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ABSTRACT

The teaching of English language has undergone some changes in the last few years to improve the quality of teaching and learning. With the introduction of the 8-4-4 system of education in 1984/85, the integrated approach to the teaching of language was adopted. English language and literature in English in Kenyan secondary schools were combined into one subject. The English syllabus has since then been revised twice in 1992 and 2002 to improve performance in English language. Despite all these efforts, performance in the teaching and learning of English in Kenyan secondary schools is still poor. Teachers have often found themselves on the receiving end, the claim being that they perform poorly in their teaching.

This study therefore sought to investigate the attitudes of secondary school teachers of English towards the integrated approach to the teaching of English language and establish a link between these attitudes and their teaching performance. The study targeted teachers of English language in Rachuonyo District. From the target population, a total of thirty teachers were selected using the stratified random sampling technique.

The research design employed was survey. Survey was the best as this study sought to explore relationships. The survey was comparative and correlational in nature. Data was collected using three instruments thus: an attitude scale called Likert-type Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS), Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS), and Interview Schedule. English language teachers were compared, using the t-test at $P < .05$ level of significance, with respect to their attitudes towards integrated approach to English and their teaching performance. These were then correlated at the same level of significance to establish the existence of any relationship. Pearson product-correlational coefficient was used for this purpose.
The study came up with findings, which are summarised thus:

- Attitudes of graduate and untrained teachers towards integrated approach to English differed significantly. However, there was no significant difference when the graduates were compared to the diploma teachers.
- There was lack of significant difference in teaching performance between graduate and diploma teachers. Significant difference was reported when the graduates were compared to the untrained teachers.
- There exists a weak and insignificant relationship between attitudes towards Integrated English and teaching performance.
- Majority of teachers do not have a clear understanding of the concept of integration. This explains their negative attitudes towards certain areas of the integrated approach to English.

In light of the above findings, the study recommends the need to conduct in-service training courses for the teachers on subject integration, involvement of teachers on any curriculum innovation, and making pre-service training more integration-oriented.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Study

The teaching of English language in Kenya dates back to the time Kenya was a colony of Britain. English was the language of colonial masters who gradually taught it to selected colonised people to prop up the British administration (Wasambo-Were, 1986). Before formal education, Kenyans received basic English lessons from missionaries to understand the Bible for the specific purpose of evangelisation and to assist the colonial government in the policy of indirect rule.

With the onset of formal education, mission schools were modelled into elementary schools, which are now called primary schools and the English public schools, which are now called secondary schools (McGregor, 1971). It was not before long before all subjects were taught in English.

English was also taught to a chosen cadre of labour force whose knowledge of the language would play the intervening role between the colonial masters and the working force in various plantations. This training was later extended to the armed forces in which a few Africans had been conscripted and where English would become a very necessary tool of communication.

When Kenya became independent, the government perpetuated the use of English in official and academic spheres. English was adopted for official usage because of its access to higher learning, modern technology and international communication. English language plays a significant role in the school curriculum the most obvious role being the medium of instruction from standard four onwards.

Due to the importance and role that English plays in education, there is need for the language to be taught well. This puts on the shoulders of the teachers of
English language the task of moulding the students so that they can express themselves effectively in both oral and written work (Sereti, 1993).

The teaching of English language in Kenya has undergone some changes in the last few years in order to improve the quality of its teaching (Mwangola, 1993). The introduction of the 8-4-4 system of education brought radical changes in the educational structure, the curriculum and in the teaching approach (Magoma, 1999). The current structure comprises eight years of primary, four years of secondary and four years of university education respectively.

With the introduction of the 8-4-4 system of education in the mid 1980’s, a number of subjects were integrated. Lugha ya Kiswahili and Fasihi ya Kiswahili were integrated to form Kiswahili. Clothing and Textiles, Home-Management, Food and Nutrition were all offered as one subject under the title “Home-Science”. At the primary school level, Integrated Social Studies (combining Geography, History and Civics) became part of the school curriculum (Shiundu and Omulando, 1992). English language and Literature, initially taught as separate subjects, were combined and taught in an integrated manner. For the purposes of this study, “English” will henceforth be referred to as “Integrated English”.

The syllabus review by Kenya Institute Education [K.I.E] in 1992 brought some changes in the Integrated English. The syllabus was found to be overloaded with very few periods allocated to English. Before this review, there were only six periods per week for forms three and four classes. These were increased to eight per week. The time allocated for the teaching of Integrated English in form one and two was set at six lessons per week. Some advanced level components of Literature were also removed from the syllabus. For instance, the literary appreciation component of advanced level Literature was found to be too deep for ordinary level students to comprehend. The oral literature project was removed and students were only required to collect materials for discussion in
the classroom. Style was also simplified and teachers were required to teach only simple aspects of style.

During the 2002 syllabus review, a number of areas including poetry, plays, novels, summary writing, grammar and oral literature were found to be difficult for pupils. These areas were primarily perceived as difficult due to the approach adopted in teaching them. The review therefore recommended that the oral aspect of poetry and oral literature be covered under the skill of listening and speaking. The study of novels would be handled under intensive reading. Summary writing skills would be taught under reading and writing. Grammar would be reorganised and content presented in a spiral approach under broad areas of parts of speech, phrases, clauses and sentences.

Language is not learnt in a vacuum. It revolves around issues and concerns that affect human kind on daily basis. It is in this view that exposure to emerging issues is recommended in the Integrated English syllabus. The English language teacher is therefore required to expose the learner, through language skills, to issues such as: the HIV/AIDS pandemics, the need to conserve our environment, the fight against corruption, moral and spiritual values, and technological advancement (K.I.E, 2002).

Integration of subjects emphasises relationships between various curricula areas in an attempt to interrelate content, or learning experiences in order to enable students to perceive a unity of knowledge (Shiundu and Omulando, 1992). Blenkin and Kelly (1981) view integration of subject matter as an approach to learning that does not accept or base itself on any notion of sanctity of traditional divisions. Pring (1971) on his part asserts that subject integration is connected to natural inquiry of children, which does not respect subject divisions. Division of knowledge into distinct subjects is artificial and does not reflect correctly the essential unity of reality.
Not everyone favours integration of language and literature. Carter (1986) argues that literature and language are distinct subjects of study and that the two have intrinsic values for the learners and teachers. Therefore, the distinctiveness of each discipline of study has to be preserved. Integrating English language and literature thus waters down the distinct nature of each.

The Koech Commission (2000) received submissions to the effect that integration of various subjects had made content of the affected subjects too wide and unmanageable. The commission thus, in its recommendation 15.22, proposed that existing integration be stopped and instead the subjects be offered separately from form three. This recommendation was not, however, adopted in the syllabus review in the year 2002. Rather than stop integration as was recommended by the commission, the approach was clearly emphasised and defined to make the teaching of English language more effective.

Following the proceedings of new teacher requirements between 1988 and 1992, the Kenya Institute of Education, the Ministry of Education and the British Council introduced the Secondary English Language Project (SELP) to help acquaint the practising teachers with the Integrated English innovation to enable them to implement the course fully. Unfortunately due to lack of funds, the project did not take off at the district level (Magoma, 1999).

Despite the foregoing, the problem of poor teacher performance in the teaching of Integrated English still persists. Graduate teachers have more often found themselves on the receiving end; the allegation being that they perform poorly in their teaching (Shanguya, 1995; Ogolla, 2000). The situation and problem are summarised by one of the dailies thus:

Doubts and aspersions have been cast over the present crop of teachers, especially graduate ones... The contention is that the graduate teachers do not measure up to the expected professional standards (Aduda, D. in Daily Nation, August 14, 1993).
This study sought to investigate the problem of poor teacher performance by considering attitudes of teachers towards the integrated approach to the teaching of English, then establish the relationship between attitudes and teaching performance.

Graduate teachers formed the main group of comparison, with untrained and diploma teachers in this study. However, diploma and untrained teachers were not compared, as the researcher believed that comparing graduates with the other teacher categories would shed more light on the allegation that graduates perform poorly yet they have the highest professional qualifications.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The Integrated English has been a compulsory subject ever since the establishment of the 8-4-4 system of education in 1985. As a compulsory subject and the medium of instruction, there is the need for the teachers to perform well in the teaching of the course.

The problem of poor teaching in school subjects in general and in the teaching of English language in particular, has persisted despite the efforts to improve the same (Njue, 1986; Shanguya, 1995; Ogolla, 2000). Efforts such as the establishment of the SELP by K.I.E, Ministry of Education and the British Council (Magoma, 1999) and the revision of English syllabus in 1992 and 2002 have not made significant impact. Poor performance in the teaching of Integrated English has been attributed to factors such as lack of in-servicing in the teaching of Integrated English, inadequate resources, inadequate teacher preparation and overloaded curriculum (Mukhebi, 1986; Magoma, 1999; Wanjuki, 2000). Most of these studies assume that poor teacher performance is a function of external factors to the individual thus ignoring intrinsic variables such as one’s attitudes towards a given object.

Omollo (1990), Muutu (1993) and Magoma (1999) identified teacher attitudes as contributing to poor teacher performance. These studies, however, looked at
English language teachers in general without considering their training backgrounds. This study focused on attitudes and teachers' performance alone. This focus, it was believed, would give a better picture of teachers' attitudes and performance. More so, the previous studies did not involve quantitative analysis of teachers' attitudes and their teaching performance. This study went a step further by investigating attitudes of teachers with diverse training backgrounds and established the relationship between these attitudes and teachers' performance.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

This study was based on Progressivist Theory of Curriculum Renewal (Clark, 1987). According to this theory, curricula renewal is both teacher-based and school-based. Learners must be considered as individuals with learning histories, aspiration, interests, personalities and learning styles. Similarly, teachers must also be acknowledged to have differing background experiences, attitudes and personalities that they bring to the classrooms. In terms of teacher attitudes towards a course, Clark (1987) identifies four types of teachers thus: the 'conservatives', the 'adopters', the 'adaptors' and the 'innovators'.

The 'conservatives' are usually older teachers who are resistant to change because of their strong faith in a given approach, fear of the unknown or because their education has not equipped them well for a new course such as the Integrated English. It is also possible to get 'conservatives' amongst younger teachers who find it difficult to come to terms with the ideas or strategies not in accordance with the approach they have developed. Based on this, the study considered teachers' attitudes towards Integrated English and teaching performance.

The 'adopters' wait for approval on any innovation before making a move. They are concerned about whether they are doing the 'right' thing and tend to have a naïve faith in the official panacea that will solve their problems. They are rigorous attenders of INSET courses, when for example examinations change.
Only then, do they become keen on innovations.

The ‘adaptors’ are sufficiently independent to wish to bring their own personal ideas, attitudes and practice to bear upon classroom procedures but may not wish to jettison existing materials and practices entirely. They are usually keen to attend INSET meetings but only if they are relevant to problems relating to their own classroom reality.

The ‘innovators’ believe that they can devise curricula which respond to their pupils’ needs and aspirations better than any external body. They work best when they are experimenting with their own new ideas and techniques. Imposing a standard teaching style on these teachers may make them perform poorly.

Given the differences in attitudes and stages of development between individual teachers, the progressivist form of curricula renewal places its emphasis on the need for teachers to work out their own solutions to their own problems in the context of their own school.

1.3 Study Objectives

The following were the objectives of this study:

- To identify the attitudes of English language teachers towards Integrated English.
- To compare the attitudes of graduate teachers towards Integrated English with those of the untrained and diploma teachers.
- To assess the teaching performance of graduate teachers, untrained teachers and diploma teachers in Integrated English.
- To compare the teaching performance of graduate teachers with untrained teachers and diploma teachers in Integrated English.
- To determine the relationships between teachers’ attitudes towards Integrated English and their teaching performance.
1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were based on the objectives of the study:

a) Is there any significant difference in attitudes towards Integrated English between graduate teachers and untrained teachers?

b) Is there any significant difference in attitudes towards Integrated English between graduate teachers and diploma teachers?

c) Is there any significant difference in teaching performance between graduate teachers and untrained teachers?

d) Is there any significant difference in teaching performance between graduate teachers and diploma teachers?

e) Is there any significant correlation between teachers’ attitudes towards integrated English and their teaching performance?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The study used primary data to test the following null hypotheses at $P < .05$ level of significance.

$H_{01}$: There is no significant difference in attitudes towards Integrated English between graduate teachers and untrained teachers.

$H_{02}$: There is no significant difference in attitudes towards Integrated English between graduate teachers and diploma teachers.

$H_{03}$: There is no significant difference in teaching performance between graduate teachers and untrained teachers.

$H_{04}$: There is no significant difference in teaching performance between graduate teachers and diploma teachers.

$H_{05}$: There is no significant correlation between teachers’ attitudes towards Integrated English and their teaching performance.

1.6 Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the findings of this study will be beneficial to the following.

a) Language Education Researchers

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher made
recommendations that would stimulate further research in the field of language education.

b) Language Teachers
Through the researchers’ interview with English language teachers, it is hoped that teachers will be able to reflect upon their own teaching practices and improve on the same.

c) Language Teacher Educators
English language teacher educators will find the study useful in preparing teacher trainees. This will entail instilling favourable attitudes in their teaching of Integrated English.

d) Curriculum Developers
The findings of the study will enable K.I.E language curriculum developers design an approach that takes care of the teachers’ attitudes towards integration of English and Literature.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study
The study made the following assumptions.

- That all schools under investigation adhered to the Integrated English.
- That teachers expressed their true opinions towards the Integrated English.
- That data derived from classroom observation is a true reflection of teacher performance.

1.8 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

- The term ‘teacher performance’ as used in existing literature refers to a wide range of practices and competencies. In this study teacher performance was strictly defined by five competencies that include teachers’ lesson preparation, proficiency in content, use of appropriate teaching methods that promote integration of English language and Literature, use of instructional resources and use of assessment
techniques. Any other competencies under the broad concept of teacher performance were not included.

- The study was only limited to Rachuonyo District (see Section 3.2). Generalisability to other areas is thus limited. However, the study opens up avenues for similar studies elsewhere.

- Assessment of teachers' performance was based on classroom observation. There was therefore, a likelihood of researcher's subjectivity and the "Hallo Effect". To minimize these, teachers were observed twice. For the purpose of analysis, only the second observation was used.

1.9 Definitions of Terms, Abbreviations and Acronyms

- **Integration**-It refers to horizontal relationships that exist between the content and learning experiences between or among subject areas in order to enable students to perceive a unity of knowledge.

- **Integrated English approach** -Refers to the teaching and learning of literature through language and teaching and learning of language through literature materials.

- **Attitudes**-Affect for or against psychological objects. It is the liking for or dislike of certain things, people, objects or states.

- **Teacher performance**-Teachers' capacity to achieve the desired results as measured by the Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS) used in this study. It also refers to the teachers' ability to meet the expected professional standards.

- **Graduate teachers**-Teachers with B.Ed degrees. This category also includes university degree holders with post-graduate diploma in education (PGDE).

- **Diploma teachers**-Teachers who have undergone training in Diploma colleges and qualified with Diploma certificate that allows them to teach at the secondary school level.

- **Untrained teachers**-Teachers without professional training in education.

- **Curriculum**—Activities, programmes and procedures designed to enable a learner acquire knowledge.
• **Curricular Renewal**- process of making changes in the curriculum.

• **Course**- a detailed plan for the study of a subject. It includes both what is to be taught (content) and suggestions on how to teach the subject (Oliva, 1992).

• **In-Service Course**- Short-term courses for already serving teachers to introduce them to various areas of innovation in order to enable them implement the curriculum effectively.

• **Pre Service training**- An initial four or three year training to prospective teachers by University or Diploma colleges.

• **B.Ed**- Bachelor of Education

• **DEO**- District Education Office

• **HO**- Hypothesis

• **INSET**- In-service Training

• **KCSE**- Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education

• **K.I.E**- Kenya Institute of Education

• **M.Ed**- Master of Education

• **PGDE**- Post Graduate Diploma in Education

• **SELPP**- Secondary English Language Project

• **SPSS**- Statistical Package for Social Sciences

• **TAS**- Teacher Attitude Scale

• **TPOS**- Teacher Performance Observation Schedule

• **TSC**- Teachers Service Commission
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, literature related to the problem is reviewed under the following sub-topics:

- Integrated English.
- Attitudes.
- Teachers' attitudes towards the Integrated English.

2.1 Integrated English

A linguist deaf to the poetic function of language and a literary scholar indifferent to linguistic problems and conversant with linguistic methods is equally flagrant anachronisms (Jackobson 1960: 377).

The issue of 'Literature and Language teaching' is generating a great deal of interest. Roman Jackobson's (1960) statement could be considered relevant to today's literature and English teaching debate. Two schools of thought, namely, Pro-Integrationists and Anti-Integrationists have emerged (Omollo, 1990).

2.1.1 Anti-Integrationist Views

Language and Literature as distinct subjects with their own intrinsic value should not be integrated. This is a view held by some literature and language specialists.

Girard (1977) argues that there can be no reconciliation between the traditional view of teaching English and Literature separately, and the emerging approaches in which the two are integrated. Literature should never be integrated with English because there can never be such a reconciliation without disadvantages.

Similar views are held by Carter (1986). Literature and language are distinct subjects of study and have intrinsic values for the learners and teachers. As
such, integration may lead to dilution of one or both. Literature, he claims addresses itself to certain matters which are uniquely its own, and teachers have to appreciate that each subject has something to offer and so must be taught separately.

While Indangasi (1988) believes in integration, he warns that too much optimism as regards such a course would be dangerous especially where one subject might be subordinate to the other. He warns:

...if literature is subordinate to language, if it is used simply as means for teaching, then its special moral and aesthetic concerns will diminish its importance (Indangasi, 1988:23).

There is the need to consider Indangasi’s view particularly before any integration is made. Where the course is compulsory as the Integrated English, one of the disciplines may suffer if considered subordinate.

According to Ahmed (1994), successful integration of subjects depends on how the subject and its approach are conceived, the degree of support or resistance given to it and above all the kind of strategy used to develop and implement it. Teachers need adequate training on subject integration for them to perform well in the teaching of Integrated English. Unless this is done, teachers trained as either language or literature specialists may align themselves to their subjects of specialisations at the expense of the other (Sure, 1986). Even those teachers who trained in both English language and literature may not implement Integrated English effectively if they are not taught on how to integrate the two subjects (Magoma, 1999).

Mukhebi (1986) reported that teachers in Kenya feel uncertain about the task of integrating language and literature as many of them were trained as language or literature specialists, not both. Owino (1991) and Indangasi (1991) state that the merger between English and Literature meant that Integrated English may
not be taught well since some of the teachers were trained in the 1970’s and 1980’s when language teaching was separated from that of literature.

Omollo (1990) summarises reasons advanced by anti-integrationists as:

- Literature has much to offer in its pure form.
- Integration leads to dilution of either or both disciplines.
- Integration can only take place after a learner has been exposed for sometime to the necessary language skills.
- Very little of the intrinsic values of the two come out when they are integrated hence should be taught on their own.

From the above review, anti-integrationist teachers are likely to perform poorly in the teaching of Integrated English. Imposing subject integration on such teachers may lead to resistance and so teaching may be poor. Clark (1987) thus stresses the need to seek teachers’ opinions or attitudes towards a course before any innovation. This study therefore sought to establish whether attitudes of teachers towards Integrated English is related to their teaching performance.

2.1.2 Pro-Integrationist Views

A number of scholars have supported subject integration. Pring (1971) argues that division of knowledge into distinct subject areas is artificial and does not reflect correctly the essential unity of reality. Integration of subjects is a necessity if there is to be a ‘truer’ and more comprehensive picture of reality.

Taba (1962) is of the view that integration of knowledge is an important issue, from the standpoint of explosion and specialisation of knowledge and from the standpoint of social impact of technology. As the number of specialised fields increase, the pursuit of specialised subjects in schools becomes increasingly fruitless or impossible. More emphasis is therefore needed in integrating knowledge (Magoma, 1999).
Brocks (1964) argues that literature and language need to be compared and contrasted for the benefit of both. He further argues that such ‘a dichotomy between language and literature is as absurd as a dichotomy between child and man’ (Pg: 97). Literature presupposes language though the reverse may not be true. There is therefore no sharp line of demarcation but a continuum between language and literature. Literature presupposes language though the reverse is not true. He further asserts that childhood without manhood is a common place but manhood without childhood is unthinkable.

Indangasi (1991) says that literature and language are of mutual benefit to each other in the classroom situation since they reinforce each other despite their subject boundaries. This mutual benefit was the motivating factor for the integration of English language and literature into one subject-Integrated English (Magoma, 1999).

The introduction of the Integrated English meant that the objectives of the new subject would not be achieved by the traditional approach in which language and literature were taught separately (Namach, 1990). English syllabus had to change its objectives and course content to fit in with the new requirements of the new system of education. This had a serious implication for English language teachers. They were expected to teach English language using literary texts, and teach Literature using various skills of language, that is: listening, speaking, writing and reading. This task required teachers to have a good mastery of language and a clear understanding and appreciation of literature. Further, teachers were required to integrate within the literary genres, which include: drama, poetry, the short story, and oral-literature (Magoma, 1999).

The English syllabus is explicit in the integration of English language and Literature. Through exposure to literature, the learners will improve their language skills. They will enrich their vocabulary and learn to use language in a variety of ways. Similarly, an improved knowledge of the language will enhance the learners’ appreciation of the literary materials. On yet another scale,
integration means that no language skill should be learnt in isolation. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills should complement each other. The new syllabus also emphasises the need for teachers to apply methods and techniques that encourage interaction between teachers and learners and to increase practical involvement of the pupils in their learning (K.I.E, 2002).

From the foregoing, the introduction of the Integrated English was well intentioned because of its practical nature and learner-centred approach. However, it is not clear whether teachers are comfortable with the subject. This follows submissions received by Koech Commission (2000) that integration of English language and literature made the content of the subject too wide and unmanageable. This study therefore tried to find more about the submissions by investigating teachers’ attitudes towards Integrated English. Against such a backdrop, there was also the need to determine the relationship between these attitudes and the teaching performance in the Integrated English.

2.2 Attitudes

Thurstone (1970) defined attitudes as the affect for or against a psychological object. Attitudes may be perceived as complex systems comprising a person's belief of the object, his feelings towards the object, his actions and tendencies towards the object.

Zimbardo (1977) outlines three components of attitudes thus: affect, cognition, and behaviour. These involve a person's evaluation of or emotional response to or beliefs about or factual knowledge, and a person's overt behaviour directed towards some object or person respectively.

It is possible to measure each component of attitudes. Psychological responses or verbal statements of like and dislike, could measure the affective component, while the cognitive component could be measured by self-ratings or by the amount of knowledge a person has about some topic. The behavioural
component could be measured by direct observation of how a person behaves in a specific stimuli situation.

In the present study, teachers' attitudes were measured by self-ratings of their own beliefs about Integrated English. That is, each teacher rated each attitude item on a five-point Likert scale of response. The teachers were also observed in actual teaching situation. This means that cognitive and behavioural components were used.

2.3 Teachers' Attitudes towards Integrated English

Bright and McGregor (1975) point out that the teaching of English language has been affected by certain attitudes. They claim that the environment, the teacher, awareness of progress and achievement as well as attractive textbooks are likely to have a dominating influence and can create positive or favourable attitudes towards the language.

A number of studies have identified the role of attitudes in human behaviour. In a study that focused on the interpretation of the Integrated English at classroom level in Kisumu District, Omollo (1990) reported that over half of the sample for her study (54%) was not in favour of integration. At the same time, over 80% of the respondents thought that the syllabus was relevant thereby contradicting their earlier opinion on Integrated English.

Muutu (1993) researched on the state of Integration of English language and literature teaching in secondary schools in Nairobi Province. She reported that teachers have negative attitudes towards the integration of English and Literature most probably because they do not fully understand it. A great portion of her respondents (65%) indicated that they never enjoyed teaching Integrated English nor found it popular with the students.

Magoma (1999) in a study of teacher related factors which influence the implementation of Integrated English in secondary schools in Ibacho Division of
Kisii Central District found out that some teachers lacked motivation in the teaching of Integrated English. Lack of motivation was attributed to inadequate teacher preparation in the teaching of Integrated English.

Studies so far reviewed concur on the factors partly responsible for poor teacher implementation of the Integrated English. Omollo (1990), Muutu (1993) and Magoma (1999) agree that the teaching of Integrated English is hampered by teachers' lack of knowledge of the concept of integration, inadequate teacher preparation, teachers' dominance of classroom activities and negative attitudes towards the Integrated English.

While the above studies were general in nature, the present study focused on attitudes of teachers towards the Integrated English and their teaching performance. These attitudes were looked at against training background of teachers. The bias towards attitudes shed more light on teachers' attitudes and established whether these have any relationship with the teaching performance in Integrated English.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the methodology employed in the study. The details are organised into seven subheadings thus: research design, study area, the study population, the sample, research instruments, data collection procedures, data processing, and analysis procedure.

3.1 Research Design

This study took a survey design. The design was chosen because the study dealt with how teachers feel or perceive and behave with reference to the Integrated English. Wiersma (1985) says that any study that deals with how people feel or how they behave is considered a survey study. This view is supported by Gay (1992), who says that a survey study can be used to assess attitudes and opinions about events, individuals or procedures.

The survey was also correlational in nature. Apart from investigating teachers' attitudes, the study sought to establish the relationship between these attitudes and teachers' performance. Brown (1995) argues that a correlation study explores relationships between variables as a basis for making predictions.

3.2 The Study Area

The study was carried out in Rachuonyo District in Nyanza Province of Kenya. The district was chosen because of the following reasons.

First, the need to consider the data source favoured the district as it has a fair distribution of English language teachers with diverse training background (D.E O, Rachuonyo).
Secondly, based on Singleton’s (1993) assertion that the ideal setting for any study is one that is directly related to the researcher’s interests, the district was considered. The researcher had a professional interest as a teacher in the district. More so, from the literature reviewed, there was no evidence that a study on Integrated English had been done in the district.

3.3 Study Population

The study targeted English language teachers in Rachuonyo District. The District had 58 secondary schools and 112 English language teachers (2002:D.E.O Rachuonyo). Specifically, teachers teaching Integrated English in form three were targeted. Form three forms the base for the preparation for KCSE examination in the Integrated English. It was also interesting to study the Integrated English at form three level based on the recommendations that integration of Literature and English be stopped and instead the subjects offered separately from form three (The Koech Commission, 2000). This study, it was believed; would shed more light as to why integration was recommended stopped at form three level based on teachers’ attitudes and their performance. From this target population, a two-stage sampling procedure was used to pick the sample.

3.4 Sampling

3.4.1 Sampling Procedure

Before settling on the sampling technique, the researcher considered the question of who teaches English in Kenyan secondary schools. Three categories of teachers were identified based on training background. Thus, at the initial stage, stratified sampling was used. From the TSC Schools’ Returns data, teachers were stratified into graduate, diploma and untrained teachers. Out of the total English language teacher population in the district, there were 52 graduates, 38 diploma teachers and 22 untrained teachers.
Since the ultimate intention was to determine teachers’ attitudes towards the Integrated English and establish the relationship between these attitudes and teaching performance, no control measures were enforced as far as teachers’ background was concerned. Random sampling was therefore used at this stage to pick the specified number of teachers from each stratum.

### 3.4.2 Sample Size

The sample size for this study was guided by two sources. First, according to Gay (1992), a minimum of thirty subjects is required for a correlational study. According to Bouma and Atkinson (1995), a minimum of thirty individuals is required in order to provide a pool large enough for simple kinds of analyses. In this respect, the sample size for this study was thirty English language teachers. This represented 27 percent of the total English language teacher population in the district. The researcher reached these subjects in their respective stations of work. Therefore, thirty secondary schools representing 52 percent of secondary schools population in the district were targeted. For statistical precision (Hinkle, 1998), a total of ten teachers, disproportionate to the number in the population, were picked from each category.

### 3.5 Research Instruments

Three instruments were used in this study. These were:

- Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS)
- Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS)
- Interview Schedule

The following is a brief description of each instrument:

#### 3.5.1 Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS)

In view of the hypotheses $H_0$, $H_1$, and $H_2$, it was necessary to solicit data from the three sample groups of teachers using Teacher Attitude Scale (see Appendix 1). The scale was based on a five-point Likert scale of the self-administered type. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part A was on teachers’ background while Part B concerned teachers’ attitudes towards the
Integrated English. Items on the attitude scale were constructed on the basis of reviewed literature though some were adapted from Ahmed (1994). These were then modified to suit the present study. The items covered five features of the Integrated English, namely: integrated approach, aims and objectives, content of the course, instructional materials and student-centred approach. Each of these features formed a sub-scale represented by each a total of four items. In total, there were 20 items in the Teacher Attitude Scale.

The Integrated English was intended to be different from the traditional approach in which English and Literature were taught separately (Magoma, 1999). This study therefore recognised that understanding teachers' attitudes towards Integrated English was only possible by looking into how teachers feel about the main features of the subject.

3.5.2 Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS)

This instrument was used to collect data on teachers’ performance, which was necessary for testing hypotheses H0, H0, and H0. Observation involved the researcher entering into the classroom and observing teachers actually teaching (Wiersma, 1985).

Before settling on this instrument, a number of observation systems in teacher performance were explored. The 'product-criterion method' (Ahmed, 1994), in which pupils’ achievement is used to measure teacher performance, was not found to be feasible because of the absence of a standardised test in Integrated English. More so, the format of examinations in Integrated English in Kenya contradicts the concept of integration as two papers, that is, English and Literature are offered separately as one paper-English. Pupils’ own rating of their language teachers was also found to be unfeasible for this study due to the 'hallo-effect' (Millman, 1990).

The researcher finally opted for Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS) primarily because of two reasons:
1. The indicators in it de-emphasise the role of contextual and personal factors in teaching.

2. It is appropriate in observing almost any lesson taught by a teacher.

Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS) was adapted from two sources namely Manning (1988) and Groenwegen (1992). TPOS had five major areas of competencies, which cover teaching performance (Manning, 1988; Ahmed, 1994). These competencies were categorised as follows:

1. Lesson Preparation
   - Scheme of work and lesson plan

2. Lesson Delivery
   - Proficiency in content
   - Use of appropriate teaching methods
   - Use of instructional resources
   - Use of assessment techniques

Each of the above areas of competencies was further defined by a list of items referred to as 'performance indicators'. For example, the first major area, lesson preparation, was defined by a total of 12 indicators (5 for scheme of work and 7 for lesson plan). For more details see Appendix 2.

3.5.3 The Interview Schedule

This instrument was used to obtain qualitative data. The schedule was of semi-standardised form (see Appendix 3). The semi-standardised interview gave the researcher the freedom to follow up whatever he thought important in his own way. Such a follow up was made during the interview within the context of particular questions. The schedule was also used to cross check the information provided by respondents in the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS).
3.5.4 Reliability and Validity

a) Reliability
The instruments were subjected to a reliability test during the piloting stage. The instruments were administered on three teachers, each representing the three teacher categories under observation, at different times in close succession (after a day) and then the correlation between the two sets of data was performed. A reliability estimate of .86 and .87 was obtained for the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS) and Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS) respectively. In line with Brown (1995) that a reliability of \( r_{xx} \geq .85 \) is suitable for a language study, the instruments were found to be reliable.

b) Validity
The validity of the instruments was initiated at the design stage. The Attitude Scale used in this study was adapted from Ahmed (1994). Similarly, the Observation Schedule was adapted from two sources, which are Manning (1988) and Groenwegen (1992). These were modified to suit the present study. The researcher developed the Interview Schedule. Opinion of experts, including the researcher's supervisors was sought regarding whether or not the items in the instruments represented the elements of the study in question. It was unanimously agreed that the instruments were valid in content.

3.6 Pilot Study
The researcher carried out a pilot study on three teachers, each representing the three teacher categories under investigation. These teachers did not form part of the sample for the main study. Piloting was necessary in enhancing validity and reliability of the instruments. All the three instruments were administered on the three teachers. Pilot work consisted of interviews and discussions, the essential purpose of which was to get vivid expressions from the respondents, in a form that would make the instruments more suitable and to explore the viability of the study.
3.7 The Main Study

During the Main Study, actual administration of the instruments and data collection were preceded by the researcher's preliminary visits to the schools from which the subjects were drawn. During these visits, the researcher explained to the teachers and pupils that the reason behind classroom observation was with the view to getting how Integrated English was being taught and learned so as to identify ways of improvements. This was intentional so as to avoid any suspicion that the teachers were to be compared with their colleagues. Necessary arrangements were also made with the teachers for actual data collection. The Questionnaire was left with the teachers during these visits for collection on an agreed later date of classroom observation.

A total of two observations were done for every teacher. However, the scores obtained during the first observations were not used for data analysis. The reason behind these observations was to reduce researcher and subject expectancy (Brown, 1995).

This approach was helpful as it created a relaxed atmosphere as the teachers and pupils did not consider the researcher a stranger during the final classroom observation. The second classroom observations were immediately followed with the interviews.

3.8 Data Processing and Analysis

Processing and analysis of data were considered individually as follows.

3.8.1 Data on Teachers’ Attitudes

Processing and analysis was made in terms of scores gained by individual teachers on the attitude scale. The first step in the analysis involved assigning numerical values to five response options given on each item in the scale. That is, for positive items the following scores were assigned.

Strongly agree -5 points
Agree -4 points
Neutral -3 points
Disagree -2 points
Strongly disagree -1 point

For negative statements, the scoring was reversed.

To obtain a teacher's attitude on an item, a score below or above the mid score (in this case three points) was considered unfavourable and favourable attitude respectively.

Teachers' attitudes towards the main features of Integrated English were determined by using the marginal scores in each attitude area. The expected mean score for each of the five attitude areas, namely: integrated approach, aims and objectives, content of Integrated English, instructional materials, and student-centred approach, were the same because each area had a total of four items. The lowest expected score in each area (1x4)=4 and the highest expected (4x5)=20 were summed up then divided by two. This provided an expected mean performance of 12 in each attitude area. Scores below or above the expected mean were interpreted as unfavourable and favourable attitudes respectively.

For teachers' overall attitudes towards the Integrated English, the expected mean score of the entire scale was used. Scores below or above the expected mean score of the scale were construed to mean negative and positive attitudes respectively. The expected mean score of the entire scale was calculated using the marginal scores, that is, the lowest expected score (20x1)=20, and the highest expected score (20x5)=100. These marginal scores were summed up then divided by two to obtain the expected mean score. That is, (20+100)/2=60.
3.8.2 Data on Teachers’ Performance

The ratings made during the classroom observation on TPOS were converted into scores. Numerical values were assigned to each of the five options on the rating scale as follows:

- Very adequate -5
- Adequate -4
- Average -3
- Inadequate -2
- Very Inadequate -1

To obtain teaching performance in the areas of competencies, individual scores on the performance indicators within the areas of competencies were summed up. Scores above and below the expected average score in each area of competency were construed to mean good and poor performance respectively. Similar procedure used in calculating expected mean score in different attitudes areas was also used here (see Section 3.8.1). The following table provides the expected average performance in different areas of competencies in the Teacher Performance Observation Schedule.

Table 3.1 Expected Mean Performance in Different Areas of Competence in the TPOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Competence</th>
<th>Expected Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher preparation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proficiency in content</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effective use of methods</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of resources</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of assessment techniques</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total score of each individual teacher on TPOS was then calculated by addition of all scores gained on each area of competency. Determining whether the performance was good or poor depended on how each teacher’s overall
score on TPOS compared to the expected mean score. The expected mean score in performance was calculated using marginal scores, in this case, highest expected score (40x5) and lowest expected score (40x1). These were summed up then divided by two. That is, \((200+40)/2=120\). Scores below or above this expected mean indicated poor or good performance respectively.

3.8.3 Data on Interview Schedule

Qualitative data collected using the Interview Schedule was analysed using descriptive analysis. However, responses to structured items were analysed using frequencies and percentages.

3.8.4 Analysis of Data

Once data on attitudes and performance had been processed individually, the mean score for each sample group, that is, graduate teachers, diploma teachers, and untrained teachers was calculated. Using SPSS, the t-test was used to determine the significance of difference between different sample groups of teachers with respect to attitudes and performance.

Finally, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards Integrated English and their teaching performance. The calculations and analyses are explained in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the data and provides the analyses of data generated from the use of Teacher Attitude Scale, Teacher Observation Schedule, and the Interview Schedule. The chapter is divided into four parts. Part one presents data concerning teachers' attitudes towards Integrated English. This is followed by a presentation of teachers' performance in the teaching of the Integrated English. Part three provides a correlation between the teachers' attitudes towards Integrated English and their teaching performance. The last part provides a discussion on the findings of the study.

4.1 Teachers' Attitudes towards Integrated English

This study was guided by five research questions. From these questions, corresponding possible outcomes in the form of null hypotheses were generated. From the first question, it was hypothesised that there is no significant difference in attitudes towards Integrated English between graduate and untrained teachers. From the second research question, it was hypothesised that there is no significant difference in attitudes towards Integrated English between graduate and diploma teachers.

Testing of these hypotheses was done at two levels. Level one involved independent group comparisons based on the mean of every sample group. As pointed out in Chapter 3, understanding teachers' attitudes towards Integrated English was only possible by looking into how teachers feel about the main features of Integrated English. Thus, the mean for each sample group of teachers in different attitude areas and in the entire scale was calculated. These means were compared against the expected mean of 12 and 60 (see Section 3.8.1) for the different attitude areas and the entire scale respectively. This was with a view to achieving the first and the second objectives of this study.
The second level of testing the hypotheses involved determining the statistical significance of mean differences of sample group of teachers in different attitude areas and in the entire scale. This was done using the t-test for independent samples of the SPSS.

4.1.1 Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Attitudes towards Integrated Approach to English Teaching

Integrated approach forms one of the main features of the teaching of English language. Integrated approach here refers to the merger of two entities, that is, English language and Literature in order to strengthen and enrich both. Items 1, 6, 9, and 12 of the Teacher Altitude Scale represent integrated approach to the teaching of English. Graduate teachers gained a mean score (11.4000) slightly below the expected mean of 12. The untrained teachers’ mean (9.9000) in this attitudes area was far much below the expected mean. Thus, the graduates and untrained teachers generally have unfavourable attitudes towards the integrated approach of Integrated English.

The above descriptions only concern whether the groups involved had favourable or unfavourable attitudes towards the integrated approach. There was the need to determine the statistical significance of the above mean difference. A two-tailed mean comparison involving the t-test was made for this purpose. The standard deviations for each of the two groups did not appear to be markedly skewed. The standard deviations for the graduate and the untrained teachers’ scores were 2.0656 and 2.0575 respectively. Thus, the assumption of normal distribution of scores in a t-test was met. Since the groups involved had equal sample sizes, homogeneity of variances criteria in a t-test was also assumed. The results are presented in Table 4.1 below.
Table 4.1 t-Test for Equality of Means of Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Attitudes towards Integrated Approach of the Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards integrated approach</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>17.993</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was 1.640, at \( p<.05 \). The \( t_{\text{critical}} \) for testing the null hypothesis at \( df=18, p<.05 \) is 2.101 (see Appendix 4). The observed statistics was found to be less than that critical statistics (\( t_{\text{observed}} < t_{\text{critical}} \)) at \( df=18, p<.05 \). The null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, the means of the graduates and the untrained teachers' attitude towards the integrated approach of the Integrated English do not differ significantly.

The two-tailed probability (.118) associated with the observed \( t \)-value was greater than the set probability level (\( p<.05 \)). The null hypothesis was therefore accepted. There exists no significant difference in graduates and untrained teachers' attitudes towards the integrated approach. Both categories equally have unfavourable attitudes towards the integrated approach used in the teaching of English in Kenya.

4.1.2 Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Attitudes towards Aims and Objectives of the Integrated English

The aims and objectives of the Integrated English formed the second attitude area in this study. This area was represented by items 2, 7, 13 and 17. To determine the graduate and untrained teachers' attitudes in this area, a similar analysis used in the integrated approach was made using the mean scores of the groups on those items and the expected mean.
The results obtained in this attitude presented a situation different from the previously reported about attitudes towards the integrated approach. The two teacher categories gained a mean score slightly above the expected mean of twelve, with the graduate and untrained teachers scoring 14.3000 and 12.2000 respectively. This implies that amongst the graduate and untrained teachers involved in this study, there exist favourable attitudes towards aims and objectives of the Integrated English. However, graduate teachers view this area more favourably than the untrained teachers do.

To determine the statistical significance of the mean difference (1.5000) between the graduate and untrained teachers with respect to attitudes towards aims and objectives of the course, a two-tailed t-test was done. The standard deviations for the graduates and the untrained teachers in this area were 1.965 and 3.9101 respectively. The means and the standard deviations of these two sample groups did not appear to be markedly skewed thus normal distribution and equal variances assumptions were met. The results are presented in Table 4.2 below.

### Table 4.2 t-Test for Equality of Means of Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Attitudes towards Aims and Objectives of Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards aims and Objectives</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $t_{observed}$ was 1.086. The critical value for testing the null hypothesis at $P<.05$, $df=18$ is 2.101. The $t_{observed}$ here was less than $t_{critical}$ (1.086<2.101) so the null hypothesis was accepted. The mean difference of 1.5000 was therefore not statistically significant.
Since the two-tailed probability \( p < .292 \) associated with \( t_{\text{observed}} (1.086) \) is greater than the probability set, a priori, \( p < .05 \), the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that there was statistically no significant difference between the graduate and untrained teachers' attitudes. Graduate and untrained teachers therefore equally have favourable attitudes towards the aims and objectives of the Integrated English.

4.1.3 Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Attitudes towards the Content of Integrated English

Content of the Integrated English formed the third attitudes area in the teaching of Integrated English. It was represented by items 3, 8, 14 and 18 (see Appendix1). The mean scores of graduate and untrained teachers on these items were computed and comparison done against the expected mean of 12.

The two sample groups of teachers, graduates and untrained, had a mean of 11.5000 and 11.2000 respectively. The standard deviations corresponding to the above means were 3.2059 and 2.6998 respectively. Because the standard deviations were nearly the same, homogeneity of variances and normal distribution assumption of a t-test were met. Though graduate teachers' score in this attitudes area was slightly higher than that of the untrained teachers, the general attitudes were found to be unfavourable as the mean score for each group fell below the expected mean of twelve.

To determine the statistical significance of the mean difference (3.000) in this attitudes area, a two-tailed t-test was performed. Table 4.3 below presents the findings.
Table 4.3 t-Test for Equality of Means of Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Content of Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of the Integrated English</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was .226 at df=18, \( p<.05 \). The \( t_{\text{critical}} \) at the same degrees of freedom and the same level of significance is 2.101. Since the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was less than the \( t_{\text{critical}} \) (.226<2.101), the null hypothesis would not be rejected.

The two tailed probability associated with \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was .823. This probability level was above the probability level (\( p<.05 \)) set, a priori, as the level of significance. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted. The mean difference of 3.000 between the graduate and untrained teachers with respect to their attitudes towards the content of Integrated English was therefore not found to be statistically significant. Thus, both categories of teachers equally have unfavourable attitudes towards the content of the Integrated English.

4.1.4 Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Instructional Materials Used in the Integrated English

Instructional materials used in the teaching and learning of Integrated English formed the fourth attitude area in which teachers were compared. Items 4, 10, 15 and 19 of the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS) represented this area. Similar analysis was done to compare these categories of teachers in terms of their attitudes towards the instructional materials used in the teaching and learning of the Integrated English.
The results found in this area were more or less the same as those found in the previous attitudes area. However, in this case, untrained teachers' mean (11.5000) was slightly higher than that of the graduate teachers (11.4000). The two means fell slightly below the expected mean of twelve. This implies that the teachers involved in this study have unfavourable attitudes towards the instructional materials used in the teaching of the Integrated English.

At another level, there was the need to determine the statistical significance of difference in mean (.1000) in this attitude area. A two-tailed significance t-test was performed using the SPSS. The standard deviations corresponding to the above means for graduates and untrained teachers, 2.9689 and 2.2236 respectively did not show skewed distribution. Thus, all the assumptions of the t-test were met. The results are presented in Table 4.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards the instructional materials</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above t-test provided a $t_{observed}$ (-.085) at df=18, $p<.05$. Since the observed value did not exceed the $t_{critical}$ in absolute value (2.101), the null hypothesis of no significant difference would not be rejected.

The two-tailed probability (.933) associated with the $t_{observed}$ in the above table was larger than the probability set, a priori, as the level of significance, the null hypothesis would not be rejected. Thus, graduate and untrained teachers
equally have unfavourable attitudes towards the instructional materials used in the Integrated English.

4.1.5 Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Attitudes towards the Student-centred Approach in the Teaching of Integrated English

The fifth attitudes area covered by the attitude scale concerned the student-centred approach, employed in the teaching and learning of the Integrated English. Items 5, 11, 16 and 20 of the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS) represented this attitudes area. The mean score gained on these items, together with the expected mean were used to determine the attitudes of each of the sample group of teachers towards this main feature

Graduate teachers' mean was 13.8000 while the untrained teachers’ mean was 10.7000. Graduate teachers have favourable attitudes towards the student-centred approach. Their mean was higher than the expected mean of twelve. The mean obtained by the untrained teachers on the other hand exhibit unfavourable attitudes because this falls below the expected mean.

The above descriptions do not however prove the prevalence of statistical significance of mean difference (3.1000) between the graduate and untrained teachers in this attitudes area. This was proven when the t-test was done. The standard deviations for the graduates and untrained teachers, 2.0976 and 2.0028 respectively did not show skewed distribution. Thus, all the assumptions of the t-test were met. The results are illustrated on Table 4.5 below.
Table 4.5 t-Test for Equality of Means of Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Student-centred Approach in Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards the student-centred approach</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t value for the pooled variances (Equal variances assumed) was used. The $t_{observed}$ was 3.380 at df=18, $p<.05$. The $t_{critical}$ at the same degrees of freedom and probability is 2.101. The $t_{observed}$ was found to be greater than the $t_{critical}$. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This implies the existence of significant difference in graduates and untrained teachers’ attitudes towards student-centred approach of the Integrated English.

At the same time, the two-tailed probability associated with the $t_{observed}$ was .003. Because this probability level is less than the probability set, a priori, as the level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore the difference of 3.1000 between the graduate and untrained teachers’ mean on this area was found to be statistically significant at $p<.05$. Graduate teachers are therefore in favour of the student-centred approach used in the Integrated English while the untrained teachers are not.

4.1.6 Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Overall Attitudes towards Integrated English

The results reported so far concern graduate and untrained teachers’ attitudes towards each one of the five attitudes areas covered by the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS). A summary of these results presented in Table 4.6 below shows that the attitudes of graduate teachers do not significantly differ with that of the
untrained teachers in the above attitudes areas except in the student-centred approach.

**Table 4.6 Summary Results on Significance Level of the Difference in Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Five Main Features of the Integrated English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main features of Integrated English towards which attitudes of graduate and untrained teachers were compared.</th>
<th>Significance level of difference at p&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrated approach</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aims and objectives</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content of the course</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructional materials</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-centred approach</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having established the statistical significance of difference in attitudes of graduate and untrained teachers with respect to various attitudes areas of the Integrated English, the first Research Question (a) (see Section 1.4) had to be answered. This involved similar inter-group comparison based on the aggregate mean score of each sample group on the entire attitude scale and expected mean of sixty (see Section 3.8.1).

From the groups’ statistics, it was evident that graduate teachers have slightly favourable attitudes towards the Integrated English. Graduates had a mean of 62.4000. This fell above the expected mean of 60. On the other hand, untrained teachers had a mean of 55.8000. This was below the expected mean of sixty thus indicating unfavourable attitudes towards Integrated English amongst the untrained teachers.

The above scores do not provide the statistical significance of difference in overall attitudes towards Integrated English between graduate and untrained teachers. To achieve this, a two-tailed t-test was done. The normal distribution assumption was met as the group means and standard deviations were not
markedly skewed. The standard deviation for the graduates was 7.0585 while that of the untrained teachers was 6.4256. Equality of variances was assumed as the two samples were of equal sizes. The results are presented in table 4.7 below.

**Table 4.7 t-Test for Equality of Means of Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Overall Attitudes towards Integrated English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>6.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>17.843</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>6.6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observed was 2.187 at df=18 p<.05. The critical associated with df=18 and p<.05 is 2.101. Since the value of observed (2.187) is greater than the critical in absolute terms, the null hypothesis (H01) for this study was rejected.

The two-tailed probability associated with observed was .042. This was smaller than the probability (p<.05) set, a priori, as the level of significance. The null hypothesis was thus rejected. Graduate and untrained teachers therefore significantly differ in their overall attitudes towards the Integrated English. Graduate teachers have favourable attitudes while the untrained teachers have unfavourable attitudes towards the Integrated English.

**4.2.0 Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Integrated English**

The second hypothesis (H02) in Chapter 1 was with reference to the attitudes of graduate and diploma teachers’ attitudes towards the Integrated English. To test this hypothesis, a similar procedure involving inter-group comparisons, based on
mean scores of sample group of teachers in different attitudes areas and in the entire scale was employed.

4.2.1 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Attitudes towards Integrated Approach to English

As pointed earlier, items 1, 6, 9 and 12 of the Teacher Attitude Scale represented this area. Comparison between graduate and diploma teachers' attitudes towards the integrated approach was made. The mean scores observed were 11.4000 and 11.3000 for graduates and diploma teachers respectively.

Both categories of teachers, graduates and diploma, obtained mean scores slightly below the expected mean of twelve. This implies unfavourable attitudes towards the integrated approach amongst both the graduate and diploma teachers involved in this study.

There was a mean difference of .1000 between graduates and diploma teachers in this attitudes area. To determine the statistical significance of this mean difference, a two-tailed t-test was performed. All the assumptions of the test were met. The standard deviations, 2.0656 for graduates and 2.0575 for diploma teachers depicted a normal distribution. Homogeneity of variances was assumed given equal sample sizes in both cases. The t-test results are presented in Table 4.8 below.
Table 4.8 t-Test for Equality of Means of Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards Integrated Approach of the Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude towards the integrated approach</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( t_{\text{observed}} \) for the comparison was .108, df=18, \( p<.05 \). The \( t_{\text{critical}} \) for the same degrees of freedom and probability is 2.101. Since the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was less than \( t_{\text{critical}} \), and the level of significance value of .915 was more than the probability level set, a priori, as the level of significance (\( p<.05 \)), the null hypothesis was not rejected. This implies that no significant difference exists in the mean score of graduate and diploma teachers on this attitudes area. Both equally have unfavourable attitudes towards the integrated approach.

### 4.2.2 Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards Aims and Objectives of the Integrated English

The aims and objectives of the Integrated English was the second attitudes area in the Teacher Attitude Scale. Items 2, 7, 13 and 17 of the Teacher Attitude Scale represented this attitudes area. The mean score for the graduate and diploma teachers on the four items was generated by the SPSS for windows.

Both the sample groups scored means above the expected mean of twelve. Diploma teachers’ attitudes were more favourable compared with the graduate teachers with a score of 15.0000 and 14.3000 respectively. However, it is not possible to claim that the mean difference (-.7000) was significant.
To determine the statistical significance of this mean difference, a two-tailed t-test result produced by the SPSS output for windows was observed. The standard deviations, 2.0656 and 2.0575 for graduates and diploma teachers respectively were not markedly skewed. Thus, all the assumptions of the t-test, that is, the normal distribution and equal variances were met. The results are presented in Table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9 t-Test for Graduate Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Aims and Objectives of Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards aims and objectives</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $t_{observed}$ for the above test of significance of difference of the means in attitudes towards aims and objectives of integrated English was -.761. This was less than the $t_{critical}$ (2.101). The null hypothesis would therefore not be rejected. The two-tail probability (.465) associated with $t_{observed}$ exceeded the probability set, a priori ($p<.05$), as the level of significance. The null hypothesis was accepted. The mean difference of -.700 was found not to be significant. Both the graduate and diploma teachers involved in this study equally have favourable attitudes towards the aims and objectives of the Integrated English.

4.2.3 Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards Content of the Integrated English

Content of Integrated English was the third attitudes area in the Teacher Attitude Scale. Items 3, 8, 14 and 18 represented this attitudes area. Similar procedure was followed to determine graduate and diploma teachers’ attitudes towards the content of Integrated English. Statistical significance of the
difference in the mean scores was determined using the t-test procedure from SPSS.

The means observed indicated that both the teacher categories involved in this study had unfavourable attitudes towards content of Integrated English. Graduates obtained a mean score of 11.5000 while their diploma counterparts scored 11.000. Though unfavourable, graduate teachers exhibited less unfavourable attitudes while diploma teachers attitudes towards this attitudes area was more unfavourable.

Once the attitudes had been identified, it was necessary to determine the significance of difference in attitudes towards the content of the subject. The two-tailed t-test procedure was run on SPSS for this purpose. The standard deviations for the two teacher categories, that is, 3.2059 and 3.9158 did not show skewed distribution. Thus, all the assumptions of t-test were met. From the print-out, the following analysis was made.

Table 4.10 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards Content of Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards content of the Integrated English</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observed value of t for this test was .312 at df=18, p<.05. Since the t_{critical} value (2.101) at df=18, p<.05 was greater than the t_{observed} the null hypothesis was accepted. The two-tailed probability (.758) associated with the t_{observed} was found to be larger than the probability set, a priori, (p<.05) as the level of significance. The difference between the graduate mean and diploma mean
(.5000) in this attitudes area was found not to be significant. Both the graduate and the diploma holders equally have unfavourable attitudes towards the content of the Integrated English.

4.2.4 Graduate And Diploma Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Instructional Materials used in the Integrated English

This area was represented by items 4, 10, 15, and 19 of the Teacher Attitude Scale. The mean scores for graduate and diploma teachers on these items were used as the basis for comparison against the expected mean.

The results obtained here were more or less the same as the results found in relation to graduate and diploma teachers' attitudes towards the content of Integrated English. With a mean of 11.4000, graduate teachers exhibited less unfavourable attitudes compared with the diploma teachers whose mean score in this area was 11.0000. In other words, though these means indicate unfavourable attitudes, diploma teachers have comparatively more unfavourable attitudes towards instructional materials used in the teaching and learning of the Integrated English.

The mean difference (.5000) between the graduate and diploma teachers in this attitudes area was not found to be statistically significant when checked using the t-test procedure. The standard deviations for graduates (2.9889) and diploma teachers (2.9059) in this area were nearly the same. Thus, normal distribution and equal variances assumptions of the t-test were met. The results are presented in Table 4.11 below.
Table 4.11 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Instructional Materials Used in the Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards the instructional materials</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $t_{\text{observed}}$ (.303) was below the $t_{\text{critical}}$ (2.101) at df=18 and $p<.05$. The two-tailed probability associated with the $t_{\text{observed}}$ was .765. This was above the probability level ($p<.05$) set, a priori, as the level of significance. The null hypothesis was therefore not rejected. This implies that both the graduate and diploma teachers equally have unfavourable attitudes towards the instructional materials used in the Integrated English.

4.2.5 Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Student-centred Approach in the Teaching of Integrated English

Items 5, 11, 16, and 20 of the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS) represented this attitude area. The analysis of mean scores of the sample groups of teachers followed similar procedure as before. The results obtained showed that both the categories of teachers generally have favourable attitudes towards the student-centred approach of the Integrated English. This finding was based on the comparison of the gained mean score against the expected mean of twelve. Graduates’ mean, 13.8000 proved that they have slightly more favourable attitudes compared to their diploma counterparts who had a mean score of 13.5000.

The difference in the mean score (.3000) of graduate and diploma teachers in the area of student-centred approach was found to be statistically not significant when the t-test was done. With the standard deviations of 2.0976 and 2.9533
for graduate and diploma teachers' scores respectively, all the assumptions of the test were met. The results are presented in Table 4.12 below.

**Table 4.12 t-Test for Equality of Means of Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Attitudes towards the Student-centred Approach in Integrated English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards the student-centred approach</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above presents a $t_{\text{observed}}$ value of .262, which is below the $t_{\text{critical}}$ (2.101) in absolute terms. The probability associated with $t_{\text{observed}}$ was .796, which was more than the probability set a priori ($p<.05$) as the level of significance. When the $t_{\text{observed}}$ is less than the $t_{\text{critical}}$, and the probability associated with the observed $t$ value greater than the probability set a priori, as the level of significance, the null hypothesis would not be rejected. This implies that the graduate and diploma teachers involved in this study both equally have favourable attitudes towards the student-centred approach of the Integrated English.

**4.2.6 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Overall Attitudes towards Integrated English**

Comparisons between graduate and diploma teachers' attitudes with respect to various attitudes areas have so far been presented. The summary of these results is presented in Table 4.13 below.
Table 4.13 Summary Results on Significance Level of the Difference in Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Attitudes towards the Five Main Features of the Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main features of Integrated English towards which attitudes of graduate and diploma teachers were compared.</th>
<th>Significance level of difference at p&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrated approach</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aims and objectives</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content of the course</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructional materials</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student centre approach</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary Table 4.13 of significance of difference of means between graduate and diploma teachers’ attitudes above indicates that there was no statistical significance of mean differences between both categories of teachers in various attitudes areas of the Integrated English. The attitudes of graduate and diploma teachers towards each of the main areas covered by the Teacher Attitudes Scale is therefore said to be the same.

Determining teachers’ overall attitudes towards the Integrated English involved similar procedure. The significance of difference in aggregate mean score of graduate and diploma teachers in the entire scale involved the use of a t-test.

The mean score of both categories of teachers were compared against the expected mean of 60 (see Section 3.8.1). In both cases, teachers scored an aggregate mean above the expected mean. This implies that both graduate and diploma teachers involved in this study have favourable attitudes towards Integrated English. However, graduate teachers’ mean (62.4000) indicate a slightly more favourable attitudes compared to the diploma teachers’ mean (61.8000).

The above description was only with reference to whether both graduate and diploma teachers had favourable or unfavourable attitudes towards the
Integrated English. The second level of analysis required the determination of the statistical significance of .6000 mean difference in score between graduates and diploma teachers with respect to the Integrated English. A two-tailed t-test was performed. The standard deviations, 7.0585 and 9.3071, for graduates and diploma teachers respectively were not greatly skewed thereby meeting the normal distribution and equal variances assumptions in a t-test. The results are presented in Table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Overall Attitudes towards Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitudes Towards the Integrated English</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.162</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>16.779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $t_{observed}$ was .162. The $t_{critical}$ at df=18 and $p<.05$ is 2.101. The probability level set, a priori, as the level was $p<.05$. Since the $t_{observed}$ (.162) was less than the $t_{critical}$ (2.101) and the probability level (.873) associated with $t_{observed}$ greater than the probability set, a priori, ($p<.05$), the null hypothesis $H_0$ (see Section 1.5) of this study was therefore not rejected. This implies that the mean difference of .6000 was not found to be significant. Graduate and diploma teachers therefore equally have favourable attitudes towards Integrated English.

4.3.0 Teaching Performance of English Language Teachers

The third and the fourth research questions in Chapter 1 were with reference to the performance in the teaching of Integrated English. To answer these questions, the null hypotheses $H_0_3$ and $H_0_4$ (see Section 1.5) were generated and tested.
These hypotheses were tested through a number of group comparisons. The t-test based on the ratings (mean scores) of the sample group of teachers obtained from classroom observation was used. Five areas of competencies, which were further subdivided into two categories, thus lesson preparation and lesson delivery, defined teaching performance. The five major areas of competencies included: schemes of work and lesson plan, proficiency in content, use of appropriate teaching methods, use of instructional materials and use of assessment techniques.

4.3.1 Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Performance in Lesson Preparation

Teachers' lesson preparation formed the first area of teaching performance upon which teachers were observed. Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS) was used for this purpose. Two subsections, thus: schemes of work and lesson plan represented this competency area. These were represented by five and seven performance indicators respectively (see Appendix 2). Similar procedure used in comparing teachers in terms of attitudes was employed in comparing teachers' performance. Graduate teachers were compared against their untrained and diploma counterparts respectively.

The results concerning the comparison between graduate and untrained teachers' performance in lesson preparations indicated that both categories of teachers performed poorly. Graduate teachers' mean in this area of performance was 35.5000 while that of the untrained teachers was 21.3000. The graduates performed relatively better than the untrained teachers though this performance fell below the expected average performance of 36 (see Table 3.1).

The second level of analysis involved determining the statistical significance of difference in the performance of graduate and untrained teachers' in lesson preparations using the t-test. The standard deviations, 4.6007 for the graduates and 4.4234 for the untrained teachers were nearly equal. Thus, the variances
for the two groups in this area of competence were assumed to be homogeneous. The results are presented in Table 4.15 below.

### Table 4.15 t-Test for Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Performance in Lesson Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance in lesson preparation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.036</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>14.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>7.036</td>
<td>17.972</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>14.2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was 7.036 at \( df=18, p<.05 \). The \( t_{\text{critical}} \) at the same degrees of freedom and the level of significance is 2.101. The probability level (.000) associated with the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was less than the probability (\( p<.05 \)) set as the level of significance. Since \( t_{\text{observed}} \) exceeded \( t_{\text{critical}} \) (7.036 > 2.101) and the associated probability (.000) level being less than the set level of significance (\( p<.05 \)), the null hypothesis was rejected at \( p<.05 \). The difference in performance between graduate and untrained teachers was found to be significant though in both cases the performance was poor.

### 4.3.2 Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Proficiency in Content

Proficiency in content formed the second area of competency in which teachers were observed and compared using similar procedures. Proficiency as used in this study referred to teachers' knowledge and mastery of content relevant to Integrated English.

The data obtained revealed that graduate teachers were more proficient in the content of Integrated English than untrained teachers with mean performance of 31.4000 and 17.9000 respectively. Compared against the expected mean of
21, it was noted that the graduates scored very highly in this area of competency than untrained teachers whose score was below the expected mean.

The t-test procedure from SPSS was used to determine the statistical significance of the mean difference (13.5000) of graduate and untrained teachers’ performance in this area of competency. Observation of the standard deviations, .9661 and 1.5239, for graduates and diploma teachers respectively, revealed that the variances were nearly the same. Thus, normal distribution and equal variances were assumed. The results are reported in Table 4.16 below.

**Table 4.16 t-Test for Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Proficiency in Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency in content</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig(2-tailed)</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.036</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>13.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>7.036</td>
<td>17.972</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>13.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) (7.036) was found to be greater than the \( t_{\text{critical}} \) (2.101) at \( df = 18 \) \( p < .05 \), the null hypothesis of no significance in the performance in the proficiency in content was rejected.

The probability level (.000) associated with the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was less than probability level \( (p < .05) \) set, a priori, as the level of significance. Consequently, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in proficiency in content was rejected. The mean difference of 13.5000 was found to be statistically significant in favour of the graduate teachers at \( p < .05 \) level of significance.
4.3.3 Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Performance in the Use of Appropriate Teaching Methods

The use of appropriate teaching methods that promote integration of English language and Literature was represented by a total of eight performance indicators. Teachers were observed whether they exhibited more of these indicators and were rated accordingly.

The data generated revealed that graduate teachers scored very highly on this area of competence as compared to their untrained counterparts. The mean scores here were 31.7000 and 19.9000 for graduate and untrained teachers respectively. Compared against the expected mean of 24, it was evident that the graduate teachers use more of methods that favour the teaching and learning of Integrated English as compared to the untrained teachers.

To determine whether the mean difference (11.8000) in this area was statistically significant, the t-test was used. The standard deviations, 2.2136 and 2.9981 for graduates and untrained teachers respectively in this area of teaching performance were about the same. This implies that the variances were assumed to be homogeneous and that the scores in each group were normally distributed. All the assumptions for the t-test were therefore met. The results are reported in Table 4.17 below.

Table 4.17 t-Test for Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Performance in the Teaching Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching methods in the integrated English</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>t: 10.013, df: 18, Sig(2-tailed): .000</td>
<td>11.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>t: 10.013, df: 16.564, Sig(2-tailed): .000</td>
<td>11.8000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The $t_{\text{observed}}$ (10.013) was greater than $t_{\text{critical}}$ (2.101) at $df=18$, $p<.05$. The two-tailed probability for the $t_{\text{observed}}$ was (.000). This was found to be less than the probability level ($p<.05$) set as the significance level for this study. The null hypothesis of no significance difference was thus rejected. The mean difference (11.8000) between the graduates and untrained teachers in this area of competency was found to be significant at $p<.05$. The difference was in favour of graduates whose score was higher than their untrained counterparts.

4.3.4 Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Use of Instructional Resources

The use of instructional resources forms an integral part in the teaching of Integrated English. As an area of teaching competency in this study, the area was represented by seven indicators (see Appendix 2). Teachers were compared on the basis of the degree in which these indicators were observed. The group statistics generated indicated that graduate and untrained teachers' mean performance in this area of competence was 22.4000 and 20.4000 respectively. Graduate teachers' performance was above average while that of the untrained teachers was slightly below the expected average of 21.

The second level of analysis involved determining whether the mean difference (2.000) was significant or not. The standard deviations for the two teacher categories were 1.9551 and 1.2649 respectively. These were not markedly skewed. Thus, normal distribution and homogeneous variances were assumed. The results are presented in Table 4.18 below.
### Table 4.18 t-Test for Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Use of Instructional Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Use of Instructional Resources</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table, the $t_{\text{observed}}$ (2.716) was greater than $t_{\text{critical}}$ (2.101) at df=18 $p<.05$. The probability level (.014) associated with the $t_{\text{observed}}$ was below the probability ($p<.05$) set, a priori, as the level of significance. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in graduate and untrained teachers’ performance in the use of instructional resources was rejected. The mean difference (2.000) in terms of performance in this area of competency between graduate and untrained teachers was found to be significant at $p<.05$ in favour of graduates. Notable however was the fact that each category of teachers’ score was above average.

#### 4.3.5 Graduate and Untrained Teachers’ Performance in Assessment Techniques

Teachers’ performance in the assessment techniques was the last area of competence upon which teachers were compared. A total of six performance indicators involving appropriate assessment techniques were included (see Appendix 2).

Observation of the mean scores in this area of performance revealed that graduate and untrained teachers performed fairly well. The mean scores obtained were above the expected mean performance of 18. Graduate teachers obtained a mean score of 23.8000 while the untrained teachers’ score was 18.9000.
The above figures only indicate graduate and untrained teachers' performance in the use of appropriate assessment techniques. This could not reveal the significance of the difference in this area of performance. To attain this, the t-test was used. The standard deviations for the graduate and untrained teachers' scores in this area were 1.8738 and 2.2336 respectively. These were nearly equal. Thus all the assumptions of the test, that is, normal distribution and equal variances, were met. The t-test results are presented in Table 4.19 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance in the use of appropriate assessment techniques</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.315</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td>4.9000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t<sub>observed</sub> (5.315) was found to be greater than the t<sub>critical</sub> (2.101) at df=18 p<.05. The two-tailed probability level (.000) corresponding to the t<sub>observed</sub> was below the probability (p<.05) set as the level of significance for this study. Thus the null hypothesis of no significance difference was rejected. The mean difference between the graduate and untrained teachers' performance in this area of competence was found to be statistically significant at p<.05. This difference was found to be in favour of graduate teachers.

4.3.6 Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Overall Performance in the Teaching of the Integrated English

The results presented so far about teaching performance were a comparison of graduate and untrained teachers' performance in the five major areas of performance in the teaching of the Integrated English.
In all these areas, graduate teachers' performance was superior to that of the untrained teachers. This superiority, as expressed by the mean score difference in all the areas was found to be significant. The following is a summary results on significance level of difference in graduate and untrained teachers' performance in the five areas of competencies.

**Table 4.20 Summary Results on Significance Level of the Difference in Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Performance in the Teaching of the Integrated English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of competency in the teaching of Integrated English</th>
<th>Significance level of difference at p&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lesson preparation</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proficiency of content</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appropriate teaching methods</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of instructional resources</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assessment techniques</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar procedure used in comparing graduate and untrained teachers in areas of competencies was used in comparing them in terms of their overall performance in the teaching of Integrated English. However, this time round, the aggregate mean score for each sample group was compared against an expected aggregate mean of 120 (see Section 3.8.2).

The data generated showed that the performance of graduate teachers (144.800) in the teaching of Integrated English was above average. This is contrary to the unpopular belief that graduate teachers perform poorly in their teaching. Graduate teachers’ score was far much above the expected average mean of 120.

Untrained teachers involved in this study on the other hand performed dismally with a mean score of 98.4000. This poor performance could be due to the fact that most of the untrained teachers do not understand the concept of integration.
in the teaching of English language and Literature. This issue is reported at length in the latter part of this chapter.

When the t-test for equality of means was run, the mean difference (46.4000) between graduate and untrained teachers' overall performance was found to be statistically significant at \( p < .05 \). The standard deviations for the two groups 4.5166 and 6.9952 were nearly same, thereby depicting equal variances and normal distribution in a t-test. This is reported in Table 4.21 below.

### Table 4.21 t-Test for Graduate and Untrained Teachers' Overall Performance in the Teaching of Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall performance in the teaching of integrated English</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th>( T )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( \text{Sig}(2\text{-tailed}) )</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>17.622</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>46.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.622</td>
<td>15.393</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>46.4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.21 show that when all the assumptions of the t-test are met, the t value observed is 17.622. This value is greater than the \( t_{\text{critical}} \) at \( df=18, \ p<.05 \). Observation of the two-tailed significance level (.000) corresponding to the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) (17.622) indicates that this value falls below the probability level (\( p<.05 \)) set as the level of significance for this study. Thus, the null hypothesis \( H_0 \) (see Section 1.5) of this study was rejected at \( p<.05 \). The difference in mean (46.400) in terms of performance in the teaching of the Integrated English between graduate and untrained teachers was found to be statistically significant at \( p<.05 \) in favour of the graduate teachers.

### 4.4.0 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Performance

The comparison provided so far about teaching performance involved graduate and untrained teachers. For the purpose of accepting or rejecting the null
hypothesis $H_0$ of this study, a similar comparison involving graduate and diploma teachers was done.

### 4.4.1 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Performance in Lesson Preparation

The first area of comparison between the graduate and diploma teachers was the performance in lesson preparation. As pointed out earlier, this area of competency was represented by a total of twelve performance indicators. These provided an expected mean of 36 (see Table 3.1). Against this background, it was observed that both the graduate and the diploma teachers' performance in this area were slightly below average. Each group obtained a mean score of 35.5000 and 31.7000 respectively. A number of reasons for this poor performance are discussed in the latter parts of this chapter.

The statistical t-test was run to determine the significance of difference in the performance of the graduate and diploma teachers in this area of competency. The standard deviations, 4.6007 and 3.3350, for graduate and diploma teachers' scores in this area were nearly the same. Since sample sizes were equal, homogeneous variances criteria and normal distributions of scores in a t-test were met. The following results were obtained.

**Table 4.22 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Performance in Lesson Preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance in lesson preparation</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig(2-tailed)</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>16.412</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The \( t_{\text{observed}} \) (2.115) for the above test of equality of means in the performance in lesson preparation between graduate and diploma teachers was greater than the \( t_{\text{critical}} \) (2.101) at \( df=18 \), \( p<.05 \). At the same time, the probability level (.049) associated with the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was less than the probability level (\( p<.05 \)) set a priori, as the level of significance. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the mean difference was rejected. The mean difference (3.8000) in this area of performance was therefore found to be statistically significant in favour of graduate, though in both cases, the observed means were below the expected average.

4.4 2 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Proficiency in Content

Seven performance indicators represented proficiency in content. The expected average mean performance was 21. The two categories of teachers, graduates and diploma, were compared and results were obtained.

It was observed that graduate teachers are more proficient in the content of Integrated English than the diploma teachers. However, compared against the expected average performance mean of 21, both the categories obtained each a mean score above average. Graduate teachers' mean score was 31.4000 while diploma teachers' score was 28.2000.

The above mean scores only provide the basis of comparison to determine the category of teachers, which was more proficient in the content of the Integrated English. The need to determine the statistical significance of this mean difference necessitated the use of a two-tailed \( t \)-test for equality of means from SPSS. All the assumptions of the test, that is normal distribution of scores and equal variances were met. The standard deviations for graduates and diploma teachers, .9661 and 2.3944, respectively were not markedly skewed. From the computer print-out generated, the following results were produced.
Table 4.23 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Proficiency in Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance in proficiency in content</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( t_{\text{observed}} \) for this test of equality of means in the proficiency in content of the Integrated English was 3.919. This was greater than the \( t_{\text{critical}} \) at \( df=18 \) \( p<.05 \). The probability level (.001) associated with the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was lower than the probability set at the design stage (\( p<.05 \)) as the level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected. The difference of mean (3.200) between graduate and diploma teachers in the proficiency in content was found to be significant at \( p<.05 \) in favour of the graduate teachers. Graduate teachers are therefore more proficient in the content of Integrated English than the diploma teachers.

### 4.4.3 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Performance in the Use of Appropriate Teaching Methods

The use of effective teaching methods that promote integration of English language and literature was the third area of competency in the teaching of the Integrated English. Rating of teachers in this area was based on eight performance indicators (see Appendix 2).

The data obtained indicated that both graduate and diploma teachers tended to use methods that favour the teaching and learning of Integrated English. The performance in this area of competence was found to be too high above the expected average set at 24. However diploma teachers score (31.9000) on this area was slightly above that of the graduate teachers (31.7000).
The mean difference (-.2000) between the graduate and diploma teachers' performance in this area was subjected to a two-tail t-test to determine whether this difference was statistically significant or not. The standard deviations of scores, 2.2136 and 2.2828 for graduates and diploma teachers respectively were nearly equal. Thus, the variances were assumed to be equal. The scores were also normally distributed. All the assumptions of the test were met and the results obtained reported in Table 4.24 below.

### Table 4.24 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Performance in the Teaching Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated English</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>17.983</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 4.24 above provides a negative $t_{\text{observed}}$ (-.199). Diploma teachers scored higher than the graduate teachers, who were used as the main group in this comparison. The $t_{\text{observed}}$ was less than the $t_{\text{critical}}$ (2.101) at $df=18$ $p<.05$. The probability level (.845) associated with the $t_{\text{observed}}$ was larger than the probability set, a priori, as the level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis of no significance difference was not rejected. The mean difference of -.2000 in this area of competency was therefore not statistically significant. Thus graduate and diploma teachers equally use teaching methods that facilitate the learning of Integrated English.

### 4.4.4 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Use of Instructional Resources

In order for a teacher to effectively help the learner acquire proficiency in language and literary skills, it is important to use appropriate human and material resources. These have to be used in the most natural and logical
manner so as to reinforce what is learnt. This area of performance was represented by a total of seven performance indicators. These represented an average mean performance of 21.

Based on the seven performance indicators, graduate teachers’ mean (22.4000) was above average. Diploma teachers on the other hand had a mean score (20.1000) slightly below the expected average mean of 21. This implies that graduate teachers performed well in the use of the instructional resources as compared to their diploma counterparts.

The group statistics above however does not provide the significance of mean difference (2.3000) in this area of performance between graduate and diploma teachers. To achieve this, a two-tailed t-test procedure was used. Normal distribution and equal variances assumptions were met as the standard deviations for graduates (1.9551), and diploma teachers (2.7264) were not markedly skewed. The results are presented in Table 4.25 below.

Table 4.25 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Use of Instructional Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance in the use of instructional resources</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig(2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>16.320</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $t_{observed}$ in this area of performance was (2.168). This $t$ value was greater than the $t_{critical}$ (2.101) at the same degrees of freedom and probability level. The two-tail probability (.044) associated with the $t_{observed}$ was less than the probability ($p<.05$) set at the very initial stages of this study as the level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. The mean difference of
2.3000 between the graduate and diploma teachers' performance in the use of instructional resources was therefore significant in favour of the graduates at df=18 p<.05.

4.4.5 Graduate and Diploma Teachers' Performance in Assessment Techniques

Assessment is an invaluable component of language teaching. Through assessment the teacher can tell whether or not the learners have mastered specific skills. The Integrated English puts emphasis on immediate, meaningful and supportive feedback in the learners' work. To determine the teachers' performance in assessing their pupils, a total of six performance indicators were used (see Appendix 2). This provided an expected average mean of 18 (see Table 3.1). Graduate and diploma teachers were compared against this expected average mean to determine their performance in the use of assessment techniques that provided meaningful and supportive feedback to the pupils.

The mean scores obtained indicated that both categories of teachers performed above average in their use of assessment techniques. However, diploma teachers' performance (25.9000) was higher than that of graduate teachers (23.800). It can therefore be inferred that diploma teachers use more of those assessment techniques that provide immediate feedback as opposed to their graduate counterparts.

The above group statistics does not however present any statistical significance of the mean difference in the performance in the use of appropriate assessment techniques. Thus, these means were subjected to the t-test to determine whether the mean difference (-2.1000) was significant or not. The standard deviations of scores for graduates (1.8738) and diploma teachers (2.0790) depicted that the scores were normally distributed. Thus, all the assumptions of the t-test, that is, equal variances and normal distributions were met. The findings are reported in Table 4.26 below.
Table 4.26 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Performance in Assessment Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance assessment techniques</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-2.373</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.373</td>
<td>17.809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( t_{\text{observed}} \) in this area of competence was -2.373. This \( t \) value fell above the acceptance region, \( t_{\text{critical}} (-2.101) \) at \( df=18 \), \( p<.05 \). The two-tailed probability (.029) associated with the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was less than the probability level set, a priori, \( (p<.05) \) as the level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the means of graduate and diploma teachers was therefore rejected. The mean difference of -2.1000 in this area of performance was therefore significant at \( p<.05 \). Though the means obtained by the graduate and diploma teachers fell above the expected average mean, the difference between the two means was significant in favour of the diploma teachers at \( p<.05 \).

4.4.6 Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Overall Performance in the Teaching of the Integrated English

Comparison between graduate and diploma teachers’ performance in various areas of competencies in the teaching of Integrated English provided a different situation as that of the graduate and untrained teachers. The initial comparison indicated that graduate teachers were superior in all the areas and the mean difference in each area was found to be significant at \( p<.05 \). The findings in this comparison are summarised in Table 4.27 below.
Table 4.27 Summary Results on Significance Level of the Difference in Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Performance in the Teaching of the Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of competency in the teaching of Integrated English</th>
<th>Significance level of difference at p&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lesson preparation</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proficiency of content</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appropriate teaching methods</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of instructional resources</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assessment techniques</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it can be observed that in all the five areas of competencies, only in one area was the difference not significant, that is, performance in the use of appropriate teaching methods. Interestingly, there were areas in which diploma teachers scored higher mean than the graduates. These included the use of appropriate teaching methods that promote integration and in the use of assessment techniques. This presents a different picture from the comparison between graduate and untrained teachers where, in all the five areas, the differences in mean performance were found to be significant in favour of the graduates.

Comparison of graduate and diploma teachers’ overall performance in the teaching of Integrated English was based on each group’s aggregate mean score on the entire instrument. Observation of the groups’ statistics indicated that graduate teachers at this level were superior to their diploma counterparts. The mean scores observed were 144.8000 and 137.8000 respectively. However, in both cases, teaching performance was good as each category scored above the expected average mean score (see Section 3.8.2). These means were then subjected to the t-test to determine the existence or non-existence of statistical significance of the observed means. The standard deviations for the two groups were 4.5166 and 6.7626 for graduates and untrained teachers respectively. Since the standard deviations were not markedly skewed, normal distribution
and equal variances were assumed. The results are presented in Table 4.28 below.

Table 4.28 t-Test for Graduate and Diploma Teachers’ Overall Performance in the Teaching of Integrated English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall performance in the teaching of integrated English</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>15.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the t-test for equality of means above, the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was 2.722. This was greater than the \( t_{\text{critical}} \) (2.101) in absolute value. The two-tailed probability (.014) associated with the \( t_{\text{observed}} \) was less than the probability set at the design stage. Thus the null hypothesis \( H_0 \) of this study was rejected. This implies that the mean difference of 7.000 in teachers’ overall performance in the teaching of Integrated English was found to be significant at \( p<.05 \). Graduate teachers performed well in the teaching of Integrated English compared to the diploma teachers.

4.5 Correlation between Teachers’ Attitudes towards Integrated English and Their Teaching Performance

Apart from assessing teachers’ attitudes and teaching performance in the teaching of Integrated English, the major concern for this study was to determine whether there exists any significant relationship between the teachers’ attitudes and their teaching performance in the Integrated English. This was, however, not possible before getting clear picture of teachers attitudes and their performance in the Integrated English.
To achieve this objective, the fifth Research Question in Chapter 1 was generated. To answer this question, the null hypothesis $H_0$ (see Section 1.5) was formulated. Testing of this null hypothesis did not involve each category separately. Rather, the aggregate mean score of all the teachers on the Teacher Attitude Scale and Teacher Performance Observation Schedule were used. These were then correlated to determine whether there existed any relationships. The following table presents overall aggregate mean score of teachers in Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS) and Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (TPOS).

Table 4.29 Descriptive Statistics for Aggregate Mean Score of Teachers on Attitude Scale (X) and Teacher Performance Observation Schedule (Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of teacher</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
<th>Mean (Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.4000</td>
<td>144.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61.8000</td>
<td>137.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8000</td>
<td>98.4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A cursory glance at the above table reveals a positive relationship between (X) and (Y). That is, the higher the score on (X), the higher the score on (Y) and vice versa. Both the graduate and diploma teachers scored above the expected mean of 60 (see Section 3.8.1) and 120 (see Section 3.8.2) in (X) and (Y) respectively. The untrained category on the other hand scored below the expected average on the two measures.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient illustrating the relationship between attitudes and performance in the Integrated English was done using correlations procedure in SPSS. This allowed for the determination of the strength and the significance of the above relationship. The following results were generated.
Table 4.30 Correlation Coefficient for Attitudes towards Integrated English and Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards Integrated English</th>
<th>Performance in Integrated English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig(2-tailed)</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Integrated English</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig(2-tailed)</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=28, p<.05, r=.361

Note: "." Is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed.

From the table above, a weak relationship exists between teachers’ attitudes towards Integrated English and teaching performance. The correlation coefficient observed was .329. Since the r_{observed} (.329) was less than the correlation coefficient in absolute value (.361) (see Appendix 5) the null hypothesis H_0 of this study was accepted at p<.05.

The two-tailed probability (.076) associated with the r_{observed} was greater than the probability level (p<.05) set as the level of significance. When the observed probability level is greater than the probability set, a priori, as the level of significance, the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is therefore no significant correlation between attitudes and performance in the teaching of Integrated English.

4.6 Discussion

The findings of this study support to a large extent the hypotheses of no significant difference in attitudes and teaching performance between graduate and diploma teachers. Statistically significant difference, in favour of the graduates, was however observed between graduate and untrained teachers.
The study findings therefore conflict with findings from Muutu (1992) and Magoma (1999), that teachers have negative attitudes towards Integrated English. This conflicting finding could be attributed to the fact that the previous studies did not consider different aspects of the Integrated English and so did not give the teachers a chance to express fully their opinions regarding different areas of this subject.

Notable was the fact that teachers showed negative attitudes towards most areas of the Integrated English. This could be attributed to the fact that teachers' opinion concerning the Integrated English was not sought before implementation of the innovation. As pointed out in the Theoretical Framework, introducing an innovation without consulting the teachers could lead to their resistance of the innovation. Negative attitudes towards most areas of the Integrated English, could therefore be an indication of resistance to the implementation of Integrated English.

A number of possible explanations could be forwarded in connection with teachers’ negative attitudes towards most areas of the Integrated English. First, as pointed out in the Theoretical Framework, majority of the older teachers (conservatives) who taught English before integration may have developed a system and would not accept integration easily. These teachers may have also influenced younger teachers who trained after the introduction of integration.

Secondly, training in diploma colleges and universities may not have been in conformity with the views of the younger teachers. Upon joining the profession, these teachers may have been victims of negative attitudes towards Integrated English. At the same time, majority of trained teachers involved in this study claimed that the training accorded to them did not reflect integration that they found in the profession. This could be said to be impacting negatively on their attitudes towards most areas of Integrated English.
The results found regarding teacher performance were almost similar to the findings regarding attitudes. Graduate and diploma teachers proved superior to their untrained counterparts. Contrary to Shanguya (1995) and Ogolla (2000), graduate teachers were found to perform better in their teaching.

Relatively good teaching performance by graduate and diploma teachers could be attributed to their training. This finding is in consistency with Magoma (2000) that one of the factors that have led to poor implementation of the Integrated English is inadequate pre-service preparation. Graduate and diploma teachers in this case appear to be well prepared while the untrained teachers are not.

Though performance of graduate and diploma teachers was relatively good, findings regarding certain areas of competencies are worth noting. The first major area of teaching performance in which teachers were observed was in the lesson preparation. This involved the way they planned their teaching and how the plan was used in facilitating lesson delivery. A common weakness observed amongst the three teacher categories was that planning for the teaching of Integrated English was not taken seriously. Planning by majority of teachers was only limited to preparing brief schemes or work which hardly offer guidance in actual lesson teaching. This shortcoming did not only lower the average rating score in this area but also affected other areas of performance in the entire lesson.

From the findings of the study, there appears to be an interactive nature, though not significant, between attitudes and performance. This could be explained by the resulting weak positive correlation coefficient obtained ($r = .329$).
5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a general summary of the study, its findings, conclusions, implications of the findings and recommendations. Suggestions for further research are also made.

5.2 Summary

This study focussed on finding out whether there exists a relationship between teachers' attitudes towards Integrated English and their teaching performance in the subject. It also involved determining teachers' attitudes and performance in various areas of Integrated English. The study came up with several findings, which are summarised as follows:

5.2.1 Findings Concerning Teachers' Attitudes towards Integrated English

The analysis of scores obtained by the use of Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS) revealed that graduate and diploma teachers generally have fairly favourable attitudes towards the Integrated English. Both categories scored 62.4 and 61.8 respectively. These fell above the expected mean of 60. Untrained teachers (mean score of 58.8000) on the other hand have unfavourable attitudes.

Comparison concerning significance of mean difference between graduate teachers and their untrained counterparts revealed that there was statistically significant difference in overall attitudes towards Integrated English. Similar comparison between the graduate and diploma teachers revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in their attitudes towards Integrated English.
Comparison between graduate and untrained teachers with reference to each one of the five main features covered in the Teacher Attitude Scale revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in four attitudes areas namely; integrated approach, aims and objectives, content, and instructional materials. However, the difference in attitudes towards the student-centred approach was found to be significant at $p < .05$.

Similar comparison between graduate and diploma teachers revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in their attitudes towards each one of the main five features of Integrated English, namely; integrated approach, aims and objectives of the subject, content of the subject, instructional materials and the student-centred approach in Integrated English.

Regarding attitudes towards each of the main features of Integrated English, it was revealed that all the three sample group of teachers hold unfavourable attitudes towards the integrated approach of the Integrated English. This finding was found to be consistent with the finding in item six of the Interview Schedule in which a total of twenty four teachers representing 80% of the total sample reported that they were not motivated to continue teaching English language in an integrated manner.

All the sample groups of teachers have favourable attitudes towards the aims and objectives of the Integrated English. This finding was further supported by the response teachers gave to item 7 of the Interview Schedule. A larger chunk of teachers (24) representing 80% agreed that the Integrated English is relevant to the needs of pupils in Kenyan secondary schools.

Analyses of teachers’ attitudes towards the content of Integrated English reveal that all the category of teachers have unfavourable attitudes. This finding was not only observed in the attitude scale. Teachers’ response to item 9 of the Interview Schedule provided amongst other things that some content areas of integrated English were irrelevant to the study of language. A case at point here
is the interpretation of graphs as part of the study skills. A teacher remarked that interpretation of graphs is well covered in Geography and Mathematics hence no need of being included in the Integrated English. Majority of teachers also pointed out that the content of the Integrated English is too wide and needs to be reduced so that teachers and pupils are not overburdened. All these revelations indicate unfavourable attitudes.

The scores obtained on the attitude scale by all the teachers also reveal negative attitudes towards the instructional materials. Majority of teachers (18) representing 60% remarked that the Integrated English Course series recommended by K.I.E provided very little illustrations to students and covered wide areas shallowly.

Analysis of scores in attitudes towards the student-centred approach was different. Graduate and diploma teachers had favourable attitudes. The scores in this attitudes area, 13.8000 and 13.5000 respectively, were above the expected mean score of 12 thereby indicating favourable attitudes. However, the untrained teachers’ score (10.7000) in this attitudes area indicated unfavourable attitudes.

5.2.2 Findings Concerning Teaching Performance in Integrated English

The analysis of data obtained by the use of Teacher Observation Schedule (TAS) revealed that graduate and diploma teachers performed well in the teaching of Integrated English. The untrained teachers on the other hand performed poorly.

Further analysis revealed the existence of significant difference in overall performance between graduate and diploma teachers. The difference in the means of graduate and untrained teachers overall performance was also significant at p<.05 in favour of the former.
Comparison between the performance of graduate and untrained teachers in the five areas of performance in the teaching of Integrated English revealed a significant difference at $p<.05$ in all the areas of competencies, thus: lesson preparation, proficiency in content, effective use of methods, use of resources and effective use of assessment techniques.

Similar comparison involving graduate and diploma teachers however revealed significant difference in the mean score obtained in lesson preparation, proficiency in content, use of resources and assessment techniques. Difference in the mean scores obtained in the use of methods was, however, found not to be significant. Notable here was also the fact that the difference in assessment techniques was significant in favour of diploma teachers.

Concerning the general performance in each area of competence, the analysis of scores obtained in teachers’ lesson preparation revealed lack of proper preparation by all the categories of teachers. Majority of teachers did not have lesson plans or if available, were prepared haphazardly and did not reflect what actually took place during the lesson. Schemes of work were sketchily prepared only to act as a safety net just in case an inspector showed up.

Graduate and diploma teachers were found to be more proficient in the content of Integrated English than the untrained teacher category. The score in this area of performance was above the expected average of 21. Graduate teachers were more proficient than the diploma teachers. The untrained teachers’ score reflected little proficiency, which was below average.

The data obtained pointed to the fact that graduates and diploma teachers’ score in the use of appropriate teaching methods was higher than that of the untrained teachers. Graduates and diploma teachers performed better than their untrained counterparts.
Performance in the use of instructional resources by all the categories of teachers revealed that only the graduates performed above average. They tended to use varieties of resource materials primarily because they pointed out that the Integrated English series by K.I.E was inadequate in one way or the other. Untrained and diploma teachers on the other hand performed poorly in this area of competence.

Findings concerning assessment techniques revealed that diploma teachers were more superior. They were followed by graduate and untrained teachers respectively. Overall performance in this area was above average as all the categories scored above the expected average of 18.

5.2.3 Findings Regarding Relationship between Attitudes and Teaching Performance

Findings revealed that there exists a weak positive relationship between teachers’ attitudes towards Integrated English and their teaching performance. This relationship was however found not to be significant at p<.05.

5.3 Conclusions

The conclusions of the study are summarised as follows.

i. Most teachers do not have unfavourable attitudes towards Integrated English in entirety. Negative attitudes only arise due to problems experienced by teachers in certain areas of the subject.

ii. Teachers have favourable attitudes towards the aims and objectives of Integrated English and the student-centred approach.

iii. There exist negative attitudes towards the integrated approach, content of the subject, and instructional materials used in the teaching of Integrated English.
iv. Majority of teachers do not understand the concept of integration. A good number reported they do not integrate yet classroom observation revealed integration.

v. Negative attitudes towards content of the subject are partly due to the wide areas of coverage some of which are irrelevant in the learning of English language.

vi. Problems experienced by teachers regarding teaching and learning resources in the Integrated English contribute to teachers' negative attitudes towards the instructional materials.

vii. Contrary to the unpopular belief that graduate teachers are not well prepared for their teaching role, the findings rated this category of teachers high in terms of their teaching performance. Significant difference exists in performance between graduate teachers, and their diploma and untrained counterparts. Though the diploma teachers did perform well in their teaching, untrained teachers are not adequately capable of handling the Integrated English.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the followings are the suggestions and implications regarding Integrated English:

Teachers are not entirely against the Integrated English. The success of teaching Integrated English requires that serious attention be given to certain areas of the subject. In view of the above, the following are recommended.

1. There should be regular in-service courses initiated to appraise teachers on the innovations in the teaching of Integrated English. During these trainings teachers need to be encouraged to produce materials of their
own in the teaching of Integrated English. Experts in subject integration should do the training.

2. There should be regular formative evaluation of the teachers under the coordination of K.I.E and the Inspectorate division of the Ministry of Education Science and Technology. Peer-supervision is also encouraged so that the teachers can identify their own areas of weaknesses and improve upon them by sharing ideas.

3. Language teacher training should be tailored towards integration so that teachers do not experience problems in the teaching of Integrated English.

4. Untrained teachers should not be allowed to implement the Integrated English, as they are ill prepared to handle it.

5. Curriculum developers should involve more teachers in the development of the curriculum and instructional materials. This should involve seeking the teachers' opinions on the materials most appropriate in the teaching of Integrated English.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

This research was not carried out on a large scale due to limitations. However, it is hoped that this will provoke further research into many areas that were not covered. The following areas are therefore suggested for further research:

1. Since the study was only limited to Rachuonyo District, there is need to carry out a study of this nature in other regions of the country to confirm or dispute the findings in this study.
2. The sample size involved was minimal. A similar study needs to be undertaken elsewhere with a larger sample size to establish whether or not similar results will be obtained.

3. There is the need to investigate the impact of training on the attitudes towards Integrated English and teaching performance in the subject.

4. Part of this study was correlational in nature. There is the need to determine to what extent teachers’ attitudes towards Integrated English affect their teaching performance of the subject.

5. A study should be carried out to establish the pupils’ views and attitudes towards Integrated English.

6. Research should be done to determine whether teachers’ attitude towards Integrated English affects pupils’ performance.
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Introduction
This study seeks to investigate the teaching of Integrated English in Kenyan secondary schools. You are kindly requested to answer the questions below honestly. The information you provide will be treated with strict confidence and will not be used in any way against you.

Instructions
1. This questionnaire is divided into two parts.
   Section A requires your background information.
   Section B seeks your opinion towards the integrated English.
2. You are required to answer all sections and questions by putting a tick (✓) where appropriate.
3. There are no correct or wrong answers.

Section A
1. Name of your school  
2. Academic qualification  
   KJSE ( )  
   KCSE ( )  
   KACE ( )
   KCE ( )  
   EAACE ( )  
   Graduate ( )  
   State degree  
   Other (specify)  
3a. Are you a professionally trained teacher?  
   Yes ( )  
   No ( )
3b. If yes what is your professional qualification?  
   SI ( )  
   Diploma ( )  
   B.Ed ( )  
   Other (specify)  
4. For how long have you been teaching at the secondary school level?  
   ___ Years  
5. Which two subjects in the curriculum did you specialise to teach? (Write major one first)  
   a)  
   b)  
### SECTION B

Kindly respond to the following statements by putting a tick (✓) against one of the following statements as appropriate to you.

**KEY:** SA-Strongly agrees  
A-Agree  
N-Neutral  
D-Disagree  
SD-Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Integrated English is easy to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The objectives of Integrated English are clear to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content area of Integrated English is too wide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Materials for teaching Integrated English are easy to obtain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To teach Integrated English effectively, one has to use techniques in which pupils do much work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Integrated English makes unnecessary demands on teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The aims and objectives of the Integrated English are irrelevant to the needs of education in Kenya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Content areas of Integrated English are equally balanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My training did not prepare me well to teach Integrated English Course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pupils are not fully exposed to literary texts under the Integrated English course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students learn best when taught Integrated English using the lecture method.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I prefer teaching English and literature separately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The objectives of Integrated English are attainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Some content areas of Integrated English are too difficult to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Prescribed texts on Integrated English contradict the concept of integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Classroom discussion takes too much time in the teaching and learning of Integrated English Course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Integrated English is irrelevant to the needs of learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Content of literature and English language are different hence the need for separation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It is easy to prepare instructional materials for teaching Integrated English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A great deal of practical work is essential in teaching Integrated English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 2

## Teacher Performance Observation Schedule

### Directions:

1. This instrument is designed for assessing the teaching performance of Integrated English language teachers. It covers six main areas and a total of 40 performance indicators.

2. In using the instrument, the following steps are followed.
   - **Step 1**: Use a copy of the instrument for each observation.
   - **Step 2**: Briefly describe in writing on the space provided under each performance indicator, exactly what was observed that demonstrates each performance indicator.
   - **Step 3**: Rate the performance of teachers on each five point scale as given on the instrument. Put a tick (✓) on the appropriate column to indicate the rating.

### KEY:

- **Va**: Very adequate
- **Ad**: Adequate
- **Av**: Average
- **In**: Inadequate
- **Vi**: Very inadequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. SCHEME OF WORK</th>
<th>Va</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Vi</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Correspondence of scheme of work with the syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Inclusion of relevant details (aims, content, activities, resources and evaluation procedures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Content coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Appropriateness of learning activities and content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Adequacy and usefulness of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. LESSON PLAN</th>
<th>Va</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Vi</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Inclusion of clear and appropriate topic for the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Correspondence of instructional objectives to the aim in the scheme of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Statement of instructional objectives in terms of learners' observable behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Correspondence of content and learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Specification of appropriate teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Specification of appropriate resources and teaching aids for the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Specification of appropriate assessment procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. PROFICIENCY IN CONTENT

| 3.1 Teacher's knowledge and understanding of all the content relevant to the lesson |
| 3.2 Ability to handle appropriately normal student questions on the topic |
| 3.3 Ability to link lesson content to previous lessons content and daily experience |
| 3.4 Ability to apply knowledge appropriately as demanded by the classroom situation. |
| 3.5 Ability to decide on appropriate methods based on the nature of content. |
| 3.6 Mastery of content |
| 3.7 Learner motivation during the classroom. |

### 4. EFFECTIVE USE OF METHODS

| 4.1 Use of method(s) which motivate students to find for themselves information, applications, links etc |
| 4.2 Students direct participation by way of role-play, discussions project work, group work, dramatisation, or fieldwork. |
| 4.3 Use of a method(s) to encourage and facilitate the development of valuing skills |
| 4.4 Ability to vary the kind of activity during the lesson |
| 4.5 Ability to switch or combine sensory channels when using such transmission methods as lecture, story telling, text reading, note taking dramatisation, Audio visual presentation etc |
| 4.6 Ability to use and vary verbal reinforces to encourage student participation. |
| 4.7 Ability to use non-verbal reinforces such as gestures, posture and facial expression effectively |
| 4.8 General appropriateness of the method(s) chosen and used for this particular lesson |

**5. USE OF RESOURCES**

| 5.1 Teacher's ability to use planned resources effectively |
| 5.2 Ability to use the chalkboard effectively and systematically |
| 5.3 Use of text books effectively |
| 5.4 Use of audio-visual presentations effectively for better learning and without waste of time |
| 5.5 Efforts to enrich lesson by use of self made teaching aids from locally available materials |
| 5.6 Readiness and ability to effectively use the local environment as a resource for teaching |
| 5.7 Students participation in the preparation and use of teaching aids |

**6. USE OF ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES**

| 6.1 Use of appropriate questioning techniques to gauge whether the class is catching on |
| 6.2 Monitoring of class performance and individual performance by passing from desk to desk |
| 6.3 Readiness to classify or do remedial teaching where students show lack of grasp |
| 6.4 Giving enough class work or home work at the end of the lesson |
| 6.5 Giving feedback to students about their performance by way of correcting their assignments |
| 6.6 Ability to keep adequate record of continuous assessment results of students. |
APPENDIX 3

Interview Schedule for Teachers

1a) School_________________  b) School level_________________

2a. State your academic qualifications_________________________

  b. State your professional qualifications_______________________

3. What do you understand by the concept 'integration' as used in the
   Integrated English Course?

4. In your content teaching of Integrated English Course, do you integrate?
   a) Literature and Language Yes ( )  No ( )
   b) Within literary genres Yes ( )  No ( )
   c) Within skills of English Yes ( )  No ( )

5. If your answer in 4a is No, how many of each do you teach per week?
   English language ( ) lessons per week.
   Literature ( ) lessons per week.

6. Do you feel motivated to continue teaching English in an integrated manner?
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   What are the reasons for your answer?

7. What are your opinions about the need and relevance of Integrated English
   Course in Kenyan secondary schools?

8. Did your training prepare you well enough for the teaching of integrated
   English?
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   If your answer is No, what was lacking in the training?

9. What recommendations would you make for the effective teaching of
   Integrated English Course?

10. Are there any advantages of integrated English over the teaching of English
    and Literature as different subjects?  Yes ( )  No ( )
# APPENDIX 4

## Critical Values of the t-Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.02</th>
<th>0.01</th>
<th>0.005</th>
<th>0.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.078</td>
<td>6.314</td>
<td>12.706</td>
<td>31.821</td>
<td>63.657</td>
<td>126.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.886</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>4.303</td>
<td>6.966</td>
<td>9.925</td>
<td>31.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>4.541</td>
<td>5.841</td>
<td>12.941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>3.747</td>
<td>4.604</td>
<td>8.610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>4.032</td>
<td>6.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>3.707</td>
<td>5.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>2.998</td>
<td>3.499</td>
<td>5.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>5.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>2.821</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>4.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>2.764</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>4.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>2.718</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>2.179</td>
<td>2.681</td>
<td>3.055</td>
<td>4.318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>3.012</td>
<td>4.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>2.624</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>1.753</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>4.073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>4.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>2.567</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>3.965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>2.539</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>3.883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>2.528</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>3.850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>2.518</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>3.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>3.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>2.787</td>
<td>3.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>2.779</td>
<td>3.707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>3.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.704</td>
<td>3.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.390</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>3.460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>3.373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>1.960</td>
<td>2.326</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td>3.291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: From Table C.3, of Hinkle (1998).
# APPENDIX 5

## Critical Values of the Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of significance for one-tailed</th>
<th>Level of significance for two-tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: From Table C.7, of Hinkle (1998).