time between the researcher and the sampled teacher.

The questionnaire was basically used to collect qualitative data from teachers of English. The questionnaire included their bio-data and the items relating to the teaching of reading and specifically use of reading strategies. The questionnaire was also designed to collect information regarding the teachers’ perceptions and practices in respect to teaching reading and reading strategies in secondary schools. Factors that influenced their choice of reading materials for their Form 3 learners were also sought.
3.6.3 Focus Group Discussion

A Focus Group Discussion (FGD) is a qualitative method of data collection. It comprised a group of approximately 6 - 10 interacting individuals having some common interest or characteristics. In this study, 18 groups comprising of 10 learners from each school were brought together by the researcher who used each group and its interaction as a way to gain information about specific focused issues. These were selected through simple random sampling where small pieces of paper were prepared with 10 written FGD and the rest blank. They were carefully folded and each student picked only one and unfolded it. Those whose papers were written FGD participated in the discussion of 30 minutes. Their teacher of English attended the discussion but did not participate.

The individuals who interacted in the FGD were approximately 25% of the sampled Form 3 class that was not observed. Robson (2002) points out that FGD is an appropriate method when one wants to: (i) explore the depth and nuances of opinions regarding a given issue, (ii) understand the differences in perspectives, and, (iii) understand what factors influence opinions or behavior. This instrument was therefore very useful.

The FGD was used to find out learners’ views about what enhanced or inhibited their efforts to read well. It was used to supplement the information that was given in the teachers’ questionnaire. The researcher guided the discussion in such a way that the group members (students) talked freely and
reflectively about their reading comprehension proficiency and instruction in reading lessons.

In this study, the FGD was specifically used to: (i) get from learners’ opinions on the tactics they employ when reading for comprehension (ii) give greater insight into the factors that affect learners achievement of reading proficiency, (iii) give information on methods teachers use when teaching reading comprehension in class and, (iv) shed light on the reading programmes that teachers of English language expose learners to.

3.6.4 The Interview schedule

A semi-structured interview guide (Appendix 4) was used to collect information from ESL teachers to supplement their responses to the questionnaire. It was a useful method for following up ideas, probing responses to opinions which the quantitative tools might not do (Sarantakos, 1998). The interview consisted of some structured questions and open-ended questions. The researcher used this instrument in one-on-one interviews with the sampled teachers who had been observed in class. Data from the interviews guide sought for opinions and views regarding perceptions, instructional practices and reading materials. It helped seek for explanations on discrepancies between stated perceptions and observed practices.
3.7 The Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted prior to the start of the main study to establish the feasibility of the study and to also ensure the research instruments were clear, appropriate and error free. Four schools from the two counties and which were not included in the main study sample were selected: two (1 county boys’ and 1 mixed sub-county school) from Kitui Central sub-county and the other two (1 national boys’ and 1 county girls’ school) from Nairobi County. These formed four classes for observation. Four teachers of English were observed as they taught during a reading lesson and they also responded to the questionnaire. According to Ary, et. al., (1990), the pilot study would demonstrate the adequacy of the research procedures. Unanticipated problems which might include logistical and ethical considerations would be solved at this stage, thereby saving time and effort later during the main study data collection. Where necessary, modifications of the instruments would be made in line with the purpose of the study.

The teachers were observed only once in class. The researcher went to the classroom with the teacher, sat at the back and observed how the teacher was teaching reading, then recorded it in the observation checklist.

The interview was also piloted to determine the best wording of items that could be used to collect the required information. Pilot study helped in refining and modifying the interview items. Usually, the piloting time was determined by the researcher with the help of the selected teacher in the school. This was
done to avoid interfering with the normal school programme. There were no significant changes, so the items in the interview guide were retained.

Piloting of the questionnaire was done on the teachers whose classes were used for piloting the observation items. It helped to find out if teachers understood the questions. Questions that elicited responses that were not clear, there were modified and then adopted for use in the main study.

The focus group discussion (FGD) was conducted by the researcher on four Form 3 classes in the four schools selected for piloting. The FGD guide was piloted to establish learners’ reading preferences in line with their preparedness before, during and after reading. The FGD also sought to find out whether learners had reading difficulties and the causes of the same. This was done to find out whether the constructs under study were covered well and complemented or not the teachers perceptions and practices in teaching reading comprehension strategies.

Further, it was also conducted to find out how long it would take to interact adequately without rushing the learners in their responses. The data collected from the FGD was then analyzed, after which the instruments were determined as suitable and then adopted for actual data collection.
3.8 Validity and Reliability

3.8.1 Validity

Validity measured achievement of the objectives of the study in relation to its content (Cerych, 1986). According to Enon, (1998), validity refers to the quality that a procedure or an instrument to be used in research was made accurate, correct and meaningful. Further, Wierma, (1995), points out that analysis of a research instrument capacity to measure given content through pre-testing, validates the tool. The validity of an instrument is the extent to which that instrument measures what it is designed to measure (Hitch, et. al., 1995)

Content-related validity of the observation schedule, the questionnaire, the FGD and the semi-structured interview were pre-tested to establish inclusiveness of the items with respect to perceptions and practices upheld by teachers in regard to reading instruction. Expert opinion and scrutiny by experienced lecturers in the department of Educational Communication and Technology, Kenyatta university and from senior lecturers in the school of education, South Eastern Kenya university was sought to establish whether the various items collectively cover the material that the instruments were supposed to cover with respect to the set objectives. Construct-related validity was established by a scrutiny of the constructs included in the questionnaire, observation and teachers interview which were related to the development of reading proficiency.
Any ambiguous or unclear items on any of the four instruments were corrected or if redundant it was removed altogether. Focus was specifically on clarity of questions and/or statements, the ability of the instruments to answer the set objectives and acceptability of the items in terms of order given by Ary, et. Al., (1990). The comments made were appropriately incorporated to come up with final research instruments that were used to collect the final data.

3.8.2 Reliability

Reliability has been described by Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) as the accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument. Additionally, Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003), describe reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. In research context, it means the instrument is dependable, stable, consistent, predictable and accurate. The test re-test method was used to test the reliability of the instruments between October and November, 2011. To test whether or not the instruments were reliable, the researcher piloted them in 4 secondary schools in 3 sub-counties prior to actual research.

The questionnaire was administered to four sampled teachers who filled and returned them. Classroom observation was conducted on the same teachers. After observation, the FGD and the semi-structured interview were conducted. Data collected was analysed to establish whether they elicited the desired information. Items in the interview guide were refined and made unambiguous.
After two weeks, the four instruments were re-administered to the same informants, then each analysed.

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (formula) to determine the consistency of the questionnaire and the observation in giving information. It is given in terms of content validity index in each case.

Cronbach Formula:

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{K} \sigma_{Y_i}^2}{\sigma_X^2} \right)$$

In the above formula, K is the number of items in the questionnaire, $\sigma_X^2$ is the variance of the observed test scores, and $\sigma_{Y_i}^2$ is the variance of component i for the current sample of respondents. The reliability coefficient for the questionnaire was, therefore, found to be 0.871 with the cronbach formula for the items on the likert scale. Items in the observation schedule were subjected to the same formula and the reliability was found to be 0.890. Reliability of both the questionnaire and observation were above the critical value of 0.70 (Streiner, 2003). This critical value is the recommended reliability for most questionnaires and observations. So given the determined reliability, the questionnaire as well as the observation were therefore adopted for collecting data. The reliability of the semi-structured interview guide and FGD were ensured by use of a highly structured interview protocol, with the same format and word sequence for the respondents as stated by Cohen, (2000).
3.9 Data Collection Procedures.

Before commencing the research study the researcher sought permission to conduct the exercise in schools from National Council for Science and Technology. More permission was sought as advised from the Provincial Commissioner, Nairobi province, District commissioners and District Education Officers in the selected districts. Then a visit was made to the selected schools to request the headteachers to allow the researcher to carry out research in their schools. Permission from the headteachers then enabled her to consult with the concerned teachers who agreed to participate in the study. Arrangements with the selected teachers were made on the convenient time to conduct the observation have them respond to the questionnaire and conduct the FGD.

The first instrument to be administered was the observation which was done when the teacher concerned was teaching a reading comprehension lesson. With classroom observation, van Lier, (1988:39) observes that while learners, for whom the L2 classroom after all is a public stage, by and large take classroom visits in their stride after a while. The teachers on the other hand, may well find the presence of a researcher vaguely threatening, and conduct lessons differently because of it. This in turn may have some effect on the learners, so that an observer may never be able to observe a natural, undisturbed lesson. To make the environment relaxed and free, the researcher ensured that she won the confidence of the selected teachers before going into their classrooms. She further established rapport with the teachers so that they could
view the data collection procedures positively. To limit the observer-effect, familiarization visits were conducted in the sample classrooms two days before the actual data collection. The visits helped acquaint the researcher with the setting. They also put the learners and the teacher at ease, since the researcher had to be seen as familiar.

During data collection, the researcher entered the classroom with the teacher and sat at the back to avoid interrupting the classroom interaction in any way as the lesson progressed. The researcher recorded interactive activities as stated in the observation schedule (Appendix 1). She wrote any unique occurrences that captured her attention but were not included in the observation schedule. This was done manually and it enabled accurate coding of live classroom practices.

After observation, one questionnaire was given to the English language teacher and another to his/her colleague teaching the other Form 3 class to respond to. The researcher waited until the teachers had responded to the questionnaire and then collected them back. The FGD (Appendix 3) was conducted with a group of 10 sampled students in a quiet place. The researcher sat with them and the teacher who taught them, asked them carefully prepared questions and listened to their responses and wrote their responses down. Lastly, the semi-structured interview was conducted on the teacher who had not been observed teaching. The teachers volunteered their views and experiences on reading instruction. The researcher took all the dully completed instruments for processing the data.
3.10 Logical and Ethical Considerations

The procedure that was used to collect data ensured that existing policies for data collection from schools were followed. A research permit was obtained from the Ministry of Education. With this, together with a letter of introduction from the university, consent to conduct research was obtained from the District Education Officers (DEOs) in each district. Using the endorsed documents, permission to visit schools was sought from the headteachers in all the sampled schools. The headteachers introduced the researcher to the teachers of English who in turn introduced the researcher to the students. Before data collection, the nature and purpose of the study was explained to teachers and students and their voluntary consent to participate was solicited. The researcher made efforts to put the learners who had to respond to the FGD at ease by reassuring them that the information gathered was meant for research purposes. They were asked to answer the questions as accurately as possible.

3.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter introduced the research design and described both the study location and study population. Sampling techniques, sample size and research tools were described. Methods of ensuring validity and reliability were explained. It also outlined and explained how data obtained were analyzed by using descriptive statistics in form of percentages, means and standard deviations. The following chapter presents data, the analyses and discussion of the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

Effective teaching of reading involves an insight of how learners read and construct meaning. It also requires an ability to design appropriate remedial and enrichment tasks. This study aimed at analyzing effective reading instruction by focusing on language teachers perceptions on efficient teaching of reading and how these are reflected on their classroom practices at secondary school level in Kenya. The study was based on five objectives which guided data collection. The objectives of the study were to;

1. investigate language teachers’ perceptions about teaching reading and strategy use in reading.

2. examine how teachers’ tacit perceptions about reading instruction and use of reading strategies are reflected in their classroom practices

3. establish the factors that influence teachers’ choice of reading texts.

4. find out the reading enrichment activities designed for the learners to practice strategy use when reading.

5. find out the challenges that teachers’ face when teaching reading and strategy use in reading.

Data for this study were collected for analysis from a sample of English language teachers in secondary schools in the study locations of Nairobi and Kitui counties.
4.1 Methods of Data Analysis

Cohen and Manion, (1997) posit that data collected is raw information and is not knowledge by itself. It, therefore, has to be organized in various stages. Several methods were used to present and analyse the data obtained. First, all the data obtained were assembled, coded and analysed along the objectives of the study. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics from which explanations and inferences based on the results were made. Analysis was also supplemented by views of qualitative data in the form of selected respondents’ opinions, comments and judgements on the various themes the study had raised. Analysis of the data is based on data collected using four main instruments: questionnaire, classroom observation, interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs).

Data collected using the questionnaire was meant to provide information about the English language teachers’ perceptions on; (i) reading instruction, (ii) reading strategies, reasons for use and extent of learners engagement in using them, (iii) factors that influence teachers’ choice of reading materials. (iv) enrichment forums provided for learners to practice use of learnt reading strategies and (v) challenges language teachers face when planning and teaching use of reading strategies. This information was collected using an opinion Likert scale format. The questionnaire was designed to produce quantitative data which were presented mainly descriptively using frequency counts, percentage tables and charts. Pearson Chi-Square tests, that employed Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), were used to test significance
between the variables of teaching reading. The results helped answer questions on the perceptions of teaching reading that are held by teachers of English language and the practices they engage in during reading interactions. This data also shed light on factors that influence teachers’ choice of reading materials.

Classroom observation focused on the teachers’ instructional acts when teaching use of reading strategies at three levels of prereading, reading and postreading of presented lessons. The results were then interpreted against a rating scale ranging from ‘not demonstrated, needs improvement, satisfactory and outstanding.’ Interpretations of observed results formed the discussion points. The findings of the questionnaire and classroom observation were correlated to establish a translation of theory onto practice in reading instruction.

Interviews with teachers elicited supplementary but useful information on teaching of reading. They were used to clarify pedagogic acts observed during the lessons study and to provide related information on reading instruction. The FGDs were used to elicit learners’ interests and preferences about their reading preparations and their reading problems.

Using this information, it became possible to establish the reasons behind teachers’ instructional practices in reading instruction. The findings were discussed and conclusions based on the variables of the study were made.
Recommendations for further actions for improvement of instruction in language education were given.

The opinion section of teachers’ questionnaire sought information on teachers’ academic qualification, their subject combination, their experience, and source of pedagogic knowledge. All this information when triangulated gave insight into teachers’ ability levels for teaching English language and specifically the reading skill in secondary schools in Kenya.

This study used the teacher as the unit of analysis. Quantitative data from the questionnaire were coded for computer analysis using the SPSS package. For this analysis, frequency distributions, descriptive statistics and Chi-Square techniques have been used. Data from classroom observation were analysed descriptively to explain classroom discourse. A comparison of observed teachers perceptions against their practices was also carried out. A total of 36 questionnaires, 18 classroom observations, 18 interviews with teachers and 18 FGDs with learners in the study group were analysed for this study. Results and interpretations of the teachers’ questionnaire are described below.
4.2 Teachers Background Information

Data obtained from the 36 sampled teachers were checked for completeness and coding categories established. The teachers of English were the units of analysis. All 36 teachers responded to the questionnaire. Out of these, 18 were observed teaching a reading lesson. The other 18 teachers who were not seen in class responded to the interview.

4.2.1 Academic Qualification

The study further sought to establish the academic qualification achieved by the teachers of English in this study. The results are shown in Figure 4.1

Figure 4.1 Frequency Distribution by Academic Qualification
The findings shown in Figure 4.1 above revealed that on average, half the number of the teachers in the study were trained and had university degree (B.Ed), some 19.4% had Post-graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) and a handful (11.1%) were Diploma teachers. Moreover, about 8.3% had master of education and an equal number (8.3%) had Master of Arts. One teacher did not indicate his/her qualification.

This finding suggests that all the sampled teachers were professionally trained. It also implied that the required academic qualifications of the language teachers in the study areas fulfilled the requirements. This demonstrated that teachers of English were equipped with the requisite instructional techniques. Therefore, it was expected that they were capable of teaching the specific subject content competently and could handle learners’ under their charge. This finding corroborated Umar-ud-Din, et. al. (2010) study on effects of academic qualification of teachers on learners performance in English language which stated that, teachers’ professional qualifications influenced their perceptions about teaching and classroom practices and eventually the performance of students they teach.

4.2.2 Subject Combination

In Kenya, to teach a given subject at secondary school one should have learnt the subject and then trained to teach it. In view of this requirement, the teaching subjects of the sampled teachers who participated in this study were identified as presented below.
Table 4.1  Frequency distribution of teachers by subject combination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/Literature</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/CRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Secretarial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings shown in table 4.1 revealed that all (100%) of the sampled teachers of English were qualified to teach English and one other subject. Further, three quarters (75%) of the sample teachers were trained to teach English and Literature, very few (2.8%) taught English and CRE, some (5.6%) English and Geography and a handful (13.8%) taught English and secretarial studies. This placed all the teachers as having specialized in English as a teaching subject. This was an indication that the respondents were knowledgeable to teach English. It is important to note that all teachers of English are expected to teach literature. However, a quarter (25%) of them were not trained to teach literature and although this was outside the scope of this study, it was interesting to find out how they were coping when teaching the integrated syllabus.

4.2.3 Teachers’ Experience

The study sought to determine if teachers possessed thorough experience a depth of knowledge on how to present subject matter to learners. This knowledge is shaped by their cognitions although this acquired knowledge in
the art of teaching could be influenced by their classroom practice. Analysis of teachers' experience in the field was intended to establish whether they had familiarized themselves with the subject technicalities. The teaching experience was interpreted against a competency scale that categorized their experience into different cohorts along the continuum of five skill levels of expertise ranging from novice to expert. Data collected was put to these levels to represent the study definition of the novice-expert continuum: novice (1 - 4 years), established (5 – 8 years), competent (9 -12 years), proficient (13 – 15 years) and expert (16 years and above) as shown in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 Frequency distribution by teaching experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill level</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>5 – 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>9 – 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>13 – 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>16 years and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.2 the results show that a few (27.8%) of participants formed the teacher category which is described by the study as established language teachers. It is expected that these teachers are able to set practical objectives that can be realized within a set lesson period. They can judge learners linguistic abilities with accuracy. It can be argued that, although these teachers use the syllabus as a guideline to teach in limited and controlled contexts, these teachers are still focused on completing tasks (Dreyfus, 1986). The competent
category formed 22.2% of the participants. These are able to organize and sort out learning materials and learning activities by relevance of the abilities possessed by their learners. They get involved in active decision making in choosing a course of action that benefits their learners.

The expert category comprised a small number (19.4%) of the teachers. Experts tap into their vast pool of knowledge and depending on the context, embrace what works best for their learners. They do this by drawing on knowledge of content, critical issues to be learnt and the context that the learners live in. It was expected that the teachers set lesson objectives, determine the most effective strategies needed to accomplish these objectives and then implement the use of the strategies through meaningful reading activities. The proficient group (13 – 15 years) formed a 16.7%. Proficient teachers are perceived to go beyond oversimplified information given in the texts and integrate real-world complex situations into their classroom plans.

The novice category formed a 13.9% of the total participants. Novices rigidly follow rules of instructional activities as received during pre-service training.

A look at teaching experience was important in that teachers change their instructional practices for particular tasks in response to the realities in the classrooms so as to benefit the recipient of the instruction. Experience unveils rich ground that can be tapped for modifications of instruction in the second language classrooms to benefit the learner. This was important in this study in the light of instructional practices.
4.2.4 Pedagogic Knowledge

Although the teachers in the study were trained, this study sought to find out where the teachers outsourced further instructional knowledge for teaching English (pedagogy). This came from the fact that teaching has become dynamic today and so the teacher can no longer cling to only those techniques that they were taught at college. Figure 4.2 below summarizes the findings.

Figure 4.2 Source of teaching pedagogy

Findings on respondents’ basis of informative knowledge showed that nearly three quarters (72.2%) were trained how to teach at teacher training institutions. This was an indication that they knew how to successfully conduct reading lessons. Only a small number (5.6%) of teachers indicated that their
knowledge of teaching reading was inculcated by experience. This implied that teachers who had taught for 16 years and above and who had had students come and go after KCSE had gained rich experience on what worked best with each kind of students. Out of the total sample, a handful (11.1%) indicated that their pedagogic knowledge was derived from research/seminars. This was a clear indication that teachers carry out research and attend seminars that sensitize them on effective methods of teaching the subject. This finding concurs with Miheso-O’Connor (2009) study which found out that teacher pedagogic knowledge is very important in teaching as it informs them on various ways of teaching. However, a few (11.1%) of the teachers’ did not indicate the source of their teaching knowledge.

The findings on demographics in this study indicated that the sampled secondary schools in this study had highly qualified and experienced teachers of English and who had the pedagogic knowledge necessary for the transmission of knowledge to their learners. The majority, however, had their pedagogic knowledge derived from training at higher institutions of learning. One of the tenets of vision 2030 is the need to modernize teacher training through research so that teachers may become more knowledgeable and globally competitive. This argument agrees with Kaahwa (2002) who pointed out that teachers must acquire skills including personal values, vision, collaboration, recognition and communication as agents of change. There is need to involve more teachers in research and other matters relating to the teaching of English.
4.3 Objective 1

Language teachers’ perceptions about strategy use in reading instruction.

The study sought to explore language teachers' perceptions about what reading is and what it means to teach use of reading strategies for comprehension. The information required was meant to give insight on whether teachers’ theoretical perceptions on reading and strategy use instruction were reflected in their classroom interactions with the learner. This was so because the study posited that identification of classroom activity, the level of engagement of the learners and instructional goal for the activity depend on teachers’ perceptions about reading and strategy use instruction. The classroom activities include the levels at which teachers engage learners in the art of reading for comprehension and which reflects their perceptual understanding of what strategy use instruction entails. Understanding what reading strategies are and how they are used affects teachers decisiveness on what tasks necessary for learners to engage in.

4.3.1 Teachers’ perceptions about Reading

The findings from the teachers’ of English perceptions about reading in secondary schools resulted in a great diversity of responses as illustrated by the tables that follow. This section sought to find out teachers perceptions on the teaching of reading and the use of strategies for comprehension. This includes teachers opinions on meaning of reading instruction and reading strategies, perceptions about reading instruction, importance and necessity of using reading strategies in reading, reasons for teaching reading strategies, methods
used to teach reading strategies, use of reading strategies during English lessons, choices of reading materials, opinions on provision and impact of reading enrichment forums and challenges teachers faced when teaching use of reading strategies in class.

Each of these was discussed to determine what the respondents pointed out about their perceptions on teaching of reading and specifically the teaching of reading strategies. This was crucial because it could explain the significant role played by teachers’ perceptions in relation to their classroom practices. Table 4.3 below gives teachers opinions of the different facets that define reading.

**Table 4.3 Distribution of teachers views of reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets of Reading</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Missing system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Construction of meaning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of strategies &amp; techniques</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Modeling reading strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reading aloud in class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n= 36)

f - Frequency  
D - Disagree  
A - Agree  
SD - Strongly Disagree  
UC - Uncertain  
SA - Strongly Agree

The results of teachers’ opinions of what meaning they assigned to reading instruction revealed that all the teachers, (100%) agreed that reading instruction
involved engaging learners in construction of meaning. Constructing meaning from texts is the essence of any reading activity without which it would be a useless endeavour. This finding demonstrates that teachers’ focused learners attention during reading instruction to constructing meaning from various types of printed material. To establish the relationship between reading instruction and construction of meaning, Pearson Chi-square test was administered in Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.440b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(a)</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Valid Cases</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi-square tests analysis of results in Table 4.4 above was done to establish whether there was a relationship between construction of meaning and teaching of reading or not. The focus on the analysis was based on Pearson chi-square tests while other details on the table were not relevant for this study. The table dwelled on the assumption that there was a statistical significance in the relationship between teaching of reading as a skill and construction of meaning as a result. The conventional probability level of confidence used to measure
this relationship was .005. However, the following rule was utilized when making a decision on probability level;

a) if the probability is greater than .005, then the variables were not significantly related.
b) if the probability is less than or equal to .005, then the variables were significantly related.

As it was stated in the beginning, our level of probability (alpha) is .005. If the “Asymp Sig. (2-sided)” for the Pearson Chi-Square statistic is less than .005, there was a relationship between the variables based on the level of confidence we stated in the beginning. As seen in the table 4.4 the Chi-Square significance value is .001 which is less than our value of .005 which shows that there is a relationship between construction of meaning in teaching of reading.

This finding demonstrates that the essence of reading is the interaction between the learner and the writer with the learner playing the central role of constructing meaning from the text. This result corroborates Johnson, (1999), Pang et. al., (2003) view that it is very important that students read with understanding and construct meaning from what they read. They stressed that reading for meaning improves creativity which is a prerequisite to writing. Further, this finding confirms Hudson (2007) Allen and Bruton, (1998) opinion that reading is a process of making meaning from a text, for variety of purposes and in a wide range of contexts.

Moreover, the finding in table 4.4 revealed that the statistical relationship between construction of meaning and reading instruction was significantly
related and this confirms the finding that the purpose of reading is creation of meaning a habit that teachers of English should inculcate in the learner during reading instruction.

Table 4.3 above, shows that more than three quarters (83.3%) of the respondents were of the opinion that knowledge of strategies and techniques of reading was useful when engaging learners in reading. However, it was not shared by all the teachers as 16.7% of them negated the view of the majority. The high response in agreement implied that teachers exposed learners to reading strategies that would enable them understand what they read. The response further connotes that it was the responsibility of the teachers to teach learners to select strategies appropriate for different reading activities. The findings of the majority contended that proficient reading should incorporate knowledge of strategies and techniques of reading. This correlated to the views of Koda, (2005), Grabe and Stoller, (2002) that strategies and techniques can be used to facilitate reading comprehension. Therefore, teachers’ knowledge of various reading strategies that aided comprehension was crucial in order to impart the same to the learner.

Chi-square test was carried out to establish if there existed a significant relationship between knowledge of strategies and techniques and reading instruction or not. The results of significance are shown in Table 4.5 below.
Table 4.5 Chi-square test on knowledge of strategies and techniques as intent to teach reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.440b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(a)</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Valid Cases</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table the focus was only on Pearson Chi-square test and not in any other information computed by SPSS. Table 4.5 relied on the assumption that there was no statistical significance in the relationship between reading instruction and knowledge of strategies and techniques. It was clear that the conventional probability level used to measure this relationship was .005.

From table 4.5 the Pearson Chi-square value computed by SPSS was .003. This showed that the probability was less than .005. This therefore pointed out that the two variables were significantly related. This finding revealed that knowledge of strategies and techniques in reading was significantly likely to be the focus of teachers of English when teaching reading. These results therefore signified that there was need to focus reading instruction by teaching reading strategies in order to equip the learners with tactics that would help them develop their reading proficiency.
The findings in table 4.5 reveal that knowledge of tactics and techniques for effective reading and meaning of reading were significantly related. This finding implies that understanding of reading strategies in relation to a sense of reading was indispensable. This finding corroborates Anderson (2000), Chou (2008) views that teachers should provide learners with reading strategies and offer practical guidance in how to use them to read. They content that it is necessary for teachers to possess this practical expertise in order to offer it.

Further, Table 4.3 above revealed that nearly half (58.3%) of the teachers expressed the view that teaching reading made it necessary to model reading strategies to students. This implied that by modeling and making explicit the ways learners should read, interpret and evaluate the ideas discussed in what they read, teachers were apprenticing learners into independent reading. About a quarter (27.8%) of them were of contrary view. A critical part of reading instruction is to directly explain to learners how to use efficient strategies in order to read proficiently.

Chi-square test was carried out to establish whether a relationship between modeling of strategies and the intent to teach reading did exist or not. The focus was on the Pearson Chi-square test analysis and not on any other information in the table computed by SPSS.
Table 4.6 Chi-square test on modeling of strategies as intent to teach reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.083b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td></td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Valid Cases</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 dwelled on the assumption that there was no statistical significance in the relationship between modeling of strategies and the intent to teach reading. It was noted that the conventional probability level used to measure this relationship was .005. The results shown in table 4.6, Pearson Chi-square value was .073. This indicated that the probability was greater than .005. This revealed that the two variables were not significantly related an indication that modeling reading strategies, a direct demonstration through examples on how to use a strategy, was of little importance to teachers when teaching reading.

This finding disagrees with Maamouri, (2003); Barnett, (1988); Block and Pressley, (2002) and Johnson, (1992) that teachers should model reading strategies through a think-aloud, sharing their self-talk about how they tactically engaged in reading, making their expert thinking visible to learners. A question arises; why was this so? This could be attributed two major factors; lack of enough time and pressure to complete the syllabus on time (Asselin, 2002) and which teachers have little or no control over.
Although the relationship between modeling of reading strategies and teaching of reading was of little significance, Pressley, (2000), Ismael, (2005) pointed out that it helped to teach learners how to apply appropriate strategies of reading by modelling them. This concurs with Duffy, (2009) assertion that teachers do not merely mention what the skill or strategy is, but model or provide direct explanation of what, how, why, and when a strategy ought to be used. The finding therefore, concludes that lack of modeling how to use reading strategies normally results in learners inability to use them effectively and therefore, they become more dependent on the teacher and serious reading problems are a likely consequence.

Teachers views on reading aloud in class as intent to teach reading in table 4.3 above revealed that roughly 41.6% of the respondents agreed that teaching reading involved reading aloud. This finding showed that reading aloud could be used to help students learn to read smoothly to build fluency skills, continuity and confidence when they are challenged to read difficult texts. However, nearly half (55.6%) were of contrary opinion.

**Table 4.7 Chi-square test reading aloud in class as intent to teach reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.676b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Pearson Chi-square test analysis displayed the results in table 4.7. This Pearson Chi-square test was carried out to find out whether a relationship between reading aloud in class and teaching of reading existed or not. The table was based on the assumption that there was no statistical significance in the relationship between reading aloud in class and reading instruction. The researcher observed that the conventional probability level used to measure this relationship was .005. Looking at table 4.7, the Pearson Chi-square computed by SPSS was .095. This probability was greater than .005 which implied that the two variables were not at all significantly related.

This finding suggests that reading aloud was not considered in reading instruction. Further, the study established the reasons why teachers disagreed with the view of reading aloud in class as a time consuming and boring activity and that it was a strategy for lower grades of primary pupils.

The view corroborated Birch, (2002), Grabe, (2009); Nuttall (2005) views that reading aloud disempowers the mind, made it hard to concentrate and processing of the meaning as well. Although the relationship between reading aloud and teaching of reading was insignificant, the study noted that 41.8% of the teachers agreed that it was part of their focus to have learners read aloud when they taught reading.

This finding confirmed Dhaif, (1990); Conley (1992) belief that reading aloud is beneficial, both in the early stages of reading development which is aimed at
improving learners’ reading fluency, accuracy, and pronunciation as well as in the advanced stages of reading, where a need to improve reading speed and accuracy still exists. In support of this point of view, Kailani (1998), gives the prospect that the advanced level learners need to practice speech delivery skills for public speaking, speech and drama and acting in theatre.

4.3.2 Perceptions about Reading Strategies

Perceptions of teachers of English in regard to reading strategy instruction were assessed on the basis of their responses to the interview questions (Appendix 4). The aim of the interview was to get in-depth information on teachers’ opinions about teaching reading and use of strategies. Analysis was based on the interview data collected from the 18 teachers who were not observed teaching. The general finding was that most teachers of English were aware of reading strategies, the content and importance. However, many gaps still existed in teachers perceptions on strategy use when reading. Descriptive statistics in percentages were used to present findings as shown in each of the tables of the interview items presented below.
Table 4.8 Teachers perceptions of reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Techniques to read a text effectively</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tools learners use to understand the text thoroughly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Essential techniques e.g. scanning, skimming, questioning, predicting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 above, shows that half (50%) of the respondents defined reading strategies as ‘techniques used by learners to read a text effectively’. Nearly half (45.4%) pointed out that reading strategies were tactics that learners use to understand the text thoroughly and further, two-thirds (66.7%) asserted that ‘reading strategies were essential techniques, such as scanning, skimming, questioning, predicting’ that readers use to promote their own reading so as to achieve their set purposes for reading.

These findings further indicated that most teachers of English understood reading strategies as scanning, skimming and using questions to encourage learners to understand what they read. This finding confirmed Oczkus, (2003), Janzen, (1996), and Block and Pressley, (2002) view that reading strategies are very useful for reading comprehension. This finding affirmed that teachers of English understand what reading strategies are and their importance in reading comprehension.
Further, the researcher sought to find out language teachers’ views regarding
the teaching of reading for comprehension as well as how teachers’ dealt with
various dimensions of reading instruction. It was necessary to establish their
perceptions and ideas of teaching that underlie their classroom actions. The
perceptions of teachers that were of interest to this study included; perceptions
about reading instruction and reading strategies, importance and necessity of
reading instruction and reading strategies, reasons for teaching reading
strategies, methods for teaching reading and reading strategies, perceptions
about use of reading strategies in class activities, the range of reading materials
commonly used in class and factors that influence choice of reading materials.
Additionally, extensive reading enrichment forums for learners to practice
reading strategies, effects of these enrichment forums on learners achievement
of reading proficiency and challenges faced when teaching reading strategies
were explored. Generally, what teachers do is a reflection of what they know
and perceive as feasible. Teachers’ pedagogic knowledge provides the
underlying framework which guides their classroom actions.

4.3.3 How the teachers perceived reading strategies instruction

The focus of this section was to establish teachers common perceptions that
they held in regard to teaching strategy use in reading. The purpose of this
analysis was to illustrate how 36 trained teachers of English generally perceived
teaching of reading and use of reading strategies. The data regarding their views
were collected and analyzed as presented in table 4.9 below.
Table 4.9 Frequency distribution of teachers’ views about reading instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of school</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within school category</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=36

Table 4.9 presents language teachers perceptions in agreement to reading instruction. It is clear that the majority (88.8%) of language teachers; with a few (5.6%) in national category of schools, 44.4% in the county category and another 38.8% in the sub-county schools agreed that learners need to learn purposeful reading comprehension strategies. This finding indicated that more than three quarters (88.8%) of the teachers were able to systematically facilitate learners understanding of texts and this helped them build their reading proficiency. The implication of this finding is that there is plenty of work for the language teacher to do; for instance, s/he could make use of appropriate texts and activities that focused learner’s attention on the text itself.
Further, this finding pointed out that there is need for learners to learn and use reading techniques so that they develop their reading competence. For this reason, the teacher’s are charged with the role of providing learners with the relevant reading tactics in their potential reading situations in and out of the classrooms. Therefore, the teacher needs to be a reading guide in the learners’ process of becoming thriving independent readers.

Further the findings show that more than a third (38.8%) of teachers in the county category and a third (33.3%) in the sub-county category agreed with the fact that there was need to assist learners when engaged in reading. This could be done through motivating them, monitoring their progress in reading, providing clues to activate their schema and giving feedback on their progress. Almost a quarter (25%) of the teachers did not assist learners during reading lessons. This could mean that instead of guiding learners in L2 reading exercises, they are often left alone, further implying that teachers’ of English avoided teaching reading and reading strategies.

A look at column three on teachers perceptions, about a third (36.1%) of them in the county category and nearly another third (30.6%) in the sub-county category felt that it was their responsibility to plan and support learners when reading. This was possible through dialogue, questioning and conversation exercises. This finding suggested that about two-thirds (66.7%) of teachers of English were aware that they needed to carefully plan to teach reading and reading strategies in their classrooms. On the other hand,
teachers in the national category disagreed with this view. Further, column four on teachers perceptions about reading instruction sought information on whether or not teachers assisted learners to elaborate information they read. The findings show that about a third (38.8%) of the teachers in the county and almost a quarter (27.8%) in the sub-county category were of the opinion that learners needed to be taught how to elaborate information within and across texts. This indicated that texts were interrelated in many aspects and even across cultures. Elaboration strategy helped learners greatly in identifying the text associations. However, a third (33.3%) teachers were of contrary view. This indicated gaps in reading instruction.

Focus on the student is crucial when planning for instruction. Item 5 sought to establish whether teachers of English focused on the learners’ needs when planning for reading instruction or not. Findings indicated that a small number (2.8%) of teachers in the national, a third in the county and a quarter in sub-county schools were of the opinion that focus of learners’ needs determined their planning for reading. This view indicated that the learner was the centre of their instructional planning. This indicated that teaching reading in ESL classrooms can be highly demanding and it required teachers understanding of not only the nature of reading and teaching methodology, but also the nature of the learners to be taught. Learners greatly determine how successful the teachers approach will be. Further, this response implied that teachers were able to make assessments on students’ strengths and weaknesses and identified gaps in knowledge that would need further guidance and practice.
Item 6 sought to establish whether teachers had understanding of what reading strategies are. The findings indicate that one (2.8%) of teachers in the national category, a quarter (25%) in the county and about a third (36.1%) in the sub-county category agree that they sufficiently understand what reading strategies are. This implied that they taught learners how to use them during reading lessons.

It could be construed that from table 4.9 more than three quarters (88.8%) of the teachers in this study perceived reading instruction as involving teaching purposeful reading strategies to learners. This implied that reading comprehension would be enhanced by use of reading comprehension strategies. This finding agrees with Grabe, (1988), Robbins, et. al.,(1994), Grunewald, (1999), Grabe and Stoller (2002) and Nuttal, (2005) view that reading strategies help learners become prudent readers as they increase their awareness, practice, use and monitoring of the strategies they are using. The findings also suggested that learners’ assistance during reading was crucial. This meant that if learners were taught how to use reading strategies, then they needed practice to internalize use of the same. This would be possible if they were assisted. This pointed to the fact that teachers were responsible for planning the necessary support activities for learners. This opinion concurs with Oxford, (2001) and Johnson, (1999) perceptions that ESL learners needed guidance and support when reading.
4.3.4 Importance and necessity of reading strategies in reading

In this section, the researcher sought to ascertain teachers views regarding the importance and necessity of reading strategies for reading. Reading comprehension strategies were believed to increase students reading proficiency. This finding was necessary as it enabled the researcher to establish teachers views on some given reading strategies. Analyses were done as presented in the Table 4.10 below.
Table 4.10  Distribution of teachers views on important and necessary reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of school</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10 Table 4.10 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=36
Findings in table 4.10 indicate that item 8 that required information on how meaning was clarified from reading selections showed that a few (11.1%) teachers in national schools, about a third (38.9%) in county and a third (33.3%) in sub-county schools agreed that they taught learners how to ask questions related to the text for clarification of meaning. This suggested that questioning for clarification was a strategy that could be used by learners to obtain explanations from teachers or other learners to get the correct interpretations for the reading tasks. Further, use of this strategy could help learners to build their effective reading habits. This was a highly preferred reading strategy in which more than three quarters (83.3%) teachers indicated they taught.

Item 3 sought to determine whether teachers activated learners prior knowledge. The results showed that very few (5.6%) of the teachers in national, about a third (36.1%) in county and a similar number (36.1%) in sub-county schools agreed that it was necessary to activate learners prior knowledge before they read a selected material. The level of prior knowledge a reader possesses has a direct relationship with comprehension. Its importance is crucial to the reader as it facilitates the reader in making connections among concepts that make sense and add to the reader’s schemata. It is important that learners must know when and how to make relevant connections using prior knowledge in order to increase their comprehension. Activated prior knowledge helps one link what one is reading with what one already knew.
Activated prior knowledge also helps to comprehend and assimilate new information, organize the same information into appropriate useful categories, focus attention and remember it more efficiently. Overall, activation of prior knowledge was rated as important by about three quarters (77.8%) of teachers.

Item 4 required information on whether teachers identified a strategy, explained when it was applicable and demonstrated how it was used. The findings revealed that a few (8.3%) teachers in national schools, a third (33.3%) in county and nearly a third (30.6%) in sub-county schools agreed that identification of a strategy, explanation of when it was applicable and demonstrating how it was used was very necessary for reading comprehension. Certainly, use of this reading strategy played a major role in helping the learner to understand the information being read. This practice made thinking and reasoning possible to learners when constructing meaning from a reading text.

Since reading texts contain highly condensed information, learners needed to be instructed on how to examine a text by identifying the main idea(s) in the text. It could be seen from teachers’ responses to item 11 that few (5.6%) teachers in national schools, a third (33.3%) and almost a third (30.6%) of teachers in county and sub-county schools respectively believed that knowledge on how to skim could help learners to pick main ideas in the reading selection confidently. Though nearly a third (30.6%) of teachers
indicated that it was not important, this strategy was acknowledged as being important. It can be taught with other effective strategies, such as previewing the story, making predictions, activating prior knowledge, using text features such as the title and other headings, and pre-reading key sections such as the introduction and conclusion. All of these strategies could help ESL learners improve their understanding of the material that they read.

Another important strategy is teaching how to make outlines and summaries. Out of the sampled teachers, only 2.8% teacher in national schools, a third (33.3%) in county and a quarter (25%) in sub-county schools shared the idea that it was very important for students to know how to synthesize new information gained through reading. Although about a quarter (27.8%) of teachers attached no importance to it and there was a non-response of 4 (11.1%) of teachers; teaching students how to summarize improved their memory in almost every content area. Pedagogically, summary involves teaching students how to discern the most important ideas in a text, how to ignore irrelevant information, how to differentiate important from less important ideas and how to integrate the central ideas in a meaningful way.

Generally ESL teachers use different methods to estimate student understanding of what they are learning. In reading instruction, teachers can do so by asking students to retell, in their own words, the main ideas they have read from a selected material.
Item 13 required to get information on what teachers thought about retelling as a reading strategy. The findings on the importance of this strategy revealed that about a quarter (27.8%) of teachers in county and an equal number (27.8%) in sub-county schools indicated that retelling strategy could help in assessing learners understanding of what they were reading. This implied that retelling was useful in that it could help to demonstrate understanding. However, almost half (44.4%) of the teachers disagreed with the view which implied that it was a waste of time. Needless to say, retelling is a useful strategy because it could be used to measure simple to advanced comprehension.

Findings on item 5 showed that a small number (8.3%) of teachers in national schools, a quarter (25%) in county and a similar (25%) number in sub-county schools agreed that guided practice was important in reading instruction. This implied that after the teacher modelled the strategy, s/he released some responsibility to learners which allowed them to authentically use the strategy with little teacher support. The goal of reading instruction is to provide learners with explicit tactics they can use as they make sense of text and construct meaning. Learners who can articulate why, how, and when to use a particular strategy and who were observed applying the strategy independently, could be considered to have internalized and mastered the strategy. Effective reading instruction and strategy use grows out of what teachers know about learners’ strengths and needs as readers. Therefore, guided practice using a selected strategy would help the teacher to identify which learners needed
explicit instruction. The strategy aids the teacher to guide learners to articulate their thinking as they practice use of the strategy. Guided practice reinforces what is learnt and builds confidence in use by the learner.

In Item 1, the findings show that about half (55.6%) of language teachers agreed that semantic mapping was necessary in reading comprehension. This was illustrated by about a quarter (27.8%) teachers in county, a quarter (25%) in sub-county schools and a lesser number (2.8%) of teachers in national schools, agreed that semantic mapping was necessary in reading. Semantic mapping was important in that it helped learners develop a mind map which would help them engage actively in constructing meaning. Additionally, it also helped them make associations and connections among conceptually related words/phrases which in turn would help them to foster their reading efficiency.

Moreover, item 7 which sought to establish whether learners were taught how to guess and infer meaning when reading showed that about half (55.6%) of teachers, with 2.8% teachers in national schools, about a third (30.6%) in county and nearly a quarter (22.2%) in sub-county schools felt it was important to instruct them on how to guess and make inferences when reading. The implication of this response was that comprehension beyond the word level required the reader not only to activate background knowledge but also to use it in integrating meaning across sentences and paragraphs. As the message of the reading text become less familiar, demands to infer for meaning increase.
Further this view suggested that teachers of English provided instruction to learners on how to actively construct a mental model of the text which was an interaction between the text and learners' background knowledge. On the same item seven, 44.4% teachers indicated it was not important. The implication was that the students were focused on the content of the text in which the teacher took the lead and did not release any responsibility to the learner because the student might have lacked prior knowledge of the content and so they could not infer from context.

Item 2 required information regarding teachers’ provision of reconciled reading. Analyzed data on this strategy indicated that very few (2.8%) teachers in national schools, nearly a quarter (22.2%) in county and slightly above a quarter (27.8%) in sub-county schools recognized that reconciled reading was important strategy in reading indeed necessary for developing reading proficiency. Provision of reconciled reading involves development of pre-reading questions from questions at the end of reading text. This is meant to help students connect text to their prior knowledge. This strategy was important in that it made it possible for learners to reorganize their mind map to reflect on a given situation.

Item 6 needed information on whether or not teachers of English taught learners how to use paraphrasing strategy. Teachers views indicated that 5.6% teachers in national schools, nearly a quarter (27.8%) and 19.4% in the sub-county schools agreed that paraphrasing was necessary in reading instruction. This indicated that teaching how to paraphrase involved teaching Form 3
learners to use synonyms to restate a text in their own words. This made it possible for them to actively engage with the material. By teaching how to paraphrase, the teacher would focus on building up the student perceptions of themselves as readers. Paraphrasing makes learners clarify ideas with confidence.

Analysis of item 14 which required information on the importance of comprehension monitoring in reading showed that 52.8% of teachers maintained that it was necessary. Out of these, few (5.6%) in national schools, about a quarter (27.8%) in county and 19.4% in sub-county schools agreed that comprehension monitoring was important in reading comprehension. This implied that when learners understand and take control of what they read, they would be able to develop their efficiency in reading comprehension and this knowledge would save time when reading.

The other reading strategies were rated below 50% which implied that, in the opinion of language teachers, they were of little importance for reading comprehension. These included item 9 in which the researcher sought to find out whether teachers activated learners prior knowledge through previews of the reading tasks. Findings on the importance and necessity of previews as a reading strategy indicated that 2.8% of teachers in national schools, 22.2% in county and 19.4% in sub-county schools reported that previewing strategy was important. The essence of previews is to encourage learners to generate their own ideas about the text content. By analysing the title, headings, illustrations and graphics if included, the learners would be made able to anticipate the
content of the reading selection and thus focus their thinking when reading. Previews helped the reader to select the information they would want to read. Previews helped in activation of prior knowledge. In total, less than half (44.4%) of teachers indicated previews of texts as necessary. This implied that almost half (55.6%) teachers of English perceived previews as a less important reading strategy.

Another strategy rated less important is item 10 which required information on reading aloud, a method that could help learners discover how to read smoothly and build fluency, continuity and confidence when reading. Findings of teachers response to this item suggested that less than a quarter (19.4%) of teachers in county, 16.7% in sub-county and none in national schools stated that reading aloud was necessary during reading lessons. The high percentage (63.9%) of disagreement implied that reading aloud was a waste of time. In essence, reading aloud could be used to improve learners’ visual memory and the ability to see images in their minds as well as training them in proper punctuation. Hence, reading aloud can not be construed as a time wasting strategy.

Item 15 sought to establish teachers opinions on use of visuals as a reading strategy. About a third, 36.1% of the teachers agreed that use of visuals was necessary in reading instruction, but about two-thirds 63.9% were of contrary view. The importance of visuals lies in their potential to help learners to make mental pictures. The use of a variety of visuals; including pictures, diagrams and charts helps learners to easily conceptualize essential information and its
relationship to supporting ideas. Visuals help make both the language and the content clear to learners.

This finding implied that although more than half (58.3%) of the teachers had a teaching experience ranging between 11 - 21 years and who were thought to have grasped reading instruction techniques thoroughly, they either ignored using visual support to stir critical thinking or they were not trained on how to use it. Besides, this response indicated that these language teachers were inclined to teacher-centred approaches to reading instruction.

Item 16 required information on whether teachers encouraged learners to generalize the use of strategies that they had been taught. The results indicated that only 27.8% of the teachers supported the view that generalization of the use of reading strategies was necessary. Across the category of schools, very few (2.8%) of them were in national schools, 16.7% and 8.3% in county and sub-county schools respectively agreed that it was necessary to encourage learners to use learnt strategies in their general reading. However, there was a 72.2% who were of contrary view. Needless to say, application and generalization of reading strategies can be encouraged with extensive reading where opportunities were provided for learners to explore their personal interests. The role of the teacher here is to provide guidance so that students continued to extend and adapt strategy use to different reading situations.
4.3.5 Teachers interview responses about strategy use instruction

The following findings are based on responses from interviews that were made during the study period. Interviews were carried out on participating teachers who were not observed in class teaching but had responded to the questionnaire. The interview was used to collect in-depth data that complemented data collected using the questionnaire or classroom observation. This was a follow up of what the teachers had indicated in the questionnaire. More specifically, the interviewees responses as given below were answers to two interrelated questions;

Do you often teach reading strategies during reading instruction? Why?
What are some of the reading strategies that are effective?

Teachers of English expressed the strong need of teaching reading strategies to learners. For example, teachers were concerned that although learners knew how to read in their first language, they could not transfer the techniques they used to cope with reading in the L2 as the two languages are significantly different. They contended that reading is a difficulty skill which could only be improved after rigorous teaching. Further, teachers maintained that use of reading strategies could be employed to activate and/or create background knowledge, learn vocabulary and understand unfamiliar topics. Without them learners could hardly complete the reading tasks in time. Table 4.11 below presents a summary of some responses regarding effective reading strategies.
Table 4.11 Effective Reading Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are some of the effective reading strategies that you teach learners to use when reading?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Skimming and scanning</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summarizing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Retelling</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discussion in pairs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Questioning for clarification</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Previews of a text</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Elaboration &amp; inference</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Use of visuals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the effective reading strategies that aimed to develop learners reading abilities showed that teachers taught learners how to ask questions for clarification. As regards this response, about three quarters (72.2%) of the teachers held that they encouraged learners to ask teachers or their classmates questions about what they did not understand when reading. This answer suggested that learners asked their partners to help them find meaning of the new words or new information that they came across during class activities. Further, this response implied that teachers encouraged learners to learn from their classmates. This was considered as good examples of pair-work between teacher-learners and learner-learner as well as group-work in practicing strategy use. This encouraged co-operation between the different abilities of learners with the teacher as a facilitator in learning.
The finding implied that questions were important and necessary for proficient understanding of the content. This opinion confirmed McDonough, (1999), Steven, (1999), Klingner, and Vaughn, (1999) position that engaging in learning dialogues with text (authors), peers, and teachers through self-questioning, question generation, and question answering was very necessary for textual understanding.

Besides, more than half (61.1%) of teachers underscored that they asked students to skim the text, read the comprehension questions in order to discern what to focus on before reading in details. These teachers encouraged learners to scan for key words and or skip inessential words. According to these teachers, these activities were very important and necessary when teaching reading. Teachers highlighted that the purpose of these activities was to direct selective attention of the learner. They argued that these strategies prepared learners for the construction of meaning. Further, these basic strategies were important for finding the main ideas of a reading text. This observation concurs with Adams, (2002), Alfassi, (2004), Bullock and Pressley (2002) beliefs that skimming and scanning techniques are necessary in surveying the text to get the main idea, identify text structure, confirm or question the predictions that were made before they started reading.

Another strategy was the summarizing strategy that could be used in spoken or written form. The findings revealed that 61.1% of the respondents expressed the idea that it was very important for learners to know how to synthesize new
information that they gain through reading. Besides, this strategy was perceived to be important in a sense that when learners review the content or main ideas of the text, they must have something in their mind. For that reason, they could remember key words or main ideas. This helped the teachers developing or improving learners knowledge about the issues presented in the reading text.

Additionally, nearly half (55.6%) of teachers added that they used retelling strategy as a means to assess learners understanding orally. It is at this point any guesses made before the learners started reading would be verified or rejected by picking evidence from the text. Teachers asserted that this technique made reading more meaningful. A further reasoning by the teachers was that presentations by the learners of what they had read was equally necessary and effective. This helps in giving teachers feedback which is used to give more guided practice when it was necessary. This finding corroborates McIntyre and Pressley (1996) and Long (2000) who posit that class presentations and discussions as very useful tools to help learners learn from each other. Discussions are very helpful in that learners become familiar with unfamiliar content.

Further, findings from the interview revealed that half (50%) of teachers generally used pair work or group work in reading activities. The teachers pointed out that pair/group discussions were useful on the basis that some learners were shy to speak and very afraid of making mistakes in front of the whole class. As a result, discussion in small groups and in pairs were encouraged in order to minimize learners' anxiety. Use of this strategy implied
that teachers were considerate of their learners’ psychological outlook and linguistic limitations. So teachers created opportunities for learners to work together to solve learning tasks and get feedback.

Other strategies that a few teachers were keen on using included previews of the reading tasks, elaboration and inference and use of visuals in the text. Although previews of a text before reading is important, only 44.4% of teachers argued that they asked learners to preview the text and brainstorm some words related to the reading text. They believed that by so doing, they could elicit learners’ background knowledge about the text. These activities could be categorized as advance organizers that were useful to the teachers for purposeful organization of instruction. For example, these teachers said that they often asked learners to look at the headings of the selection and guess what they were going to read. This implied that previewing helped learners predict the concepts explained in the text which was an effort that would keep learners focused as they read. Additionally, 38.9% teachers reported using reading strategies such as elaboration and inference. This teachers’ response suggested that learners were empowered to not just understand the words but to be able to express the words in a different ways in their own words and relate new information to old information.

From these findings, it became clear that on average 8 teachers in a sample of 18 use two to three clearly defined reading strategies. Further, 8 more teachers use only one strategy but do not engage the learner sufficiently.
However, two teachers in every 18 teachers focus on solving the reading tasks without employing any clearly defined reading strategies. Teachers were categorical that their pace of teaching was dictated by the national examinations. They had to complete the syllabus and start the following years work before end of third term and so they used methods that direct learners mostly to the content of the reading text, the new words and new structures. This implied that they did not plan to concertedly teach learners reading strategies though they still underscored the importance of reading strategies in the reading process.

4.3.6 Teachers Reasons for teaching the use of Reading Strategies

In general, most teachers were knowledgeable about the importance of reading strategies. Teachers responses about effective, important and necessary strategies above gave the indication that they integrated reading strategies in their everyday reading materials explicitly or implicitly by embedding them into the reading tasks in order to provide for contextualized strategy practice. Table 4.12 below presents their reasons for teaching the learners the use of reading strategies in their reading tasks.
## Table 4.12 Distribution of teachers reasons for teaching use of reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Why do you teach reading strategies during reading instruction?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>It provides necessary feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>It instills independence &amp; self-direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It helps learners to exchange ideas &amp; present problems freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It creates a sound reading situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Easy to guide the different levels of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>It helps learners take to responsive reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>It helps learners form productive reading habits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of school</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Provincial (county)</th>
<th>District (sub-county)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75% 8.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 25%</td>
<td>2 25%</td>
<td>2 50%</td>
<td>4 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9% 19.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12 88.9%</td>
<td>10 66.7%</td>
<td>14 55.6%</td>
<td>11 77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (County)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7% 13.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13 85%</td>
<td>11 92.8%</td>
<td>10 78.6%</td>
<td>14 71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.6% 41.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27 80.5%</td>
<td>22 75%</td>
<td>26 61.1%</td>
<td>29 80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.6% 41.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27 80.5%</td>
<td>22 75%</td>
<td>26 61.1%</td>
<td>29 80.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=36
An analysis of the study findings in Table 4.12 demonstrated that in item 3 teachers pointed out that teaching the use of strategies in reading helped learners exchange ideas and present reading problems in class freely. This was unanimously supported by more than three quarters (88.8%) of the teachers distributed thus, 11.1% in national schools, nearly half 44.4% in county and a third (33.3%) in sub-county schools. The implication of this response was that professional teachers who knew that learners discover meaning through sharing, discussing, exchanging and refining experience and therefore learners were encouraged to incorporate reading techniques when reading.

Item 9 sought information on whether learners completion of assigned tasks on time and to work independently was a reason to teach use of reading strategies. The responses revealed that strategy use was very important in building reading comprehension. This was a decisive reason that was agreed upon by the majority (80.5%) of the participants with 2.8% of teachers in national schools, about half (44.4%) were in county and a third (33.3%) in sub-county. These findings corroborate Sweet and Snow, (2003), Day and Bamford, (2003) assertions that reading proficiency was a product of an organized use of reading strategies selected appropriately to facilitate learners reading and understanding of materials, share information contained in it, and answer the questions as a measure to show their understanding. The implication was that by use of reading strategies learners thinking was provoked. Further, in
classrooms striving for reading proficiency teachers train learners to be skilled thinkers and readers who solve problems and reflect on their reading.

A very important reason for teaching reading in Kenya today is to prepare learners for the national examinations at end of four years in secondary school. Teachers responses to item 13 confirmed that most (80.6%) of the participating language teachers in which few (11.1%) of them were in national schools, nearly a third (30.6%) in county and more than a third (38.9%) in sub-county schools expressed that teaching learners how to read to pass end of course examination was a real reason in ESL classrooms. This implied that teachers drilled the learners on the content in order to cover the syllabus. This finding corroborated Inyega, et al. (2007), Konrad (2008) findings that Kenya’s education system was and still is examination oriented. However, it is critical that teachers need to equip learners with techniques that they can use to independently seek for information when they left school.

Teacher responses to item 10 that sought to establish whether use of reading strategies saved time or not indicated that few (5.6%) of teachers in national schools, a third (33.3%) in county and nearly a third (36.1%) in sub-county schools believed that use of reading strategies saved time. This suggests that proficient reading was a product of proper use of reading strategies. By and large, the three-quarters (75%) response in agreement implied that when learners use reading strategies they do not use a lot of time when reading. This result concurs with Nystrand, and Gamoran, (2003) Beck and McKeown,
(2001) stand that use of reading maximizes the information gained and minimizes the energy used to get it. This revealed that less time is used to analyse a reading text, learners monitor their comprehension and when necessary they skip obvious information. Further, they made predictions and read fast to confirm them. It is therefore clear that reading strategies help the learners in becoming strategic readers.

Item 12 explored more reasons why reading instruction and use of reading strategies was important and necessary. The findings revealed that about three quarters (72.2%) of teachers indicated that use of reading strategies improved autonomy. The high positive response implied that reading instruction aimed at raising learners’ awareness of comprehension strategies and provided learners with systematic practice, reinforcement and self monitoring of their strategy use while attending to reading activities. It concurred with Duffy, (2009), Koda, (2005), and Kamhi-Stein (2003) who posit the idea that teachers can use reading strategies to motivate learners, cultivate in them a reading culture. When learners became active participants in the reading-learning process, they become more efficient and positive in their approach to learning. Through this approach, students’ knowledge of reading strategies became more practical and there was a positive effect on their motivational level, autonomy, transfer of strategies and improved reading proficiency.

Item 1 in Table 4.12 that sought to find out whether teachers of English were able to assess reading proficiency of learners, showed that, very few (8.3%)
teachers in national schools, nearly a third (30.6%) in county and about a quarter (27.8%) in sub-county schools indicated that when they taught reading and instructed on how to use reading strategies they were able to gauge overall reading proficiency levels of their learners. In addition, this helped them greatly in providing necessary feedback to the learners. In total the two-thirds (66.7%) agreement to this item was a clear indication that feedback was not only used to give more or redirect instruction on a certain reading strategies but could also be used to increase motivation and in the case of this study, build a supportive classroom reading climate. The implication feedback being important and necessary is used refine and redirect instruction. This reason maintains Valencia, and Lowe, et. al., (2005) view that feedback helps teachers and learners look back and critique how well they have performed in order to perfect the skill.

Item 7 focused on the idea that reading strategies helped in formation of productive reading habits in the school. By and large nearly two thirds (63.9%) of the sampled teachers were in agreement. Instructively, when learners formed good reading habits, fundamental blocks of learning were build. This in turn enhanced chances of success in school and beyond. This response therefore recognized the fact that, reading in all its entirety was vital to being better informed. Through productive reading habits in which learners read widely and applied it practically, the learner was helped to see reading as a salient ingredient and a major source of their competitiveness and knowledge base.
Item 5 sought to find out the benefits of strategy use for the teachers. The findings on teachers responses indicated that very few (2.8%) of the teachers in national schools, about a third (36.1%) in county and a third (33.3%) in sub-county schools agreed that reading strategy use helped them guide the different levels of learners. Although just about a quarter (27.8%) differed, it could be pointed out that since learners possess different levels of reading expertise, proper use of reading strategies could help them enhance their proficiency. Further, strategy use could help learners maximize and judiciously use instructional time. From these findings, it could be construed that when learners understand what they read, they enjoy, interact and therefore, good reading habits are inculcated in them.

Item 11 required information on effects of learners interaction with the text. It was found that few (2.8%) of teachers in national schools, about a quarter (27.8%) in county and nearly a third (30.6%) in sub-county schools indicated that use of reading strategies helped the learner appreciate the text. This was a belief that when learners gained the knowledge on how and when to use reading strategies and read effectively, they grasped easily the meaning of the text and they were able to integrate what they read with what they already knew. This response suggested that teachers of English mentored learners into proficient independent readers. Additionally, this response implied that teachers designed activity-based lessons and further scaffold student reasoning.
It could be construed that teachers apprenticed learners into proficient reading which in turn helped learners understand and appreciate what they read.

Further, a look at item 2 that required information effects of strategy use by the learner, few (5.6%) teachers in national schools, a quarter (25%) in county and nearly a quarter (22.2%) of teachers in sub-county schools respectively reported that reading instruction and strategy use helped language teachers instill independence and self-direction in the learner. This implied that use of strategies helped learners become active and focused when searching for knowledge. It also meant that when learners become self-directed they could carry out independent studies on their own.

The study’s findings of item 4, which required information on views about the state of reading when using reading strategies, revealed that not many (5.6%) of teachers in national schools, a third (33.3%) and a quarter (25%) in county and sub-county schools respectively agreed that they taught reading strategies because they created a sound reading situation. This came as a result of learners gaining confidence of their achievement through use of reading strategies. Nevertheless a third (36.1%) disagreed. The reason for this disparity could be due low motivation levels of learners and many reading difficulties.

Findings of item 6, that required information on whether or not learners took reading as their responsibility, revealed that very few (5.6%) teachers in national schools, nearly a quarter (22.2%) in county and not many (16.7%) in
sub-county schools felt that teaching reading strategies helped learners take
reading as what they ought to do dutifully. This also facilitated teachers gradual
release of responsibility to learners. This response implied that when learners
were guided on how to use reading strategies they interacted with the text,
responded and participated in answering questions and this helped them
became confident and accountable for their reading. The learners became able
to apply that was learnt with relative ease, and this made it possible for them to
monitor and evaluate their comprehension. Therefore, as the learners become
familiar with the use of reading strategies, the teachers played a less prominent
role of guiding and the learners took the central role in reading.

Item 8 sought to find out whether strategy use promoted student self-
monitoring and evaluation of their reading comprehension. The findings
showed that less than half (41.7%) gave the view that it was a reason to teach
strategy use. Although self-monitoring and evaluation of one’s reading is very
important, slightly above half (58.3%) disagreed with the perception. This
finding suggested that teachers of English did not teach learners how to
monitor their reading comprehension.
4.3.7 Findings on how teachers perceived use of reading strategies in class

Teachers’ perceptions on how they taught reading strategies was analyzed and presented in table 4.13 below.

**Table 4.13 Use of reading strategies in class activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Set a purpose for reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Generate questions based on the passage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Respond to questions to activate relevant schemata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Engage in group discussions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Predict the main idea of the reading selection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Look for the main idea from reading selection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Previewing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Answer questions which have implicit ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Make connections to familiar life experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Reading to present individually or as a group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Reading critically</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Summarize the text</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.13 above showed that answering questions which had implicit ideas was a strategy that teachers of English encouraged. The findings revealed that about half (55.6%) teachers engaged learners from time to time and slightly above a quarter (27.8%) on regular basis. This response implied that teachers encouraged learners to use questions as they read and to enable
them think critically. This way, learners were able to explain and support their reasoning empirically.

Engagement of learners in looking for main idea meant that they were helped to predict it. The findings showed that more than three quarters (77.8%) teachers engaged learners sometimes or always. This concurred with their perception that it was important in reading comprehension. It is assumed that learners had been taught the strategies of eliciting main idea and support details. However, this response appeared to contradict their response on helping learners to predict the said main idea in which a more than two thirds (69.4%) never or rarely engaged learners. It would be almost be impossible to look for main idea before first predicting it. This apparent contradiction pointed out to the fact that teachers did not always prepare their lessons.

Further, findings of teachers response to engaging learners in summarizing that text showed that half (50%) teachers engaged students quite so often and about a quarter (27.8%) always. Summary as a strategy enables the teacher gauge learners understanding of what they read. This finding suggested that student were put into guided practice when reading some new content. This corroborated their response that they did engage learners in looking for the main ideas since this was the basis for making a summary. It is necessary that learners demonstrate what they have learnt. This could be done through organized presentations either by a small discussion group or by individual learners.
Findings to teachers’ responses on whether they engaged learners in group discussions showed that almost (52.8%) did it while more than a third (38.9%) seldom engaged them. Group discussions were valuable in the teaching-learning process. Failure to engage learners in group discussions denied them the opportunity to exchange ideas and learn from one another. Group discussions provided comprehensive coverage of the required strategies. It was assumed that when learners discuss issues, the language teacher was able to gauge their reading comprehension in efforts to help them expand their understanding. In this light, students practice by learning from each other, demonstrate their understanding and make connections. Group discussions promoted learners motivation which fostered increased interest.

Nevertheless, findings on teacher responses on learners generation of questions that were based on the passage was not practiced by the teachers. This item sought to find out whether teachers provided reconciled reading to the learner. The findings indicated that about a quarter (27.8%) teachers never used it and more than half (61.2%) rarely engaged learners in using it. This finding implied that teachers did not tailor reading instruction to meet learners needs. Further, teachers failed to understand that guiding learners on how to generate questions for clarification of meaning was an engaging idea. More to this, students were more likely to make meaning and gain understanding when they think at the edge of their current knowledge. This would be occasioned by thoroughly exploring a text through generation of critical questions, relating facts to old knowledge and applying their learning to new contexts. Seemingly, learners’
questions should drive the lesson. What was important was that learners generated questions and discussions led to greater retention and integration of ideas that further led to more information and more knowledge.

Moreover, the findings show that less than half (44.4%) teachers of English pointed out learners should be engaged in setting a purpose for reading from time to time; 50% did so rarely and very few (5.6%) never engaged learners in setting a purpose for reading. The implication of this response was that students prior knowledge was not tapped. Further, response to setting a purpose for reading had a about half (55.6%) rare engagement of learners participation. This was a clear indication that most classrooms practices did not focus on students needs. The direction on how to read and construct meaning was set and specified by the teacher. Student initiatives were rarely solicited. The fact is when learners pose their own questions to set a purpose for reading, they direct their thinking; they read actively. However, some engagement from time to time gave the impression that sometimes teachers of English were guides and facilitators during reading lessons. Engaging learners in setting a purpose encouraged them to think and reason throughout the text.

Another question from Table 4.13 was whether or not teachers engaged learners in predicting the main idea. Teacher responses to this item showed that a few (13.9%) of teachers never engaged learners and slightly more than half (55.6%) rarely engaged learners in the practice. Only a quarter (25%) teachers engaged learners from time to time. This finding implied that learners prior
knowledge about the text was not tapped. It can be pointed out that lack of background knowledge made it impossible for learners to make connections between new information and what they already knew.

Purpose setting encouraged learners to preview. Previews are very important in reading comprehension because it encouraged learners to think in a focused manner. The findings on this showed that many (88.9%) of teachers never or rarely engaged learners in previews. This response implied that teachers did not encourage learners to generate their own ideas about the content of the text. Further, learners were denied the opportunity to anticipate the content of a reading selection and consequently focus their thinking while reading.

Findings on teacher responses on engagement of learners in reading to present showed that about (58.3%) never or rarely engaged learners in demonstrating what they had learnt. Presentation could involve the whole class with some asking questions, some responding on behalf of the main presenter, some thinking beyond the presentation and making mental applications to life experiences and yet others just getting entertained. This finding implied that teachers never taught learners to take reading as their responsibility.

To enhance understanding and interpret issues and events from different points of view, it was necessary that teachers engaged learners in making connections between what they read and real life experiences. Findings on teacher responses showed that about (55.6%) of teachers did not engage learners. This
finding implied that learners were hardly encouraged to make connections. The content of the selection read was not connected to already known content to expand comprehension and knowledge. This confirmed that teachers did not help learners in activation of prior knowledge. By activating learners’ prior knowledge, the teacher engaged learners in meaning construction which was important in facilitating text comprehension.

4.3.8 How the teachers approached their reading class

Besides asking the teachers to point out their opinions about reading instruction and reading strategies highlighted in the questionnaire, the teachers were also interviewed about reading in general and reading strategies in particular. That is, after stating their practices, the teachers were invited to provide their perspectives of the reading instruction process and of how reading can be taught effectively to achieve reading comprehension.

Perceptions and attitudes of the teachers of English about how they thought reading should be taught assessed on the basis of their answers to the interview questions, ‘How do you think reading strategies should be taught?’ The general findings were that reading strategies can be divided into 3 stages: planning (pre-reading), monitoring (while reading) and evaluation (post-reading). Table 4.14 shows teachers’ interview opinions on use of pre-reading strategies.
From table 4.14 above, it can be deduced that panning or pre-reading strategies were taught quite frequently. In general two thirds (66.7%) of the teachers argued that they guided the learners to skim and scan when reading. They asserted that skimming and scanning helped learners get focused on what was necessary when reading using least effort. They further pointed out that teaching reading this way made it less tedious and learners were active in constructing meaning. This finding implied that skimming and scanning were the most commonly engaged strategies with the teachers and their learners.

Further, almost three quarters (77.8%) of the teachers used the questioning technique to activate or create a schema for the reading task at hand. Teachers highlighted that use oral questions moved the lesson. Oral questions were used to guide learners to link text with what they know by using the title and pictures in the reading passage (if any). They also used questions to find out the actions (strategies) they will use. Finally, teachers reported that they focused the learner on questions they might answer. This response implied that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Purpose setting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Questioning to activate schema</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advance organizers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. making predictions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Generating questions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. skimming &amp; scanning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=18
questions were used to make reading a more interactive process. Besides, learners generation of comprehension questions was a strategy encouraged by half (50%) of teachers of English.

One reason for use of this strategy was to provide reconciled reading which was a strategy meant to help the learner connect the text to what they already knew. This finding implied that learners were prepared before they began to read the text. However, it also pointed out that many teachers did not teach learners to utilize this strategy.

Additionally, many pre-reading strategies were utilized by individual teachers. More so just about a third (38.9%) of the teachers focused on advance organizers and only a third (33.3%) on purpose setting. Advance organizers in form of carefully chosen pictures could be used to get learners actively involved and making the content more accessible. However, this finding indicated that these strategies were not used to engage the learners despite their importance.

Other strategies used included making predictions in which less than half (38.9%) of the teachers reported using it. Teachers said they used them in preparation for reading. It could be construed from this finding that learners were not prepared to read efficiently. These findings pointed out to the fact that teachers used teacher-centred tactics to teach reading.
Although teachers tried to prepare learners for reading, the preparation was not adequate. This means learners start reading without a clear purpose and have no mind map as to what they know and want to know further about the subject. These results disagree with those of Dole, Brown, & Trathen, (1996), Grabe, and Stoller, (2002) and Paran, (1996) who conceive that learners should be adequately prepared for reading.

Table 4.15 below presents observed while-reading strategies that ESL teachers felt they were necessary for effective reading. The most common strategy used during reading stage was use of questions. Questions were used by both the teacher when guiding the learner as well as the learners when asking for information that they did not understand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of mental images</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration &amp; inference</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing a text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying main idea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=18

The researcher observed that less than half (44.4%) of the teachers used visuals to teach reading. This strategy was seen in such activities as use of the illustrations in the reading texts or real objects to help students understand or remember new words or new information. However, these teachers argued that most of the time they asked students to carry out activities without explaining
clearly the purposes of using them due to time factor. This finding implied that teachers got the learners engaged as they read the text.

Teachers of English suggested other reading strategies for use during reading but these were used with decreasing numbers of teachers. Elaboration and use inference was used by slightly more than a third (38.9%) of teachers. An explanation to the infrequent use of the strategy was that although these two strategies helped learners explain writer’s ideas, teachers focused much on the content of the text because their learners lacked prior knowledge so they could not use strategies such as in elaboration, or inference. This finding implies that teachers used other strategies to get learners over the reading tasks.

Another suggested strategy was summarizing which was used by almost a quarter (27.8%) of teachers. However, many did not teach students how to summarize. Due to time constraints, teachers argued that they asked students to outline the main ideas and answer the reading comprehension questions as a way of indicating their understanding. The implication was that many learners did not benefit from this vital strategy.

During reading phase (table 4.15), teachers did not make a significant effort to engage the learners in using reading strategies. Attempts made included identification of main idea by less than half (44.4%) of the respondents. More engaging strategies such as elaboration and inference which help learners use context clues to understand unknown words were used comparatively by more
than a third (38.9%) of the learners. The lack or minimal use of strategies when learner engages with the text indicates that learners use a lot of effort to understand the information in the text since they lack the techniques to engage in efficient reading. This also insinuates that learners encounter difficulties and have no repair techniques. This also brings to the fore the fact teachers supervise reading exercises. The results disregard the perception held by Oxford, (2001), Macaro, (2006), Ikeda and Takeuchi (2003) and Duff (2008) that learners need to be equipped with strategies so that when comprehension breaks down they can repair it easily.

Post-reading strategies facilitated learners reconstruction and extension of meaning. They were meant to help the student look back and think about the message of the text and determine what was important. They consisted of activities that encouraged personal response to text. The activities chosen would help integrate the text selection with others of similar content. The interviewees indicated that because of time limitations, they paid little attention to post-reading strategies, although they were very valuable in evaluating learners’ comprehension. Table 4.16 below summarizes their responses during the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy used</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair work &amp; group work discussions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for clarification</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-talk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=18
Findings from the table 4.16 above, showed that Just about three quarters (72.2%) of the interviewed teachers argued that they encouraged learners to use questions for clarification to evaluate their understanding. It was a strategy to elicit explanations from teachers to find the logical answers for the reading tasks.

The implication that learners endeavoured to ask their teachers about new information (new words, new structures) and the teachers also encouraged them to ask questions so that they could understand the information in the selected text clearly. This finding suggested that clarity was very important.

A further look at the table shows that strategies that helped learners look back and respond to issues in the text were pair-work and group-work discussions used by about three quarters (38.9%) teachers. An explanation of their use was that learners would speak out answers as groups. This indicated that many learners would get help and learn from their classmates. Individual work was also emphasized and the answers were checked with the whole class. Additionally, co-operation strategy was used between students. A third (33.3%) of the teachers argued that learners could find it difficult to check their work or solve some problems beyond their ability if there was no co-operation in class.

This finding implies that if learners worked together, they could have opportunities to share information, pool information, check a learning task or get feedback from the partners. Therefore, use of the strategy ensured co-
operation of students during the reading tasks. Self-talk, a form of class presentation was the least used post-reading strategy. It was also used by learners to reduce their inner anxiety.

In summary, teachers believed that it was necessary to teach learners purposeful reading strategies. Additionally, they posited that learners should be assisted when they read. These opinions stemmed from the fact that reading strategies helped learners activate their prior knowledge and achievement of reading proficiency was easily tenable through guided practice using reading strategies. The commonly used reading strategies were skimming and scanning, previews and use of questioning strategy.

**4.3.9 Methods used to teach use of strategies in reading**

A successful teacher needs to be familiar with as many instructional methods as possible (Duffy 2009). She or he should know how to use them flexibly with different levels of learners.

In this study teachers were requested to indicate how they employed some given reading instructional methods to teach reading on a scale ranging from never to always. Table 4.17 presents this information.
Table 4.17  Common teaching techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 above shows teachers use of common reading methods and techniques that they used to teach reading strategies. The findings on use of deduction strategy revealed that just about three quarters (77.8%) of teachers used the deductive technique. This result implied that the learners were involved in meaning construction. It also suggested that teachers gave the learners tasks for learning, explained them and then asked them to practice using the new concept in a variety of ways. Applied to reading instruction and strategy use, there was reasonable level of interaction among the learners, the teachers and topic. It could be construed that this strategy was used to encourage divergent thinking in the learner. This finding confirms Maamouri (2003), Oxford, (1999) and Yamashita, (2004) views that to understand reading
texts it would be prudent to start from general (what a person knows about the subject) then narrow it down to the specific content.

A further look at the table shows that guided discussion as an instructional technique was used by three quarters (75%) of the teachers quite often. This implied that teachers used it in order to help learners exchange ideas. The findings were of the same opinion with McCarthy and Carter, (2004), Richards, (2001) contention that teachers should know the many advantages associated with use of discussion technique. Therefore, they guided learners to find the right connections even if the text was culturally unfamiliar. A further implication was that teachers of English knew that guided discussion led to retention of information. This response typically requires the learners to provide ideas, experience, opinions and information. The teachers’ role was to carefully prepare questions for learners to do the discussion.

Another commonly used technique was the teacher-centred lecture method. The findings indicated that over half (63.9%) used it as often as possible. This technique is a teacher-centred method and affords the learner the least opportunities to actively participate. The results, therefore, implied that the learners carried out reading tasks with minimal guidance from the teacher. Although a reason was not given why teachers use this technique, they taught for meaning using this traditional fact-based method due to the fact most teachers had big classes coupled with less time for more productive interaction with the students.
This way teacher had no time for the kind of in-depth and engaging instruction that helped learners constructively engage in meaning making and deepen their understanding. The greatest disadvantage on use of this method is limiting student thinking.

Guided demonstration was used by just about half (55.6%) teachers. Student demonstration of learning is very important. This response implied that teachers provided the learners with the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of what they had learnt. However, there was need for teachers to guide learners in expressing what they learn as a means of giving feedback.

Additionally, activity-based as an instructional technique was based on the assumption that learning occurs as learners become actively involved. This item sought to find out if teachers engaged learners in the process of constructing meaning and acquiring knowledge instead of being passive participants. The findings indicated that nearly half (47.2%) of the respondents used the technique quite often. However, close to half (52.8%) of respondents rarely or never engaged learners in using this technique when teaching reading strategies. Despite the fact that teachers did not use this technique quite often, it is important in that its use helps give the necessary feedback the teachers need from the learners. The implication was that learners received knowledge passively.
However, the least used instructional method was role play. Role play required information on whether teachers encouraged learners to act the role of characters in the reading text. The findings indicated that a third (33.3%) of the teachers used play-acting sometimes. This meant that the method was not common. In spite of this, this method is very useful in paraphrasing, outlining and summary. Generally, role play strategy provides teachers with an instructional technique that is intrinsically motivating for learners. The strategy plays a key role in providing a purpose for reading and an avenue for expression of student understanding. However, this could only be done only if there was understanding.

Another least used method for teaching reading strategies was discovery. This method helps the teacher guide students in building reading proficiency through dialogue and questioning. Teachers response revealed that close to a third (36.2%) used it often and almost two thirds (63.8%) rarely or never used it. Applying these responses to reading instruction and strategy use in the ESL classrooms, the majority of teachers who never or rarely used it gave the implication that, though there may have been reasons for not using it, the learners got the opportunity to react to challenging reading tasks. Further, it implied that learners potential was not tapped the discovery method provides important dimensions to classroom reading instruction. By and large, discovery method is very useful in teaching reading strategies.
A further look at the table, showed that the use of inductive method was not commonly used. The findings indicate that less than half (41.7%) of the respondents used it. Applied to reading instruction and strategy and use, many learners were not given a variety of examples for a given strategy showing how the strategy was used in order to discover meaning for themselves when they read texts.

Further, less than half the number of teachers (41.7%) helped students find the right connections by asking relevant and related questions on the content. It could be presumed that the teachers role was to help the learner internalize the ideas through activation of appropriate schema, a practice that the majority of teachers never engaged the learner in. This is supported Kailani (1998), Koda (2005), Richards, et. al. (1997) and Pearson and Hamm (2005) views that learners find meaning when their background knowledge is directed toward the content under review.

4.4 Research Objective 2

How the teachers’ perceptions are reflected in their classroom practices

This objective required information on how teachers of English prepared their learners before, during and how they evaluated their understanding.

4.4.1 Teachers classroom practices

This study collected data through classroom observations with eighteen teachers. At the core of this undertaking was to carefully examine how teachers
taught reading and use of strategies in reading in the ESL classroom. A carefully designed checklist of observable events which were based on the understanding of modern instructional techniques was used. Specifically this section concerned itself with observation and description of practices in regard to regarding instruction and use of reading strategies.

Observation was done because teachers play a crucial role in provision of strategy instruction and therefore this study tried to describe the current status of reading practices within the classroom setting and how (or if any) explicit instruction and practice was given. Specific observation focus was given to the various comprehension strategies that were used before reading, during reading and after reading.

4.4.2. Findings of pre-reading instructional strategies

Teachers practices related to reading strategies that were useful before reading were observed. This section consisted of those strategies that learners were taught to use to get ready to read a text selection.

Understanding of reading strategies used before reading helps learners create a mental alignment that is useful for anticipating the meaning of a text selected before one started reading. Table 4.18 below gives teachers pre-reading activities.
Table 4.18  Use of pre-reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learner involved in purpose setting</td>
<td>2. Asking learner to read title, illustration &amp; make predictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asking learner to guess how illustrations relate to text</td>
<td>4. Engaging learners in pair/group discussion, writing gist sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preview text by reading topic sentences</td>
<td>6. Learners generate questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pre-teaching vocabulary</td>
<td>8. Explicit explanation &amp; modeling of strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provision of reconciled reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of school</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Provincial (County)</th>
<th>District (Sub-county)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count % within school category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>25% 5.5%</td>
<td>55.6% 27.8%</td>
<td>42.8% 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % within school category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>25% 5.5%</td>
<td>44.4% 22.2%</td>
<td>14.3% 5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % within school category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>25% 5.5%</td>
<td>55.6% 27.8%</td>
<td>44.4% 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>50% 66.7%</td>
<td>38.9% 5.5%</td>
<td>55.5% 55.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% within school category:
| 1 | 25% 5.5% | 25% 5.5% | 42.8% 16.7% |
| 5 | 25% 5.5% | 25% 5.5% | 14.3% 5.5% |
| 4 | 11.1% 5.5% | 57.1% 22.2% | 0% 0% |
| 5 | 25% 5.5% | 66.7% 33.3% | 0% 0% |
| 6 | 0% 0% | 11.1% 5.5% | 0% 0% |
| 1 | 25% 5.5% | 25% 5.5% | 14.2% 5.5% |
| 1 | 25% 5.5% | 25% 5.5% | 11% 11% |

n=18
The findings in table 4.18 on teachers use of pre-reading activities revealed that teachers used a variety of pre-reading strategies to direct learners attention before they began reading. The most common strategy used to help the learner increase the capacity to understand the text was asking learners to read the title and make predictions on what the text was about. This item sought to find out whether teachers provided a context for reading by actively engaging learners and helping them make connections to the text through use of the title before they began to read. The findings indicated that two thirds (66.7%) of the teachers observed used the strategy adequately. This included very few (5.6%) teachers in national schools, a third (33.3%) in county and over a quarter (27.8%) of teachers in sub-county schools. Learners were encouraged to look at clues suggested by the title and figure out what information they were likely to get from the reading. This strategy was meant to find out whether teachers activated learners prior knowledge about the text. Nevertheless a third (33.3%) did not demonstrate any use. They showed lack of engagement of the learner actively.

Another pre-reading technique observed was generation of questions about the topic. Over half (61.1%) of the teachers who comprised just one (5.6%) in national schools, a third (33.3%) in county and almost a quarter (22.2%) in sub-county schools used the strategy adequately. This demonstration by teachers revealed that by engaging learners in generating questions about the text, the teacher helped learners check their comprehension when they read. It was
observed that at initial stages, learners got involved by asking questions that required them to combine information from different segments of the text. Question generation was important because it helped learners focus their attention on what they were learning. This finding confirms Ennis (1987), Birch, (2002), Asselin, (2002) who contend that questions help readers rethink about a text and they approach the reading text with an open mind. However, more than a third (38.9%) of the teachers who did not use the strategy had the learners not actively engaged in reading. In such settings learners read without direction and the possibility was that they could not relate what they read to what they already knew.

Text previews was a strategy popular with about half (55.6%) of teachers who involved just one (5.6%) teacher from national schools, almost a quarter (27.8%) from county and nearly another quarter (22.2%) from sub-county schools used the strategy satisfactorily. Observation of texts previews was made to ascertain whether teachers prepared learners mentally to receive information from written materials by discussing the topic and generating possible questions that could be answered through reading. Previews gave learners an outline into which information from the texts could be better understood. Use of this strategy helps raise learners attention by activating their prior knowledge and setting the stage for them to receive and incorporate new information to their understanding. Through use of previewing strategy, teachers also helped learners built interest and focus on the text. Nevertheless, it was observed that use of the previewing strategy, though necessary and
important for reading, was not practiced by almost half (44.4%) of the teachers in preparing learners for reading. Accordingly, learners were not able to generate their own ideas about the text and because of this gap, they did not learn much during the reading lesson.

Use of setting a purpose as a strategy was demonstrated by half (50%) of the teachers. Out of these, very few (5.55%) teachers were in national schools, just about a quarter (27.8%) in county and 3 (16.7%) in sub-county schools helped the learner set a purpose for reading. To set a purpose there was use of oral questions that helped in providing a direction and focus for understanding and thinking about the text. When learners are guided in setting a purpose for reading, they establish a goal. This active involvement motivates students to read and this enhances their reading comprehension. They think and reason throughout the text to achieve their goal.

However, half of the teachers spent little time interacting with learners. The learners were generally passive in the classroom as they listened or watched the teacher talk about the ideas related to the topic. This implied that many teachers plunge learners into reading without preparing them on what to read to achieve. This situation breeds disinterest and learners’ comprehension is not likely to improve.

The findings further showed that there was use of illustrations to guess how they related to the text. Over a third (38.88%) of teachers who consisted of
very few (5.6%) teachers from national, less than a quarter (22.2%) from county and a small number (11.1%) from sub-county schools demonstrated sufficient use of this instructional technique. Conversely, more than half (61.1%) of the teachers did not demonstrate use or there was need for great improvement. The observation on this item revealed that language teachers hardly used diagrammatic representations in the text books or created their own in order to help learners activate appropriate schemata in order to manipulate it in relation to the material they were about to read. The 61.1% who never displayed any aspect of use of this strategy clearly indicated ill preparation of learners to access additional information / knowledge. Further, this indicated that learners comprehension of new experience was not aided. This was contrary to Nuttall, (2005) and Thornbury, (2005) views that use of visuals made it possible for learners to think creatively and critically both of which helped the learner interact with the text.

The findings also indicated that a number of pre-reading strategies, though they were necessary and important, were not employed by teachers to prepare the learner for reading. One such pre-reading strategy was semantic mapping, which involved pre-teaching vocabulary. This strategy was necessary for observation as it sought to find out how teachers assessed learners knowledge in regard to the topic. Findings showed that no teacher made use of it.

Additionally, findings point out that engagement of learners in discussions either in pairs or in groups was not a popular practice by teachers. This strategy
was useful in that it helped to get the learners share what they thought the selection was about. This item required information to ascertain whether teachers organized learners to discuss briefly for the teacher to gauge general schema that learners possessed in order to help them develop and refine appropriate schema in preparation for comprehension of new information in the selected text. Findings revealed that this pre-reading strategy was not used to engage learners in readiness for reading comprehension as only one (5.5%) teacher in county schools demonstrated its use adequately. Nevertheless, it is important to point out that class discussions minimize anxiety and develop confidence in the learners.

Another pre-reading strategy that teachers of English could help the learners read through the text and help them get ready to read the text was through provision of reconciled reading. Observation on use of this strategy showed that few (11.1%) teachers used it adequately. These was one (5.6%) teacher in national schools and another (5.55%) from provincial schools. However, the majority (94.4%) did not use the strategy at all despite the fact that the strategy is very important at initial stages of reading. The teachers who used reconciled reading had developed pre-reading questions from questions that appeared at the end of a reading passage and this helped the teachers engage learners in interactive and reflective activities. This strategy assisted teachers in providing necessary background information to the reader, which in turn facilitated better understanding.
Teachers of English also described the strategies that were relevant to the reading selection by providing explicit information on when it was necessary for use, how it could be used and why it was necessary. However, although this was a necessary and important instructional practice, only a few (16.65%) teachers; 5.55% in national schools, another 5.55% in county and 5.55% from sub-county schools demonstrated adequate use.

In summary, a number of pre-reading strategies were used by language teachers. An overview revealed that there was no demonstrated use of the strategies at outstanding level. The findings showed that the most used pre-reading strategies were: asking learners to read the title, illustrations and making predictions, learners generation of questions and previewing the text by reading topic sentences. Pre-reading strategies that were least used included provision of reconciled reading, pre-teaching vocabulary and engaging learners in pair/group discussion and writing gist sentences.

The discrepancy between theory and practice displayed here points out to the fact that teaching reading is a complex process where teachers need to have a clear procedural knowledge in order to merge theory into their classroom practices. This incongruence was noted by Block & Pressley (2002) who observed that in teaching reading strategies as part of comprehension instruction, teachers seemed not to merge what they perceived to work well and what they actually did. Teachers continued to use strategies without clear knowledge on when and how they should be used. Further, Singhall (2001), Pang and Kamil
(2003) and Sailors (2008) contend that there should be concerted efforts in development of reading teachers and comprehension instruction because new teachers still enter schools "with the understanding of how to teach comprehension based on how they were taught to read.

4.4.3. The While-reading instructional strategies

Teachers’ practices of while-reading instructional strategies comprised those tactics that learners were taught to use when they read a selected text. These tactics were meant to help the learners focus on how to determine what the writer would actually be attempting to say and to match the information with what the learners already knew. These strategies were likely to be influenced by the pre-reading strategies for the reason that learners would be keeping in mind the previews, outlines, questions, predictions, etc. that were generated before reading and then using this information to digest what they would be reading. Table 4.19 below shows the while-reading strategies that teachers used with varying degrees of adequacy.
Table 4.19  Use of while-reading strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=18
Findings in table 4.19 above show about a half (55.6%) of teachers, in which one (5.55%) was in national schools, a third (33.33%) in county and less than a quarter (16.66%) in sub-county schools interacted with learners adequately while they read by prompting them to make guesses about up-coming information. This item intended to find out whether teachers aided learners reading by directing them to use topic sentences. Despite the fact that the strategy is very useful in helping learners read fast in search of information to fulfill their curiosity, less than half (44.4%) of the teachers were not keen to use the strategy.

A look at the table shows that teachers of English engaged learners in using inference strategy in which half (50%) of them demonstrated its use satisfactorily. These included one (5.6%) teacher in national schools, almost a quarter (22.2%) in county and an equal number (22.2%) in sub-county schools. Use of this strategy implied that as learners read, they were not only able to recognize what they read but also restated the words/phrases or expressed them in a different ways. The teachers engaged learners in analyzing the ideas that were expressed and then synthesizing the information into a whole.

Findings in the table indicated that a third (33.3%) of the teachers who comprised of one (5.55%) teacher from national schools, a few in county (16.66%) and 11.1% in sub-county schools facilitated learners creation of mental images about the concepts discussed in the reading text. These teachers
demonstrated adequate use of the strategy. However, 66.7% of teachers did not demonstrate its use which implied that teachers did not use the strategy.

The strategies that were least demonstrated included the minority (5.5%) in county schools who used questions to monitor learners' comprehension and verify their understanding. Identification of main ideas was satisfactorily used by an insignificant number (16.7%) of teachers consisting of one from each category of schools. This strategy was observed to establish whether teachers guided the learners in distinguishing relevant from irrelevant information; facts from opinion, support details from the main ones and finding out the connection between textual information and self experience.

Assisting learners to connect to self and other texts was used adequately by very few (11.1%) teachers. However, a majority 88.9% did not help learners see the connection between what was on print and their real life experiences.

Looking at the foregoing findings, teachers use of while-reading instructional strategies was minimal. On average, making guesses about up-coming information was demonstrated by over half (55.6%) of the teachers and another strategy, helping learners to infer unknown words as they read had 50% of the respondents practicing it. All the other strategies observed at this level had negligible demonstration. Observation of while-reading strategy use was minimal and this gave the implication that learners got deterred when comprehension broke down. When such scenarios occur, teachers bear the
blame because they don’t guide the learners in making relations between what they know and what was in print.

From these findings, there is a clear indication that learners were not taught explicitly nor exposed to many reading tactics. Instead, teachers used broad instructional methods such as lecture method, question-answer method with no clear purposes for reading. This leaves a big question whether practicing teachers received adequate preparation during pre-service training or they neglected good instructional practice and if they could be expected to promote and practice reading techniques when they did not receive training and practice in the same. The incongruence in these findings agrees with Walsh, Glaser and Yigister and Sariciban (2005), Birch (2002), Cummins, et.al. (2004) and Asselin (2002) opinions that teachers who may not have sufficient information and focus about reading comprehension strategies in their content areas can not teach using them.

4.4.4 Teachers use of post-reading strategies.

This section discusses teachers’ use of post-reading instructional techniques. It was based on the data obtained from classroom observation with 18 teachers in real classroom setting. Their actual practices are tabulated in table 4.20 below.
Table 4.20 Post-reading strategies

What are the most commonly practiced post-reading strategies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>1. Asking learners to discuss text</th>
<th>2. Asking learners to retell what they have read.</th>
<th>3. Asking questions with explicit answers</th>
<th>4. Asking follow-up questions to confirm prediction</th>
<th>5. Asking learners to analyze text critically</th>
<th>6. Asking learners to outline main ideas</th>
<th>7. Asking learners to write a summary</th>
<th>8. Asking learners to draw conclusion about the text</th>
<th>9. Providing feedback</th>
<th>10. Asking learners to read other material to practice using the strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % within school category % of total</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (County)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % within school category % of total</td>
<td>66.6 %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
<td>11.1 %</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>27.77%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (Sub-county)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count % within school category % of total</td>
<td>71.4 %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.7 %</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=18
Findings in table 4.20 above show that the majority (94.4%) of the teachers used questioning strategy satisfactorily. These comprised of one (5.55%) teacher in national schools, half (50%) in county and more than a third (38.88%) in sub-county schools. The questions asked by the teacher had explicit answers from the text that the learners had read. These questions needed short simple answers. These questions were not the same as questions at the end of reading selection but were effective in understanding the text better. This great number (94.4%) of the respondents who displayed adequate use of question-answer strategy gave the implication that teachers used the strategy quite often to assess learners understanding of what they read. Further, it also helped teachers to give their input in order to help the learner comprehend the text better. However, a very small number (5.6%) did not use the strategy but only asked learners to do comprehension questions at the end of the passage.

Besides the extensive use of the questioning strategy, teachers engaged learners in discussing the text. The findings showed that two-thirds (66.7%) of the teachers encouraged learners to discuss in pairs the content of the text they had read. The teachers gave guidelines of what the learner had to focus on. This use of the strategy was demonstrated by very few (5.55%) teachers in national schools, a third (33.3%) in county and almost a quarter (27.8%) in sub-county schools. The teachers who used discussion as a post-reading instructional technique assisted in establishing whether the learner had understood what they had read. However, there was need to encourage the learners to take active roles throughout their learning.

Further, the findings in table 4.20 show that about half (55.6%) of the teachers engaged learners in drawing conclusions. This was demonstrated adequately by a minority
(5.6%) of teachers in national schools, about a quarter (27.8%) in county and less than a quarter (22.2%) in sub-county schools. These teachers presented learners with the opportunity to look at the text judiciously, integrating the information with their schema and drew conclusions about the purpose of the writer. The learners were encouraged to check their predictions about the text and what they had read to sort out what they had read and their thinking. This implied that learners were likely to discover new information. This further brings out the idea that the learners critical thinking was developed. On the contrary, 44.4% did not engage learners. Learners just read the selected passages and answered the questions at the end of the passage.

Additionally, the findings in the table show that half (50%) of the teachers; one teacher in national schools, about a quarter (27.8%) and a few (16.7%) of the teachers in county and sub-county schools respectively engaged learners sufficiently in making outlines of the main ideas of the text they had read. The outlining strategy which is a prerequisite for good summary writing entails pointing out key points of a reading selection. Although this strategy is essential in reading, half the number of the teachers did not prepare the learners for sketching the main points in the reading selection. This indicated lack of preparation of learners to separate main parts from their support detail, distinguish the relevant points from irrelevant ones with regard to the topic given. Absence of good preparation in how to use the strategy was likely to impact negatively on the learners’ ability to summarize reasonably large pieces of writing.

Other instructional techniques that were necessary but had low rates of practice which was almost nonexistent were teachers encouragement of learners to retell what they had read. Observation on use of this technique only sought to find out if teachers assisted
learners in recalling, paraphrasing and exhibiting their understanding. Over a third (38.9%) of the teachers encouraged learners’ retellings satisfactorily; some 22.2% of them were teachers in county and not many (16.7%) were in sub-county schools. The teachers directed learners as they presented their understanding in paraphrased form. Retelling is an excellent way that helps learners to examine how much they could remember. The learners reviewed only important details at the beginning, middle and end of what they read. Although the majority (61.1%) of teachers did demonstrate use of the strategy, the practice significantly helps learners display their understanding of concepts in the reading selection.

Another instructional technique that was used, though with fewer teachers, was giving learners follow-up questions related to predictions at the beginning of their reading. The instructional activities were in line with the generated questions and predictions before they started reading the selection. Findings from observation showed that less than half (44.4%) of the teachers who consisted of the minority (11.1%) in national schools and a handful (16.66%) each in county and sub-county schools demonstrated use of the strategy adequately. The teacher(s) helped the learners confirm or reject their predictions and guesses. However, over half (55.6%) did not use the strategy. A critical examination on teachers’ use of this strategy showed a disparity. During pre-reading phase, two thirds (66.7%) of the teachers encouraged learners to predict what was likely to be in the text by looking at the topic. However, during reading and after reading, less than half (44.4%) of them helped learners confirm or reject their predictions. This showed that teacher actions before reading may differ significantly with their actions at the end of the lessons.
However, findings in table 4.20 further reveal that a number of strategies were not used despite the fact that they are important for reading. These strategies include critical analysis of the text that the learners had read. Findings indicate that less than a quarter (22.2%) of the teachers involved learners effectively in critical analysis of the text. This is a strategy that encouraged learners to isolate evidence in given selected readings. Moreover, learners were afforded the prerogative to analyze their understanding and in the process they would discover valuable information. However, much as the strategy is very important, the findings showed that teachers did not employ it a lot.

Teachers’ feedback on use of all these post-reading instructional techniques was important as it acted as the gauge on how well the learners were progressing in using reading strategies. However, this strategy was minimally used by some 16.7% of the teachers felt that learners needed feedback. However, the majority (83.3%) teachers did not give any feedback. Feedback is necessary in that it ensures that the strategies are used correctly. Without feedback learners are likely to use the strategies incorrectly or avoid its use altogether.

Writing summaries followed outlining the main ideas. Nevertheless the findings in table 4.20 showed that teachers did not practice using this strategy. Very few (11.1%) of them in national schools engaged learners adequately in writing summaries of one paragraph. These summaries were based on their outlines. The engagement was appropriate as learners wrote short summaries. The greater number, (88.9%) did not demonstrate any attempt to use the strategy. An examination of this trend in strategy use pointed to the fact that many teachers do not provide the students with the
opportunities to organize their thinking through summary writing. It is clear from this finding that learners were not guided in reconstruction and extension of meaning.

Further, generalization of strategy use requires that student are given more opportunities to practice oftenly how to use the strategy in groups or individually. This activity where teachers give student new materials to read during study time was not a common practice. An insignificant number (5.6%) of the teachers in national schools gave learners work to do after the lesson but the greater (94.4%) number did not make an effort. This suggested that students do not talk about how they learn and how they arrive at logical conclusions. This trend where teachers do not recommend reading of related materials is likely to limit students schema and consequently limit their practices of strategy use which is likely to result in their disinterest in reading.

The observation findings revealed that teachers used a variety of reading strategies to prepare the learners for reading before they started. These strategies include asking them to read the title and illustrations in order to make predictions. They also asked learners to generate questions and engaging them in previewing the text by reading topic sentences. During reading, teachers encouraged learners to guess about upcoming information in order to enhance their comprehension as they read. At the end of the lesson, teachers employed the questioning technique where learners gave direct answers from the text.

During the post-reading stage, the teachers were expected to consolidate construction of meaning by checking on the foundation for construction of meaning that they laid at the beginning and how they maintained it for achievement of the set purpose. To
consolidate the two, teachers had many tactics. Observed findings show that asking questions with explicit answers was utilized by the majority (94.4%) of teachers with over a quarter (77.8%) perceiving it as necessary to recap what learners had read. Additionally, two thirds (66.7%) asked learners to discuss text. Further, half (50%) of them asked learners to outline main ideas. On the contrary, during the interview none of the teachers regarded it as important. Wigfield, et.al. (2008), Stahl (2004), Fang, (1996), Brophy, (1985) and Kinzer, (1988). point out that failing to use post-reading strategies signifies that teachers did not set up useful pre- and active reading strategies to follow up at the end. The post reading phase is critical to comprehension without which learners can not clarify their interpretations of the text.

4.4.5 Findings of teachers’ classroom practices in relation to their perceptions

Table 4.21 below illustrates the results of the teachers’ pre-reading, while-reading, and post-reading instructional practices in relation to their stated perceptions.
Table 4.21 Teachers perceptions and classroom practices

How are teachers perceptions reflected in their practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception/Practice</th>
<th>Category of school</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated perceptions</td>
<td>Observed practices</td>
<td>Stated perceptions</td>
<td>Observed practices</td>
<td>Stated perceptions</td>
<td>Observed practice</td>
<td>Total stated perceptions</td>
<td>Total observed practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking out the heading, illustrations &amp; making predictions</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
<td>12 (66.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (55.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose setting</td>
<td>2 (5.55%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct attention through skimming &amp; scanning</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>12 (66.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre–teaching vocabulary</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, explain &amp; model strategy</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of reconciled reading</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating questions</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
<td>11 (61.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying main idea</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>8 (44.4%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guessing about upcoming information</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (55.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (77.8%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping learner create mental images</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking questions to check comprehension</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing guided practice</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping learners elaborate &amp; infer unknown words</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping learner connect text to others</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping learner confirm, revise &amp; reject predictions</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retelling</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary writing</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-talk</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of text</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking learners to analyze text critically</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlining main ideas</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 4.21 illustrates, 18 teachers were observed in class teaching and were interviewed afterwards. A general opinion held by all teachers of English was that although the learners should have matured in their reading proficiency and that they should study on their own, there was need to teach techniques that would enable them to become thriving readers during their time in school and also outside. However, from observation, it was established that the reading instruction was associated with giving learners exercises for in class and just checking the answers. However, learners need to be lead into and taught reading strategies more explicitly, for the reason that they would become enthusiastic readers.

Overall, the findings of the study revealed that teachers perceptions and what they actually do are quite different. In the pre-reading phase, the reading techniques that teachers engaged learners in were very few considering the fact that learners needed to be prepared adequately before they began to read. A look at table 4.21 indicated that two-thirds (66.7%) of the teachers engaged learners in checking out the heading, illustrations and making predictions. This was a reflection of their perceptions although fewer, slightly over a third (38.9%) perceived reading strategies to be crucial in preparing the learner before letting them start reading. it could be deduced that teachers of English used this strategy since they believed it could increase learners' interest and understanding of the text.

Another pre-reading perceived and practised by teachers of English was setting a purpose for reading. Half (50%) of teachers demonstrated adequate use of the strategy but more than a third (38.9%) acknowledged that they used it. This implied that sometimes teachers cannot explain their actions. This impacts on the learners who are
not guided step by step through the reading tasks. It could be affirmed that due to this mismatch in instructional setting, learners find themselves reading without direction, consequently losing interest for reading.

Furthermore, teachers’ perceptions in involving the learner in generating questions to answer when reading and the actual practice in class also showed incongruence. Half (50%) of them had the view that they slotted in learners in generating questions based on the text. However, the actual practice was demonstrated by more than half (61.1%) of teachers. When using this strategy, learners may realize that they need to adjust their reading rate by reading slower, and they may need to repeat this process as they work through the entire reading assignment. In any case, the practice of using questions should take place throughout the reading. By employing questioning technique it becomes possible to solve their own failures in understanding and weak readers can develop the confidence to become strong readers.

While pre-reading strategies are very supportive in learning, many teachers do not practice what they perceive to be the basis of their actions. This was a case of two-thirds (66.7%) of the teachers who alleged they directed attention through skimming and scanning. These two strategies are necessary in giving an overview of what a text is all about or when looking for specific information. Teachers could confuse it with preview strategy. However, previews in which slightly above half (55.6%) teachers demonstrated it adequately involve discussions that help learners create questions about what they want to look for from the text. Previews help readers to think about what they already know concerning the topics in a selected reading task.
Moreover, teachers demonstrated strategies that they felt they were less important. These included identification, explanation and modeling of a strategy to be used and provision of reconciled reading. These were demonstrated by some 16.7% and a few (11.1%) respectively. Demonstration without certainty of a perception is likely to lead to confusion on the part of the learner who may not know what it is and how to use it. Reconciled reading helps learners connect to text. Though the strategy was not considered as important, it helps learners to reorganize their present thinking about a given concept. The two teachers who used it had developed pre-reading questions from those at the end of the end of a reading selection.

The while-reading strategies also indicated a lot of incongruence between perceptions and practices. Teachers suggested that they used questioning to break down text into pieces in order to put it into context and paraphrase it. This was a perception indicated by a majority (77.8%) against the classroom involvement of the learner in practice by very few (5.55%) teachers. Questioning strategy facilitates learners understanding by answering questions such as; what has the text informed me? Are there other ways of stating this information? How has the text so far challenged my stand? This finding suggests that teachers perceptions that are embedded in their theories have not been put to practice. Additionally, identifying the main idea from a selected passage was not a common practice among the teachers. Less than half (44.4%) of the teachers indicated they engaged learners in using the strategy when reading. However, some 16.7% of them practically used them in class. Further, teachers perceptions and their actions in assisting learners create mental images that they could use to understand a text were different also. Some 44.4% of the teachers argued that they engaged learners while in class, a third (33.3%) of them adequately demonstrated its use. The strategy, very important and necessary, is underutilized. The discrepancy between teachers’
perceptions and practices implies a situation where learners read without direction. Besides, while-reading strategies enables learners engage effectively in the written discourse. An equally important while reading strategy was helping learners elaborate and infer unknown words from text.

Over a third (38.9%) of the teachers argued that they engaged learners in elaborating information to understand it better and infer the meaning of unknown words in context. In class, half (50%) of them demonstrated adequately the use of elaboration and inference strategies.

Nevertheless, teachers demonstrated while-reading strategies that they did not perceive as necessary and important. These strategies included guessing about up-coming information which was adequately demonstrated by more than half (55.6%) teachers, provision of guided practice in which almost a quarter (27.8%) teachers’ demonstrated their use sufficiently. Other while-reading strategies observed in practice included helping learners connect text to self and the world. However, this was displayed adequately by very few (11.1%) teachers. This item sought to find out whether teachers engaged learners in connecting their experiences to the one discussed in the reading selection and make connections to other texts they had read. This would help learners understand intertextuality of written texts. Another equally important but not perceived as necessary was helping learners confirm, revise and reject predictions. This item which was expressed sufficiently by about 22.2% of teachers required information on whether teachers engaged learners in confirming the predictions that they had made in the pre-reading stage, either by revising them or rejecting them altogether.
In summary while-reading strategies were not exploited adequately by teachers of English. Teachers had a perception on what works well but they did not put their opinion into practice. On the other hand, teachers felt some strategies were not important. Moreover, they showed adequate use. This finding revealed that there was a gap between teachers professional training and practice. Further, the findings also revealed that teachers lack procedural knowledge on how to teach reading and reading strategies. This is a drawback to teaching reading strategies.

The purpose of post-reading strategies is to examine or appraise the purpose of the reader and how well s/he achieved the stated purpose at the pre-reading stage. In addition, the instructional activities in the post-reading phase assists in review and evaluation of the reading strategies used. The most common post-reading strategy was questioning for understanding in which nearly three-quarters (77.8%) perceived that use of the strategy facilitates learners search for clarification and for more information. During observation almost all (94.4%) of the teachers satisfactory displayed the use effectively. This implied congruence in opinion and practice.

Other post-reading strategies with little importance attached to them were summarizing and synthesizing the important information in the text read. Both the perception and practice responses suggested under-utilization of the strategies. Teachers perception indicated that nearly a quarter (27.8%) asserted that they learners in using them but only a few (11.1%) demonstrated its use effectively. Further, discussion of a text was very important, however, teachers perceptions on learners engagement in pair or group discussion was low. Besides, during observation, two-thirds (66.7%) of them engaged learners in pair/class discussions. This indicated a big gap between theory and practice.
The outlining strategy was displayed effectively by half (50%) of the teachers although they did not think it engaged the learner effectively. Any activity needs feedback to find out how successful or incomplete the engagement was. However, some (16.7%) of teachers offered feedback to the learners. The majority (83.3%) did not seek to know the level of understanding of the learner and this implied that learners did not get to know how their reading comprehension progressed.

From the above findings in which teachers’ had reported their perceptions about teaching reading strategies which were compared with observed actual teaching have shown inconsistencies between teachers’ self-reports of perceptions and observation of their actual classroom practices (Bradley (1998); Ness, (2007)). It can be interpreted that this inconsistency was due to contextual realities of the teachers’ schools that constrain teachers’ ability to follow their perceptions about what works best and provide instruction which transforms learners working knowledge (Fang, 1996; Pang and Kamil, 2003 and Oxford, 2001).

4.5 Findings for Objective Three

Factors that influence choice of reading texts for English lessons

This research question intended to find out the range of reading materials that teachers of English choose reading selections from when planning for reading instruction and to establish the factors that influence teachers’ choice of reading materials for their Form 3 learners.
4.5.1 Range of reading materials

The data shown in table 4.22 displays the range of materials from which teachers choose reading selections for teaching reading strategies.

Table 4.22 Frequency distribution of reading materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material used</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Magazines/newspaper articles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passages from the course textbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internet articles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Literature such as novels, poems, short stories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Passages or articles from other areas of study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in table 4.22 revealed that the use of reading passages from the course or prescribed text books was predominant. The majority (88.9%) of the teachers used this material always while a few (11.1%) used them quite often. It can be pointed out that, this response implied that language teacher’s depended heavily on what was readily available. They concentrated their reading instruction on what was constructed by others. Reading comprehension shapes the way we think and determines what we can think about. Perspectives to events and issues to think about change each day and much as these teachers used what was available—prescribed textbooks, in which the perspectives to look at issues might have changed with time they still used them wholesome.
The findings further indicated that in the use of literature texts such as novels, poems and short stories, approximately half (44.4%) of the teachers used it always, less than half (41.7%) used the material sometimes. However, some 13.9% used them rarely though they were part of English language syllabus. This observation suggests that although literature set books were in abundance in all secondary schools, teachers were not keen on extracting parts of the text (novel, play, short stories or poems), to instruct learners on how to read intelligently.

It can also be noted that, on use of magazines and newspaper articles, a third (33.3%) of the teachers used them sometimes while two-thirds (66.7%) rarely or never obtained reading selections from them. These findings implied that reading passages from these sources were not popular even though the sources contained unlimited and latest information. Notwithstanding these reading materials contain fresh information everyday, teachers do not prepare their reading selections by tapping on what is current as background for learning actions so as to expand learners critical thinking.

It can also be seen that the choice of reading articles from the internet showed that more than three-quarters (77.8%) never or rarely used them whereas nearly a quarter (22.2%) used it occasionally. Like newspapers, the internet carries fresh information on nearly all issues that are happening all over the world. The majority (77.8%) response as never / rare use was an indication that teachers did not use reading materials that contained rich and current information. Use of diversified reading materials serves as a springboard for collecting knowledge for greater understanding on the interrelatedness of experience across cultures and the digital divide. In fact, uses of these materials make it possible for teachers to select passages of personal interest to the learners.
A further look on the findings on language teachers sourcing for passages or articles from other areas of study showed that a handful (30.6%) of the teachers used them sometimes. However, more than half (69.4%) of them were of contrary view. The implication was that teachers did not think other areas of study were rich in supplying rich interesting content for teaching reading or the teachers are constrained by the school environment. Needless to say, as people read, they rediscover themselves historically, geographically, scientifically and literary in all aspects. When little attention is given for selection of reading materials from other subjects, then this meant that each subject is learnt in isolation from the others except the use of a common language of instruction.

In summary, only two sources for selecting reading passages seem popular here; the use of the course/prescribed text books and the literature texts. Other sources suggested here, show varying degrees of use but they were not in popular use.

4.5.2 Factors that influence choice of reading materials

Factors that influence teachers choice of reading materials were sought. Teachers were requested to indicate their opinion in regard to this issue on a 4-point scale ranging from SD to SA which were then converted to percent (%) then presented in table 4.23.
Table 4.23 Factors about the Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>SD -- D</th>
<th>A -- SA</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The nature of the learner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Content of the text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objectives of the reading lesson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learners background of reading strategies/skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learners level of motivation/interest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reading environment in the school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supplementary reading material</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=36

The data in table 4.23 shows that the amount of time in which learners and text interacted was a variable that influenced the choice of reading material. The table above therefore revealed that the majority (72.2%) of teachers agreed that limited time influenced greatly their choice of reading selections. However, about a quarter (27.8%) felt that time was not an issue in their choices. This suggested that teachers of English did consider the amount of time available for the material chosen for learners. This meant that inadequate time impacted negatively on the coverage of objectives. Further, this would suggest that very little coverage was done because teachers chose few reading tasks and activities commensurate with the time available. It can be argued that this practice compromised adequate attainment of set objectives and purpose. It also implied that because of limited time, the material chosen might not provide adequate opportunities for discovery.

The findings further indicate that clearly set out instructional objectives and the priorities given to these objectives influence the selection of reading materials. Objectives of a reading lesson are the foundation upon which content materials and the instructional techniques are chosen. Findings of teachers’ responses on this item
showed that many (83.3%) teachers agreed that objectives of a reading lesson greatly influence their choice of reading materials. On the other hand, a few (16.7%) disagreed. The pedagogic implication is that, clearly set out objectives for reading should guide the selection of reading materials. Further, this finding also suggested that consideration of objectives to be achieved guided them in selecting the best materials which would help them decide on the best and appropriate learning activities and strategies that would help learners to construct meaning based on the set purposes.

This study also sought to find out teachers understanding of knowledge about the background of reading strategies of learners which they would have to draw upon as they worked out on the reading materials. Findings showed that the majority (80.6%) of the teachers indicated that the internalized reading strategies that learners possessed helped the teachers gauge the reading material they took to class. However, some 11.1% of the teachers held a contrary view. The majority (80.6%) response implied that the materials teachers choose for reading would challenge the learners and stretch their mind but this demand had to match learners level of reading competence and strategy repertoire.

Further, teachers knowledge of learners background of reading strategies also meant that when choosing reading materials teachers found it necessary to decide whether the material chosen required great deal of teacher assistance or whether the learner could work independently without much direction. Influence of this aspect made it possible for teachers to select materials which would be suitable for the group of students at hand. This was a view agreed upon by 80.6% but a minority 19.4% held a contrary view.
The results in the table further indicated that a reflection of the nature of the learner was a basic requirement that the language teachers reported it called for consideration when choosing reading materials. Findings on this item revealed that the greater number (77.8%) of the teachers considered it a crucial issue whereas very few (8.3%) felt that it did not influence their choice of reading materials. These majority (77.8%) assertive response implied that teachers focused on the learner competencies when choosing reading materials.

This focus was on learner background knowledge, linguistic competence and the learners abilities to approach for assistance when there was need on the basis of the objectives of the reading lesson. However, the 8.3% of teachers who indicated a disagreement and 5 (13.9%) who did not respond indicated some inconsistency between teachers perceptions about reading strategies and their classroom practices. This meant that the lessons were teacher-centred most of the time leaving the learner disadvantaged.

Findings on whether learners level of motivation influenced teachers choice of reading selection or not revealed that three-quarters (75%) agreed that learners interest for reading played a crucial role in the choice of material to be read. This suggested that teachers of English had to assess the level of interest of learners so as to choose a reading material that they could read enjoyably. However, low levels of motivation/interest placed the teacher in ungainly situations as to what genre of a reading material would be appropriate. This response also implied that, on the contrary,
low level of motivation posed challenges on the language teacher as to how they should engage student curiosity and promote active reading.

Teachers responses on content of text as a factor that influenced their text selection varied as the majority (72.2%) of the teachers agreed that it played a key role while some 11.1% did not respond. The implication here is that teacher’s careful examination of text content on the basis of learners prior knowledge played an influential role in selecting the text. This is still so because reading comprehension is a process of interaction between text content and the readers prior knowledge. Teachers’ prior examination of text content was meant to ensure that the material chosen for reading contained something familiar to learners. These findings show that since time was limited, teachers chose those materials that had embedded reading strategies. These findings maintain Anderson, et. al., (1987), Dole, et. al. (1991) and Farrell, (2004) who pointed out that teachers are the decision makers in choosing the instructional material since they know the types of their learners. Therefore, as the situation stands, teachers would find it easy to activate appropriate learners schema by helping them recognize the knowledge they had about the topic of the text through discussion of titles, subheadings and previewing. It is likely that an unfamiliar content would pose reading problems.

Additionally, findings in the table above show that teachers are often hard-pressed to choose appropriate supplementary reading material. These would aid learning and also help to locate other materials which would provide additional practice. Teacher responses on this item shows that many (72.2%) of the respondents indicated that supplementary reading materials played a key role in the choice of reading material.
whereas about a quarter (27.8%) were of contrary opinion. This implied that supplementary reading materials need be considered alongside the main material which would be used to introduce concepts and reading strategies. This is so because learners require a variety of reading activities that emphasized different reading strategies. Further, this positive response pointed out that choice of supplementary and enrichment reading materials to support reading was a very important consideration in the selection of materials. The contrary opinion meant that teachers relied on the main course book. It also implied that the new strategies and skills taught were not reinforced.

Moreover, another finding that came to light and which teachers’ asserted influenced their choice of reading selection was the reading environment in the school. Results of this finding indicated that two-thirds (66.7%) of the respondents pointed out that this factor was really crucial. Contrary to this view was a third (33.3%) of them who expressed the opinion that reading environment was not an influential factor for their material choice. This response implied that teachers of English consider it important that learners need to feel a part of reading process. The reading environment in the school need be appropriate and empowering. Further, this response also implied that when the environment is empowering learners are encouraged and when they make mistakes they tried to fix them. It also meant a rich reading environment meant that the classroom was more interactive, the teacher and the students worked as a group. As teachers gave feedback, he/she encouraged peer feedback. This environment of learning made learners feel comfortable and took initiatives to improve on their weak areas. Such disclosures would enable teachers of English to encourage learners to use effective reading strategies and create a further environment for open discussion of ideas and multiple perspectives.
In summary, these findings indicated that teachers of English consider a variety of factors when selecting reading passages for their learners. The key factors included availability of time, objectives of the lesson and learners background of reading strategies.

4.6 Findings for Objective Four

4.6.1 Reading Enrichment Forums

This research question surveys the enrichment reading activities that teachers engaged learners in. They were aimed at enabling learners to build their reading proficiency.

Enrichment reading activities are interactive situations in which learners actively participate. The main purpose of enrichment activities is to get learners build confidence and enjoyment and become responsible for their reading. Many enrichment activities from which teachers’ can make choices for purposes of building reading proficiency of learners are available. Provision of extensive reading enrichment activities is reinforced by presence of interactive avenues which include among others, meetings with neighbouring schools, and teachers-learners conferences. This information is presented in table 4.24.
Findings on table 4.24 shows that provision of reading enrichment activities included symposiums with neighbouring schools as the most popular. The results revealed that nearly a quarter (22.2%) of the teachers assisted learners always to read in readiness for discussions with neighbouring schools, two-thirds (66.7%) sometimes and a few (16.7%) of them organize learners for symposiums rarely. The high encouragement in use of this enrichment activity implied that teachers encouraged learners to tap the opportunity of sharing understanding with other learners in the neighbouring schools. This opens round-table discussions for learners to read more.

From the findings, it was noted that reading clubs in the school offered excellent opportunities for teachers to engage learners in interactive reading. About half (55.6%) of the respondents said they engaged learners quite often whereas some 11.1% involved learners always. Well directed reading clubs in the school create a culture that socializes learners into independent, thriving and vigorous readers. Such opportunities nurture in the learners a lifelong habit of reading. This habit in turn opens a broad
horizon to view issues and critique their appropriateness to pertinent issues affecting them.

In addition, the results of the findings in the table indicated that half (50%) of the teachers provided reading workshops to learners. This response suggested that a significant 50% of language teachers do organize learners for workshops that enable them to learn how to take control of their reading. This is one way of encouraging a potential desire to search for information. Conversely, provision of reading workshops affords the learner the opportunity to consolidate their comprehension strategies. More importantly, it provided the space for learners to learn from each other and to evaluate the meaning for what they have learnt in an interactive manner. Workshops encourage comprehensive lively discussions and this creates a context in which people build their thinking. However, half (50%) of the respondents rarely or never encouraged the use of this opportunity to practice use of reading strategies.

Furthermore, the findings indicated that teachers hardly encouraged learners to extend their reading practices by making use of relevant movies. The findings pointed out that over half (55.6%) of the respondents rarely provided learners with opportunity. However, less than half (44.4%) provided them sometimes. This finding indicated a situation where as much as this support activity could be captivating, teachers did not make them available to learners. This further implied that learners’ chances of practicing use of reading strategies were few.

Cultural reading promotions in school and public libraries offered opportunities that teachers of English could use to promote reading interest of their learners. This item
sought to find out whether teachers included materials of culture in the extensive reading enrichment activities for their learners. Teachers responses on this item showed that only a third (33.3%) used them sometimes. Nevertheless, about a quarter (27.8%) rarely availed the opportunity while more than half (38.9%) never provided them. These findings implied that the two-thirds (66.7%) of the teachers who never or rarely provided the opportunities meant that these promotions lacked in their schools as well as in the locality. Further, this also implied that public libraries that provide reading materials for all and sundry are either lacking or teachers do not know how to use them. This then leaves learners with class text books as the only readily available reading material. However, the a third (33.3%) who indicated that from time to time they provided the opportunity as a means to arousing the curiosity and also assist in activating appropriate schema of the learner about the text.

The study findings to establish whether teachers hold conferences with learners revealed that approximately a quarter (27.8%) of them sometimes encouraged interaction between themselves and learners in planned conferences. On the other hand, the majority (72.2%) rarely or never engaged in them. Teacher-learners conferences provide teachers with opportunities to address concerns specific to each learners’ progress. During conferences, learners’ too have a chance to ask for clarification on feedback, discuss ideas with others to deepen their understanding on how to read effectively and efficiently.

Also learners are afforded the chance to seek guidance or support for what afflicts them when they engage in reading for meaning. These responses suggest that, the greater
number of teachers do not avail this opportunity where learners engage in personal reflection.

Field trips provide environments that trigger curiosity in the learner to want to read about the scenic beauty of the places they visit and learn peoples’ cultural and socio-economic aspects and present their findings in class as a means of explaining their understanding. Such exposure does not only assist learners in reading with understanding but also in essay writing. Teachers responses to this item showed that nearly a quarter (27.8%) of them availed the opportunity to learners. However, the majority (69.4%) of them rarely or never had learners go for field trips with the aim of integrating what they read in print with reality. The implication of this response was that the learner did not get opportunities to interact with authentic materials which would go a long way in motivating and sustaining their reading interest. Research suggests that field trips make learners reach out eagerly with confidence for newer and richer experiences, understanding and these motivates them to want to read more. Field experiences make reading more vivid, more interesting, enjoyable and applicable to personal situations.

From these findings, the favourite enrichment forum used to offer reading opportunities and reflections to learners is symposiums with neighbouring schools. However, there is need to expand readers forums so as to enhance their proficiency levels. Symposia with neighbouring schools helps learners have a round-table discussions on issues addressed in literature set books. Besides, it was noted that two-thirds (66.7%) of them offered opportunities for learners to be engaged in interactive reading through reading clubs in the school. This finding upholds Hampton, (1994), and Miller, (2002) views that interventions of well directed reading activities in the school create a culture that
socializes learners into independent, thriving and vigorous readers. Such opportunities nurture in the learners a lifelong habit of reading. This habit in turn opens a broad horizon to view issues and critique their appropriateness to pertinent issues affecting them.

Additionally, findings in the table illustrate that half (50%) of the teachers had organized reading workshops for learners. This is one way of encouraging a potential desire to search for information. Equally, provision of reading workshops affords the learners the chance to consolidate their comprehension strategies. More importantly, they present the opening for learners to learn from each other. Workshops encourage lively debates and this creates a context in which people build their thinking. This finding concurs with Pressley (2000) stand that teachers ought to involve learners in extensive activities to practice and learn the art of reading with understanding on their own.

4.6.2 Teachers views on effects of reading enrichment forums

Enrichment forums for reading provide avenues for learners to create relevant prior knowledge. Schools that create enrichment reading climates to their learners empower them with the opportunities to practice independently. Results from the question that sought to find out the outcomes of enrichment forums on learners reading accomplishments are shown in the table below.
Findings from this study indicate that these enrichment forums help students perform better in the national examinations. Findings on this item indicated that most (83.3%) of the respondents agreed that these forums were effective as they helped learners do well in examinations. This response implied that availability of reading forums had a positive influence on learners performance in their national examinations. The forums help them to interact and exchange information on friendly basis; they borrow from each other and discuss issues to make them clear. In the process, their understanding and critical abilities are broadened. This makes reading exercises participatory, motivating and learners curiosity and in this way learners search for knowledge is deepened. This finding brings to light the knowledge that reading programs are indispensable resources for interactive ESL classrooms. However, a few (11.0%) of the teachers disagreed. What this disagreement suggested was a clear indication that no forums were provided.
Confidence in reading is a product of inspiration to read. Findings on effects of reading enrichment forums show that more than half (61.2%) felt that these forums do encourage or build reading interest in learners but above a third (36.1%) disagreed that reading forums do motivate learners to read more. These responses implied that much as there was little effort to make available reading enrichment forums to secondary school learners there were disagreements that these forums motivated learners to want to read. These forums were meant to practice learnt strategies and share the knowledge gained with other learners. The 61.2% teachers’ response in agreement suggested that these forums provided platforms for interaction and sharing to gain knowledge and build more background knowledge.

Teachers indicated that reading enhancement opportunities that they availed to their learners assisted learners in getting more confident and interested in their reading tasks. In their response, half (50%) pointed out that enrichment forums assist learners in becoming confident and interested in reading. However, almost half (49.2%) of them disagreed that reading forums do have such effects. The 50% agreement that learners exposure to reading forums builds in them a profound reading effect. The negative opinion by nearly half (49.2%) of the respondents on confidence building meant that reading forums were either never or rarely availed to learners. Rare provision of these forums meant that teachers cannot evaluate the effect on reading. From these findings, therefore, enrichment forums build confidence. Furthermore, this positive response meant that when learners are encouraged to use available opportunities to enhance their reading abilities, they become confident and interested readers who through well planned and directed reading forums perceive opportunities to learn and apply comprehension strategies as they reflect upon and think critically about what they read.
Findings on effects of reading forums also showed that learners tried to monitor their reading in efforts to increase their comprehension. When this happened, learners were optimistic to read beyond the assigned tasks. The results of the findings confirmed that half (50%) of the teachers agreed that reading forums do enhance reading abilities. This response clearly indicated that teachers tried to avail the opportunities for learners to practice use of the strategies taught to them so as to build and enhance their reading proficiency. On the contrary, less than half (44.4%) disagreed that reading enrichment forums do not play a major role in building learners reading proficiency. This revealed that learners were not engaged in any reading forums that could assist them in improving their reading abilities. These findings agree with Aebersold (1997), Cohen, (1989), Duke, and Pearson, (2002), Gallagher, (2007) and Kaahwa, (2002) views that learners need the tools to unpack a text and step by step they will develop a reading autonomy.

4.7 Findings for Objective Five

Challenges faced by teachers of English when planning and using reading strategies

It is important to acknowledge that teaching reading strategies to ESL learners has restraints. This research question was meant to find out the restraints that teachers of English faced when they planned to teach strategy use in reading.
4.7.1 Constraints experienced when teaching reading strategies

The findings from the data collected resulted in an array of challenges that experienced by teachers in ESL classrooms as they come face to face with a cut and paste generation of learners whose impetus for reading was low. This setting limits teachers as they strive to help learners achieve reading proficiency. These challenges are in the table below.
Table 4.26 Challenges in reading strategy instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (County)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (Sub-county)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within school category</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.26 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Provisonal county</th>
<th>District Sub-county</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heavy demands for completion of syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learners inability to transfer learnt strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advent of video houses and other electronic gadgets which have lowered intellectual moods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Change of value system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Language load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cultural load in the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cognitive load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category of school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within school category</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within school category</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within school category</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within school category</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 36
From the analysed data shown in table 4.26, the findings indicated that all the teachers (100%) agreed that they were faced with the challenge of meeting deadlines for final assignments and completion of the syllabus. It was a requirement for them to complete the syllabus long before the start of KCSE examinations. This posed a problem for them in that in their rush to meet the deadlines, teachers were likely to neglect high-order reading strategies which are very useful for learners proper functioning once out of school. Besides, this response also insinuated that teachers did not focus on learners learning needs during instruction.

A further examination of the findings in the table showed that teachers faced the challenge of learners wanting linguistic competence. Although the teachers in national schools did not find this as a problem due to the cadre of their learners, findings in this study showed that less than half (44.4%) of the teachers in county schools and over a third (38.9%) in sub-district schools agreed that the low linguistic competence of their learners posed problems when planning for strategy use instruction. The majority (83.3%) of the teachers in both county and sub-county schools who agreed that this was a restraint in their efforts to teach strategy use in reading implied that reading difficulties of the typical L2 student existed because they often do not have the adequate threshold reading competence in the language. Further, this finding implied that learners whose linguistic competence was low in the target language could not read well. Therefore, teachers of English face this challenge when teaching reading. It also implied that teachers could not release responsibility to learners to practice reading independently. Furthermore, differentiated motivation which is the key to learning also posed problems. Low levels or lack of motivation is another major obstacle facing teachers of English.
The findings further revealed that few (5.6%) of teachers in national schools, about a third (36.1%) in the county schools, and almost a third (30.6%) in sub-county schools agreed that different levels of motivation or lack of it altogether was a problem. The learners’ energy, attention, and curiosity are channeled elsewhere; hence the learners’ affective filter is high. When this situation happens as the case, the learners’ motivation to read and understand new materials is low, and therefore, one cannot learn or even extend learning. It becomes more difficult for teachers when the motivation levels of learners differ, time is limited, and teachers are overwhelmed by big class sizes that they have to cater for. This finding implied that without motivation on the part of the student, instruction would be an uneventful exercise.

A closely related restraint to low motivation was the language load. This item sought to find out whether teachers of English analyse the language requirements of their learners in terms of their reading comprehension and their ability to express themselves. The study findings showed that very few (2.8%) of the teachers in national schools, almost a third (36.1%) in county schools, and a third (33.3%) in sub-county schools agreed that the language requirements of their learners were quite a big challenge.

This finding implied that since ESL learners had not yet fully acquired the linguistic proficiency in English, they were reliant on teachers to support their reading comprehension needs.

Language load in lessons and tasks does not refer merely to vocabulary items, but also to the phrases and sentences that are used in expressing concepts. The majority (72.2%) response implied that unfamiliar words, phrases, and complex sentences that learners encountered when reading stumbled them. This could be a problem created by the type of instruction that was given
to learners and also by the low motivational levels of learners. Most reading instruction is geared
toward making learners good test-takers instead of effective lifelong readers.

The findings in table further show that teachers also restrained by lack of clear and precise
knowledge of how to teach reading. Precise knowledge here involves knowing how to teach
reading strategies and applying appropriate strategies practically in given classroom activities.
Teachers responses indicated that few (5.6%) of them in national schools, close to a third
(30.6%) in county and a third (33.3%) in sub-county schools agreed that lack of clear procedural
knowledge posed problems in teaching reading strategies effectively. This majority (69.4%)
agreement revealed that there was a gap; lack of clarity on how to teach reading and this could be
attributed to another factor, that teachers did not get proper or no training on how to teach
reading strategies. However, nearly a third (30.6%) disagreed, meaning they had knowledge on
how to teach reading effectively.

Further, the findings indicated that the teaching load and big classes posed more problems for
language teachers when planning to teach reading strategies. One such big challenge for having
big classes was meeting individual needs of learners. Another connected restraint to large class
sizes was that learners were likely to be anxious and would not ask questions or participate and
many times this by-passed teachers notice. Equally difficult when class size was very large was
monitoring the progress of each learner, that is, keeping students on task as teachers monitored
pair and group work. Big class sizes also put a challenge on resources such as textbooks and
other necessary resources. This situation coupled with time constraint put teachers of English in
a position where they ended up supervising reading exercises instead of teaching reading.
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The results of the findings showed that few (2.8%) in national schools, a third (33.3%) in county and a quarter (25%) in sub-county schools agreed that their workload coupled with the great number of learners per teachers was overwhelming. Nevertheless, over a third (38.9%) disagreed which implied that their teaching load and the teacher-student ratio was manageable.

Additionally, the results of findings in table 4.26 showed that teachers of English face challenges of negative attitudes of their learners towards English. Their responses demonstrated that less than a quarter (22.2%) of them in county and almost half (36.1%) in sub-county schools asserted that their learners displayed an unconstructive perspective towards English. The teachers expressed the view that this created challenges in their planning to teach and guide the use of reading strategies. In spite of this, less than half (41.7%) of teachers disagreed. This implied that much as ESL learners may be disinterested in reading and learning in a non-native language, they also planned how to lower this negative barrier, rejuvenate learners interest and curiosity and develop in them a creative, wise and passionate desire for reading. The over half (58.3%) who agreed it was a problem painted a picture that many students were uninspired. It also meant that there might be other problems that needed urgent attention before solving the problem of negative attitude. This finding illustrates an option taken by teachers whose learners have negative attitudes towards learning English; to get the learners do reading tasks in the text.

An understanding of the culture load in reading texts is very important for comprehension to take place. This item sought to find out whether teachers of English experienced the problem of their learners inability to deeply get involved with the text. The results of the findings indicated that almost a quarter (27.8%) of teachers in county schools and an equal number (27.8%) in sub-
county schools agreed that the cultural load in text posed difficulties for learners. This implied that learners would not construct meaning on the basis of their personal experiences and social perspective. Further, this implied that the text content was alien and so it became difficult to create the motivational aspects of reading the texts which would enhance personal involvement and enjoyment on the part of the learner. This made learner-text interaction difficult as they had different linguistic and reading abilities. Nevertheless, almost half (44.4%) disagreed with the view. This suggested that teachers created appropriate during pre-reading strategies which the learners could use to understand a text from different linguistic cultural settings.

Another challenge that bedeviled teachers of English was Change of value system. The results of the findings showed that few (5.6%) teachers in national schools, some 16.7% in county and close to a third (30.6%) in sub-county schools agreed it was a constraint to teaching reading effectively. This response implied that many people no longer value reading greatly because of quest for materials wealth. This change of focus has eroded the interest for search of knowledge. However, nearly half (47.2%) of them disagreed. This gave the indication that learners search for knowledge was upheld.

Teachers of English also faced challenges brought by advent of video houses and other electronic gadgets which have lowered intellectual moods of learners. The study’s findings showed that very few (2.8%) teacher in national schools, a handful (19.4%) in county schools and close to a quarter (27.8%) in sub-county schools agreed that it was a real challenge. This finding implied that learners spent a lot of time watching movies/soap operas but very little on reading informative texts. Although movies could be used to create interest for reading, it could
also kill the imagination and corrupt the original work. Conversely, half (50) teachers disagreed with this view.

Besides, the findings in the table pointed out that there was lack of opportunities for sustained reading in their school environment. The table reveals that nearly a quarter (27.8%) of teachers in county schools and a handful (19.4%) in sub-county schools agreed that lack of school-wide environment for sustained reading was a challenge since it impacted negatively on students’ independent reading practice. Students need to extend what they read/taught by teachers through private study and in group discussions. When appropriate texts lacked, then learners were likely to avoid reading. When good and interesting books were not available, learners did not develop a love of reading. This was a challenge because students don’t apply creative and critical thinking skills to works of their choice but only did what the teacher had digested for them. This could explain why many people don’t read after leaving school when it is a well known fact that reading is a salient ingredient for success in life.

From table 4.26, it was also found that cognitive load was a challenge to language teachers. This item sought to establish whether teachers of English scrutinized the amount of schema learners possessed in relation to what they were to teach and how it affected their planning and consequent teaching of reading strategies. The findings indicated that a small number (5.6%) of teachers in national schools, a quarter (25%) in county schools and a handful (13.9%) in sub-county schools agreed that students learn better when they can build on what they already understand. Moreover, they indicated that learners differed significantly in their processing
capacities and this posed great difficulties for the teachers. On the other hand, study findings show that over half (55.5%) of teachers felt that cognitive load was not a problem to their learners and so it was not a problem.

Though their learners might have cognitive load inadequacies they activated appropriate schemata in them. This suggests that they chose instructional materials that promoted learning. Generally the findings highlighted by this item indicated that prior knowledge played a crucial role in reading comprehension.

An additional challenge that thwarted teachers’ efforts in teaching reading well was learners’ inability to transfer strategies to different reading texts. The findings showed that less than a quarter (22.2%) of teachers in county schools and some 19.4% in sub-county schools agreed that learners were unable to transfer learnt strategies to similar or appropriate texts. This finding suggested that learners do not put into practice the use of learnt strategies.

Further, it could also be pointed out that learners’ inability could also be due to their linguistic incompetence and teachers’ overload such that they had no time for follow-up individual learner activities. On the learners’ part, inability to use learnt knowledge could be demotivating in that the learners may look at such lessons as frustrating and a waste of time. This posed a real challenge on the teachers. During the interview, teachers expressed their frustration by the fact that learners did not transfer the strategies they had learnt in one lesson to another lesson. Instead, they read passages word by word, stopping to look up every unknown item until they finished reading.
Another problem faced by language teachers was the teaching context. Teaching context here includes limited time which caused them a lot of difficulties. The findings revealed that a small number (5.6%) of teachers in national schools, almost a quarter (27.8%) and a third (33.3%) in district schools agreed that it was a constraint in planning and teaching reading strategies in their classes. They pointed out that within the allocated time of 40 minutes, they tried to present some introduction, provide some sense of direction, focus on objectives, present lesson activities and appraise the lesson. Arguably, this strained them. In such set-ups, teacher focus on getting learners do the reading activities in the chosen texts but could not teach reading strategies.

Bearing in mind that appropriate prior knowledge had to be activated, coupled with unfamiliar cultural load and learners low level of motivation, teachers faced multi-level challenges in developing critical reading skills that would help learners to unpack the text adequately. However, a third (33.3%) had a contrary opinion.

During the interview, less than quarter (22.2%) of the 18 teachers who were observed in class asserted that they were not trained on how to teach reading strategies. This implied that these teachers taught reading without a technical knowledge about the procedures. That was the reason why they only taught some certain strategies but not many. The problem of overloading teachers with many lessons, leaving them with very little time for preparation featured prominently during the interview.
In summary, teachers of English efforts to teach reading strategies effectively were beset by heavy demands for completion of syllabus, learners wanting linguistic competence, language load and lack of clear procedural/technical knowledge. Despite all this, teachers encouraged learners by helping them transfer learnt strategies and increasing their cognitive load by increasing their ability to process new material with ease.

4.7.2 Supplementary findings on improvement of reading instruction in secondary schools
This section considered teachers input in an effort to improve reading proficiency and cultivate a reading culture for long-life reading. To begin with, teachers were requested to indicate the level of reading of their students as ‘competent’, ‘modest’ or ‘limited’. Their responses varied, with a few (11.1%) of them indicating that their learners were competent in reading, two-thirds (66.7%) pointed out their learners could read moderately and less than a quarter (22.2%) indicated that their learners had limited levels of reading proficiency. This implied that most ESL classrooms have learners with moderate reading proficiency levels.

This being the case in the real ESL classrooms, teachers were requested to make recommendations on what could be done to improve reading skills from falling short of expectation. The study findings showed that teachers felt there was need to in-service teachers on the effective procedure of teaching reading. This implied that since technology had advanced very fast in late 20\textsuperscript{th} century, there was need to update instructional techniques to be in tandem with the current technology. Further, updating procedural knowledge of teachers would make it possible for language teachers to practically get the student-hooked on tactics of reading that made them evaluate their comprehension as they read.
Teachers pointed out that time was very important for effective instruction. They argued that enough time was of essence for introduction of concepts to be learnt, teaching how to use them and giving exercises for practice. They contended that there was need to increase the amount of time for teaching and monitoring reading comprehension. On the same, they pointed out that double lessons were necessary for teachers to teach and asses in class whether the learners had grasped the lesson ideas.

Allied to this, they recommended that teacher-student ratio should be reduced to 1:20 because they are currently overloaded and they could not cater for every learners need. To teach reading effectively, they suggested with proportionate student numbers, they would find it easy to guide the disinterested learners, strive to create in them interest and background knowledge that they would use as foundation to build their reading proficiency. Besides, teachers revealed that learners had passive attitudes towards English as a subject and reading as a skill. They asserted that teaching them specific reading strategies would improve their reading comprehension through careful planning and integration of reading strategies in reading instruction.

More to the point, teachers also pointed out that schools should have modernized libraries which are well equipped with reading materials. These libraries form learning centres where learners would be encouraged to read widely. Teachers insisted that without a library, learners rely on course books for reading which are insufficient. Further, they said that for learners to attain reading proficiency; they stated that there must be extensive selection of quality, engaging highly interesting books and other reading materials in the library which were currently lacking.
Teachers also stated that there was need to design different types of exercises and activities to facilitate flexible use of different reading strategies. They agreed that these exercises could be used to activate learners prior knowledge so as to prepare them adequately for a given lesson.

In summary, to improve reading instruction in Kenya, there was need to give teachers of English refresher seminars in order to update their pedagogic knowledge. Additionally, there was also need to increase the amount of time for teaching reading strategies so that students can master and use them effectively. Further, libraries were very necessary as centres of information so they needed to be equipped with the most modern texts for use by both teachers and students.

4.8 Supplementary findings on learners interests and preferences in reading

Qualitative data arising from the focus group discussions (FGD) on learners interests and preferences in reading, reading materials that they used often, preparedness for reading, enrichment forums apart from reading activities in class that they got engaged in, and problems that deterred them from forming productive habits in reading were discussed. The FGD data was obtained from 180 learners (10 students from each observed class in the sampled schools). It was meant to get more insight on teachers opinions in the questionnaire.

Findings on learners’ interest and preferences in reading revealed that student liked reading. All the learners in the ten groups pointed out that it opened doors for more information beyond their current understanding. In addition, they said they read to pass examinations and be successful in life. A further probing indicated that students liked reading, silently because they were able to concentrate and they didn’t forget easily.
Learners response on what made their reading interesting indicated that a flowing content was encouraging. Even so, they argued that most texts for reading were fictional and when such texts were selected for reading, they encountered problems of comprehension and especially when the teachers didn’t give a background related to what they knew about the topic. Learners pointed out that when the teacher made the text accessible through schema creation or activation, they became earnest thinkers and enjoyed reading by constructing what was printed in relation to their personal experience. They pointed out that reading became interesting if the issues discussed by the absent author had a bearing on the issues they had some knowledge in.

Besides, learners revealed that many texts were not interesting because the information were alien and even when some knowledge was given by the teacher, they still did not enjoy reading it. The researcher further sought to find out the texts they liked reading generally. There was a plethora of responses from students. Many students said they liked reading fictional texts. Some very few (5.6%) groups of the learners argued that they liked reading authentic historical texts.

When asked to give reasons for their preference, they argued that, people must know where they have come from, where they stand and focus on where they are going. A further probing indicated that a carefully analysed present moment eliminates failures in future.

On commonly used reading materials during reading lessons, learners argued that textbooks were used mostly and they were shared between a pair. Learners from a handful (22.2%) of the schools added that they also used cuttings from newspapers and educational magazines. When
asked whether their library contained texts of their interests, over a third (38.9) groups of learners maintained that the library was stocked with old paced out texts. The other texts on the shelves were a few newspapers and bound past examinations pamphlets. Generally, they felt that their libraries were “ornaments” which contained current and past coursework books. So their reading revolved around passages from these workbooks.

Findings from learners responses on how they prepared to read during reading lessons, half (50%) of the groups of learners said that teachers asked them a few questions about the topic before they began to read. They further pointed out that teachers asked them why they would want to read the selected passage(s).

The researcher asked them to provide some of the responses that they offered and the learners argued that they wanted to know what the text was about. Further, they also said wanted to know whether it had any lesson for them to learn from. This response pointed to purpose setting. However, students from more than half (61.1%) of the schools argued that teachers only asked them to read the passage and answer questions at the end of the passage and the teacher would go round in the classroom marking their answers. In these situations learners were not prepared to predict the contents of what they were to read.

The researcher sought information on how learners began reading, how they progressed and how they ensured they understood what read. The results of their responses showed that about half (55.55%) of the groups of learners pointed out that their teachers asked them to skim first, that is, read the first sentence of each paragraph to get a gist of the text. After skimming, teachers
guided them in formation of mental images of what the likely message was. However, they asserted that they needed more preparation about the background of the text.

When they began reading, about a quarter (27.77%) contended that the teacher would interject with a few questions which helped them maintain focus so as to understand what they were reading. However, they commented that though these during reading activities were helpful, they were disruptive. They justified this comment by stating that they don’t read at the same speed, that their linguistic abilities were different and that the culture load for each learner differed significantly.

After reading the passage, the learners even those who were not prepared for reading were asked questions that were meant to draw information about the text to find connections to what they knew. However, for the close to a third (30.5%) of the groups whose schema was not activated commented that they had varying responses and that the teacher would make connections that they did not conceptualize well. These allude to the importance of activating or creating relevant schema.

Findings on learners responses on provision of reading enrichment forums within and outside the school indicated that the majority (83.3%) groups of learners pointed out that debates with neighbouring schools were the most common forum. They also held discussions of current literature set books once a term.
Learners expressed their feeling about the enrichment forums which they felt they were good and enriching but argued that more value and learning could be added if the frequency of these forums was increased. Moreover, they pointed out that there were no reading clubs in their schools but felt that such clubs were very important in creating productive reading habits. Some (16.7%) groups of the respondents had extensive reading enrichment forums which included symposiums with schools within and outside their district. Students usually went and camped for two days to watch and learn from others. They pointed out that they asked for assignments that they would do and give presentations during a defined forum. This way they would seek their teachers’ critical input. By doing this, they got an upper hand in improving their reading proficiency.

On the contrary, about three quarters (77.8%) of groups of learners pointed out that they faced reading challenges. They said that creativity was not encouraged in the schools as teachers rushed them to complete the syllabus, do thorough revision and start at a slow phase the following year’s work. Learners expressed the opinion that lack of creativity created other problems like lack of interest for reading as reading had become a regular habit of reading selected passages and answering questions at the end.

Learners expressed the view that the KCSE examinations administered for only two hours at the end of four years of study killed their morale to want to read outside the syllabus. They further argued that the education system encouraged reading to pass examinations and, therefore, killed the ability to form life-long reading habits.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate Kenyan language teachers’ perceptions to reading instruction, their instructional practices and the relation between these two constructs. As teachers’ pre-existing perceptions of their subject instruction may constrain them from adopting practices that conflict with those views, understanding how teachers’ perceptions relate to their classroom practices may provide a useful link between improvement of instruction and teachers’ implementation of the same. The data for this was collected using questionnaires, classroom observation and interviews. In this chapter key findings were presented, some pedagogic
implications of the study were made, conclusions were drawn and the recommendations of the study were given.

5.2 Summary of key findings

The study addressed five research questions translated from the five objectives.

1. What perceptions do teachers of English have about reading instruction and use of strategies in reading?

2. How are language teachers’ tacit perceptions about use of strategies in reading reflected in their classroom practices?

3. What influences teachers’ choice of reading texts for their English lessons?

4. What enrichment forums do teachers expose learners to as basis to practice strategy use?

5. What challenges do ESL teachers face when planning and using of reading strategies?

5.2.1 Objective 1

Teachers perceptions about reading instruction and use of reading strategies

Based on the findings and discussions of this study, the following major findings about teachers perceptions about teaching reading and strategy use in reading were made. This study revealed that reading was construed be the construction of meaning which is the main purpose of any reading exercise. Construction of meaning is facilitated by use of reading techniques, such as questioning about the information in the text and predicting upcoming information. In addition, teachers understand that reading strategies are essential techniques that readers should use to
assist them in their reading so as to achieve a set purpose. Teachers’ views illustrated that learners need to be taught purposeful reading strategies in order to prepare them to read for comprehension.

From the discussion of the interpreted data, it was apparent that the most commonly used strategies were the basic ones. These included use of questions to seek for information and clarification. The other important techniques were skimming and scanning strategies which are very useful when reading for a gist of the reading selection but which were not taught adequately.

Teacher’s reasons for teaching reading and use of reading strategies were that reading strategies help learners to exchange ideas and present problems freely and they were important in preparing learners when reading for examinations. Equally important was the fact that use of reading strategies helps save time.

It was important to establish what teachers thought about their classroom practices in regard to teaching use of reading strategies. Teachers reported that they encouraged learners to look for the main idea from the reading selection in order to get the gist of the text. Teachers asked questions whose answer could directly be found in the text. Learners were mostly engaged in group discussions. Needless to say that the questioning strategy dominated strategy use instruction in all the phases of reading for meaning.

The most common method to teach reading and use of strategies was deductive strategy which encouraged learners to think from the general to the specific. It is a method can be used to
activate or create background knowledge. Other instructional methods used were guided discussion and lecture method.

A close look at the key findings of this objective demonstrates that what teachers consider to work best and how they instruct learners in their classrooms are not always consistent. All the teachers in this study reported that they were not consciously aware of their perceptions about teaching reading strategies until directly asked by the researcher. Teachers perceptions are therefore very important guides to their classroom instructional practices.

From these findings, it is apparent that teachers perceptions about teaching appropriate reading strategies for enhancing and supporting the development of learners reading proficiency were not always consistent. The lack of knowledge about a variety of reading strategies posed challenges to them which they consciously or unconsciously were aware of.

5.2.2 Research question 2

How the teachers incorporated reading strategies into classroom activities

A close look at table 4.21 shows disparities between teachers stated perceptions and observed practices. Few reading strategies were used to prepare the learners for reading the selected texts. The strategy used frequently was guiding learners to generate questions. It is clear from this observation that 61.1% of them practised it in class but about half of them perceived the strategy as important. Although these are close, there is inconsistency between their perceptions and classroom practices.

Focus on while-reading strategies and perceptions revealed that there were great disparities during the reading stage. What teachers stated as important and what they did were different.
For example, the majority (77.8%) of teachers perceived questioning as compared to only a few (5.6%) who demonstrated its use in class. Guessing about up-coming information was demonstrated by more than half (55.6%) but none perceived it as important. This finding is a demonstration of lack of a clear procedural knowledge on the part of the teacher.

Focus on post-reading strategies and perceptions demonstrated that teachers used questioning most of the time in which many (77.8%) perceived it as necessary and important. Moreover, the majority (94.4%) demonstrated its use in class. The strategy was used to monitor learners comprehension and check on their predictions.

From observation, it was clear that teachers could not explain explicitly when most of the strategies they used were useful. These strategies include discussion of text and how to outline main ideas albeit their demonstration in class. From these findings, the way teachers think about, understand and value instructions influences their classroom practices.

Generally, findings in this study demonstrated that teachers’ classroom practices did not always correspond to their perceptions. Sometimes they practised what they believed works best for the learner but at certain times they did not. To some extent, their classroom practices were based on their perceptions and cognition. On the other hand, their perceptions were not reflected. The perceptions of the teachers’ in this study were affected by a variety of external factors, (teaching content, type of material, students’ motivation) and internal factors (teachers training, teachers views and knowledge). These factors interplayed to influence them in their process of teaching.
5.2.3 Research question 3

Factors that influence choice of reading texts

From the findings, it was apparent that several factors did influence the choice of reading texts. For example, time available for teaching was very crucial in selecting material for reading during the lesson. It appeared that since time was limited, teachers chose materials that did not call for a lot of their intervention. Further, objectives of the lesson also dictated the material to be read; the text chosen was expected to fulfil the set objectives. Learners’ background of reading strategies was also a consideration when choosing reading materials. Therefore, teachers’ actions about what to teach are dictated by time allocated to the subject.

5.2.4 Research question 4

Enrichment reading forums

The study established that the most used reading enrichment forum for learners to practice use of learned strategies was symposiums with neighbouring schools where learners exchanged ideas and learnt from each other. Other enrichment forums were organized reading clubs in the school and also reading workshops in which learners interacted with each other freely as they discussed issues in the materials they read.

Teachers indicated that these enrichment forums were very useful as they facilitated learners in doing thorough revision and consequently they were able to do well during KCSE. Reading forums also made reading interactive and learners became motivated. This finding also established that the problem of negative attitude by the learner was eliminated and learners
reading competence improved. However, these forums should be increased for the benefit of the learner.

5.2.5 Research question 5

Constraints to teaching use of reading strategies

The findings show that ESL language teachers face a myriad of challenges when teaching reading strategies. The most critical ones include the fact that the syllabus must be completed in time, long before the exams for that term are due. This finding suggests that teachers do not pay attention to teaching reading strategies, instead they try to cover the syllabus. Learners wanting linguistic competence, lack of clear procedural/technical knowledge and language load were the other major impediments to teaching reading strategies.

5.3 Conclusions

This explorative study investigated perceptions of 36 experienced teachers of English, 18 of whom were observed in class teaching reading lessons. The findings suggest that ESL teachers do indeed have a set of complex belief systems, however, they are not reflected in their classroom practices.

From the discussion of key findings, this study has made five (5) main conclusions as follows. First, teachers have clear perceptions regarding reading and reading strategies and attach a lot of importance to reading instruction and reading strategies for improvement of reading proficiency of their learners. Conversely many (50%) teachers were not consciously aware of them.
Second, theory and practice did not match in this study. Teachers did not teach as they theorized. Inconsistencies were observed between teachers perceptions and their classroom practices. There was mismatch in what teachers perceived as the best practice and what they actually did in class.

Thirdly, the reading materials from which teachers chose reading passages were the prescribed texts. Authentic materials were rarely used or even passages from other areas of study such as geography and science. The dictating factor in the choice of reading material was time among other factors, which influenced the choice of reading materials.

Fourthly, extensive practice on use of reading strategies was limited due to the few available reading enrichment forums for learners. Fifth, teachers faced a horde of challenges when teaching reading and reading strategies, the greatest challenge being the pressure to complete the syllabus at a stated time. This demand left them with no option but to rush the learners through the syllabus content.

5.4 Recommendations

Following the findings in this study that language teachers perceptions do not match their classroom practices, the following recommendations need to be taken into consideration by language teachers, teacher educationists and education policy makers if quality in reading proficiency has to be attained and performance in English improved at all levels.
(a) To improve quality of reading competence, it is necessary for teachers to be sensitized on the differences between their perceptions and their practices and think of ways to improve student reading proficiency by providing them instructions on use of reading strategies. There is need to consider improving teacher-learner ratio to give the teacher a workable number. It can be seen clearly that all the sampled teachers were aware of the importance of teaching reading strategies to their students but they did not really teach these strategies in their classrooms. Some teachers taught reading strategies but the majority did not really do so partly because of lack of knowledge, big classes, time constrains and heavy demands for completion of syllabus. This needs to be greatly improved.

(b) In order to do this, teachers should upgrade their own theoretical knowledge about reading strategies. This can be done through refresher courses/seminars. Teachers should be made aware of effective reading strategies for use before, during and post-reading phases.

(c) Teachers should be given opportunities to participate in training activities that extend over a period of one year or so and include frequent workshops, collaborative planning and classroom observation with peers. This will give them opportunities to design materials that cater appropriately for their kind of learner and stop depending on texts that may be culturally alien and which discourage and demotivate the learners.

(d) During workshops, sensitization seminars and language shows and conferences, teachers in high schools in Kenya can design more enrichment reading forums that engage learners frequently throughout the year. This would help learners practice and extend strategy use
beyond the classroom and this has the potential of forming in the learner productive reading habits.

(e) The challenges facing the teachers are many. However, it would be advisable for teachers to plan and teach within the given time frame.

Suggestions for further Research

(ii) Teachers’ perceptions are very important in teaching reading and use of reading strategies. It is apparent that classroom practices are based on a logical set of perceptions. However, teachers perceptions are complicated and so there should be further research into teachers belief systems in primary schools since this is where the teaching of reading starts.

(iii) In addition, similar studies should be conducted with private high schools to find out more about teachers’ perceptions about teaching use of strategies in reading.

(iv) Further research may look at the learners perceptions about use of strategies in reading when dealing with texts in designed materials. It will be interesting to see their attitudes towards reading strategies and what reading strategies they employed. This research would be useful for teachers to enhance their students reading proficiency.

(v) There is need to investigate whether or not experienced teachers do the same things as the less experienced ones in terms of teaching reading comprehension.
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APPENDIX 1: OBSERVATION SCHEDULE CHECKLIST

The researcher will observe the interactions, whether they are silent or loud, during the reading lesson and fill in the checklist.

(A) Items related to pre-reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions of the language teacher</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Involves students in setting a purpose for reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asking the learners to read the title and predict what the text is about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asking learners to look at illustrations and try to guess how they relate to the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engaging students in group discussions on topic and writing down gist sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Previewing text with students using pictures, reading first and last paras, asking qns on heading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher asking students to generate questions about the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preview of structural organizers used in the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Semantic mapping (pre-teaching vocabulary as away to judge students Schema availability on topic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provision of reconciled reading lesson (dev’t of pre-reading qns from qns at the end of reading passage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Describing the strategy for the learner &amp; providing explicit info’ on the strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Modelling its use in reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provision of explanations on procedures and use of strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B) Items related to during-reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions by the English language teacher</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. asking learners to identify the main idea of the reading passage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. create mental images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Telling students to make guesses / predict about upcoming information in the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asking questions to check comprehension of the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Verifying and clarifying students understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. engaging learners’ in group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Helping students guess the meaning of unknown words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. confirm, revise or reject predictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. drawing inferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. helping students connect to self and other texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Providing ample assisted practice time e.g. monitoring, providing clues, giving feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Items Related to post-reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions by the English language teacher</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asking students to discuss the text after reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asking learners to retell the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asking learners to outline the main ideas / points in the reading selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asking students to draw conclusions about the text they have read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Asking learners to summarize the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Giving students a quiz about the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Giving students follow up activities related to the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assigning students tasks to do using the information in the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asking students to complete a given task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Asking students to role play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. asking learners to read other related/new material and demonstrate use of the strategy on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. providing feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Sir/ Madam.

The following questions are aimed at obtaining information on the teaching of reading comprehension strategies in your class. Please respond to the questions by ticking your answer in the brackets or writing in the spaces provided. The information will be used only for the purpose of the study and will be treated with strict confidence. Your cooperation is highly appreciated. Do not write your name in this paper.

PART 1: General information

*Tick ( √ ) in the appropriate option*

1. Your teaching experience. Please state number in years

2. Your highest academic qualifications
   a) Dip in education  b) PGDE  c) B.Ed  d) BA  e) M.Ed
   f) MA  g) Others (specify) _____________

3. You are trained to teach:
   a) English/Literature  b) English/Kiswahili  c) Literature/C.R.E
   d) English/Geography  e) English/History  f) others (specify) ______

4. Your pedagogic knowledge is derived from
   a) Training at college  b) experience  c) informed research
PART 2

(A) Reading instruction

What does reading instruction mean to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does reading instruction mean to you?</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) engaging learners in construction of meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) knowing strategies and techniques of reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) provision and modeling of reading strategies to the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) making students read aloud so as to practice correct pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) General perceptions towards Reading instruction in Secondary Schools

Put a tick (✓) against your option: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Uncertain (UC) Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are your views regarding the teaching of reading for comprehension?</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Secondary School Form 3 learners need to learn purposeful reading comprehension strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learners need to be assisted during reading comprehension lessons through motivating, monitoring, providing clues and giving feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is my responsibility to plan and support learners reading through dialogue, questioning and conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is my responsibility to help students to elaborate information so that they can find associations within and across texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Focus on the learners needs is necessary in planning for reading instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I sufficiently understand what reading comprehension strategies are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C) Language teachers’ perceptions regarding the importance and necessity of reading strategies for comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The following is important and necessary for reading instruction</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Semantic mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provision of reconciled reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Activating prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of a strategy, explicit explanations on how it is used and the teacher modeling it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guided practice with the strategy to instil confidence in the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dialogue with the learners to share written meanings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Paraphrasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Guessing and inference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clarification of meaning through questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Previewing text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Reading aloud the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Finding the main idea from the reading selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Outlining and Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Retelling / reading to present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Monitoring and evaluating reading comprehension constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Using visual support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Encouragement of continued use and generalization of the strategy through extensive reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(D) Reasons for use of Reading Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your psychological justification for reading instruction and use of reading strategies to the student?</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) provide necessary feedback: it helps to know overall proficiency of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) it instills independence and direction in the learners and able them to approach for help when necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) it helps to exchange ideas and present problems freely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) it creates a sound reading situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) it makes it easy to guide the different levels of learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) it helps learners take reading as their responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) it helps to form productive reading habits in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) it promotes student self—monitoring and evaluation of personal strategy use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) help students complete assigned tasks on time, work independently, make best use of time allocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) it saves time while reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) for appreciation of the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) to enhance autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) to prepare students for examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E) Reading Instruction Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In practice, what methods do you commonly employ when teaching reading?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. lecture chalk and talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. guided demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. guided discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. deductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. inductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. role play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. discovery method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. activity – based reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(F) Use of Reading Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you engage your students in doing the following reading tasks and activities in class</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. set a purpose for reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generate questions based on the passage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Respond to questions to activate relevant schemata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage in group discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Predict the main idea of the reading selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Look for the main idea from reading selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Previewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Answer questions which have implicit ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make connections to familiar life experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reading to present individually or as a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Read critically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Summarize the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(G) Use of Different Reading Materials

**Question:** School textbooks and manuals are the main references for most teachers. What percentage of your teaching depends on textbooks?

- a) 50% [ ]
- b) 70% [ ]
- c) 100% [ ]

**How often do you use the following in class?:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Magazines / newspapers articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passages from the course / prescribed textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internet articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Literature such as novels, poems, short stories, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Passages or articles from other areas of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(H) Choice of Reading materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What influences your choice of reading materials for use in reading lessons?</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) the nature of the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) content of text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) objectives of the reading lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) learners background of reading strategies/skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) students low level of motivation / interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) reading environment in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) limited time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) supplementary reading material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(J) Reading enrichment forums

**Question:** Do the school have a fully equipped library?  **YES [ ] NO [ ]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you provide the following reading enrichment forums for your learners</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) symposiums with neighbouring schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) teacher – student conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) reading workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) reading clubs in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) field trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) relevant movies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Cultural reading promotions in school &amp; public libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(K) Effects of Reading enrichment forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do these forums help learners’ in achievement of reading proficiency?</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) students try to monitor their reading, they get encouraged and read beyond the assigned tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) students become more confident and interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) they get motivated and learning improves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) they perform better in their academic areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) any other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constraints in planning and teaching reading and reading strategies

What constrains you from teaching reading and reading strategies effectively in your actual reading lessons?

1) lack of clear procedural knowledge
2) negative attitude toward English as a subject --- it is a difficult language
3) the teaching context e.g amount of time
4) teachers overload & big classes
5) students with different levels of motivation
6) learners wanting linguistic competence
7) lack of opportunities/school-wide environment model for sustained reading
8) heavy demands for final assignments and completion of syllabus
9) learners’ inability to transfer learnt strategies to different reading texts
10) advent of video houses and other electronic gadgets which has lowered the intellectual moods
11) change of value system
12) Language load
13) cultural load in the text
14) cognitive load

Reading instruction in secondary schools in Kenya

(i) According to your experience, how would you describe the reading level of your students?
   a) Competent  b) Modest  c) Limited

(ii) What do you think should be done to improve reading proficiency in secondary schools

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING
APPENDIX 3: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

1. (a) Do you like reading?
   
   (b) What makes your reading interesting?
   
   (c) Do you like reading silently or loudly? Why do you prefer that mode of reading?
   
   (d) What type of texts do you like reading? Where do you get them from?

2. In your English language reading comprehension lessons, what reading materials do you usually use?

3. Generally, how does the English language teacher prepare you for reading exercises during the lesson?

4. When the teacher asks you to read the selected passage, how do you read the text?

7. a) Are you aware of any reading problems in and out of class?
   
   b) What do you think are the causes of your reading problems?

8. a) What programmes, apart from reading passages from class textbooks, are you exposed to by the English teacher?
   
   b) How often do you participate in these programmes?

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING
APPENDIX 4: TEACHERS INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What do you think reading strategies are?

2. Do you often teach reading strategies in your reading class?
   i. What are they?
   ii. How do you use them?
   iii. What are your reasons for use?
   iv. What difficulties do you face?

3. Suppose you are giving reading text to your students:-
   i. How do you deal with it as a start?
   ii. When students start reading do you suggest to them the strategies they could use?
   iii. After reading do you encourage your students to use reading strategies? What are they?

4. How do you think reading should be taught? What should be the properties of reading instruction?

5. How do you ensure that student understand the reading material?

6. What do you think influences your teaching of reading?

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING