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ABSTRACT

The implementation of FPE in the year 2003 introduced many challenges to teaching and learning in public primary schools in Kenya. This study sought to find out the effects of the inception of FPE in Kenya in 2003 on the teaching and learning of English in public primary schools in Eldoret municipality. The specific objectives were to: determine the influence of FPE on teaching and learning resources; establish the influence of teaching techniques on the English language teaching and learning; to determine the influence of selected aspects of FPE on English language teaching and learning, and; to find out the challenges faced by teachers as a result of FPE. The research design for the study was descriptive survey. The research was carried out in Eldoret municipality primary schools, Kenya, among 4200 standard six pupils and 82 English language teachers. By use of simple random sampling, 8 teachers from the 42 public primary schools, representing 10 percent of the English language teachers and 45 standard six pupils representing 1 percent of the population were involved in the study. The research instruments were: interview schedule for English language teachers and an English language proficiency checklist used to evaluate pupil’s performance on an English composition topic for pupils of standard six. Measures of central tendency such as mean, together with measures of variability, frequency distribution and t-tests were used to analyze data. It was established that FPE significantly influenced the practice of classroom discussions and presentations and adoption of learner-centered approaches, which negatively influenced pupils’ English language proficiency. Learning facilities were inadequate to undertake proper teaching and learning. Support from parents should be harnessed in a structured way. Educational and learning infrastructure should cater for the influx of pupils in these schools due to FPE. Innovative approaches need to be developed to enhance teaching and learning the Future research should explore how the community could be involved to enhance the English language teaching and learning.
**ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Communicative Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELN</td>
<td>English Literacy Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>English Medium Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>English by Radio Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST</td>
<td>General Systems Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Integrated Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIE</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI</td>
<td>Language of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA</td>
<td>New Primary Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SbTD</td>
<td>School based Teacher Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>Universal Primary Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.2 Background to the Study

Free primary education is a policy that has been implemented in several countries. In developed countries such as the USA, free education is provided as an essential service (Mitchel & Salsbury, 2008). This ideal formed the second goal in the United Nations Millennium Development Goal which sought to ensure that by the year 2015, children everywhere will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling (United Nations, 2010).

In the 1960s, as developing countries in Africa got independence, investment in basic free primary education was one of the policies used to build capacity and provide for equitable participation in economic growth and politics (Wright, Horn and Prouty, 2009). The large majority of countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) are at risk of not reaching the Universal Primary School completion by 2015 (Fredriksen, Watt, & Gabriel, 2001; UNESCO, 2002, Rakatomala, Bruns, & Mingat, 2003). In many countries in SSA, recent efforts to abolish school fees are, in fact, second attempts. In Kenya and Tanzania, for example, fee abolition policies were introduced in 1974. These policies resulted in significant impact on enrolment and rapid benefits towards Universal Primary Education (UPE). Gradually, fee abolition policies were largely abandoned and literally, all gains reversed (Fredriksen et al., 2001).

Between 1960 and 1980, SSA’s Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) grew from 45 per cent to 80 per cent (UNESCO, 2007). Partial implementation of UPE in Kenya was introduced in 1974 for standards 1-4, and was extended to standards five to seven in 1978 (Sifuna,
The Gross Enrolment Rate in primary schools in Kenya rose from 50 percent in 1963 to a peak of 105 per cent in 1989 (UNESCO, 2002). But the cost-sharing policy in the financing of the education sector, recommended by Kamunge Committee was introduced in 1989 (Kamunge, 1988). This cost-sharing policy blocked many children, especially from the economically vulnerable groups from accessing education.

The Ominde Commission of was established by the Kenya Government in 1964 to chart the course of development in the education sector. The commission emphasized the need for Universal Primary Education (UPE). The report recommended among other issues, that English Literacy for all pupils, including standard one learners, be realized. The commission revealed considerable disparities in pupils’ access to English in their homes, as well as in schools. These disparities continue up to this day (Groenewegen, 2008).

The key concerns of FPE are access, equity and relevance. Expanding access to primary education is of fundamental importance to the government’s development strategy (Sessional Paper No. 1, 2005). Universal Primary Education is central to the implementation of poverty reduction strategy since the acquisition of basic literacy, and indeed numeracy skills, will expand Kenya’s access to employment opportunities and sustain the country’s economic growth (World Bank, 2009). English language is important in accessing content in most subjects in the primary school curriculum in Kenya. This is what Rosen (1984) referred to as “language across the curriculum”.

The language policy in Kenya is that the English language should be the medium of instruction from standard four upwards. In linguistically – homogenous communities, mother tongue should be used in standards one, two and three, as the language of
instruction (LOI) and English or Kiswahili as the LOI in linguistically-heterogeneous communities. However, Muthwii (2001) points out that the language education policy in Kenya is not strictly adhered to in the actual classroom situation. He adds that the overall tendency is for schools to opt for the English language as the medium of instruction right from standard one. This practice of using the English language as the LOI right from standard one, is done in the belief that it increases the children’s input of the English language, hence their chances of acquiring the English literacy skills faster. Tarone (1983); Bunyi (2001 and 2005); and Cleghorn, et al. (1989) do not agree with teachers who disregard the Kenyan language-in-education policy. Tarone (1983), on second language (L2) acquisition (adapting Labov’s Stylistic Continuum), argued that learner’s other end of continuum is the vernacular language.

Practically, the English language is used in Kenyan schools when it is necessary, for instance, when using text books in the classroom. National examinations in Kenya are written in English except for other subjects taught in different languages. This may be one reason why teachers tend to neglect the language-in-education policy. However, Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) observe that children, who are adequately prepared in the English language, find it easy to understand and progress in school, while those who are ill-prepared in the English language find it difficult to cope. This is not only in the English language, but also in other subjects which are taught in English. Quality teaching and learning of the English language in primary schools in Kenya has been one of the most challenging tasks to education planners. The provision of enough financial resources to cater for teaching and learning materials, functional libraries and the overall learning environments remain a major challenge.
This research explored the connection between the quality of teaching and learning of the English language in public primary schools in Eldoret municipality and the implementation of FPE since 2003. The research was focused on the English language proficiency among primary school pupils. The results from examinations which pupils attain in the English language are arguably, not encouraging. In the 2009 KCPE Mock results of Eldoret municipality, for example, only two out of forty seven public primary schools, got a mean grade of fifty per cent and above in the English language (Eldoret Municipal Education Office Records, 2009).

Many of the performance problems in English at the secondary school level have their roots at the primary school level. These pupils are particularly weak and often insufficiently proficient in English and lacking in the command of written and spoken English (Verspoor, 2005). Pupils should be given an opportunity to recount and write about the stories they have read. Such an approach promotes the development of writing as well as other skills. Pupils will need recounting and writing skills when they leave school (Gathumbi et al., 2003). Pupils should be exposed to creative writing, although towards the end of primary level, functional type of writing may be introduced.

According to Roy-Campbell (2015), primary school pupils begin learning English as a second language as a subject at the beginning of primary school Class One, but most pupils are not sufficiently proficient in English at the end of Class Three to effectively learn content in English in Class Four. English language lessons in standard six typically involve: a comprehension exercise, a grammar exercise from the comprehension story and a composition related to the comprehension topic. This approach mirrors the usual Kenyan paper and pen test format (Groenewegen, 2008).
1.3 Statement of the Problem

When FPE was introduced by the Kenyan government in 2003, it followed a “big bang” approach (Fredriksen, 2007). This meant that fee abolition was implemented with little or no prior planning. This approach brought the corresponding challenges of expanding access, improving quality and ensuring equity. The KCPE results for public primary schools in Eldoret municipality showed that the mean grade in English language was D+ in 2010, C- in 2011 and D+ in 2012. This indicates that pupils consistently performed poorly with no signs of improvement. Sadly, curriculum reforms to the teaching and learning of the English language have been attempted but with little success (Yaw, 2008). The triple challenges of expanding access, improving quality and ensuring equity, still need to be successfully addressed by the Kenyan government.

The current education system is overcome by excessive examination orientation of teachers, pupils, parents, text book writers and general public. Teachers largely forget that there is a normative syllabus (Groenewegen, 2008). The majority of schools, motivated by the future utility of English as the language of instruction and employment, use code switching between Kiswahili and English as the Language of Instruction (LOI) from standard one (Muthwii, 2001). They thus create a confused instructional and learning environment for learners. A very large proportion of teachers (about 84 per cent) indicated that they did not follow the Kenya’s language policy in education (Gathumbi et al., 2003). The ministry of education has decried the quality of the English language taught and learnt in public primary schools. This poor performance in the English language is being associated with Free Primary Education inception in 2003. A person who is fluent and competent in English language is socially seen as a well educated individual. Such a person stands a better chance to be considered for further education and employment.
There is need to conduct research at primary school level because it is at this level where the foundations of English language learning is established and the quality of teaching and learning at this level determine pupils’ performance in secondary and tertiary levels. This study sought to find out the effects of the inceptions of FPE in Kenya in 2003 on the teaching and learning of English in public primary schools in Eldoret Municipality.

1.4 Purpose

The general purpose of this research was to establish the influence of Free Primary Education on the teaching and learning of the English language in public primary schools in Kenya.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study were to:

i) Find out use of teaching and learning resources in FPE.

ii) Establish the teaching techniques used within the context of FPE.

iii) Investigate the influence of FPE on pupils’ English language proficiency.

iv) Find out the challenges faced by English language teachers and learners in FPE.

1.6 Research questions

The following were the research questions:

i) How has FPE affected use of teaching and learning resources?

ii) What are the teaching techniques used within the context of FPE?

iii) In what ways has FPE affected learning of skills?

iv) What challenges are faced by teachers due to FPE?
1.7 **Significance of the Study**

The research findings would be relevant to the English language curriculum planners and teachers of English in primary schools in Kenya, who might use the findings to improve the teaching and learning of English by coming up with teaching techniques that can be applied successfully in a resource-constrained environment. The study provides more background knowledge on the current situation in public primary schools, after the introduction of FPE in 2003, against which English is being taught. It also supplements other related studies so as to realize primary school pupils’ proficiency in the English language in spite of challenges brought about by FPE. The findings of this study could assist the public primary schools’ stakeholders to make informed decisions when implementing education policies, and relate the findings to effective teaching and learning of English. School heads, heads of English language department and teachers of English in the municipality may find a basis in the findings to negotiate for the allocation of more learning resources to their school.

1.8 **Scope of the Study**

The population comprised all class six pupils and English language teachers of public primary schools in Eldoret Municipality. Class six pupils represent the upper primary classes and were used to assist in studying the influence of FPE on teaching and learning of the English language after being taught for five years. The aspects of FPE influence on the teaching and learning of the English language addressed, were learning/teaching resources, teaching techniques and learning infrastructure. This study can therefore be generalized to public primary schools in other municipalities in Kenya.
1.9 Limitations of the Study

The study had a few limitations. The data obtained for analysis and interpretation, by design, came from a sample of 8 (10%) of the English language teachers and 45 (1%) of the standard six pupils. A better understanding could be obtained by gathering more information from a larger sample of pupils and teachers. Secondly, since the scope of the study was public schools, the views of the English language teachers from private primary schools were not sought to make a comparative analysis since their teaching and learning environment could be different. Last but not least, the collection of data from public primary schools in municipalities means that schools in rural settings were not represented in the study. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to the whole country. However, the study forms a basis for a larger study with expanded samples.

1.10 Assumptions of the Study

The basic assumptions of this study were:

i) All teachers in primary schools have undergone teacher training and are qualified to teach English in primary schools

ii) Each pupil in public primary schools in Kenya receives an annual capitation grant of Ksh. 1,020.

iii) All public primary schools in Kenya receive instructional materials from the government in addition to FPE funds.

1.11 Theoretical Framework

The research was based on the General Systems Theory Galbraith 1967. The General Systems Theory is a systematic attempt to coordinate all aspects of a problem towards a specific objective (Galbraith, 1967). Other proponents of this theory defined GST as a method of looking at wholes and attempting to establish relationships among their parts (Banathy, 1968). General Systems Theory is interdisciplinary in nature. A system is a
concept of function composed of united and integrated parts (Simiyu, 2004). Figure 1.1 shows the relationship of variables in general systems theory. The direction of the arrows depicts the influence relationship. The arrows suggest that there is a bidirectional relationship between the learning environment, English language teaching and learning and the teaching profession.

Figure 1.1 Relation of Variables in GST
Source: Adapted from Fessler (1992)
General systems theory is a regularly interacting or independent groups of items forming a united whole. In education, GST coordinates planning, organization and uses all available learning resources to achieve desirable learning objectives by the most efficient means practicable. This theory works on the principle of feedback from within which cannot be ignored. All parts of the system are assigned specific roles to do at the right time.

In this study, the GST is focused in the school system. The school system has smaller entities: the school community, parents, the school management, teachers and pupils. The teaching and learning of the English language depends on these components in the education system. The failure of any one part may negatively influence the outcome in the teaching and learning of the English language. English language teaching and learning depends on the extent to which English language is used as an instructional and communication tool and the techniques of instructions. Learners draw from the example set by English language teachers as role models as well as their participation in learning activities, school studies and supervision. The interaction between the learning environment and English language teaching and learning is contingent to the administration of English language teaching and learning and any mismatch between supply and demand of English language teachers.

1.12 **Conceptual Framework**

The following conceptual framework was used for the study. The framework shows the interaction between the independent, intervening and dependent variables. The directions of the arrows show the influence relationship. Figure 1.2 depicts the effect of FPE on learning resources, teaching techniques and class size as the independent variables, adequacy of English language teachers and role modeling of teachers through the
examples they set as intervening variables and English language proficiency as the dependent variable.

Figure 1.2 Conceptual Framework
Source: Author (2016)

1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

**Basic education:** It refers to an eight to twelve-year schooling duration. In Kenya, basic education includes primary and some or all years of the secondary education cycle. Basic education also refers to the opportunities provided by schools concerning low levels of literacy and numeracy.

**Big bang:** It refers to an approach where school fees abolition was announced and implemented with little prior planning. This resulted in an enrolment surge in primary schools. Kenya, Ethiopia and Malawi are perhaps the best examples in sub-Saharan Africa of the Big Bang effect.
Capitation Grant: These are fixed remittances paid as grants to schools. Each pupil is entitled to an equal amount of money within a given period. For the FPE programme (2003), the capitation grant has remained at Ksh. 1,020 per child.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): It is the notional or functional approach to teaching a language. This approach enables the learner to know if an utterance is formal, informal, feasible or appropriate rather than just mastering the language structures.

Communicative Task: This is a piece of classroom work learners comprehend, manipulate, produce and interact in target language. The attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form and has completeness.

Diagnostic Test: It is a test that diagnoses an individual’s strength or weakness. It is also used to identify problematic areas in teaching and learning. It may test learner’s understanding of a particular aspect of skill that has been taught, before moving on to the other areas.

English Literacy Norms: These are standards or benchmarks for a clearly-defined reference group on their ability to listen, speak, read and write appropriately in English in a variety of contexts. These standards or benchmarks also measure the group’s ability to carry out simple
appropriate level calculations and incorporate the skills of critical thinking, problem solving and creativity.

**Equity:** Refers to the distributive process of educational opportunities and reward in fairness and justice, equity in the provision of instructional materials, teaching time and learning of English cost-effectively.

**Fluency:** This is the extent to which the language produced in performing a task manifests pausing, hesitation or reformulation. Fluency is the capacity of the learner to mobilize her/his system to communicate in time.

**Grammatical errors:** These are errors in either grammar or usage, and sometimes include a subset of spelling errors. For example, where a pupil writes: “he writed” instead of “he wrote”.

**Integrated English:** It is an approach to language teaching where language and literature are taught as a single subject. Integrated Language and Literature aim at maximizing meaningful communication and classroom interactions in meaningful situations.
**Mechanical errors:** These are errors that can hinder communication such as vocabulary confusion, violations of syntactic rules that obscure meaning and incorrect, irrelevant or missing information.

**Learning infrastructure:** This refers to the physical aspects of primary schools that provide the enabling environment for proper learning to take place such as classroom size and conditions of furniture and fixtures.

**Learning resources:** Refers to resources that act as knowledge repositories that can be used by learners to acquire the education and competence they need to read and write English proficiently such as text books.

**Mechanical Errors:** These are errors that can hinder communication such as vocabulary, confusion; violation of syntactic rules that obscure and incorrect irrelevant or missing information.

**Performance:** Refers to the capacity to achieve the desired efficiency in spoken and written English Language by an individual.

**Quality education:** It refers to efficiency in education. It’s most important concern involves the relevance of programme content for the effective preparation of young people for participation in an economy and society certain to see dramatic changes in the next decades. Quality of instruction, the learning environment in schools and the level of learning achievement are its equally important concerns.
**Task:** Any structured language endeavour which has a particular objective, appropriate content, specified working procedure and a range of outcomes for those who undertake it.

**Teaching techniques:** Refers to methods used by teachers of the English language to impart skills of writing and speaking English to pupils.

**Traditional Approach:** It is the product–oriented approach to writing the English language. The three common features are: a title is given by the teacher; learners are asked to write on the titles; the composition is then marked by the teacher. The teaching concentrates on forms, syntax, grammar, mechanics and organization rather than content. Learners see the work as being tedious and burdensome.

**Free Primary Education:** It is an attempt to achieve free primary education through significant increase in participation rates, that involves every child without jeopardizing improvements in quality and relevance. It is about equitable access to education for all.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter helps to sharpen and define understanding of existing knowledge in the problem area. It reviews literature in research studies which is relevant to the study. The chapter provides a framework for establishing the importance of the study and relating it to the larger literature about the topic, filling the gaps and extending prior studies. It attempts to discuss rationale, issues and conditions for the effects of abolition of school fees on the proficiency in the English language of pupils in public primary schools in Kenya. The literature review is thematically presented according to the specific objectives. The first section reviews the effect of FPE on teaching resources and its role on teaching and learning of the English language. The second section discusses the role of teaching policies introduced within the context of FPE on the English language teaching and learning. The third section considers the effect of FPE on learning infrastructure and its influence in the English language teaching and learning. And four to determine the influence of FPE on use of teaching and learning resources.

2.2 Influence of Free Primary Education on Teaching and Learning Resources

2.2.1 Adequacy of teaching resources

Severe shortage of the English Language textbooks for example, 90% of the pupils in lower primary share text books (ELN, 2003). The absence of reforms in teacher training and ineffective teaching deployment policies, can only impact negatively on learner performance and the quality of English in primary schools in Kenya. The government may not be able to supply enough English text books and other teaching and learning materials to individual learners (Gathumbi et al., 2003). Sharing of English text books
inhibits individuals to work independently. Learners may not be able to carry home the text books to do homework. Schools also need to build libraries and stock them with reading and educational materials, since most schools lack libraries and where they exist, they are poorly stocked (Gathumbi et al., 2003). This would go a long way to develop the language skills which is the backbone of literacy development. Improving the quality of teaching and learning the English language should include practices that use current resources creatively and most effectively. These resources potentially determine the teaching and learning of the English language. However, the relationship between availability of teaching resource to pupils’ proficiency in the English language is not discussed by Gathumbi et al. (2003). This is a gap the study sought to fill.

Reche et al. (2012) held that the adequacy and use of teaching and learning materials affects the effectiveness of a teacher’s lesson as teaching and learning resources enhance understanding of abstract ideas and improve performance. Such resources include text books, library books and exercise books. Their findings showed that library books were not adequate. It is thus possible that library books which could be used to enhance the teaching and learning of the English language were scarce. This perspective is supported by empirical reports of the research undertaken by Orodho et al. (2013). These scholars established that among the key challenges affecting effective implementation of FPE was insufficient instructional resources to cope with the exponential growth of student population.

2.2.2 Quality of teachers

Teachers’ efficiency in handling content and pedagogy is essential for high quality teaching in all subjects in the curriculum. Classroom teaching and learning is closely
linked to teacher training (Gathumbi et al., 2009). The academic qualifications of the trainees both in selection for training as well as in the process of training, are very important (Kimemia, 2002). However, a study by Daljaeghere and Leu (2007) revealed that little attention is given to teaching and learning of the English language. This depends on the recruitment and effectiveness of school leadership. Availability of adequate supply of teachers of the English language is constrained by the output of well educated KCSE graduates. Second, the finances available for employing more teachers are limited and often insufficient to meet the standards expected. Third, some, if not most teacher trainees have little grasp of the English language – the language of instruction (Lewin, 2002). The broad consensus is that teacher quality is the single most important variable influencing pupil’s achievement in the English proficiency (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2004).

Emphasis on teacher professional development should be on pupil-centred methods to the teaching and learning of English language. According to ELN (2003) project, regular use of school library, creating of opportunities for pupils to read, discuss, write about what they have read and discussions on real life situations are among the interactive approaches to apply in teaching and learning of the English language.

2.3 Influence of Teaching Techniques used within the context of Free Primary Education

There have been various efforts over time to introduce newly developed techniques to the teaching and learning of the English language in Kenyan Primary Schools. Lewin (2008) advocated for doing away with outdated and inappropriate English language curriculum content. The implementation of the English language curriculum reform has
usually been difficult and the outcome on pupils’ learning far less than expected. Some of the reasons for unimpressive results are: some innovations to the teaching and learning of English have been designed without adequate assessment of classroom and school-level realities; implications for the demand on teacher skills; the cost of implementations, insufficient teacher preparation, and the shortage of essential instructional materials. The inception of FPE in 2003 has probably made the learning and teaching conditions of the English language more difficult. Innovations that have received some attention in the literature include: the English Medium Project, the New Primary Approach; English by Radio Project; the Integrated Approach; and the English Literary Norms Project. Lewin (2008) however did not demonstrate the influence of the English language curriculum on the teaching and learning of English at the primary level. This study sought to establish the effect teaching techniques adopted in public primary schools in Eldorate municipality impacted pupils’ English language proficiency within the context of FPE.

2.3.1 The English Medium Project

The English Medium Project was implemented in 1961. Its main features were: use of English language for teaching across the curriculum from standard one, learner-centered approach, and specially prepared instructional materials for teaching and learning processes. Teachers underwent in-service training in the use of English medium in teaching across the curriculum. Emphasis was on pupil’s proficiency in the English language, literacy and its learner-centered teaching and learning processes (Bunyi, 2001). However, because of the high demand for the project, expansion was difficult, even though by 1965, 1920 schools were using the approach compared to only one in 1961 (Bunyi, 2001). The deployment of teachers trained and in-serviced in the English Medium Project and the supply of especially prepared teaching and learning materials
could not satisfy the schools (Groenewegen, 2008). The consequence was that the teaching and learning based on English Medium Project deteriorated greatly. Both Bunyi (2001) and Groenewegen (2008) however did not demonstrate the effect of in-service training on the teaching and learning of the English language. This study sought to fill the knowledge gap by investigating the influence of in-service training on pupils’ English language proficiency.

2.3.2 English Literacy Norms Project

Further attempts to improve the teaching and learning of the English language are through the English Literacy Norms (Groenewegen, 2008). English Literacy Norms refer to the prescribed standards of competence and proficiency or benchmarks or targets for performance in language use. English Literacy Norms are targets of literacy to which the English language practitioners should meet for learners in any of the primary grades from class one to eight.

The English Literacy Norms Project was an attempt to support the efforts of the Kenya government to attain appreciable education standards in primary schools in the country (Gathumbi et al., 2009). Norms refer to prescribed standards of competence and proficiency or benchmarks or targets for performance in language use (Bunyi, 2005). In this project, the researchers guided the English language practitioners to teaching and learning processes which can improve language learning in primary schools. The research team is unanimous in pointing out the frustrations arising from the fact that after numerous in-service efforts, new approaches and innovations, English language performance of primary school leavers, leaves much to be desired (Groenewegen, 2008). The main concern of the ELN project included the low level of English literacy among
school leavers admitted to teacher education programmes; the shortage of language learning resources, the lack of interactive and cooperative approaches in language teaching and learning; the lack of exposure to social environment where English is the means of communication, and excessive examination orientation that makes teachers and learners neglect the English language practice that is recommended by the language policy (Groenewegen, 2008).

It was expected that norms would help primary school teachers to interpret the syllabus more effectively, teach more efficiently using current trends such as learner-centered methods and techniques, consolidate knowledge and assess the mastery of the English language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing, grammar and vocabulary at different primary grade levels (Groenewegen, 2008).

In order to ensure pupil’s proficiency in English, ELN project (2003) developed English language benchmarks that would guide teachers in the development of English literacy. According to Pagie (2003), reading is the gateway to learning and that learning to read is much easier before standard three. Being the language of instruction and text books, the English language is vital in accessing knowledge, not only from English as a subject, but also from other subjects taught in English. Areas of interest included methods of training for teachers; types of learning aids and materials used; school environment and ethos; teaching techniques, methods and techniques; and methods of assessment. Setting of norms also ensures that step-by-step order is followed (Groenewegen, 2008).

Groenewegen (2008) has however not pointed out the potential challenges that the introduction of FPE further meted on the efforts of English language teachers to help
pupils achieve targeted standards of proficiency in the English language. This study sought to evaluate the effectiveness of such techniques in the teaching and learning of English language under FPE.

2.3.3 The Integrated Approach

The Integrated Approach to the teaching and learning of the English language and literature is another effort by English curriculum planners to make the language more meaningful. In this approach, the English language teaching aims at maximizing meaningful communication and classroom interaction in meaningful situations (Groenewegen, 2008). Content based courses are premised on the assumption that learners will best learn language while they are engaged in learning subject content (Ellis, 2005). Such an approach is aimed at learners achieving high levels of grammatical and social linguistic accuracy.

The integration of English and literature is based on the concept of holistic education (Gathumbi & Masembe, 2008). The aim is to gain the interaction of English and literature in meaningful situations. The Integrated Approach to language teaching aims at maximizing meaningful communication and classroom interaction in meaningful situations. Despite such innovation as the Integrated Approach, ELN and the School based Teacher Development (SbTD), most primary school graduates do not attain proficiency in the English language and literacy skills to access knowledge in the content subjects in secondary education curriculum. Most of them are also unable to communicate efficiently in English as this depends on the users’ knowledge of the language itself.
The FPE policy should ensure that all children have an opportunity to quality teaching and learning regardless of income, background or social identity through proper utilization of the FPE funds. However, school improvement efforts seem threatened by financial and management realities. Public school educators find themselves pulled between improvement demands and financial management conditions. In the process, initiatives towards realizing pupil’s proficiency in English through the adoption of new teaching and learning methods in English have not yielded much (Mulkeen, 2007). Improvement programmes such as ELN project 2003, the Integrated Approach and others can provide some of the inspirations. However, education resources, services and expertise that can help schools develop the capacity for adoption of such programmes can bring new demands, requirements and costs that may not be forthcoming. Many initiatives in the implementation, involve far more time, effort and resources that may not be met with current FPE funds of Ksh. 1020 per pupil per year (Mulkeen, 2007). Keen and Jenkins (1997) point out that in the final analysis, the success of implementing teaching and learning, will depend on the deep concern for learners and the willingness to adjust the teaching and learning environment to meet the learning needs of the individual pupil.

The current pupil: teacher ratio of about 100:1 in Eldoret (Eldoret Municipal Education Office Records, 2008), may not allow for personalized instruction to teaching and learning of English. The issue of large enrolment is perhaps one of the major challenges of FPE since inception in 2003. Seymour (2002) has called for creating new setting that reflects critical inquiry about educational practice. But most schools may merely fine-tune traditional patterns of school organization and pedagogy in their attempt to implement FPE programme. In spite of large classes, the teachers’ approach to teaching
English should feature reasonably structured learning activities which are challenging, integrative but child-centered learning environment.

The methodology should be interactive and meaningful in order to greatly improve pupil’s performance in English. The teacher should flexibly use space and time and authentic performance-based assessment of pupils’ progress (Lewin, 2002). The ELN Project (2003) set benchmark standards that were expected to provide information on individual pupil’s performance in English literacy to a variety of groups, including professionals and non professionals (Bunyi, 2001).

The kinds of literacy, proficiency in English and problem solving skills that were once expected of only some pupils in the past, are now needed by all in the society to succeed in a fast moving technology-driven world. These are the tangible outcomes that parents want for their children (Vranek et al., 2001). The urgency of the situation in our schools in relation to poor performance in the English language should be viewed by English practitioners in the context of larger changes that have taken place in the society. The implementation of FPE programme in 2003 came with the enrolment in standard one, in some cases of pupils who were as old as 12 years or even more (Eldoret Municipal Education Office Records, 2008). The age of a pupil is related to academic achievement in the English language (Groenewegen, 2008). The older the pupil, the poorer his/her performance is in English. There is compelling evidence that younger children, especially in reduced class size will attain proficiency in English much faster (Murphy & Rosenberg, 1998).
The Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) in primary schools in Kenya rose from 75 percent in 1999 to 105 per cent in 2005 (Lewin, 2008). This may have caused a negative effect on the new approaches to the teaching and learning of the English language such as the Integrated Approach and the English Literacy Norms (2003) Project. The high number of pupils in public primary schools presents a particular challenge to the quality of teaching and learning of the English language. Due to the inadequate supply of the English language text books, teaching materials and crowded classrooms most teachers now resort to a teacher – centered and not pupil – centered classroom approach. However, the effect of this reality on teaching and learning of the English language in public primary schools is not investigated by Lewin (2008) and his colleagues. This study sought to establish the application and effectiveness of the integrated approach to English language teaching and learning under the FPE program.

2.4 Influence of Free Primary Education on English Language Teaching and Learning Proficiency

2.4.1 Class size

In most schools, there are large classes that impede giving individual attention. In such a situation, teachers may use “chalk and talk” method where listening, in most cases without understanding, reading and writing are emphasized (Gathumbi et al., 2003). The learner does not interact with the teacher in a one-to-one basis; hence the teacher may not know whether the pupil can communicate verbally in English. The teacher should give individual attention to pupils in order to enable them to master the use of the English language with respect to listening, speaking, reading, writing and paying attention to correct use of grammar and vocabulary. They should be taught to appreciate the need for proper planning and composition of sentences in a logical manner as this is necessary to
learning in other subjects besides the English language. But how possible are these methods in large classes? In Kenya, government’s financial constraints have lowered the employment of qualified teachers (Lewin, 2002).

The proponents of small class size such as Glasser (1986) and Hammond (1997) believe that small schools (300-600) promote an interactive learning environment, higher pupil achievement, higher attendance, lower dropout rates, greater participation in school activities, less violence and greater post-school success. All learners want to feel competent and capable if they are to understand and accomplish real-world tasks (Newmann & Wehlage, 1955). They argue that teaching and learning which inhibit transfer of learning to issues and problems faced outside school are trivial, contrived and meaningless to pupils and stakeholders. Elliot (1998) however cautions that small classes are not a solution for language education. To be effective, careful planning and consideration for needs and strengths of the school system is necessary. When planned thoughtfully and funded adequately, such early gains in language education generate substantial and long term benefits in advance-level courses (Carnegie, 1989).

Moving from a system based on school fees being paid by parents and guardians, to one of free basic education, has hidden costs if the effort is unplanned or under-planned. Whereas school fee payment stifled enrolment of the poorest and most vulnerable children, the inception of free primary education in Kenya in 2003, resulted in immediate and dramatic influx of pupils which overburdened the education system. The quality of teaching and learning the English language, among other subjects in the public schools become compromised. The pupil teacher ratio in Eldoret Municipality, for instance, rose from 40:1 in 2002 during the cost-sharing system of education to 100:1, in 2004, after
the introduction of FPE in 2003 (Eldorate Municipal Education Office Records, 2009). English language is hence taught under conditions in which effective instruction is almost impossible (Ottervanger, Akker & Feiter, 2007). However, the impact of FPE through a high pupil to teacher ratio on the pupils’ English language proficiency is not tested by Ottervanger et al. (2007). This study sought to establish the influence of increased class size on English language teaching and learning in public primary schools in Eldoret municipality.

2.4.2 Library resources

According to Kinya (2013), the school library is a learning workroom where users interact directly with resources and develop research skills for lifelong learning. School libraries encourage active and participatory lifelong learning. The library environment facilitates teamwork and cooperation, its role in voluntary reading and personal development through literature is well-known. Kinya (2013) however argues that the school library situation in Kenya is on the whole unimpressive. In primary schools the situation is worse with over 11,756 primary schools in Kenya, less than 2% have libraries and to be specific private schools. The running of these libraries is assigned to clerical staff and pupil assistants who manage the affairs of many school libraries. The lack of recognition of the importance of school libraries on the part of the authorities adds to the staffing problem and collection in these institutions. Despite these problems, attempts are being made to mend the situation through implementation of free primary and secondary education policy and in line with national vision 2030. The Ministry of Education through free primary and secondary education policy is gradually realizing the value of school libraries and new library education and training programs are being developed by increasing the per student allocation annually and development funds to schools; particularly for building libraries and information centers (Kinya, 2013).
A study by Reche, Bundi, Riungu and Mbugua (2012) held that the adequacy and use of teaching and learning materials affects the effectiveness of a teacher’s lesson as teaching and learning resources enhances understanding of abstract ideas and improves performance. Such resources include text books, library books and exercise books. Their findings showed that library books were not adequate. It is thus possible that library books which could be used to enhance the teaching and learning of English language were scarce. This perspective is supported by empirical reports of the research undertaken by Orodho, Waweru, Ndichu and Ntinguri (2013). These scholars established that among the key challenges affecting effective implementation of FPE was insufficient instructional resources to cope with the exponential growth of student population. What Kinyua (2013) did not discuss is whether the new realization by the Ministry of Education has translated into real libraries in public primary schools and whether the said libraries influence English language proficiency outcomes of pupils under the FPE program. This was of interest in this study.

2.5 Summary

The chapter has presented a review of literature on free primary education and the potential effect on pupils’ English language proficiency. It has looked at the effect of FPE on teaching resources and its role on teaching and learning of the English language. It has also reviewed the role of teaching policies within the context of FPE on the English language teaching and learning. It has further reviewed effect of FPE on learning infrastructure and its influence in the English language teaching and learning. In sum, the literature has identified how FPE affected teaching and learning resources but the influence of this on English language teaching and learning was not investigated. This is the gap that the current study sought to fill.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the research design and the target population of study, sampling procedure, sampling technique and sample size, research instrument, pilot study, data collection and data analyses.

3.2 Research Design

The research design for the study was descriptive survey. Descriptive survey design is concerned with gathering information regarding perceptions of the state of affairs through the use of questionnaires and observations (Matthews & Kostelis, 2011). This research design is generally meant to describe what is happening with respect to a specific phenomenon within a given population (Rovai, Baker & Ponton, 2013). Surveys are used to determine opinions, attitudes and perceptions of groups of people of interest to the researcher (Kathuri & Pals, 1993). In this study, the research design was used because the researcher sought to describe what aspects of Free Primary Education influenced teaching and learning of the English language in public primary schools. The purpose was to explore and describe the outcomes of FPE on teaching and learning of the English language.

3.3 METHODOLOGY

3.3.1 Variables

The independent variables investigated were: learning resources, teaching technique teachers’ content knowledge and learning resources. The intervening variables were: adequacy of English language teachers and the example they set. The dependent variable pupils’ proficiency in the English Language.
3.3.2 Location of the Study
The study was conducted in public primary schools in Eldoret municipality, Kenya. The rationale for focusing on public schools only is because it is in these schools where free primary education policy was implemented. Challenges from the inception of FPE in 2003 to the teaching and learning of the English language such as lack of learning resources, instructional methods and high population affect pupils’ performance in a way similar to all other public primary schools in Kenya. The data collected from these schools in Eldoret municipality can legitimately be generalized to other public primary schools in urban settings in Kenya.

3.4 Target Population
The research was carried out in Eldoret municipality primary schools in Kenya, among standard six pupils and teachers of the schools. There were 42 public primary schools in Eldoret municipality with a total of 4,200 standard six pupils and 84 English language teachers; this gives a total of 4,284 persons (Eldoret Municipality Education Office Records, 2012). The research targeted Eldoret because most of the public primary schools were clustered within Eldorate municipality. The researcher targeted a school in each of the four zones in the Municipality.

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size
3.5.1 Sampling Techniques
Simple random sampling was used to get the required sample. This method generally eliminates bias and the sampling error can be estimated (Cohen & Manion, 1995, Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Kothari, 2007). Simple random sampling provided a representative sample related to the key purposes of the research. It enabled the
researcher to select a number of schools from which pupils of class six were randomly selected for the study. The teachers of the English language for standard six were involved because the study was particularly concerned with the English language teaching and learning after having undergone five years of primary education. Standard six pupils were chosen because they have undergone the teaching and learning of the English language long enough under the FPE. By use of simple random sampling (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003), ten percent of 42 public primary schools in Eldoret municipality were selected for the study.

3.5.2 Sample Size

Eldoret municipality is divided into four zones and has 42 public primary schools. By use of simple random sampling, 8 English language teachers out of 84 teachers from the 42 public primary schools and 45 standard six pupils out of 4200 pupils were involved in the study. The use of a sample size of 8 for the English language teachers was justified because it satisfied the 10 percent rule recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) while the use of a sample size of 45 pupils was considered adequate because it exceeded the required minimum of 30 cases to achieve a normal distribution based on the central limit theorem (Brase & Brase, 2008). The following sampling grid was used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Zones</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of schools sampled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of teachers sampled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. Pupils Sampled</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eldoret Municipality Education Office Records (2014)
3.6 Research Instruments

The research instruments were: interview schedule for teachers of the English language (Appendix I) and an English language proficiency checklist used to evaluate an English composition topic titled “Accident” for pupils of standard six (Appendix II). The interview schedule for teachers was basically to solicit information on the effects of FPE on teaching and learning of the English language. The other areas of concern for the interview were on learning resources, instructional methods, pupil’s activities and assessment procedures as they related to a large number of children in particular. The English language proficiency checklist was used to tally the number counts in grammatical and technical errors found in the English compositions submitted by the standard six pupils sampled.

3.7 Pilot Study

The purpose of piloting was to ensure that the instruments to be used in the study were applicable and detect any difficulty the instrument might have. The clarity of the instruments was therefore ascertained. During the piloting, the researcher also assessed the time it took to administer the instruments. Any items in the instrument which were not clear were reworked. The subjects in the actual sample were not involved in the piloting stage. The pilot study was conducted in class six in one public primary school in Eldoret municipality.

3.7.1 Validity

Validity is an indication of accuracy in terms of the extent to which a research conclusion reflects reality (McBurney & White, 2009). The validation of the instruments involved piloting in the public primary school in Eldoret municipality. The school and the streams in standard six involved in the piloting were randomly chosen. Inferences
were made based on results from the instrument and by comparing responses from teachers’ questionnaires and pupils’ composition assessment results.

### 3.7.2 Reliability

Instrument reliability is concerned with an instrument measuring what it intends to measure (McBurney & White, 2009). To determine the reliability of the instruments used, a Cronbach’s alpha test was run in SPSS. The test results returned an alpha value of 0.71. This is above the desirable alpha value of 0.7 as recommended by Andrew, Pedersen and McEvoy (2011) suggesting that the instrument was reliable.

### 3.8 Data Collection Techniques

The instruments to collect data for the study comprised an interview schedule and an English proficiency checklist used to extract data from a written English composition assessment test titled “Accident”. The researcher directly interviewed teachers of the English language and their head teachers in the study. Predetermined interview questions were used by the researcher to get information from the respondents. The questions explored themes such as adequacy of teaching and learning resources, problems experienced when teaching English language in relation to pupils’ population, the state of library facilities, effect of student population on teaching techniques, perceived relationship between FPE and English language performance, adherence to language policy and obstacles faced in implementing language in education policy. The English proficiency checklist enabled the researcher to count occurrence of mechanical and grammatical errors in the pupils’ composition test.
3.9 Data Analyses

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to analyze data. Qualitative data comprised data from open-ended questions whereas quantitative data was drawn from responses to closed-ended questions. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviations and percentages were established. The data were presented in the form of tables and graphs. The statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 18 was used to analyze data.

3.10 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

The researcher contacted schools under study seeking consent and cooperation from the head teachers and teachers of the English language. Informed consent was sought through the head teachers. Teachers and pupils were not coerced into participation in the study. Respondents were assured that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. They were also given the opportunity to withdraw from the study if they so decided. The subjects in the research were also assured of protection of their identity and any embarrassment from the information collected. The researcher revealed to the subjects that the purpose of the study was purely academic and sought their permission to proceed.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction
The general purpose of this research was to establish the influence of Free Primary Education on the teaching and learning of the English language in public primary schools in Kenya. This chapter presents and discusses the research findings. The first section presents descriptive statistics of respondents’ general data. The rest of the analysis is thematically presented according to the specific objectives. Section two presents and discusses the influence of Free Primary Education on teaching and learning resources. Section three analyzes the influence of teaching techniques used within the context of FPE. The fourth section presents the analysis and discussion of the influence of FPE on English language proficiency.

4.2 General Information
The general data analyzed in this section includes distribution of responding teachers by district, level of education and years of teaching service. It also presents descriptive statistics of school category by streams, and stream size. It also analyses and interprets findings on pupils’ English language performance in terms of overall percentage test scores and the count of grammatical and mechanical errors.

4.2.1 Teachers’ Level of Education
The distribution of the responding teachers’ level of education is given in table 4.1. The table shows that 62.5% (5) of the teachers held KCSE certificate whereas 37.5% were university graduates with a B.Ed degree. Therefore, the majority of the responding teachers were KCSE certificate holders, meaning that majority of the teachers held low qualifications.
Table 4.1 Teachers’ Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE &amp; professional qualifications</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree in B.Ed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Teachers’ years of service

The study sought to establish the teacher’s years of service. The results are presented in figure 4.1. The figure shows that the average years of service of the teachers was 21, with the number of years varying from this average by 4.7 years (M=20.75; SD=4.713). The findings showed that the minimum years of service, was 14 and the maximum was 26. Therefore, most of the respondents had provided teaching service for decades, and therefore, can be said to possess adequate teaching experience. The bar chart below illustrates the number of teachers and the years for which they have served.
4.2.3 School category

The schools were classified by number of streams as shown in table 4.2. The table shows that 75.0% of the schools were triple streamed and 25.0% of the schools were double streamed. This coincides with the gross enrollment rate which according to Lewin (2008), rose from 75 percent in 1999 to 105 per cent in 2005.

Table 4.2 Distribution of the Sampled Schools by Number of Streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double streamed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple streamed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 The Influence of Free Primary Education on Teaching and Learning Resources

In this section, an analysis of the effect of FPE on learning resources is presented along with its impact on pupils’ English language proficiency. The resources under review include: classroom size, resources from FPE fund, assistance from parents, teachers’ working space, and frequency of the English language homework.

4.3.1 Classroom size

The study sought to establish the number of pupils in a class. Figure 4.2 represents the findings. The figure shows that the average class size was 59 pupils, with the number of pupils varying from this average by 10 pupils ($M=58.75; SD=9.362$). This means that the classrooms were overcrowded. The findings further showed that the minimum stream size was 44 pupils and the maximum was 69 pupils. Therefore, the average class size was very high. The implication of this finding, in view of the earlier findings which
showed that majority of the classes were triple-streamed, is that each class had a minimum of 132 pupils. This agrees with the analysis as found in the Eldoret municipal education office records (2008). They indicate that the current pupil: teacher ratio is 100:1 in Eldoret, which may not allow for personalized instruction and learning of English.
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### 4.3.2 Adequacy of teaching and learning resources

English language teachers in the sample were asked whether the teaching and learning resources for English language in their class is adequate. Table 4.3 shows that 75% of the respondents said “no” while 25% of the respondents said “yes”. Some of the respondents complained that funds at times come late, the resources are few and sharing is a problem. Respondents said they try to overcome the inadequacy of resources by asking parents to add what they can to what the school has been allocated in order to assist in teaching.
English. They observe that a few parents reluctantly supplement the textbooks and storybooks, but these are too few and are generally ineffective. This means that the teachers had to make do with the limited learning resources which potentially affected the quality of learning that they imparted to the pupils in terms of the English language learning.

Table 4.3 Teachers’ Views on Adequacy of Teaching and learning Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are teaching and learning resources from FPE funds adequate for the teaching and learning of the English language</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

4.3.3 Library facilities

The study sought to establish from the English language teachers whether their school had a functioning library to facilitate the teaching and learning of English language. Table 4.4 shows that 50% of the respondents said “yes” whereas another 50% said “no”. This means that for the primary schools that lacked a functional library, the limited school resources being stretched by the pupil population as a result of FPE only added to the challenges they grappled with towards improving performance in the English language learning.
Table 4.4 Availability of a Functioning Library

| Functioning library to facilitate the teaching and learning of the English language | Distribution |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | Frequency | Percent |
| Yes | 4 | 50.0 |
| No | 4 | 50.0 |
| Total | 8 | 100.0 |

Source: Author

4.3.4 Resources from Free Primary Education Fund

English language teachers were asked whether the provision of teaching and learning resources from FPE funds was adequate for teaching and learning of the English language. Table 4.5 shows that 75% of the teachers said “no” whereas 25% of the teachers said “yes”. Therefore, majority of the responding teachers were of the view that resources from FPE fund were not adequate for teaching and learning the English language. This has potential negative implications on the quality of learning in the schools which may be linked to the poor English language performance of the pupils. This agrees with Lewin (2008) who argued that the high number of pupils in public primary schools presents a particular challenge to the quality of teaching and learning of the English language. This is reflected in the finding which showed that inadequate learning resources such as text books and library books were a challenge.

Table 4.5 Adequacy of Learning Resources from FPE Funds

| Adequacy of Teaching resources for English Subject from FPE Funds | Distribution |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | Frequency | Percent |
| Yes | 2 | 25.0 |
| No | 6 | 75.0 |
| Total | 8 | 100.0 |
The question on adequacy of FPE funds was cross-tabulated with effect on teaching and learning of English language to establish whether there was a significant difference in impact. Table 4.6 shows that respondents who perceived that the provision of teaching and learning resources from FPE funds was not adequate for the teaching and learning of the English language were the majority at 83.3% in terms of their agreement to the question of whether FPE affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. This suggests that there was a relationship between FPE and inadequacy of teaching and learning resources. This potentially affected the quality of teaching and learning of the English language as a subject. This could influence the performance of pupils in terms of written and spoken English.

### Table 4.6 Adequacy of FPE funds and Influence on Proficiency Cross-tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of teaching and learning resources from FPE funds for the teaching and learning of English language</th>
<th>FPE effect on pupils' proficiency in English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

#### 4.3.4 FPE’S Impact on Pupils’ Composition Skills

An independent samples T-test was run to compare the means of class size and teachers’ perception of the effect of FPE on the English language proficiency of pupils as shown in Table 4.7. The table shows that the streams which were negatively affected in terms of pupils’ proficiency in the English language were higher (M=60.17, SD=8.305) compared to the average class size of streams which were not negatively affected (M=54.5,
SD=14.849). This suggests that FPE led to an increase in class size which had a direct negative effect on the pupils’ English language proficiency. This is consistent with the views of Gathumbi et al. (2003) who associated poor performance in the English language to large classes that impede giving individual attention. This confirms earlier findings as given in table 4.2 where majority of the responding teachers was of the view that FPE negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language.

Table 4.7 Group Statistics of effect of Class Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPE effect on pupils' proficiency in the English language</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size of pupils saying yes</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>8.305</td>
<td>3.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size of pupils saying no</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>14.849</td>
<td>10.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

4.3.5 Free Primary Education’s Impact on Library and its Effect on Pupils’ Composition Proficiency

Teachers’ response to the question on whether they organized English library lessons in their class was cross-tabulated with the effect of FPE on the English language proficiency in order to determine whether there was any significant difference. The results are shown in Table 4.8. The table shows that all of the respondents who did not organize the English library lessons for their class agreed that the inception of FPE in 2003 negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. This implies that FPE affected the giving of library lessons which impacted negatively on the pupils’ English language proficiency. This agrees with a study by Kinya (2013) who concluded that the school library situation in Kenya is on the whole unimpressive. That is, they do not encourage active and participatory lifelong learning, which reflects on the poor performance in pupils’ English language proficiency.
4.4 The Influence of Free Primary Education on Teaching Techniques

This section analyzes the influence of teaching techniques within the context of FPE on the English language proficiency of the pupils. The variables examined included: classroom discussion and presentations, compliance with Kenya language policy, adoption of learner-centered approach.

4.4.1 Classroom discussions and presentations

The study sought to establish whether teachers engaged their pupils in class discussions, presentations, simulations and debates to enhance performance in the English language. Their responses were cross-tabulated with the effect of FPE on the English language proficiency to establish whether there was any significant difference in the proportions. The results are shown in Table 4.9. The table shows that the proportion of the teachers who did not engage pupils in discussions, presentations, simulations and debates to enhance performance in English language was the majority. They were responding to the question whether FPE negatively affected the pupils’ proficiency in English language.
This means that FPE potentially affected the teachers’ ability to effectively engage pupils in discussion, presentations, simulations and debates. The finding implies that FPE affected the teacher’s ability to effectively apply learner-centered teaching methods which consist of strategies such as discussion and presentations.

### Table 4.9 Influence of FPE on Pupils’ Skills and Classroom Discussion Cross-tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement of pupils in discussions, presentations, simulations and debates to enhance performance in their English language</th>
<th>FPE effect on pupils’ proficiency in the English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.2 Compliance with Kenya language policy**

The question sought to determine whether the schools complied with the Kenya language policy. The responses to this question were cross-tabulated with FPE effect on the pupils’ English language proficiency as shown in Table 4.10. The table shows that all the schools complied. This contradicts Groenewegen (2008) who attributed low level of English literacy among school leavers to the neglect of the English language practice that is recommended by the language policy. However, respondents who said “yes” to FPE effect pupils English language proficiency were the majority at 75% (6), implying that the language policy did not moderate on the negative impact of FPE on the pupils’
English language proficiency. It means that compliance with English language policy is not sufficient under the FPE program to ensure proficiency of pupil’s English language.

**Table 4.10 Influence of FPE on Pupils’ Proficiency and Compliance Cross-tab**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School compliance with the language policy in education</th>
<th>FPE Effect on pupils' proficiency in the English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.3 Adoption of learner-centered approach**

Respondents were also asked whether their class allowed for learner-centered teaching in learning the English language. Their responses were cross-tabulated with their views on the effect of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency as shown in table 4.11. The table shows that the proportion of respondents who said their class did not allow for learner-centered approach was the highest at 80% (4) in terms of saying yes to the question of whether the inception of FPE in 2003 negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. Therefore, it can be inferred that FPE inhibited the adoption of learner centered approach with negative implications on the pupils’ English language proficiency.
Table 4.11 Influence of FPE on Pupils’ Proficiency and Learner Centered Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether class allows for learner-centered teaching in learning English</th>
<th>FPE effect on pupils’ proficiency in the English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% count</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to establish from the respondents whether the head teachers facilitated the English language subject panel meetings to discuss ideas and issues such as new approaches on the subject. The responses were cross-tabulated with the respondents’ views on the effect of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency. Table 4.12 shows the results. The table shows that the proportion of teachers who said their head teacher facilitated the English language subject panel meetings to discuss ideas and issues such as New Approaches on the subject were the majority at 66.7%. They were responding to the question whether the inception of FPE in 2003 negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. This implies that even with head teachers’ support, the impact of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency was still negative.

4.4.4 Support from head teachers

The study sought to establish from the respondents whether the head teachers facilitated the English language subject panel meetings to discuss ideas and issues such as new approaches on the subject. The responses were cross-tabulated with the respondents’ views on the effect of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency. Table 4.12 shows the results. The table shows that the proportion of teachers who said their head teacher facilitated the English language subject panel meetings to discuss ideas and issues such as New Approaches on the subject were the majority at 66.7%. They were responding to the question whether the inception of FPE in 2003 negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. This implies that even with head teachers’ support, the impact of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency was still negative.
Table 4.12 Influence of FPE on Pupils’ Proficiency and Head Teachers’ Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teacher facilitation of the English language subject panel meetings</th>
<th>FPE effect on pupils’ proficiency in the English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

4.4.5 Support from quality assurance and standards officers

English language teachers were asked whether quality assurance and standards officers (QASO) came to their schools to provide helpful teaching and learning suggestions in the English language. The responses were cross-tabulated with the views on the effect of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency as shown in Table 4.13. The table shows that the proportion of teachers who said that they received support from quality assurance officers was still the majority in terms of saying “yes” to the question on whether the inception of FPE in 2003 negatively affected pupils' proficiency in the English language. This suggests that support from QASOs did not moderate the negative impact of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency.

Table 4.13 Result of FPE on Pupils’ Proficiency and Support of Quality Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether Quality Assurance and Standards Officers provide helpful teaching and learning suggestions</th>
<th>FPE effect on pupils’ proficiency in the English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.6 Free Primary Education’s impact on frequency of the English language homework

The study sought to establish how frequent teachers gave their pupils homework in the English language. Table 4.14 shows that majority (62.5%) of the respondents did not often issue the English language homework to the pupils. However, 25% (2) of the respondents did so thrice a week and 12.5% did so once a week. This means that the pupils did not receive adequate practice in the English language learning which potentially contributed to their low proficiency in the English language. This is potentially because learners may not be able to carry home the text books to do homework as argued by Gathumbi et al. (2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice a week</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.7 Frequency of homework assignments

The study sought to establish how often the English language teachers assigned their pupils homework in the English language. Table 4.15 shows that 50% of the English language teachers assigned homework in English language once a week. However, 25% of the respondents assigned homework twice a week and 12.5% did so thrice a week. Respondents who did not assign homework often were 12.5%. Most of the respondents
said that they did not give homework assignment frequently in the week in order to give individual and adequate attention to the assignments submitted by the pupils. It means that the increase in pupil population as a result of FPE, potentially rendered the frequent issuing of homework within a week ineffective.

### Table 4.15 Frequency of Homework Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice a week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 The influence of Free Primary Education on pupils’ English language proficiency

4.5.1 Teachers’ perception of the influence of Free Primary Education on the English language proficiency

The views of the teachers were sought on whether the inception of FPE in 2003 negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. Table 4.16 shows that 75% of the responding teachers said ‘yes’ whereas 25% said no. Therefore, majority of the responding teachers were of the view that FPE negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. This implies that as a result of FPE, the English language proficiency of the pupils deteriorated. This is consistent with Gathumbi et al. (2003) who reported that underperformance in English is being associated with Free Primary Education inception in 2003.
Table 4.16 Teachers’ Views on the Influence of FPE on the English Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Effect of FPE on Pupils' Proficiency in the English Language</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 Pupils’ English proficiency in composition writing

An assessment result on English composition was analyzed to determine the English language proficiency of the pupils in the sample. Figure 4.3 below shows that the average percentage mean proficiency score of the pupils was 38.9%, with the pupils’ proficiency scores deviating from this average by 11.2 percentage points (M=38.911; SD=1.1183). It can therefore be inferred that the average score on the English language composition was low. This means that the pupils were not proficient in composition writing, and this has implication on their overall performance in school as English is the language of instruction. The findings are consistent with the results recorded in the years 2006 and 2007 as found in the Eldoret Municipal Education Office Records (2009) which showed English KCSE results of Eldoret Municipality at a mean grade of 2.7 (D-) and that of 2006 at a mean grade of 4.4 (D+). It means that the poor performance in primary school could continue into secondary school, which may be partly attributed to the weak foundation occasioned by the FPE programme.
A tally of grammatical errors in each pupil’s English composition was undertaken to determine the frequency of occurrence of the errors as a measure of the English language proficiency. The grammatical errors were mainly spelling mistakes. The results are represented in figure 4.4. The figure shows that on average, there were about 11 counts of incidences of grammatical errors in the composition written by the pupils, with a deviation of 7 counts of errors (M=10.89; SD=7.256). Examples of grammatical errors included “counciens” instead of “cousins”, “hopped” instead of “hopped”, “words landed in deaf years” instead of “words landed on deaf ears”, “my chicks” instead of “my cheeks”, “how the journey will end” instead of “how the journey would end”, “stationery” instead of “stationary”, “drankerd” instead of “drunk”, “the driver drave” instead of “the driver drove”, “hitted” instead of “hit” and “the news were on television” instead of “the news was on television”.

Figure 4.3 Pupils’ Performance on English Composition Test

4.5.3 Grammatical errors made by the pupils
The results recorded a maximum of 28 counts of grammatical errors in the pupils’ written composition. Therefore, the pupils’ proficiency in the English language in terms of composition writing was very low. The implication of this finding is that, as speculated by Gathumbi et al. (2003), teachers may be using “chalk and talk” method where listening, in most cases without understanding, reading and writing are emphasized. In this case, the pupils do not get the opportunity to hone the practical skills of communicating in English in the real world, which in essence, require their speaking and writing skills.

![Figure 4.4 Frequency of Grammatical Errors on English Composition Test](image)

**Figure 4.4 Frequency of Grammatical Errors on English Composition Test**

4.5.4 **Mechanical errors made by the pupils**

As a further measure of English composition proficiency, the same English composition test was analyzed for mechanical errors. The mechanical errors found included poor
sentence construction, misuse of syntax, tense confusion, use of wrong vocabulary. The findings are shown in figure 4.5. The figure shows that the average count per students’ written work was 13, with a deviation from this average by about 7 percentage points (M=13.16; SD=7.492). Examples of mechanical errors included “drive” instead of “drivers”, “avery” instead of “a very”, “my class teacher reminded us” instead of “my class teacher had reminded us” and “grandmother had gone to hell” instead of “grandmother had died”. The minimum count of errors was 2 whereas the maximum was 32. Therefore, it can be inferred that the pupils’ English language proficiency in terms of technical errors was low. Since English is the mode of instruction in schools, the pupils would find it difficult in expressing themselves as they take examinations, which can also result in poor performance in their KCPE examinations. Consequently, this can lead to an unending cycle of poor performance, which can also affect the morale of the teachers.

Figure 4.5 Occurrence of Mechanical Errors on English Composition Test
4.5.5 Relationship between Free Primary Education and pupils’ performance in the English language

The views of the English language teachers were sought as to whether there was any connection between FPE implementation in 2003 and the performance of their pupils in the English language. Table 4.17 show that all of the respondents were of the opinion that there was a relationship between FPE and pupils’ performance in the English language. This was expected as the question of education quality with the introduction of FPE is one which has been a subject of ongoing debate among practitioners and professionals (Gathumbi & Masembe, 2005). Most of the respondents commented that they attempt to solve the pupils’ low standard in the English language by banning mother tongue speaking in the school so that pupils are forced to perfect their English by communicating in English.

Table 4.17 Relationship between FPE and Pupils’ English Language Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is a relationship between FPE and pupils’ performance</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The challenges faced by teachers as a result of free primary education

4.6.1 Challenges experienced by teachers of English

The study sought to establish the problems teachers of the English language experienced in relation to pupils’ population. Figure 4.6 shows that most (47%) of the English language teachers identified sharing of learning resources such as text books as a problem. Limited individual attention to pupils was also identified by 33% of the
respondents as a problem. Lastly, 20% of the respondents were of the view that it was impractical to apply some of the teaching methods such as learner-centered approach due to the high population of students in a class. Respondents commented that they attempted to overcome some of these challenges by improvising learning resources and approaches. It means that with the introduction of FPE, some of the approaches recommended by the ministry of education were no-longer effective.

Figure 4.6 Problems Experienced by Teachers of English

### 4.6.2 Influence of pupils’ population on teaching technique

The English language teachers were asked whether the pupils’ population in their class affected the teaching techniques they used in English language. Table 4.18 shows that 100% of the respondents said “yes” whereas no respondent said “no”. This means that FPE affected the effectiveness of teaching methods used to teach the English language.
Table 4.18 Result of Pupils’ Population on Teaching Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils’ population affect teaching method used in English language</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.3 Obstacles of implementing language policy in education

English language teachers were asked to identify the obstacles their school faced in implementing language in education policy. Majority (44%) of them said inadequate learning resources such as text books and library books was a challenge, followed by 33% of the teachers who complained of rampant code-switching by the pupils. Another 23% of the teachers said the home environment was not supportive towards language in education policy as the primary mode of communication was mother tongue. It can be said that these factors all work in concert against the efforts by the teachers to improve the pupils’ proficiency in speaking and writing in English.

![Figure 4.7 Obstacles Faced in Implementing Language Policy](image)
4.6.4 Follow-up by municipal education office

The study sought to establish whether the Municipal Education Office Quality Control officer made a follow up to find out challenges teachers faced in teaching and learning of the English language. Table 4.19 shows that 37.5% of the teachers said “yes” whereas 62.5% of the teachers said “no”. This can potentially affect the morale level of teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 Follow up by Municipal Education Office

4.6.5 Other Problems related to Free Primary Education

English language teachers were asked whether they had any other problem related to FPE of 2003 with regards to their pupils’ proficiency in English. Table 4.20 show that none of the teachers identified any other problem with FPE that they could associate with pupils’ proficiency in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 Follow up by Municipal Education Office
4.6.6 Assistance from parents

The intervening role of assistance from parents was tested by cross-tabulating the question of whether the parents did provide some assistance to the teaching and learning of English language in terms of any shortfalls emanating from the FPE policy; with the question of whether FPE negatively affected the pupils’ proficiency in the English language. Table 4.21 indicates that teachers who said that parents did not provide assistance were the majority at 100% in terms of saying yes to whether the inception of FPE negatively affected the pupils’ English language proficiency. This implies that assistance by the parents to meet shortfalls from the FPE policy significantly reduced the negative impact of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency. This underscores the role of support from parents despite the abolition of school fees in primary schools.

Table 4.21 Assistance from Parents and FPE Influence on Proficiency Cross-tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ assistance to the teaching and learning of the English Language to bridge shortfalls from the FPE policy</th>
<th>Effect of FPE on pupils' proficiency in English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% count</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% count</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% count</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

4.6.7 Teachers’ working space

The impact of FPE was further tested by cross-tabulating respondents’ views on provision of enough working space with their perception of the effect of FPE on pupils’ English language proficiency. Table 4.22 shows that English language teachers who said their school do not provide them with enough space to work were the majority at 80% in
terms of agreement with whether the inception of FPE negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. This implies that FPE constrained teacher’s working space, which potentially affected the quality of teaching pupils received from the teachers. This is related to desirable working conditions that make teachers effective in their teaching practice.

Table 4.22 Teachers’ Working Space and FPE Influence on Proficiency Cross-tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School’s provision of enough working space to teachers</th>
<th>FPE effect on pupils' proficiency in English language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count: 2, 1, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% count: 66.7%, 33.3%, 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count: 4, 1, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% count: 80.0%, 20.0%, 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count: 6, 2, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% count: 75.0%, 25.0%, 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has discussed the study findings. It has analyzed and interpreted data on the effect of FPE on teaching resources; the role of teaching techniques introduced within the context of FPE and English language teaching and learning; and the effect of FPE on learning infrastructure and its influence in the English language teaching and learning. The findings have been presented in narrative form as well as in figures and tables. The next chapter draws conclusions and makes recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This research intended to find out the influence of the inceptions of FPE in Kenya in 2003 on the teaching and learning of English in public primary schools in Eldoret Municipality. In this chapter, a summary of the research findings is presented, conclusions drawn and recommendations made.

5.2 Summary of Research Findings

5.2.1 The influence of Free Primary Education on teaching and learning resources

In terms of the effect of Free Primary Education on teaching resources, the majority of the teachers were of the view that resources were not adequate for teaching and learning the English language. The general data showed that 75.0% of the schools were triple streamed and 25.0% of the schools were double streamed. The average class size was 59, with the number of pupils varying from this average by 10 pupils (M=58.75; SD=9.362).

5.2.2 The influence of teaching techniques used within the context of Free Primary Education

Regarding the role of teaching techniques, FPE significantly affected the practice of classroom discussions, presentations and adoption of learner-centered approach, which negatively influenced pupils’ English language proficiency. Interventions from quality assurance and standards officers and head teachers did not have a significant impact.
5.2.3 The influence of Free Primary Education on English language proficiency

The majority of the teachers were of the view that FPE negatively affected pupils’ proficiency in the English language. Assessment result on English composition showed that the average percentage mean score of the pupils was 38.9%. A tally of grammatical errors in each pupil’s English composition showed that on average, there were 11 counts of incidence of grammatical errors and 13 counts in terms of mechanical errors. In terms of learning facilities, there was a significant effect of FPE on class size and library lessons which negatively impacted on the pupils’ English language proficiency. Examples of grammatical errors included “counciens” instead of “cousins”, “hopped” instead of “hopped”, “words landed in deaf years” instead of “words landed on deaf ears”, “my chicks” instead of “my cheeks” and “how the journey will end” instead of “how the journey would end”. Examples of mechanical errors included “drive” instead of “drivers”, “avery” instead of “a very”, “my class teacher reminded us” instead of “my class teacher had reminded us” and “grandmother had gone to hell” instead of “grandmother had died”. There was a significant association between the effect of FPE on teachers’ workspace, frequency of the English language homework and negative impact on the pupils.

5.2.4 Challenges faced by teachers as a result of Free Primary Education

Most of the English language teachers identified sharing of learning resources such as text books as a problem. All the English language teachers said the pupils’ population in their class affected the teaching techniques they used in English language. Majority of them said inadequate learning resources such as text books and library books was a challenge, followed by rampant code-switching by the pupils. However, assistance from
parents significantly moderated the negative impact of FPE on the pupils’ English language proficiency.

5.3 Conclusions

5.3.1 Influence of Free Primary Education on teaching and learning resources

Free Primary Education stretched the learning resources. Funds from the FPE kitty were not adequate to meet the demand. Learning facilities were inadequate to undertake proper teaching and learning. Classrooms were overpopulated and this affected the quality of teaching and learning that the pupils received, with negative implications on their proficiency in the English language. In addition, the library resources were overstretched such that proper learning was interfered with.

5.3.2 Influence of teaching techniques used within the context of Free Primary Education

The role played by teaching techniques introduced within the context of FPE was insignificant. This is because FPE affected the practice of classroom discussions and presentations and adoption of learner-centered approaches, which negatively influenced pupils’ English language proficiency. Interventions by QASOs and head teachers did not make matters any better.

5.3.3 Influence of Free Primary Education on pupils’ English language proficiency

Free Primary Education affected the proficiency of the pupils in terms of spoken and written English. The pupils were writing low quality composition full of grammatical and mechanical errors. This ultimately reflects on their performance in KCPE English language test.
5.3.4 Challenges faced by teachers as a result of FPE

The challenges faced by English language teachers were many and included sharing of learning resources such as text books, large class size that affected the teaching techniques they used in English language and inadequate learning resources such as text books and library books. However, assistance from parents significantly moderated the negative impact of FPE on the teaching and learning of English language.

5.4 Recommendations

The study makes the following recommendations:

5.4.1 Recommendations for improvement

1. Educational leaders from the national level, down to the district and school levels should work with parents and members of the private sector to improve the quality of education in primary schools in terms of provisions of resources to enhance teaching and learning of English.

2. Educational and learning infrastructure should be developed to cater for the influx of pupils in these schools. This should include building of more classrooms, provision of more English language teachers and stocking libraries with the English language teaching and learning materials and those for other subjects.

3. Innovative approaches need to be developed to enhance teaching and learning the English language where options such as classroom discussions and presentations and adoption of learner-centered approaches become impractical due to the number of pupils in these schools.
5.4.2 Suggestions for Further Research

This research established that support from parents played a positive role towards reducing the challenges of learning under the FPE program. Therefore, future research should explore how the community gets involved or should be involved to enhance the English language teaching and learning.
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Appendix I: Teachers’ Interview schedule

District ________________________________________________________________

School __________________________________________________________________

School category: Single stream ____________________________________________

Double stream ____________________________________

Triple stream ____________________________________

Class taught ____________________________________________________________

Number of pupils in class ______________________________________________

Boys _________________________ Girls ________________________________

Teacher’s level of education

KCSE _____________________________ University graduate _________________

Years of service _________________

1. Are the teaching and learning resources for the English language in your class adequate?

   Yes □       No □

   Please explain the impact the answer you have given has on teaching and learning English in your class____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________

2. What problems (if any) are you experiencing when teaching the English language in relation to pupils population?

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________
3. How do you solve the problem you have mentioned in number two above if any?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

4. Does your school have a functioning library to facilitate the teaching and learning of
   the English language? Yes ☐ No ☐
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5. Does the pupils’ population in your class affect the teaching method you use in the
   English language? Yes ☐ No ☐
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6. How often do you assign your pupils homework in the English language?
   Once a week ☐ Twice a week ☐ Thrice a week ☐ Not often ☐
   Please give reasons for your answer ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

7. Is there, in your opinion, any connection between FPE implementation in 2003 and
   the performance of your pupils in the English language?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

8. How does your school solve the pupil’s low standard in the English language if that
   is the case?
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

9. Is the school abiding by the Kenya government language policy in education?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
10. What obstacles does your school face in implementing language in education policy?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

11. Does the Municipal Education Office Quality Control officer make a follow up to find out the challenges you have in teaching and learning of the English language in your class?

Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Do you have any other problem related to FPE of 2003 and your pupil’s proficiency in English?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If the answer is “Yes” please briefly state them.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
Appendix II: Sample of English Composition by one of the Pupils

Question: Write a composition titled “AN ACCIDENT”. Make it as interesting as possible.
### Appendix III: English Language Proficiency Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Error Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Error Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fraenkel & Wallen (2010)
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