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ABSTRACT

This study analyzed the whole program of integrated English curriculum since its inception to its current state and practice in secondary schools. The specific objectives of the study were to: Find out the justification for initiation and introduction of secondary integrated English curriculum; Analyze the implementation process of secondary integrated English curriculum.; Find out the challenges facing effective implementation of the integrated English curriculum; and to explore how implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum can be improved. The study mainly used a qualitative approach in the form of a case study design and it employed questionnaire, interview and observation instruments to collect data from 101 teachers of integrated English and 20 head teachers in Nairobi North District area. Also, three heads of English – one from each of three Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC) were interviewed. The researcher organized raw data collected from questionnaires, interview and observation schedules into significant patterns so as to easily interpret and understand the essence of the data. It was realized from the study that integrated English curriculum was introduced to enable teachers use integration as a teaching approach across the two disciplines and between and/or among their constituent parts. Despite this good intention, it was found that 57.4 % of the teachers of integrated English did not undergo any type of in-service training before they started the actual teaching of integrated English curriculum. Therefore, they started teaching the curriculum without proper understanding as regards the implementation of integrated English curriculum. Consequently, 55.5 % of teachers of integrated English and 80 % of their head teachers faced difficulties in the process of implementing integrated English curriculum. Due to these difficulties that they faced, most of the concerned teachers (86.1 %) taught English language and Literature as separate subjects. They did not exploit the complementary relationship between the two subjects to teach the integrated English curriculum. Even in instances where integration was attempted, there was no meaningful and significant integration between the teaching of English language and Literature. The study concluded that there has been no effective implementation of integrated English innovation in Nairobi North District as was/is intended by the curriculum developers. To ensure effective implementation of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools, the study recommends that proper and continuing professional support in the form of in-service training and other activities on the implementation of integrated English curriculum should be conducted by experts. This will assist teachers and their head teachers to acquire and develop necessary skills on how to integrate English language and Literature. Equally, the study recommends that pre-service training in colleges and universities should be reformed and an integrated approach adopted. This way, teachers-to-be will be familiarized with the integrated approach and their competence in handling integration developed. The teachers-to-be will eventually develop great interest in the approach and this will impact positively on their teaching and evaluation once they get to the field. It is also recommended by this study that adequate teaching and learning resources should be provided to teachers such that they can teach and evaluate integrated English as expected.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter covers the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose, of the study, specific objectives of the study, research questions, assumptions of the study, significance of the study, delimitations and limitations of the study, theoretical model of the process for curriculum innovation and operational definitions of key terms.

1.1 Background to the Study

This section deals with the following sub-sections: Role and place of English language in Kenya, curriculum innovation in Kenya, and general objectives of the integrated English (2002) syllabus.

1.1.1 The Role and Place of English Language in Kenya

English language plays a very significant role in Kenya. It is the official medium of instruction in all school subjects (starting from Standard 4) except for other languages such as Kiswahili, French and German. This means that English language is a service subject across the curriculum and also the language of examinations. English language is also used in the judiciary, commerce and in parliament (Waithaka, 1993; Sereti, 1993; Teyle and Okatch, 1991; Republic of Kenya (RoK), 1964). Further, English language is a language of regional communication, used in East African regional forums. The language is also one of the leading media for communication in international conferences and meetings (Okwara, Shiundu and Indoshi, 2009). The importance of English language in the Kenyan school curriculum cannot therefore be overstated.

Due to the importance and role that English language plays in education in Kenya, the Ministry of Education (MoE) places a lot of emphasis on the development of the subject. The Ministry
also has tasked teachers of English language with the responsibility of helping the learners to be able to express themselves effectively in both oral and written work (Sereti, 1993).

1.1.2 Curriculum Innovation in Kenya

Curriculum is by nature very dynamic and it is usually necessary to change it according to the ever-changing needs of the society, new knowledge and new ways of organising the curriculum [Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), 1999]. To accommodate the dynamism of any society, the school curriculum should be reviewed from time to time to take into account any emerging concerns, changes and challenges (Abagi, et al., 2000; and Kiminza, 2000). Consequently, a number of curriculum innovations have been mounted by the government of Kenya since independence. The rationale for most of the curricula innovations has been to improve the value of the curricula offered in schools. Examples of curricula innovations that have been implemented in Kenya include the following:

i) School Mathematics of East Africa (SMEA)

The School Mathematics of East Africa (SMEA) is an adaptation of the Schools Mathematics Project (SMP). The Schools Mathematics Project is a developer of mathematics textbooks for secondary schools, based in Southampton in the UK. This innovation began as a research project inspired by a 1961 conference chaired by Bryan Thwaites at the University of Southampton, which itself was precipitated by calls to reform mathematics teaching in the wake of the Sputnik launch by the Soviet Union. SMEA filtered into several high-status schools in East Africa after the 1961 conference (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/School_Mathematics_Project).

Lillis (1985) says that SMEA was a materials-development and teacher-education in-service project with a number of identifiable phases. It began in 1963, when expatriate teachers at
three Kenyan (and one Ugandan) schools adopted SMP materials for use in their classrooms. As these materials were disseminated, a team of expatriate teachers-writers informally undertook to adapt them, under copyright from SMP and edited by SMP in the United Kingdom, in order to create materials with local contextual and linguistic modifications.

The first phase of materials development lasted until 1968 and produced the first draft of materials in a 4-year course for secondary schools known as the School Mathematics of East Africa (SMEA). The introduction of SMEA in a growing number of schools in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania during this period was supported by in-service training of teachers in Kenya by SMP curriculum developers and teachers from schools that were using SMP. The SMP curriculum developers and teachers from schools that were using SMP were United Kingdom based. Thus, SMEA was an extension of the United Kingdom project in East Africa.

The second phase (development and wider diffusion of materials to a greater number of schools) took place at the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) from 1968 – 1970. During this phase, the East Africa-based team of expatriate teachers-writers formally revised the first drafts as a 4-year course that became SMEA. The second phase was supported by an in-service program in Kenya, again by SMP curriculum developers and United Kingdom-based teachers from schools using SMP.

The third phase of the project, from 1970-81, was the “mass dissemination” phase, supported by a wide-scale in-service training program controlled by the Kenya Ministry of Education with resounding support from the British Council, Overseas Development Administration, and Centre for Renewal of Educational Development Overseas (CREDO).
In 1970 (7 years after the start of the SMEA), the Ministry of Education decided to implement modern mathematics nationwide at the primary school level, commencing January 1971 (KIE, 1977). Already in existence at the KIE was the Kenya Primary Mathematics (KPM), a materials development and in-service training program for the 7-year primary school modern mathematics course. Much of the evidence suggests that modern mathematics was inadequately piloted, and most of the teachers (who were predominantly African at this level) had not sufficiently mastered the content and concepts to teach modern mathematics to primary school pupils.

The inevitable consequences of the 1970 decision to adopt modern mathematics at the primary school level for all of Kenya was the enforced nationwide adoption of modern mathematics at the secondary school level commencing with Form 1 in January 1978. Thus, by December 1981, it was mandatory for all Kenyan schools to teach all pupils modern mathematics. This mass-dissemination phase was supported by the third phase of materials development at the KIE, as well as by a wide in-service training program.

The in-service training program, however, was deficient on two scores. First, it concentrated on the content rather than the methodologies of modern mathematics and, even then, did not reach the teachers most in need of in-service training in the majority of schools (KIE, 1978). Second, and equally important, the pre-service program failed to transmit the necessary methodologies for primary or secondary school. The decision to abolish modern mathematics in January 1981 thus reflected a public crisis of confidence in modern mathematics education. Neither pupils nor teachers had mastered the necessary concepts and methodologies.

ii) Africanization of the Literature Curriculum

The Africanization of the Literature curriculum began as an attempt to change the existing curriculum (Lillis, 1985). Its ultimate targets were the contexts in which the curriculum was set,
which included the institutional and decision-making contexts of the school system as well as the wider Kenyan value system. Lillis (1985) further points out that the Literature curriculum immediately after independence was rife with urban assumptions and controlled by the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate.

The syllabus, as was manifested in the established set of books from which teachers could select, was predominantly European, chiefly English Literature. In 1974-76, members of the Department of Literature at the University of Nairobi (whose personnel and syllabi had become Africanized in the late 1960s and early 1970s) made a dramatic and radical call for revision of Literature to Africanize the content and control of curriculum development. In essence, they attacked the examination formats that prescribed choice of books, and they sought to replace Eurocentric content with Afrocentric texts. Ngugi wa Thiongo, a leader of this movement, attacked the existing curriculum as a form of “cultural genocide” that perpetuated intellectual dependency on the West (Lillis, 1986). He proposed a new sequence with primacy given to African and other Third World Literature. Many of provisions of this movement were later adopted.

iii) The 8-4-4 System of Education

The 8-4-4 system of education is a product of the Presidential Working Party on the Second University in Kenya (Abagi et al, 2000; RoK, 1981). The Working Party recommended, among other things, the major change to the 8-4-4 system of education.

According to the Ministry of Education (1984), the essential elements of the new system were: In the idea of the structure which was to have 8 years of primary, 4 years of secondary and a minimum of 4 years University education; and in the improvement of curriculum content with greater orientation towards technical education and the movement from education being examination centred to being practical oriented.
The old structure was 7 years primary, 4 years secondary, 2 years “A” level (high school) and a minimum of 3 years University education. Little technical education was offered at primary, secondary and higher levels and the measure of success at each of these levels was on the basis of examinations which took little or no consideration of a child’s progressive growth at school. The system relied mainly on rote learning and memorization. The new system (which was implemented in 1985) was, therefore, intended to make education and training more practically oriented.

The rationale for the introduction of the 8-4-4 system of education in Kenya, according to the Ministry of Education (1984), was as follows:

1. Challenge for National Development - The concept of 8-4-4 was aimed at responding to the challenge of national development and the participation of the youth in development. The previous system had failed to respond adequately to the needs of the country and its people.

2. Need for a more relevant Curriculum - The new system was meant to provide practical oriented curriculum that would offer a wide-range of employment opportunities.

3. Equitable Distribution of Education Resources - The 8-4-4 system was to ensure that there were equal opportunities to all students regardless of their place of origin, creed, or race by providing equitable distribution of resources.

4. Technical and Vocational Training - The 8-4-4 system, with its emphasis on technical and vocational education, was meant to ensure that the students graduating at every level had some scientific and practical knowledge that could be utilized for either self-employment, salaried employment or for further training.
5. Assessment and Evaluation - In the previous system, learners’ achievements were assessed by one single examination at the end of the course. The 8-4-4 system was to lay emphasis on continuous assessment as an integral part of evaluating students’ abilities and achievements. This meant that the students’ future was to be determined by both continuous assessment as well as the final examination.

6. Increased Opportunities for further Training - The main objective of the post primary technical education and training was that pupils who could not proceed to secondary schools could enter the Craft Training Centres and could then proceed to post secondary technical training institutions for Diploma and Higher Diploma courses. Increase in the opportunities for further training would ensure that funds invested in education are not lost through dropouts who have neither useful education nor the opportunities to improve on what has already been gained. The scientific and technological education that was to be provided to the majority of Kenyans at the higher level was intended to produce highly skilled and specialized manpower in such areas as engineering, agriculture, technology, building construction and other areas that were at that time dominated by experts from other countries.

7. Education for National Unity - The 8-4-4 was supposed to foster a sense of nationhood among young people by promoting positive attitudes of mutual respect which would enable them to live in harmony and to make a positive contribution to society.

Among the weaknesses of the 8-4-4 structure as identified by the Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya (RoK, 1999:313) include:

1. Lack of incorporation of the pre-school circle as part and parcel of the structure;
2. The loss of two years of A- level which was said to rob the students of the opportunity to mature before entering universities;
3. The structure lacks open-door opportunities for the learners to pursue further education towards life-long learning;

4. The structure is characterized by unhealthy competition and over-emphasis on examinations;

5. The mismatch between the curriculum content and the time allowed within each level of the structure which leads to stretching time to evenings, weekends and school holidays;

6. The hurried implementation without any prior consultations with, and preparation of, key stakeholders especially teachers and parents; and

7. Poor linkages between the curriculum design at secondary and university levels, and lack of appropriate mechanisms for identifying gifted learners and supporting them due to exclusion of opportunity for specialization at primary and secondary levels.

iv) Integrated English Curriculum

The result of the syllabus review of 1984/85 (that resulted in the 8-4-4 system of education) brought about a diversification of the curriculum in schools. Many new subjects were introduced, others gained new names and others underwent changes in their content and objectives. Amongst the subjects affected was the secondary school English language curriculum. English language was integrated with Literature and the resulting subject was renamed integrated English. As a result of these changes, an integrated course of English language and Literature was introduced into the secondary schools in 1986 [Muutu, 1993; Ministry of Education (MoE), 1984]. Otherwise, in the previous system of education, English language and Literature were taught separately and not necessarily by the same teacher. In fact, Literature in English fell under Group 2 (Humanities) while English language was classified on its own as Group 1 (Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC), 1986).
The integration of English language and Literature in its broad sense meant that the same teacher would teach the two subjects as one subject: English (KIE, 1987). Thus, the teacher of English was expected to have a sound command of the English language as well as possess sufficient understanding, knowledge and skills in Literature. Despite this requirement and expectation that the teachers teach English language and Literature as one subject – English, the two subjects continued to be examined separately. This practice worked against the demand to teach the two subjects in an integrated manner.

The 8-4-4 curriculum was revised in 1992 and 1995 (MoE, 2010 and Kiminza, 2000). The 1992 revision entailed re-organization of subject content across subjects and levels, revision of some examination requirements and reduction of some content in some subjects. In its evaluation of the secondary curriculum in 1995, KIE recommended separation of English language and Literature, arguing that the combination of the two subjects tended to seriously overshadow English language. The Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya (RoK, 1999) also recommended that the integration of the two subjects be stopped.

Despite the recommendation that integration be done away with, the 2002 English syllabus has retained integration. The current secondary English curriculum, in its re-organized form, has adopted an integrated approach not only to teaching, but also to the assessment of English language and Literature (KIE, 2002). This re-organization is meant to improve the standards of teaching and performance in English (MoE, 2006; KIE, 2002). At this point, it is important to note that performance in integrated English has been consistently below average, contrary to expectations, at both the national and provincial levels since 1989 when the first 8-4-4 examinations were conducted. The national mean percentage marks ranged between 24.50 and 42.74 between 1989 and 2010 (see Appendix VIII).
According to the Ministry of Education (2006), the re-organized and strengthened secondary English curriculum is supposed to be taught through the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and grammar. The content for language and that of the various genres of Literature (poetry, drama, short stories and novels) is, therefore, covered under these skills. This means that the teacher is expected to focus on both the skill and the content. For example, the teacher is required to use content from oral Literature and poetry to teach the four English language skills.

Further, according to the Ministry of Education (2006), the teacher is also expected to teach the features and the content of oral Literature and poetry. By doing this, oral Literature and poetry are taught in a natural context, thus making learning more meaningful and interesting. However, since the two genres call for reading, they are also taught under the reading skill.

Grammar is another area that has been re-organized such that parts of speech, phrases, clauses, and sentences are the broad areas under which grammar content will be taught (MoE, 2006). This content is presented in a spiral approach so that each of the areas is taught from Form One to Form Four but the level of difficulty of the content varies according to the class level.

Written Literature should be covered under the reading skill. The learner should be introduced to the reading skills: silent reading, interpretive reading, critical reading and study reading, among others taught (MoE, 2006). According to the MoE, these skills prepare the learner for intensive reading through which the learner will be expected to do a critical analysis of the novels, plays, short stories and poems.

The secondary English curriculum is currently organized in such a way that none of the language skills should be taught or assessed in isolation (MoE, 2006). The teacher should,
therefore, as much as possible integrate the teaching and assessment of the skills. This will help avoid segmentation of the teaching and assessment of the individual skills and will make the learning of the skills complementary. For example, while teaching reading, the teacher may reinforce the mastery of grammar by pointing out instances of grammatical items already taught.

The teacher may also generate writing tasks and debates from the reading materials. The teacher can also use a novel, which is being studied under intensive reading to generate a descriptive essay for the teaching or assessment of writing skills. This will not only make the teaching or assessment of the writing skill more meaningful but will also provide the learner with more opportunities to interact with the literary text and consequently enhance their understanding of the text (KIE, 2002). Kenya Institute of Education recommends that grammar should also be taught using this integrated approach. Content drawn from literary and non-literary materials should be used either to introduce a grammatical concept or to reinforce the learner’s understanding of the concept.

The Ministry of Education (2006) points out that integration is based on the premise that good mastery of language enhances effective appreciation of literary material. On the other hand, it points out that literary material provides a natural context for teaching of language. This means that the methods used in the teaching/learning and assessment of English language and literature should facilitate integration. The teacher should, therefore, endeavour to understand the integrated approach.

According to KNEC (2006), major changes have been introduced in secondary English examination format. It now adopts an integrated approach, where English language is tested together with Literature. Previously, the two were tested separately, with language being tested in papers One and Two; and Literature in Paper Three. In the new format, English
Paper One examines functional skills - application of language in daily life (see Appendix V); while Paper Two contains comprehension, literary appreciation and grammar (see Appendix VI). Paper Three assesses writing through creative composition and composition based on set Literature books (see Appendix VII).

Previously, Paper One was on composition; Paper Two grammar and Paper Three Literature. The Literature paper comprised oral Literature, poetry and set literary books. But now these (Composition, Grammar and Literature) have been integrated and are being tested together in all the three papers (see Appendices V, VI and VII). For example, functional skills tested in Paper One are about prose; literary appreciation in Paper Two is about writing techniques used in writing Literature; and so is Paper Three’s creative composition based on set texts.


According to the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education Regulations and Syllabuses 2006-2007 (KNEC, 2005:6), at the end of the course, the learner should be able to: Listen attentively for comprehension and respond appropriately; Use listening skills to infer and interpret meaning correctly from spoken discourse; Listen and process information from a variety of sources; Speak accurately/fluently, confidently and appropriately in a variety of contexts; Use non-verbal cues effectively in speaking; Read fluently and efficiently; Appreciate the importance of reading for a variety of purposes; Develop a life-long interest in reading on a wide range of subjects; Read and comprehend literary materials; Read and analyze literary works from Kenya, East Africa, Africa and the rest of the world, and relate to the experiences in these works and appreciate and respect own as well as other people’s culture.

Other general objectives of the integrated English (2002) Syllabus include the following: Make an efficient use of a range of sources of information including libraries, dictionaries,
encyclopaedias and the internet; Use correct spelling, punctuation and paragraphing; Use a variety of sentence structure and vocabulary correctly; Communicate appropriately in functional and creative writing; Write neatly, legibly and effectively; Use correct grammatical and idiomatic forms of English; Think creatively and critically; Appreciate the special way literary writers use language; and Appreciate the universal human values contained in the literary works.

The 20 general objectives for the teaching of secondary integrated English specify the knowledge, skills and attitudes that the learner is expected to achieve at the end of Form Four (MOE, 2006). It is important to note here that listening and speaking skills are not assessed in KNEC examinations and yet development of English language and Literature depends heavily on the two skills. This is a serious mistake that causes a negative backwash effect on the teaching and development of these skills.

The stated objectives in the 2002 integrated English syllabus can only be achieved if the teachers of secondary integrated English have a good masterly of English language and Literature and their constituent parts, and adequate knowledge and skills on how to teach and assess in an integrated manner. The current study was meant to critically analyze the whole program of integrated English curriculum since its inception to its current state and practice in secondary schools, and particularly its implementation in public secondary schools in Nairobi North District.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Since independence, many African states have made major changes in their curricula so as to improve the quality of education and educational outcomes. However, some of the curriculum changes have happened in a haphazard manner, failing to bring about the much desired improvement. Instead, some of them have created more problems for teachers,
students and curriculum developers (Carless, 2009; Fernandez, 2007 and Shiundu and Omulando, 1992).

About 10 curriculum reviews by special commissions and working parties have been undertaken in Kenya since independence (Abagi et al., 2000). In line with these reviews, in 1986, Kenya adopted the 8-4-4 structure of education (as compared with the previous structure of 7-4-2-3) with its attendant broad-based curriculum at the secondary school level. The curriculum review of 1984/85 brought about a diversification of the curriculum in schools. Many new subjects were introduced, others gained new names and others underwent changes in their content and objectives. Amongst the affected subjects was the secondary school English curriculum (Muutu, 1993; MoE, 1984). English language was integrated with Literature and renamed English. The integrated English course was introduced into the secondary schools in 1986 for the purpose of improving teaching and performance in English (Muutu, 1993; MoE, 1984).

Despite this innovation, performance in English has not improved as was expected. In fact, the overall provincial and national KCSE mean grades in the subject between 1989 and 2010 show that performance has been consistently poor (see Appendix VIII). Over time, calls have been made to separate English language and Literature into two distinct subjects as was the case before they were integrated (RoK, 1999; KIE, 1995). Despite these calls and the fact that the innovation has not produced the intended results, it is surprising that integration has been retained in the current syllabus and even strengthened in terms of both teaching and assessment (MoE, 2006 and KIE, 2002).
Due to the fact that there is no proper analysis of the integrated English curriculum since its inception in 1984/85 to its re-launch in the year 2006, and to its current status, this study is therefore necessary and timely.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The main purpose of this study was to critically analyze the introduction and implementation of the secondary integrated English curriculum right from its first phase (1984/85-2001) to its now second phase (2002 to date).

1.4 Specific Objectives of the Study
The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Find out the justification for initiation and introduction of secondary integrated English curriculum.
2. Analyze the implementation process of secondary integrated English curriculum.
3. Find out the challenges facing effective implementation of the integrated English curriculum.
4. To explore how implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum can be improved.

1.5 Research Questions
The current study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What was the rationale for the introduction of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools?
2. How was integrated English curriculum introduced in Kenya?
3. What are the teachers’ reactions regarding the need for the secondary integrated English curriculum?
4. To what extent are teachers clear about the objectives of the integrated English curriculum and how to achieve them?
5. How is integrated English curriculum being implemented in the secondary schools?
6. What challenges are encountered by teachers and Government agencies in the process of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum?

7. How do teachers and Government agencies deal with the challenges.

1.6 Assumptions of the Study

The study made the following assumptions:

1. Teachers of English in public secondary schools in Nairobi North District were teaching and assessing students according to the demands of the 2002 integrated English curriculum syllabus.

2. Respondents willingly and truthfully responded to the demands of the study.

3. Head teachers and heads of English had necessary knowledge concerning the teaching and assessment of integrated English curriculum.

4. Teachers and the government agencies face challenges in the implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The study will contribute to the understanding of theory and practice of the integrated English curriculum, particularly at the secondary school level. It is hoped that practicing teachers, teacher educators and educational administrators, who will manage to read on the findings and recommendations of this study, will gain vital information regarding the teaching and assessment methods, and related activities including practical limitations of each of them. In the end, they may refine their ideas about curriculum integration through developing a solid understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of integration and as a result, improving practice in an informed way.

Since there are few studies on the teaching of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya, the study will fill this gap by adding to the existing body of knowledge in the area of English education and instruction in general. The study, therefore, will provide
policy makers, educationists, and educational researchers with general information on the formulation and implementation of education innovations. The study has the potential to trigger other researches in Kenya on the concept of integration.

Curriculum developers, and in particular English subject panelists, will also benefit from the results of this study. The results may give them some direction in coming up with more adequate resources such as syllabuses, teachers’ guides and textbooks. Up-to-date resources will then be written with the concept of integration in mind and this will guide the teachers of secondary integrated English in carrying out their classroom practice as required.

Quality Assurance and Standards Officers, and tutors in the resource centres may also benefit from this research. Once they know the teachers’ challenges and barriers in the teaching of secondary integrated English curriculum, they may design adequate in-service training courses, which will help to alleviate the teachers’ challenges and problems.

The results of this study, it is hoped, may enable teachers of secondary integrated English to identify and correct some of the challenges faced in the teaching and assessment of the curriculum. Consequently, quality teaching and assessment of integrated English will be ensured.

1.8 Delimitations and Limitations of the Study
For the purpose of manageability, the study was delimited to Nairobi County and therefore, the state of affairs regarding the teaching and assessment of secondary integrated English in the 46 counties in Kenya was not dealt with. Even in Nairobi County, only public secondary schools in Nairobi North District were used in the study. Nairobi County was used in the study due to the fact that it houses KIE which is responsible for initiation, development, diffusion and implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum in the country.
Consequently, it was hoped that there would be a strong guidance and interaction between KIE staff and the teachers of integrated English in Nairobi County.

The study was also delimited to the integration of English language and Literature, and integration between and among their constituent parts. Integration in other subjects such as Business Studies, Physical Sciences and Kiswahili was not the concern of this study. The study was only concerned with teachers of integrated English in public secondary schools in Nairobi North District of Nairobi County.

Generally, lack of data related to this study and in particular data related to performance in English language and Literature as distinct subjects before integration was a limitation. KNEC officials claimed that the records were destroyed during the Nairobi 7th August, 1998 bomb blast in Nairobi by the Al Qaeda terrorists. Equally, schools under study did not have data for the period when the two subjects were taught as separate entities in Kenya.

Attitudes of the respondents might have affected the quality/accuracy of the study. Respondents, who had a positive response and attitudes to the study, enabled the researcher to carry out the research much more easily. The opposite was true with those who displayed a negative attitude and lack of interest in the study.

Findings of this study only apply to Nairobi North District public secondary schools and not necessarily to all the secondary schools in the whole County or the whole of Kenya.
1.9 Theoretical Model of the Process for Curriculum Innovation

This study was guided by Clark and Guba’s (1967) model for curriculum innovation (see Figure 1.1). In their model, Clark and Guba attempt to link the processes of research, development, diffusion and adoption into a practical strategy. In this model, curriculum innovation is described as a four-stage process as follows:

1. The initiation of the innovation (the decision-making process inside and/or outside the educational system) by which it is decided that a particular innovation in the curriculum is required.

2. The development of the proposed new curriculum.

3. The diffusion of knowledge and understanding about the developed curriculum beyond the institution concerned with the development stage.

4. The implementation of the developed curriculum in the schools.

According to Kelly (2007), diffusion can be conceived as the process by which a ‘package’ of understanding about a curriculum (or part of a curriculum) is passed from a curriculum development centre (such as KIE) to the schools in which it is to be put into practice as a teaching and learning activity i.e. implemented. Before the curriculum can be implemented, the decision to adopt it has to be made. This may involve an individual teacher, a committee of administrators, or a combination of these and, almost inevitably, students when, for example, they select to take a new type of course.

Adoption is best conceived as the inter-phase between diffusion and implementation, intimately and diversely connecting the two, rather than a separate entity as Clark and Guba (1967) and other writers depict it, or merely as the product of individual mental processes. This latter is the view of, for example, Rogers (1962), who defines adoption as the mental process through which an individual passes from first hearing about an innovation to final
adoption. Rogers says that diffusion occurs among persons while adoption is an individual matter.

In the implementation stage, further processes involving teachers and curriculum materials will operate, again invariably to modify the innovation, to form the eventual input into the student. The results of this implementation can be measured in terms of the output of the student as, for instance, in levels of achievement. Hence, the levels of achievement will be products of the influence of perception, motivation, ability, and other characteristics of the student on the implementation input.

Kelly (2007) points out that Clark and Guba’s model has depicted the stages of curriculum innovation in a linear fashion. In practice, however, the stages are related in a much more complex way. For example, the development stage has, within it, aspects of diffusion and implementation in relation to schools that take part in the trials. Furthermore, adoption will not necessarily occur in all schools at the same time. This means that diffusion can overlap implementation.

This situation is even more complex because the process of curriculum innovation is an ongoing exercise. During curriculum innovation, knowledge in its broadest sense (including understanding and attitudes as well as information) passes from various original sources e.g. experts and scholars, and is translated into books, teaching procedures, examinations, and so on, and influenced by various materials, social and psychological factors to form a complex input to the student coming both from inside and outside educational institutions. The components of this mechanism are many and vary with the particular curriculum and social context under consideration (Kelly, 2007).
Figure 1.1: Theoretical Model of the Process of Curriculum Innovation

The preceding model helps to illuminate some aspects of the implementation of the integrated English curriculum and provides a framework for understanding and analyzing the innovation under study. In sum, it shows that a number of factors must interact in a dynamic way if effective implementation of integrated English curriculum is to be properly carried out.

**Figure 1.2 Conceptual Framework Diagram**

![Conceptual Framework Diagram](image)

- **Teacher related variables:**
  - Level of professional training
  - Teaching experience
  - Attitudes
  - Teacher – teacher relationships

- **Variables related to initiation and development of the innovation:**
  - Need
  - Clarity
  - Complexity

- **Variables related to the adoption/implementation process:**
  - Role of head teacher
  - Staff training
  - Availability of materials
  - Time Allocated

- **Variables related to diffusion of innovation:**
  - Role of Government agencies:
    1. KIE
    2. MOE
    3. KNEC

**Source:** Researcher

Figure 1.2 shows variables which influence the implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum. Variables related to the innovation, its diffusion and the adoption process, and those variables related to the teachers (who are to implement the innovation) interact in a way that directly influences the implementation of secondary integrated English
curriculum. Fullan (2001) points out that educational change is a dynamic process involving many interacting variables. He states that if any one or more variables are working against implementation, the process will be less effective. According to him, the more factors supporting implementation, the more change in practice will be accomplished.

1.10 Operational Definition of Key Terms

**Adoption:** Refers to the inter-phase between diffusion and implementation, intimately and diversely connecting the two.

**Curriculum Innovation:** Refers to the shift from teaching and assessing English language and Literature as separate entities to teaching and assessing them in an integrated manner as one subject- English.

**Curriculum:** Refers to the whole body of learning experiences and content offered in the secondary integrated English course.

**Implementation:** Refers to putting of secondary integrated English innovation into practice at the classroom level.

**Integrated English Approach:** Refers to the kind of teaching whereby English language and Literature are taught as one subject in a way that each is used to complement the other contextually as well as functionally.

**Integrated English Curriculum:** Refers to the syllabus that has integrated English language and Literature (that is meant to facilitate and enhance teaching/learning and assessment across the two areas).
Integration: Refers to the treatment of all English language and Literature skills as closely inter-related and mutually depending and benefiting from each other.

Needs Assessment: Refers to the determination, as honestly and as precisely as possible, of that which needs improvement in a curriculum.

Staff Training: Refers to a process through which teachers of integrated English are enabled to develop and share their knowledge, understanding and pedagogical skills.

1.11 Organization of the Thesis

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One is an introductory chapter which deals with the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose and specific objectives of the study, research questions, assumptions of the study, significance of the study, delimitations and limitations of the study, theoretical model of the process for curriculum innovation, and operational definitions of key terms. Chapter Two reviews Literature related to the present study. Chapter Three presents the methodology that was adopted in conducting the research. In Chapter Four, data is presented, analyzed and discussed. Chapter Five presents a summary of research findings, conclusion, recommendations of the study, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction
This chapter presents reviewed literature related to the study. Literature reviewed focused on the following areas: curriculum integration, rationale for curriculum integration, views against curriculum integration, motivation behind integration of English language and Literature, curriculum innovation in Kenya, factors influencing implementation of curriculum innovations, and studies on integration of English language and Literature.

2.1 Curriculum Integration
Curriculum integration has many and varied meanings and definitions. The more common examples describe integrated curriculum as interwoven, connected, thematic, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, correlated, linked, and holistic (Kathy, 2000). Consequently, those involved in education get confused when such terms are used to describe both similar and different practices under the general description of curriculum integration.

Curriculum integration is a student-centred approach in which students are invited to join with their teachers to plan learning experiences that address both student concerns and major social issues (Vars, 1991; Aikin, 1942). It is purposeful planning by teachers, of strategies and learning experiences to facilitate and enhance learning across key learning areas. It also refers to the demonstration by students, of knowledge and understandings, skills, and values and attitudes that transcend individual key learning areas.
Curriculum integration does not, therefore, abandon the skills and understandings that are specific to the individual key learning areas, but it is a means of enhancing those areas that cross key learning areas (Kathy, 2000). This study was meant to find out whether teachers of integrated English used integration as a means of enhancing learning across English language and Literature and among their constituent parts.

According to Brazee and Capelluti (1995), curriculum integration is based on a holistic view of learning and recognizes the necessity for learners to see the bigger picture rather than to require learning to be divided into small pieces. Brazee and Capelluti say that curriculum integration should ignore traditional subject lines while exploring questions that are relevant to students. Brazee and Capelluti, therefore, feel that curriculum integration is a pedagogical approach that is meant to help students build connections within and across disciplines.

In the end, according to Brazee and Capelluti, this approach may help students build a small set of powerful, broadly applicable concepts, abilities and skills. In the current study, the researcher was interested in checking whether the teachers of secondary integrated English curriculum had proper knowledge of the content, pedagogical skills and understanding regarding the teaching of the subject so as to help students build connections within and across English language and Literature.

Humphreys, Post and Ellis (1981) state that an integrated study is one in which learners broadly explore knowledge in various subjects related to certain aspects of their environment. They see links among the humanities, communication arts, natural sciences, mathematics, social studies, music, and arts. Skills and knowledge are
developed and applied in more than one area of study. In keeping with this thematic
definition, Shoemaker (1989:10) defines an integrated curriculum as:

… Education that is organized in such a way that it
cuts across subject-matter lines, bringing together
various aspects of the curriculum into meaningful
association to focus upon broad areas of study. It views
learning and teaching in a holistic way and reflects the
real world, which is interactive.

‘Interdisciplinary curriculum’ is another term that is often used synonymously with
integrated curriculum. It is defined in the *Dictionary of Education* (Good, 1973) as “a
curriculum organization which cuts across subject-matter lines to focus upon
comprehensive life problems or broad areas of study that bring together the various
segments of the curriculum into meaningful association”. The similarity of this
definition and those of integrated curriculum is clear.

Jacobs (1989) defines interdisciplinary curriculum as “a knowledge view and
curriculum approach that consciously applies methodology and language from more
than one discipline to examine a central theme, issue, problem, topic, or experience”.
He further points out that “explosion” of knowledge, increase of state mandates
related to myriad issues, fragmented teaching schedules, concerns about curriculum
relevancy, and a lack of connections and relationships among disciplines have been
cited as reasons for a move towards an integrated curriculum.

According to Taba (1962), integration of knowledge is important both from the
standpoint of explosion and specialization of knowledge and from the standpoint of
the social impact of technology. Taba observes that as the number of specialized
fields increase, the pursuit of specialized subjects in school becomes increasingly fruitless, or impossible.

For Shiundu and Omulando (1992), integration emphasizes the horizontal relationships between various curricula areas in an attempt to interrelate content, or learning experiences in order to enable the students to perceive a unity of knowledge. In this study, the rationale and benefits of teaching and assessing English language and Literature in an integrated manner in the Kenyan secondary schools was to be established.

Integration of subject matter, according to Blenkin and Kelly (1981), is an approach to learning that does not accept or base itself on any notion of sanctity of traditional divisions. On his part, Pring (1971) contrasts integration with fragmentation of the curriculum, which typifies the traditional school with subject barriers. He thinks that the compartmentalization or pigeonholing of knowledge is irrelevant to life as a whole. According to him, integration is connected with the natural inquiry of children, which does not respect subject divisions. He asserts that integration of subjects is a necessity if there is to be a ‘truer’ and more comprehensive picture of reality. He further points out that the division of knowledge into distinct subjects is artificial and does not reflect correctly the essential unity of reality.

The researcher was interested in finding out whether teachers of integrated English in secondary schools had a proper meaning and understanding of the concept of curriculum integration and in particular their perception and implementation of integrated English curriculum at the classroom level.
2.2 Rationale for Curriculum Integration

According to Beane (1997), the philosophy behind the practice of curriculum integration stems from the view that learning occurs when new knowledge and experiences are integrated with previous learning. Such integration enables the learner to deepen and broaden his/her understanding of the world and personal place in it, as well as the directly linked notion, that in a school setting the contexts for study can aptly arise from the real needs and concerns of the learner.

Beane and Brodhagen (1996) point out that curriculum integration offers any challenging curriculum higher standards and world-class education that is so often talked about, but rarely experienced. Beane (1997) argues that teachers should push themselves beyond the conventional, separate subject format and expand their use of integrated curriculum formats, which offer a correspondingly wide range of benefits for students. The current study was purposed to find out whether teachers of the integrated English curriculum went beyond the traditional teaching of English language and Literature as two separate subjects, and also their various constituent parts as separate entities.

Hirst (1974) and Hirst and Peters (1970) suggest that an integrated curriculum could be justified through a view of knowledge that is unified or perhaps even chaotic in nature. In a logical extension of this view, Hirst (1974) explains that subjects restrict pupils’ thinking and development by making the process of learning artificial and alien compared with their life experiences. In one sense, it would appear that curriculum integration has some intrinsic virtue, in terms of the way that knowledge is organized as connected, embodied, ecological, harmonized knowledge (Venville et al., 2001). Under this view of knowledge, the learner is seen to be at one with nature,
entwined and implicated in local and global conditions, large and small (Davis, Sumara and Luce-Kapler, 2000).

Cumming (1994a) draws a number of studies that show among other things that a significant number of pupils find the traditional curriculum lacks relevance and cohesion, the teaching practices are alienating or simply boring, and schools consist of rigid structures and procedures. Venville et al. (2001), in their work on curriculum integration, observe several instances of classroom environments that held pupils’ interest and enhanced learning across the curriculum. These lessons were characterized by high levels of teacher and pupil engagement and interaction. They point out that pupils in these classes had a clear sense of direction and the work was cognitively challenging. They further point out that participants were emotionally involved and there was a high level of trust and co-operation, and that teachers regularly made links to the real world and to other disciplines.

Venville et al. (2001), in summary, argue that integration enhances pupil engagement with the school. They point out that several studies show that providing an authentic curriculum well connected to pupils’ needs and interests, and to the world outside of school, can result in reducing alienation and raising participation and engagement. They further say that this authenticity is associated with integrating across the disciplines and sometimes it is to be found within a disciplinary paradigm. The current study sought to check whether secondary integrated English curriculum enhances learning across English language and Literature, and if classroom lessons are characterized by high levels of teacher and student engagement and interaction.
In arguing for integrative curriculum, National Middle School Association (NMSA) (1995) called for learning experiences that are organized around real-life issues and problems significant both to young and to adults. In examining these issues, students draw on pertinent content and skills from many subject areas and acquire many of the “common learnings” or life skills essential for all citizens (Vars, 2000b). In the integrative approach, the emphasis is on higher-order thinking processes, co-operative learning, and thoughtful consideration of human values, rather than the details of separate subjects. The intent is to make students “make sense out of their life experiences” (NMSA, 1995).

According to Beane (1997), the integrated curriculum design underscores the importance of four types of relationships that affect how students learn: i) relationships between the learner and the content, ii) relationships between the learner and the teacher, iii) relationships among the learners and 4) relationships within the content itself. The study checked out on how secondary integrated English curriculum design affected how students learnt and interacted with the content, their teachers and among themselves.

Beane (1997) asserts that as the quality of the stated relationships improves - individually and collectively - students’ success in mastering skills and concepts and more complex levels of thinking also improve. Therefore, integrated curriculum formats address and promote these four types of relationships more effectively than does the conventional, separate-subject curriculum. Because integrated curriculum strategies focus directly and purposefully on all four of these crucial relationships simultaneously, such strategies foster student success on many levels. According to Beane, the greater the degree of integration, the greater the benefits. Students
participating in full integrative programs tend to exhibit high levels of commitment, energy and performance, while assuming greater responsibility for learning and their actions.

Beane (1997) further points out that students in integrated curricula generally do well or better on standardized tests than students in conventional curricula. In fact, they maintain that, properly constructed and implemented integrated curricula can improve test scores because the emphasis on the four sets of relationships increases students’ motivation to learn. This, in turn, enhances their abilities to master concepts, including those that may appear on standardized tests. Integrated instruction helps teachers better utilize instructional time and look deeper into subjects through a variety of content-specific lens.

Another benefit of integrated instruction is that teachers can better differentiate instruction to individual student needs. Integrated instruction also allows for authentic assessment (Barton and Smith, 2000). Interdisciplinary teaching gives students a chance to work with multiple sources of information, thus ensuring they are receiving a more inclusive perspective than they would from consulting one textbook (Wood, 1997).

Educational researchers in some countries have found that an integrated curriculum can result in greater intellectual curiosity, improved attitude towards schools, enhanced problem-solving skills, and higher achievement in schools (Austin et al., 1997; Kain, 1993). According to Wolf and Brandt (1998), one of the best ways to promote problem-solving is through an enhanced environment that makes connections among several disciplines. Vars (1996) asserts that students in interdisciplinary programs do as well as, and often better than, students in so-called conventional
programs. In other words, educators who carefully implement any of the various types of interdisciplinary approaches can be reasonably assured that there will be no appreciable loss in student learning, except perhaps, for the temporary “implementation dip” that occurs whenever people try anything new.

Some schools have used an integrated curriculum as a way of making education relevant and thus a way to keep students interested in school (Kain, 1993). Kain further asserts that schools report higher attendance rate when students are engaged in an integrated curriculum. Having the opportunity to utilize knowledge and skills from several disciplines does offer increased opportunities for making the curriculum relevant. However, it may not be true that if a curriculum is integrated, it will automatically mean that it is relevant.

Another premise supporting the move towards integrated curricula is that an education system that is discipline-based is not as effective as it should be. The assumption is that most real world problems are multi-disciplinary in nature and that discipline-based curriculum is unable to engage students in real world situations. Thus, a discipline-based curriculum should be replaced with an integrated curriculum (Kain, 1993).

Kelly (1982) suggests that the integrated curriculum is part of a move towards a more ‘open’ society in which knowledge is freely available. He also suggests that curriculum integration produces a different attitude to knowledge in learners- a greater willingness to share and collaborate. The whole substance of inter-student relationship is changed. This goes for student-teacher relationship too. Kelly further points out that some themes can only be dealt with in an integrated curriculum.

Blenkin and Kelly (1981) suggest that problems of organization have led to an
unbalanced curriculum for many individual learners - hence the present concern for the whole curriculum.

Pring (1976) describes the subject-based curriculum as ‘fragmented, apathy-inducing, artificially restricting, unrelated, irrelevant and duplicating’. He suggests three reasons for advocating an integrated curriculum: i) respect for the varied mental activities of learners, ii) recognition of the commonsense language and understandings through which learners already engage in this mental life and to which the more disciplined modes of inquiry must be related, and iii) the need for a more flexible and cooperative teaching framework.

Gillard (1987) argues that curriculum integration comes in a variety of forms. However, he is convinced that anything that breaks down the traditional subject barriers and makes knowledge more meaningful, relevant and stimulating for learners must be in the interest of effective education. Curriculum integration enables teachers and learners to identify and utilize the connections between syllabuses. Its primary purpose is to enhance and maximize learning both within and across the key learning areas of the curriculum.

Through curriculum integration, teachers plan for the development of key skills and understandings that transcend individual strands and syllabuses. In practice, curriculum integration enables students to acquire a unified view of the curriculum, broadening the context of their learning beyond single key learning areas (Jacobs, 1989 and Shoemaker, 1989).

The teaching of English is concerned with enabling the learners to write and speak with facility in ways appropriate to a variety of contexts (Arden, 1988; Dunk and
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ration, therefore, enhances communicative competence in the learners (Omollo, 1990). Arden (1988:57) poses the following questions:

Can a teacher teach poetry or prose lesson and ignore vocabulary, special expressions or unusual grammatical structures? Can a teacher really concentrate on theme, character and plot and ignore language completely? Similarly when a teacher teaches grammar, should he ignore the fact that writers are actually using grammar in context, whether fiction or non-fiction? When you read a passage as a reading comprehension, should you ignore imagery and style simply because you were supposed to be answering questions on the context of the passage?

According to Jacobs (1989) and Shoemaker (1989), curriculum integration is an important aspect of learning because it enables the students to: i) identify both the distinctive qualities and the related elements of the key learning areas, ii) utilize acquired skills and prior knowledge in different contexts iii) demonstrate their skills and understandings in a variety of learning contexts, and iv) make connections more easily between the content they learn in school and their out-of-school experiences.

Jacobs (1989) and Shoemaker (1989) further argue that curriculum integration is an important aspect of secondary curriculum organization because it enables the teacher to: i) identify connections within and between the content of the key learning areas, ii) provide a relevant context for learning based on the needs of students, iii) assess students’ skills and understandings in a variety of learning contexts, and iv) manage comprehensive programs covering all key areas. Therefore, an integrated approach better reflects what children learn at home and at school. Through planning and programming integrated learning experiences, teachers enable students to make connections and to understand relationships within and between learning areas.
Teachers, therefore, have an important task to maintain and enhance the integration of education.

There is a strong belief among those who support curriculum integration that schools must look at education as a process for developing abilities required by life in the twenty-first century, rather than discrete departmentalized subject matter (Jacobs, 1989 and Shoemaker, 1989). According to Perkins (1991), curriculum integration is a way of making education more meaningful, and both manageable and relevant. Cromwell (1989) points out that the brain organizes new knowledge on the basis of experiences and the meaning that has developed from those experiences. The brain processes many things at the same time, and holistic experiences are recalled quickly and easily. Caine and Caine (1991) add that the brain may resist learning fragmented facts that are presented in isolation. Learning is, therefore, believed to occur faster and more thoroughly when it is presented in meaningful contexts, with an experiential component.

An enduring argument for curriculum integration is that it represents a way to avoid the fragmented and irrelevant acquisition of isolated facts, transforming knowledge into useful tools for learning new information (Lipson, Valencia and Peters, 1993). They further assert that curriculum integration: i) helps students to apply skills, ii) leads to faster retrieval of information, iii) leads to a more integrated knowledge base, iv) encourages depth and breadth in learning, v) promotes positive attitudes in students, and vi) provides for a more quality time for curriculum exploration.
In summary, the following are some of the major arguments in favour of curriculum integration:

1. Students are more highly motivated and learn better because integrative curriculum relates to their needs, problems, concerns, interests, and aspirations (Faunce and Bossing, 1958).

2. Students learn better because integrative curriculum is more compatible with the way the brain works, thus enhancing the development of higher-order thinking skills (Canine and Caine, 1991; Hart, 1983).

3. Students are better prepared for life in contemporary society because integrative curriculum addresses current social problems in all their real-life complexity (Til, 1976).

4. Students learn major concepts and processes of the disciplines through studying carefully designed integrated units (Erickson, 1998; Jacobs, 1989).

5. Integrative curriculum provides a coherent core of common learnings essential for all citizens (Beane, 1997).

6. Integrative curriculum provides a meaningful framework for examining values (Apple and Beane, 1995).

Given that minimal research has been done on integrated English syllabus, the researcher wanted to find out and understand the situation and practice regarding the teaching of the subject in the Kenyan secondary schools, that is, whether the theory and practice are in tandem as envisioned in the 2002 KIE syllabus. Further, with the argument that students in integrated curricula generally do well or better on standardized tests than students in conventional curricula, the researcher wanted to find out how integrated English curriculum was being implemented in secondary schools in Nairobi North District.
2.3 Views against Curriculum Integration

Venville et al. (2001) argue that although subjects constitute the foundation of curriculum structure, a movement called integration is threatening the compartmentalization of the school subjects. Integration is not a new phenomenon (Furinghetti and Somaglia, 1998; Wraga, 1997; Vars, 1991; Hirst, 1974) and it has endured alternate waves of popularity and ill repute over the past century. There is considerable breadth to the literature base, including classroom testimonials and research reports, as well as theoretical attestations of avid supporters and equally avid opponents.

Notwithstanding the push for integration as a way of enhancing pupils’ engagement, Venville et al (2001), in their work, found that examples of integration were piecemeal and idiosyncratic. Few of the examples of integration they observed were sustained over time. Indeed, much of what happens in secondary schools appears designed to protect subject interests (Siskin, 1994), and this may explain why curriculum integration and collaboration across subject boundaries are so hard to achieve (Venville et al, 2001).

Schools play a role of upholding prevailing moral and political values and parents may be concerned that integrated programs reduce the level of academic discipline or change the traditional relationship between teachers and pupils (Kaplan, 1997; Marsh, 1993). An integrated curriculum does not accord with the ongoing expectation in many countries that the school curriculum should be academically oriented, emphasizing written work and individual study and focusing on the examinable aspects of the syllabus (Kaplan, 1997). The co-existence of more conventional
curriculum requirements and university entrance examinations at a higher level of the school is a common argument against the implementation of an integrated curriculum. Pupils are expected to participate in middle school subjects that prepare them for study later in their academic career (Hargreaves et al., 1996; Clark and Clark, 1994).

The persistence of traditional patterns of assessment, parental pressure for traditional academic standards and subject-based qualifications, instructional periods, textbooks, and curriculum guides hamper effective teaching and assessment of integrated curriculum (Helms, 1998). On the same note, staff who are trained in distinct disciplines and have developed longstanding attachments to them and the lack of a culture of school collaboration, all pose significant barriers to the implementation and continuation of an integrated curriculum (Hargreaves et al., 1996; McBride and Silverman, 1991).

George (1996) gives the most passionate criticism against integrated curriculum when he claims that all the accolades about integrated curriculum are “unfounded, unsubstantiated, or both.” George, in his article, concludes that little evidence exists to show that integrated curriculum is more effective than good teaching of a traditional curriculum.

With the many views given against curriculum integration, the researcher was interested in finding out the secondary school teachers’ views and those of other officers in charge of English curriculum, on the introduction and implementation of integrated English curriculum.
2.4 A Strong Case for the Integration of English Language and Literature

The approach to English which relies on a sharp division between Literature and English language and between the component parts of the latter cannot succeed in practical classroom teaching (Brumfit, 1985). Brumfit feels that teaching of English language and Literature, as one subject will make the teaching of language more practical than when the two areas are taught separately. Literature, according to Brumfit, is a vital component of English language teaching. This is because Literature as an appropriate vehicle for language learning and development since the focus is now authentic language and authentic situations. Brumfit further states that Literature provides learners with a convenient source of content for language teaching by making language learning practical.

According to Radhika (1991), literature is an activity involving and using language. It is an example of language in use, and is a context for language use. Thus, studying the language of literary texts as language in operation is seen as enhancing the learner’s appreciation of aspects of the different systems of language organization. Carter (1986) insists that English language and Literature teaching should be more closely integrated and harmonized so that Literature would not be isolated, possibly rejected, on account of “literariness” of its language.

Radhika (1991) further argues that some of the language activities and work with models on the literariness of texts can aid such development, and that responses can best develop with increased response to and confidence in working with a language using a variety of integrated activities, with language-based hypotheses and in classes where investigative, student-centred learning is the norm. He feels that if students are
encouraged to use language imaginatively, their interest and motivation for learning English language will increase, and eventually lead to improved use and performance. For him, to assess or to examine literature in an integrated way, demands teaching strategies that also integrate language and Literature, allowing activities which require language, which involve students in experiencing language, playing with language, analyzing language, responding to language and enjoying language.

The use of literature promotes language acquisition (Sivasubramaniam, 2006). It provides interesting contexts for students to generate input, negotiate meaning and develop motivation. Literature thus becomes an efficient vehicle for language acquisition. As literary texts contain multiple layers of meaning, they can promote classroom activities that call for exchange of feelings and opinions (Sivasubramaniam, 2006). Literature develops a sense of involvement in the students (Lazar, 1993; Carter and Long, 1991; Collie and Slater, 1987).

The study of literary genres develops language awareness in students. The interesting contexts provided by literary texts serve to illustrate the noticeability of lexical and syntactical features (Sivasubramaniam, 2006). Sivasubramaniam further argues that prolonged exposure to literary texts not only familiarizes students with the numerous interesting features of the written language but also develops the response potential in them. As students respond to literary texts, they begin to realize how meaning as an outcome of response can open up contexts for imaginative use of language (Gibbs, 1994; Collie and Slater, 1987).

Povey (1972) argues that literature increases all language skills because it extends linguistic knowledge by giving evidence of extensive and subtle vocabulary usage,
and complex and exact syntax. Therefore, it can be concluded that Literature contributes to knowledge of language use. Literature, by fostering an overall increase in reading proficiency, may well contribute to promoting the students’ academic and or professional goals (Sivasubramaniam, 2006).

Savvidou (2004) suggests that rather than perceiving literary discourse as separate and remote from non-literary discourse, we ought to consider the variety of text types along a continuum with some being more literary than others. According to Savvidou, the separation of Literature from language is a false dualism since literature is language and language can indeed be literary. She points out that it is not difficult to find instances of standard transactional forms of discourse which make use of a whole array of literary devices. Savvidou further says that the boundaries that are thought to exist between literary and non-literary discourse are not so distinct. Indeed, as Widdowson (1979) suggests, the procedures, which are used to interpret literary discourse, are essentially the same for interpreting any type of discourse.

Literature, according to Savvidou (2004), offers a distinct literary world, which can widen the learners’ understanding of their own and other cultures, and it can create opportunities for personal expression as well as reinforce learners’ knowledge of lexical and grammatical structure. She adds that an integrated approach to the use of Literature offers learners strategies to analyze and interpret language in context in order to recognize not only how language is manipulated but also why. An integrated approach to the use of Literature in the language classroom offers learners the opportunity to develop not only their linguistic and communicative skills but also their knowledge about language in all its discourse types. Therefore, the use of
literary texts in the language classroom can be a potentially powerful pedagogic tool in the learners’ linguistic development.

According to Salih (1986), student surveys show that language skills seem to develop through studying literature in English. The positive impact of Literature upon language skills is by no means novel, since students exercise or practice all of the skills in Literature courses. During Literature class, students are required to listen to what an instructor is saying, jot down notes, ask or answer questions, and to read passages relevant to the idea(s) under consideration. Obeidat’s (1997) observations of his students in a Literature classroom showed that Literature helped them:

1. Acquire a native-like competency in English;
2. Express their ideas in good English;
3. Learn the features of modern English;
4. Learn how the English linguistic system is used for communication;
5. See how idiomatic expressions are used;
6. Speak clearly, precisely, and concisely, and
7. Become more proficient in English, as well as become creative, critical, and analytical learners.

John (1986) says that a student of linguistics learns about language, while a student of Literature learns language as used in poetry, drama, fiction, or any other genre. Literature should not and cannot be taught solely for a linguistic purpose as people prefer to propose (Obeidat, 1997). Obeidat argues that Literature has more to offer than language would normally do, since it has greater freedom and since it acknowledges no linguistic barriers that restrain our ability to use language. Therefore, students gain a lot from its quality and excellence.
Indangasi (1988) opines that integration of English language and Literature will compel learners to appreciate the special relationship between the two subjects and consequently the special way in which literary writers use language. Integration of language and Literature aids the learning of vocabulary and reading skills since the latter has a lot of materials (Omollo, 1990; Brumfit, 1985). Indangasi (1988) further asserts that effective teaching of English language can be done through the use of literary texts.

An integrated syllabus, according to Muthiani (1988), can help teachers to teach their learners all the possible meanings of polysemic words using relevant texts such that when they meet the same words again, they are able to discover their meanings in the new contexts. He is of the opinion that a teacher of Literature and English language should teach language and usage, not as ends in themselves, but as tools for understanding and expression. Mwanzi (1987) points out that Literature is language in context; language used creatively for aesthetic purposes.

For Carter (1986), literary texts are a fertile ground, which allows mutual supportive integration of areas, which are often kept distinct in the English language classroom. He adds that creative writing can spring from the involvement with literary aspects especially when English language and Literature are taught complementarily. Omollo (1990) says that skills such as narration are best enhanced when learners read and appreciate literary works where such style of writing is used. Thus, through constant writing practice, the teacher of English language can ensure that the format of writing is mastered.
Oxford (1996) argues that the integrated–skill approach, as contrasted with the purely segregated approach, exposes English language learners to authentic language and challenges them to interact naturally in the language. Learners rapidly gain a picture of the richness and complexity of the English language as employed for communication. This approach allows teachers to track students’ progress in multiple skills at the same time. Integrated-skill approach can be highly motivating to students of all ages and backgrounds.

Welleck and Warren (1949) point out that language forms the raw material for or the vehicle through which Literature is passed. They also assert that in reading literary texts, learners have a lot to cope with the language intended for the native speakers. They gain familiarity with the different linguistic uses, forms and conventions of the written mode. They further emphasize the importance of extensive reading and indicate that learners develop the ability to make references from linguistic cues and deduce meaning from the context. In this context, KIE (1987:15) recommends that the reading component of the English syllabus should expose the learner to applied language by stating:

*Reading plays a pivot-point role without which the integration of language and Literature becomes impossible. A lot of quality reading (intensive and extensive) must therefore be undertaken and sustained throughout the course.*

The integration of English language and Literature is also supported by Senanu and Drid (1995). They propose that the teaching of English be more closely tied to the teaching of Literature. Hence, English language must be taught through Literature written in English to provide students with ‘live’ and communicative situations in the classroom through dramatization and discussion of literature texts. Muchiri (1986)
talks of the inseparability of language and Literature in that the study of one would facilitate the teaching of the other. Therefore, Literature should form the central core of English language.

For Evans (1984), drama contributes to the realization of the aims for English teaching through:

1. Providing opportunities for learners to practice a wide range of language registers, thus extending vocabulary, particularly that which is demanded by unfamiliar contexts
2. Encouraging particular kinds of language use, essential in drama process, but too often neglected in English teaching
3. Building confidence, particularly through group co-operation and sharing of ideas
4. Furthering appreciation and interpretation of the written word and stimulating the learner’s own writing work
5. Allowing the less conventionally academic pupil learner scope for success, thus re-orienting all the learners’ notion of areas for success
6. Helping to explore and destroy stereo-types (particularly sexist and racial ones).

Thus, drama has far more to offer English language than simply a shared interest in the script play, which is where the relationship has too often ended in the past.

According to Broughton and Brumfit (1978), poetry teaching stimulates language learning. Through poetry, all the four skills of language learning can be taught and learnt (KIE, 1987). On the other hand, in an integrated language course, the ideas that come from reading a story become a catalyst for listening, speaking, reading and
further writing (Morganthau, 1998). Reading, according to Collie and Slatter (1987), exposes the learner to many functions of the written language and makes the learner gain familiarity with the many features of the written language and different ways of connecting ideas.

According to Davies (1973), Literature is seen to develop the learner’s own use of language, aids reading ability, stimulates the learner’s imagination which will enrich activities in other fields and offers the child enjoyment. Huck (1987) also sees Literature as having educational values such as language development, improving reading, improving writing, developing fluency, providing opportunities for reading and introducing our cultural heritage. Indeed, integration of English language and Literature can be of great benefit to both the teachers and their learners if the two subjects’ relationships are exploited well.

The researcher will endeavour to establish whether English language and Literature are taught complementarily as set out in the syllabus, and also whether teachers allow mutual supportive integration of the two subjects and their constituent areas.

2.5 Views against Integration of English Language and Literature

Obeidat (1997) points out that linguistics and Literature are two different fields which illuminate one another in limited ways. Each discipline cannot substitute for the other. Savvidou (2004) regards literature as inappropriate to the language classroom. Savvidou’s views reflect on the historic separation between the study of language and the study of Literature, which has led to the limited role of Literature in the language classroom.
According to Or (1995), teachers, course designers and examiners have a general perception that Literature is particularly complex and inaccessible for the language learner and can even be detrimental to the process of language learning. Savvidou (2004) adds that it is indeed difficult to imagine teaching the stylistic features of literary discourse to learners who have a less sophisticated grasp of the mechanics of English language. This perception is also borne out by research (Akyel and Yalcin, 1990) which shows that the desire to broaden learners’ horizons through exposure to Literature usually has disappointing results.

Savvidou (2004) points out that the following common beliefs held about Literature and language are the reasons why teachers often consider Literature usually inappropriate in the language classroom:

1. The creative use of language in poetry and prose often deviates from the conventions and rules which govern standard, non-literary discourse, as in the case of poetry where grammar and lexis may be manipulated to serve orthographic and phonological features of the language.

2. The reader requires greater effort to interpret literary texts since meaning is detached from the reader’s immediate social context, one example is that the “I” in literary discourse may not be the same person as the writer.

The result is that the reader’s “interpretive procedures” (Widdowson, 1975) may become confused and overloaded. What this means is that the reader has to infer, anticipate and negotiate meaning from within the text to a degree that is not required in non-literary discourse (Savvidou, 2004). Savvidou asserts that there is a perception that the use of literary discourse deflects from the straightforward business of language learning, that is, knowledge of language structure, functions and general communication.
Linguists argue that literature impedes the students’ progress in language learning (Obeidat, 1997). Literature uses language which is considerably different from the “normal” or “everyday” conversation of the common members of a speech community; it clearly uses language with greater care and complexity than the average user is able to produce. This makes it extremely difficult for teachers to explain literary texts of all kinds - poems, short-stories, novels, and plays- when exposed to linguistic techniques which are supposed to simplify, reveal, or explain meaning.

The study was conducted to find out the views and reactions of teachers regarding the teaching of English language and Literature in an integrated way.

2.6 Factors Influencing Implementation of Curriculum Innovations

In this section, the following factors are discussed: characteristics of the innovation, the role of the principal, and staff training and professional development.

2.6.1 Characteristics of the Innovation

Characteristics of the innovation itself can affect implementation of an innovation. These characteristics include the following:

i) Need of the Innovation

According to Fullan (2001), many innovations are attempted without a careful examination of whether or not they address what are perceived to be priority needs. He says that the “fit” between a new program and district and/or school needs is essential. Huberman and Miles (1984) similarly remind us that by this early implementation stage, people involved must perceive that the needs being addressed are significant. Equally, the individuals involved must feel that they are making some
progress toward meeting those significant needs. Thus, needs assessment is necessary since no curriculum planner or committee of planners is omniscient.

ii) Clarity of the Innovation

Clarity about both goals and means is a necessity if significant change is to occur. Lack of clarity (about the goals and means) is a perennial problem in the change process (Fullan, 2001). In short, lack of clarity—diffuse goals and unspecified means of implementation—represents a major problem at the implementation stage. Fullan points out that teacher and others find that the change is simply not very clear as to what it means in practice. According to him, unclear and unspecified changes can cause great anxiety and frustration to those sincerely trying to implement them.

Fernandez (2007) and Hargreaves (1994) point out that teachers should be clear about what the change is about. They argue that in most cases teachers are expected to implement changes without any clear understanding of what they entail and the purposes behind them. The current study was meant to find out whether the teachers had clarity about aspects of integrated English curriculum as an innovation.

iii) Complexity of the Innovation

According to Fullan (2001), complexity refers to the difficulty and extent of change required of the individuals responsible for implementation. He says that any change can be examined with regard to the difficulty, skill required and extent of alterations in beliefs, teaching strategies and use of materials.

While complexity creates problems for implementation, it may result in greater change because more is being attempted. In summary, Fullan argues that simple changes may be easier to carry out, but they may not make much of a difference. Thus, complex changes promise to accomplish more.
iv) Availability of Teaching-Learning Materials

The availability of teaching-learning materials and other products are considered vital for the success of educational change (Kallon, 1996). Inadequate quality and even unavailability of materials impair curriculum innovation projects. Well articulated adopted materials, which are complete, well organized, comprehensive and detailed and, address “how-to” concerns, are more effective at the implementation stage (Fullan, 2001).

Fullan (2000a) argues that for large scale reform, one needs to propel the process with high quality teaching and training materials. He further says that deeper understanding is required for substantial and sustained implementation. Quality materials should be produced and a highly interactive infrastructure of pressure and support established. In short, it is necessary to combine ambitious change and quality.

2.6.2 The Role of the Principal

The main agents (or blockers) of change are the school principals and teachers. All major research on innovation and school effectiveness shows that the principal strongly influences the likelihood of change, but it also indicates that most principals do not play instrumental leadership roles (Fullan, 2001).

For instance, Cuttance (2001) points out that strategic leadership of principals is essential in almost every successful innovation. He further argues that, in many cases, principals are the initiators and the driving force behind the innovation. Successful innovation is, therefore, principally linked to strong school leadership. Principals should have a clear vision, underpinned by an understanding of current educational thinking, national and international practice, and by a detailed knowledge of their
schools. They should ensure that the rationale and aims of the innovation are widely understood and are therefore more likely to be supported (http://www.ofsted.gov.uk). Hence, the success of implementing any innovation heavily depends on the head teacher’s clear direction and support to ensure that barriers to change are minimized (http://www.ofsted.gov.uk).

2.6.3 Staff Training and Professional Development

Both individual teacher characteristics and collective or collegial factors play roles in determining implementation (Fullan, 2001). Some teachers, depending on their previous experiences and stage of career, are more self-actualized and have a greater sense of efficacy, which leads them to take action and persist in the effort required to bring about successful implementation. Fullan further states that since interaction with others influences what one does, relationships with other teachers is a critical variable. Change involves learning something new and therefore interaction is the primary basis for social learning.

Karim (1994) is also of the view that teachers constitute one of the most important groups of people who play an essential role in the realization of the country’s educational goals. The role of the teachers in any educational innovation is crucial since their knowledge, skills and attitudes count a great deal in the success of any innovative instructional practice.

According to Kinyua (1994), unless teachers are available and willing to participate in educational development, there is no future in innovative practices. He strongly feels that the involvement of the teachers must be genuine by proper participation in planning and decision-making. There must be shared endeavours between all those working on new programs such that teachers must be consulted rather than being
patronized. Teachers are, therefore, crucial in the implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum.

Teachers, on the whole, according to Kinyua (1994), are not against innovative practices as much as they are offended by the way new ideas are presented to them or rather imposed on them. Positively, a curriculum with innovative instructional practices is enriched by the creativity and imagination of the good teacher. Negatively, it is vitiated by the limitations of poorly trained teachers (Kinyua, 1994). Therefore, however noble, sophisticated or enlightened proposals (such as integrated English curriculum) for educational change and improvement might be, they come to nothing if teachers do not adopt them in their own classrooms and translate them into effective classroom practice (Kinyua, 1994). Teacher participation and co-operation are essential for any successful innovation.

Karim (1994) believes that the quality of teachers is one of the factors that affect levels of achievement in basic learning. For her, it is important, therefore, that teachers of high quality are produced. She argues that the teachers’ performance heavily depends on the professional training, attitudes, academic background, education infrastructure of the institution, the type of leadership, the tradition of the institution including induction and staff development programs that are in place at a given time.

Over the years, it has become increasingly clear that if reforms in the system are to be sustained, sound teacher educational programs have to be established (Menya, 1994). According to Menya, instructional programs can only be effective, imaginative and sound if curriculum material for teacher education for both pre-service and in-service teacher education are mounted and developed. He points out that it is next to
impossible to produce quality education in any system without examining the quality of teachers in terms of their competencies and attitudes. This study will appraise the teachers of integrated English in terms of their training and professional competencies to implement the curriculum.

Kinyua (1994) points out that contrary to the traditional notion of the teacher and the teaching process, the innovative role of the teacher is not so secure since the new content is strange, and the new and familiar techniques such as the integrated approach to English and Literature leave him or her (the teacher) uncertain, even vulnerable. The inquiry methods are too time-consuming; and the assessment of work is difficult. According to Kinyua, innovative instructional practices place new demands and pressures on the teachers. These new demands and pressures involve acquiring knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to learning, including a degree of flexibility often uncomfortable to an insecure teacher, more work and more thinking.

With respect to their innovative role, Kinyua (1994) says that teachers can make innovative instructional practices fail if they do not have:

1. A clear understanding of what is expected of them in terms of behavioural changes expected of them and a conceptual basis of the practices;
2. The necessary knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and perspectives to carry out their new role;
3. The required equipment and materials to carry out their new role.

According to Barbara (2004), quality teachers are the single greatest determinant of student achievement. She further adds that teacher education, ability, and experience account for variation in student achievement than all other factors. She argues that 40 to 90 percent of the difference in student test scores can be attributed to teacher
quality. Knowing the subject matter, understanding how students learn, and practicing effective teaching methods translate into greater student achievement (Barbara, 2004). Therefore, it is vitally important that teachers be well prepared when they begin teaching and that they continue to improve their knowledge and skills throughout their careers.

Unfortunately, most new teachers are not adequately prepared to meet the needs of their students, and many experienced teachers have yet to adapt to new standards (Barbara, 2004). Barbara explains that teachers, just like practitioners in other professions, need to deepen their knowledge and improve their skills over the course of their careers. According to her, it is unfortunate that the need for professional development for those in the teaching profession all too often goes unmet. This is more so because teacher professional development is a vital tool for improving student learning.

In order for teachers to deal with a continuously changing environment, they must upgrade their professional knowledge and skills on a continuous basis (MOE, 1994). According to the Ministry, the trainers should be qualified and experienced in their disciplines and well informed in current research findings and any emerging trends in teacher education. The Ministry further points out that in-service education should continue to be enhanced and the courses planned in such a way as to benefit the greatest number of teachers. The aim of in-service courses, according to the Ministry, should be to improve the teachers’ qualifications; to enlarge the scope of their work and to bring them up to date on new innovations and development in content and methods in their respective subjects. Karim (1994) adds that professionally qualified
teachers are critical to the provision and maintenance of quality and relevant education.

Menya (1994) argues that if new strategies are to be introduced and sustained, this will mean making a deliberate effort of changing those involved in developing and implementing them, in particular, teachers. He strongly feels that there is need to intensify in-service programs for teacher education so as to assist the teachers adopt and adapt to the new ways of carrying out their duties.

Njoka (1994) points out that initial teacher training is not adequate for continued professional development. There is, therefore, need for regular in-service training for all teachers since they operate in a dynamic socio-cultural setting, which is subject to change. According to him, teachers should be given opportunities to acquire additional skills that would enable them to adapt to the changing environments within their profession and in society as a whole.

The trend has been for teachers to expect centralized training programs. However, current trends globally are for teachers to be encouraged to take more responsibility in identifying their own training needs. Once this has been done, teachers should be facilitated to achieve their training needs either locally or overseas (Njoka, 1994).

Halliday (1999) says that rapid changes in education exert complex demands on even the best teachers often resulting in a perceived failure to cope with expectations. Teachers should, therefore, appreciate that only by working closely with all the other stakeholders will they achieve high educational standards. The Ministry of Education (1999) notes that due to inadequate resources, it has not put in place a comprehensive teacher in-servicing program to prepare teachers to cope with the changes and
challenges in teaching. The intention of the Ministry to continuously in-service and develop teachers has been hampered by inadequate funding. According to the Ministry once teachers have completed the pre-service training; there are limited opportunities to enhance their professional growth and development. Even in cases where donors have given support, sustainability of the same has been a problem.

Quality teaching, according to Murray (1997), is characterized by teachers who:

- Have an up-to-date knowledge and are enthusiastic proponents of curriculum content. This means, for example, that teachers:
  1. Have a depth of knowledge beyond the content of the curriculum;
  2. Know that knowledge in subject areas is constantly changing;
  3. Keep up to date with syllabus changes;
  4. Are excited and curious about new knowledge;
  5. Are aware of the learning theories that underpin syllabus documents;
  6. Use current resources and technologies, which support the curriculum;
  7. Have a depth of understanding of the impact of the world beyond the classroom.

- Critically reflect on their practice and demonstrate their commitment to life-long learning by seeking out appropriate collegial support and furthering their own professional development.

This means, for example, that teachers:

1. Discuss the curriculum with colleagues.

2. Discuss and share their classroom work with colleagues.

3. Visit other classrooms in their own and other schools.
4. Pursue professional development through schools, districts, professional teaching associations, special interest groups and local networks.

5. Are willing to work with their colleagues for many purposes

6. Have enthusiasm, pride and a strong commitment to teaching.

- Can articulate their beliefs about learning and the principles, which underpin their teaching.

This means, for example, that teachers:

1. Reflect on and discuss with colleagues and others what they know and believe about learning

2. Are willing to question their assumptions about learning and teaching.

- Help students to make connections, to understand relationships within and between content areas, and to deal with general principles as well as individual facts.

This means, for example, that teachers:

1. Know that subject boundaries have been defined for convenience only, and are not fixed.

2. Discuss with others the connections and relationships within and between content areas.

3. Think about and discuss the nature of knowledge- what is included as valuable knowledge in our schools and classrooms, what is left out, who makes the choices and why and how this has changed over time.

4. Know that many school disciplines are integrated.

5. Work with colleagues from other disciplines to link learning experiences.
2.7 Studies on Integration of English Language and Literature

Kirkgoz (2008) did a descriptive study on how Turkish teachers of English in state primary education approached the implementation of a Communicative-Oriented Curriculum innovation and factors that impact on teachers’ classroom practices. The study used multidimensional research procedures that included a questionnaire, observations and teacher interviews. From this study, a picture was developed of teachers’ instructional practices and factors that influence their classroom practices.

The study identified a number of factors that have a significant impact on teachers’ classroom application of the communicative teaching. These factors include the following: teachers’ understanding of the curriculum innovation, their previous training, insufficient instructional support, limited instructional time, large class size and lack of resources.

The findings of this study revealed a gap between curriculum objectives and teachers’ implementation of the innovation. In line with the findings, the study suggested that a greater level of support in the form of in-service training and resource provision should be given to teachers to ensure more effective implementation of the curriculum initiative.

A qualitative case study was carried out by Carless (2003) to explore the implementation of task-based teaching in three primary schools in Hong Kong. This study found that teacher beliefs, teacher understandings, the syllabus time available, the textbook and the topic, preparation and the resources, and the language
proficiency of the students influence the success of curriculum implementation. Further, he reports that the complex interplay between these factors influences the extent of implementation of task-based teaching in the classroom.

Carless (1999) did a case study on curriculum implementation in Hong Kong and found that several factors influenced the successful implementation of the curriculum innovation. The factors were: teacher attitudes, teacher training and support, teachers’ understanding of an innovation, teacher reflection and development, role of the principal in facilitating innovation and the management of change.

The current study, unlike Carless’ (2003 and 1999) studies, was specifically designed to address secondary integrated English curriculum as an innovation right from its initiation to its implementation and its implications in entirety.

Ming (1995) carried out a case study of a school of nursing in Hong Kong on the implementation of a curriculum innovation for developing nursing process skills. The study uncovered that in spite of the hard work and devotion of the case school, the level of implementation was slow. Ming found that the major problems associated with the implementation included:

1. Discrepancy between the syllabus requirements and the registration examination demands.
2. Hospital context was not ready for change; and
3. Absence of essential support.
Several lessons (and which have a direct bearing in this study) can be learnt from the experience revealed in Ming’s (1995) study as follows:

1. Examination has very strong influence on the teaching and learning process.

2. A curriculum innovation which involves change in the nursing practice, appropriate groupwork in the hospital has to be laid, co-operation and support from nursing personnel, medical colleagues, hospital administrators and all those concerned should be secured when embarking on the change effort.

3. The school and teachers did not receive adequate support and resources from the central agency to implement the curriculum change. This led to frustration among the teachers and low level of implementation. This is a lesson which curriculum developers should take seriously in future developments.

In this study, the researcher wanted to find out how integrated English curriculum was initiated, introduced and implemented in secondary schools in Kenya. Just like in Ming’s (1995) study, the current study was interested in finding out, among other things, major challenges associated with the introduction and implementation of integrated English curriculum as an innovation.

In a study by Rolfe (2009) on curriculum innovation in Jersey on the transfer of children from primary to secondary schools, teachers were to teach English, Geography, History and Religious Studies in pairs. This study reveals that almost all staff embraced the programme and were enthusiastic about taking part in it. They saw it as a necessary change and looked forward to teaching outside their specialism. Just like in Rolfe’s case, the current study wanted to found out teachers’ reactions towards the introduction and requirement that they use the integrated English approach.
In Pakistan, a study on the effect of co-learning partnership classroom reform was done by Mohammad and Harlech-Jones (2008) and it was found that collaborative process advances the understanding of teachers’ problems, resolves them on the spot and provides teachers with the confidence and courage to transcend the constraints of their work places while developing professionally. The researcher was keen on finding out whether teachers in Kenya collaborated in their teaching of integrated English curriculum.

Fernandez’s (2007) study on the development and implementation of a new Physics curriculum in New Zealand secondary schools revealed that most of the ten Physics teachers (who participated in the study) did not undergo any significant change in their teaching of the new Physics curriculum. The barriers identified, such as lack of guidelines and clarity, and contentment with their own existing practice, were aligned with factors that have been identified by other researchers as important influences on teachers undergoing change, such as clarity of change and need for change. In Fernandez’s (2007) study, three key elements were identified as necessary conditions for teacher change: knowledge, support and time. Whereas this study used ten teachers only, the current study used 101 teachers, 20 head teachers and three heads of English at KIE, KNEC and MoE.

Okwara, Shiundu and Indoshi (2009) conducted a study on integrated English curriculum in Busia district and the Kenya Institute of Education in Nairobi. The study adopted a survey research design. The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Find out stakeholders’ conception of the integrated English language curriculum for secondary schools.
2. Assess the preparation of teachers of English to implement the integrated curriculum.

3. Find out the challenges and opportunities available in improving the use of the integrated approach in English teaching and learning.

Saturated sampling was used to select 120 teachers of English from the sample schools and two English language curriculum developers at the Kenya Institute of Education. Data were collected from teachers of English using a questionnaire, and from curriculum developers using an interview schedule. Qualitative data were analyzed by establishing analytical categories from the statements of the respondents. For quantitative data, cross tabulation of responses and calculation of percentages were done.

The study concluded that there was lack of consensus among the teachers of English in so far as the concept of integrated curriculum in the teaching of English is concerned. There was no uniform understanding of the integrated English approach in the teaching of English. It was also concluded that English language teacher is out of tune with the classroom needs of the teachers.

This study recommended that there was need to review the integrated curriculum to take into account the teachers’ views about the integrated English curriculum. It further recommended that curriculum developers should work as partners with teacher education institutions so that both parties initiate innovations in the curriculum.
A descriptive case study was carried out by Ochieng (2006) on the students’ attitudes towards and performance in integrated English syllabus in secondary schools in Rongo division, Migori district. In this study, 128 students, 20 teachers of English, 16 class teachers, 10 heads of department and 10 principals were used.

Results of this study showed that students were generally happy with the content of integrated English syllabus. Most students, however, preferred Literature to English language. Students’ performance in integrated English was also noted to be average. Ochieng’s study was concerned with the students’ attitudes towards and performance in integrated English.

Unlike Ochieng’s study, the current study will be more inclusive and will seek to critically analyze the initiation, development, diffusion/ adoption and implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum right from its first phase (1984/85-2001) to its now second phase (2002 to date). The study will involve heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC, head teachers and all teachers of integrated English in Nairobi North District, Nairobi province.

A study on the projection of enrolment in B.Ed program to meet the demand of teachers for integrated English in public secondary schools in Kenya was conducted by Mbeche (2003). The study’s population comprised all teachers for integrated English in public secondary schools in Kenya and all student teachers for integrated English in universities. Data was collected from the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) headquarters and Kenyan universities. Ex post facto research design was employed.
Data analysis mainly involved carrying out the desired projections. The model of compounded relationship was employed for this purpose. This involved the computation of weighted average survival rate and weighted average graduation rate. Descriptive statistics such as means, percentages and frequency tables were used to analyze some of the data. The following were among the recommendations of the study:

1. There was a mismatch between the demand and supply of teachers for integrated English in public secondary schools in Kenya. The demand for teachers was higher than the supply;
2. Five thousand, one hundred and ninety seven (5,197) teachers were required in public secondary schools countrywide by the 2001;
3. The demand for the teachers of integrated English by the year 2015 was projected to be 22,177.
4. The deployment and posting of teachers and putting up of public secondary schools in Kenya, similarly, needed to take into account equity considerations.

The findings of this study led to the conclusion that the demand for teachers of integrated English still exists in public secondary schools in Kenya. Hence, the projection of enrolment of student teachers for integrated English in Kenyan universities was identified as a worthwhile exercise to keep the demand and supply at equilibrium. The following recommendations were made by Mbeche’s (2003) study:

1. The Ministry of Education should, in conjunction with the Teachers Service Commission, collect data on the number of teachers of integrated English who opt out of teaching annually, their status, age, sex and the factors that necessitate their exit from the teaching profession. This would help the government and other stakeholders to address the problem in time.
2. Private and public universities should be encouraged to produce teachers in critical subjects such as integrated English where shortage has been noted.

The proposed study, unlike Mbeche’s, will be a qualitative one interested with secondary integrated English curriculum right from its initiation to its implementation and its implications in entirety.

Mwandoe’s (2002) ethnographic study on the teaching and learning of secondary school poetry in English in Kenya stemmed from the observation that there was poor performance by students in the integrated English course in secondary schools in Voi district. The study was an attempt to show what took place in the poetry lessons and its impact(s) on the teaching and learning of poetry including performance in this genre.

The study used two English language teachers and two schools from the seven secondary schools in the division. Sixty four Form Three students comprised the sample of the study. The research findings showed that:

1. Teachers lacked in actual classroom preparedness. They never prepared lesson plans to guide them in their teaching;

2. There was some inadequacy in the teachers’ initial professional training since at university, English language and literature were taught independently;

3. Teachers attended in-service courses on poetry teaching and learning and argued strongly for such courses;

4. Both teachers and students encountered some problems in the process of teaching-learning poetry such as inadequate poetry textbooks and other necessary resources.
The following recommendations were made by the study:

1. Pre-service training should give teachers a firm academic and professional training and experience for the program to be taught effectively;
2. Since initial professional training is not adequate, there is need for regular in-service training for all teachers to match the dynamic contextual settings in which the teachers operate;
3. Collaborative teaching should be encouraged as a means of sharing experience among teachers to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Whereas Mwandoe’s study was interested with only the teaching of poetry in Voi district, the current study will pay attention to the introduction and implementation of integrated English curriculum in public secondary schools in Nairobi North District, Nairobi province.

Magoma (1999) carried out a qualitative case study on the teacher related factors which influence the implementation of integrated English course in secondary schools in Ibacho Educational Division of Kisii Central District. Only eight schools were purposively selected for the study to obtain qualitative data from the teachers of integrated English, their respective heads of English Department and head teachers.

Results of the study showed that:

1. Although most of the teachers were generally of sound academic and professional qualifications, they did not have a clear understanding of the concept of integration in relation to the teaching of integrated English course;
2. All teachers of integrated English course were not trained on how to integrate English and Literature including those who took English and Literature at colleges and universities;
3. Most of the teachers of integrated English course had never attended in-service courses though most of them argued strongly for such courses for the sake of professional guidance.

On the basis of the findings, the study recommended that integrated English should be taught integratively in colleges and universities to the teachers-to-be by qualified staff who understand the concept of integration. The study also recommended continuous in-service training for all the teachers of integrated English course. The proposed study seeks to find out how secondary integrated English curriculum was initiated, and introduced to the schools, and how it is being implemented in public secondary schools in Nairobi North District, Nairobi Province.

A study on the state of integrating English language and Literature was carried out among teachers of English in Nairobi secondary schools by Muutu (1993). The population of the study included secondary school teachers teaching Forms 1 to 3. A total sample of 30 teachers drawn from 9 secondary schools was used. Nine lesson observations were carried out, one in each school visited. Three types of instruments were used: 1) Lesson schedules, 2) Interviews, and 3) Questionnaires. The findings of the study revealed that:

1. Most of the teachers were not trained on the integrated approach to the teaching of English language and Literature;

2. Teachers had not been in-serviced on how to integrate English language and Literature;

3. Teachers did not understand the concept of integration as it applies to the teaching of English language and Literature;
4. Generally, teachers had a negative attitude towards the integration of English language and Literature.

The study made the following recommendations:

1. Training of secondary school English teachers should be aimed at making teachers understand the interdependence of English language and Literature;
2. Systematic in-service training for secondary school teachers of English should be stepped up whenever new syllabuses and other resource materials are developed, to give teachers the necessary skills to increase their efficiency; and
3. Teachers should be encouraged and assisted to form English language teachers’ groups not only provincial or district levels, but also at grass root levels like divisional and zonal levels, where they can exchange views on the teaching of English and those who may have been in-serviced at a national or provincial level could share their experiences with their colleagues.

A study to reveal the state of affairs regarding integration of English and Literature and its implementation in Nairobi province secondary schools was necessary given that Muutu conducted hers a long time ago. The fact that examinations in all papers in English are now integrated necessitates the study even more.

A study by Omollo (1990) on the techniques and problems in the teaching of English language and literature in secondary schools in Kisumu looked at the presence of integration in the teaching of English in secondary schools, the techniques used, the attitude of the teachers towards the integrated syllabus and finally the problems affecting its teaching. The sample of the study was composed of 50 randomly selected teachers of English within Kisumu district. Data were collected by means of four
instruments: questionnaires, interview schedules, observation schedules and recording of live lessons.

The findings of Omollo’s study were as follows:

1. Integration was not new; it had been going on even before the introduction of the integrated syllabus;

2. Integration was found to be taking place between language and Literature;

3. Teachers still relied heavily on expository techniques such as lecture or question and answer techniques while disregarding other useful techniques such as discussion and small group-work;

4. Teachers’ attitudes towards integrated English syllabus were not favorable as the majority of them were still teaching according to the old syllabus;

5. Teachers were experiencing problems with resources and lack of information on the new integrated English syllabus.

In line with the findings, the following recommendations were made by the study:

1. The Ministry of Education should ensure the training of teachers of English both in pre-service and in-service courses in particular such areas as the inquiry–centred approaches to teach the integrated English syllabus;

2. The national examinations should be revised and designed in such a way that it reflects integration between language and Literature, and by revising the exam format to combine the two subjects and their respective constituent parts in an integrated manner.
Now that the examination format in English had been changed to reflect the concept of integration, it was important to carry out a study to determine the challenges and gains of such a shift.

It can be noted from the literature reviewed that there are few studies on integrated English as an innovation in Kenya. Hence, there was need for a study to be conducted on the introduction of integrated English curriculum in Kenya and its current practice in the secondary schools.

2.8 Summary

Curriculum integration has many and varied meanings and definitions. The rationale behind integration of English language and Literature stems from the view that Literature fosters an overall increase in language proficiency. The separation of Literature from English language is therefore a false dualism, and boundaries that are thought to exist between the two do not exist. Factors that influence effective implementation of curriculum innovations include: characteristics of the innovation, the role of the principal, and staff training and professional development. The methodology that was adopted in the study is described in the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents research design, variables of the study, location of the study, target population, sampling procedure and sample size, research instruments, pilot study, validity and reliability of research instruments, data collection procedures, logistical and ethical considerations, and summary.

3.2 Research Design
This study mainly used a qualitative approach in the form of a case study design. However, basic quantitative techniques such as frequencies and percentages were used to analyse some of the data that were obtained. Mason (1998) observes that although qualitative research does use some form of quantification, statistical forms of analysis are not seen as central. The researcher’s choice to use a qualitative paradigm to conduct this study was encouraged by the views of Stake, 1978; Yin, 1984; Maling and Keepes (1985) and Creswell (1994) who argue that the paradigm is generally viewed as an alternative to the quantitative approach where:

1. The study is exploratory in nature;
2. Not much has been written about the topic or population being studied;
3. The researcher seeks to listen to informants and to build a picture based on their ideas.

Shanguya (1995:11) says of qualitative paradigm as follows:

In this approach, the researcher acts as a critic – evaluator, who brings to bear his or her personal knowledge of the area under study and the prevailing “ethical reality” of underlying principles and practice, in order to inquire and critique the issue targeted for the study.
The qualitative paradigm was thus suited for this study since the researcher employed himself both as a critic and evaluator of the introduction, and the implementation process of the integrated English curriculum with the teachers and the heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC.

Although the case study method has been dismissed by critics who question the rigor of the approach, numerous studies over the past 20 years have demonstrated that the case study method can be used successfully to probe beneath the surface of a situation and to provide a rich context for understanding the phenomena under study (UNIST-CNRS, 2006). Mason (1998) also points out that qualitative research aims to produce rounded understandings on the basis of rich, contextual and detailed data.

Rather than using large samples and following a rigid protocol to examine a limited number of variables, case study methods involve an in-depth examination of a single instance, event or a case (Yin, 1993). Yin adds that case study methods provide a systematic way of looking at events or phenomena within its real-life context, collecting data, analyzing information, and reporting the results. As a result, the researcher may gain a sharpened understanding of why the incidence happened as it did, and what might become important to look at more extensively in future research.

Case study is a valuable method of research, with distinctive characteristics that make it ideal for many types of investigations (Tellis, 1997). Case study gives special attention to completeness in observation, reconstruction, and analysis of the cases under study. It is done in a way that incorporates the views of the “actors” in the case
under study (Zonabend, 1992). It gives a researcher chance to operate as a senior investigator during the course of data collection (Yin, 1994). However, the researcher does not control the data collection environment as in other research strategies; hence the procedures become all the more important.

Tellis (1997) points out that case studies go beyond the quantitative statistical results and explain the conditions through the perspective of the “actors”. Thus, case study evaluations can cover both process and outcomes, because they can include both quantitative and qualitative data. Hence, case studies have been increasingly used in education (Boisjoly & DeMichiell, 1994) due to their characteristic of striving towards a holistic understanding of cultural systems of action (Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg, 1991).

Case studies entail intensive investigations of a single unit that would take the form of one person, group, project institution or agency (Mckenzie, Powell, and Usher, 1997 and Kane, 1995). In general, case studies have an advantage of being illustrative, illuminating, insightful and strong on reality (Wellington, 2000).

Since the case study approach to research inquiry is a qualitative method, it has certain characteristics that are of great importance to this study. Sommer and Sommer (1991) say that a case study provides the opportunity to the researcher to apply a multi-method approach to a unique event or setting. According to Kane (1995), this design, like in any other case study, entails an in-depth exploration of a situation, a process or an experience so as to provide context and situation specific data.
3.3 Variables of the Study
This section looks at dependent and independent variables of the study.

3.3.1 Dependent variable
The dependent variable of the study was implementation of the integrated English curriculum.

3.3.2 Independent Variables
The independent variables of the study were:

1. Teacher related variables
2. Variables related to initiation and development of the innovation
3. Variables related to diffusion of the innovation
4. Variables related to the adoption/implementation process.

Teacher related variables consist of the teacher’s level of professional training, academic qualifications, teaching experience, attitudes and teacher-teacher relationships. Variables related to initiation and development of the innovation include: need for the innovation, clarity of the innovation and complexity of the innovation. On the other hand, variables related to the adoption process include: the role of the head teacher, staff training, availability of learning materials and allocation of adequate learning time; whereas diffusion of the innovation as a variable is closely related to the roles of Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC).

3.4 Location of the Study
The study was conducted in Nairobi North District, Nairobi County. The selection of Nairobi County was prompted by the fact that the province houses KIE which is at the centre of initiation, development, and diffusion/adoptions of school curricula in Kenya. The province is also the headquarters to the MoE and KNEC which are in charge of quality assurance and standards, and assessment respectively.
3.5 Target Population

The target population for this study consisted of 23 public secondary schools, 101 teachers of secondary integrated English, 23 head teachers, and 3 heads of English subject at KIE, MoE and KNEC. According to the records that were availed to the researcher by the office of the Director of Education, Nairobi County had three districts- Nairobi West, Nairobi East and Nairobi North. The three districts had a total of 56 public secondary schools - six national, 20 provincial and 30 district schools (see Appendix IX). Nairobi West District had three national, nine provincial and 10 district schools whereas Nairobi North District had three national, five provincial and 13 district schools. On the other hand, Nairobi East District did not have any national school but it had six provincial and seven district schools respectively.

3.6 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

This part deals with the sampling procedure and sample size.

3.6.1 Sampling Procedure

The sampling done in qualitative research is usually purposive sampling (Patton, 1990; Mason, 1998) rather than random sampling or some other method of attaining statistical representativeness. In purposive sampling, sampling is done with a purpose in mind (Trochim, 2006). In fact, the researcher selects units which can enable him or her to make meaningful comparisons in relation to his or her research questions, his or her theory and the type of explanation he or she wishes to develop. According to Guba (1981), the goal of purposive sampling is twofold: to make sure one has adequately understood the variation in the phenomena of interest in the setting, and to test developing ideas about that setting by selecting phenomena that are crucial to the validity of those ideas.
Nairobi North District was purposively selected to maximize what could be learnt in
the period of time that was available for the study. Qualitative samples are usually
small for practical reasons to do with the costs, especially in terms of time and money,
of generating and analyzing qualitative data (Mason, 1998). Tellis (1997) asserts that
case studies tend to be selective, focusing on one or two issues that are fundamental to
understanding the system being examined. They can be seen to satisfy the three tenets
of the qualitative method: describing, understanding and explaining.

3.6.2 Sample Size

There are no rules for sample size in qualitative inquiry (Patton, 1990: 169). Patton
says:

Sample size depends on what you want to know, the purpose of
the inquiry, what is at stake, what will be useful, what will have
credibility, and what can be done with available time and
resources... The sample like all other aspects of qualitative
inquiry must be judged in context.

Mason (1998) supports Patton’s argument by saying that the size of the sample should
be dictated by the social process under scrutiny. She further points out that the
principle that the sample size should help the researcher to understand the process,
rather than represent (statistically) a population is a good one.

This qualitative research adopted a case study approach which called for an in-depth
study of secondary integrated English curriculum right from its inception to its current
state/practice in Nairobi North District of Nairobi County. The case study approach
enabled the researcher to gather rich data on the subject.

Due to the qualitative nature of this study, the sample size for the study consisted of
101 teachers of integrated English and 23 head teachers in Nairobi North District, and
three heads of English language – one from each of the three Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC).

3.7 Research Instruments

In order to obtain a holistic picture of integrated English curriculum since its inception to its current state/practice in secondary schools in Nairobi North District, this case study employed a qualitative multi-technique approach of data collection that is characteristic of the case study design. The study employed three types of data collection methods:

a. Questionnaire
b. Observation
c. Interview.

These instruments were constructed with the aim of answering the research questions.

3.7.1 Questionnaire

The researcher used a teacher questionnaire. Section A of the instrument sought the teachers’ background information whereas section B was used to elicit information regarding the teaching and implementation of integrated English curriculum from 101 teachers teaching integrated English in 22 of the 23 public secondary schools in Nairobi North District. One of the 23 public secondary schools had been used in the pilot study therefore it would not be included in the main study.

3.7.2 Observation


*Observation is a fundamental and critical method in all qualitative inquiry. It is used to discover complex interactions in natural social settings...It is, however, a method that requires a great deal of the researcher. Discomfort, uncomfortable ethical dilemmas and even danger, the difficulty of managing a relatively unobtrusive role, and the challenge to identify the ‘big picture’ while finely observing huge...*
amounts of fast-moving and complex behaviour are just a few of the challenges.

Direct observation occurs when a field visit is conducted during the case study. This technique is used for providing additional information about the topic being studied (Tellis, 1997). The researcher observed lesson activities of 13 teachers of integrated English in three purposively chosen public secondary schools in Nairobi North District - one national, one provincial and one district school.

Classroom lesson observations (using a lesson observation schedule – see Appendix IV) were carried out in each of the three schools for a period of four weeks. While in the classrooms, the researcher sat at the back of the classroom so as to get a clear view of the activities of the learners and the teachers, and also to avoid distracting the learners from the learning process. The reason as to why the researcher chose fewer teachers and schools is that observation of teaching in progress is normally time-consuming and quite involving. Large amounts of data are also gathered even in only one lesson.

Twenty four lesson observations were carried out by the researcher in each of the two purposively chosen provincial and district public secondary schools in Nairobi North District over a period of two months. Further, the researcher conducted thirty two lesson observations in a period of one month in a purposively selected national school in the same district. In total, 80 lessons were observed by the researcher. Information gathered during observation sessions was treated with confidentiality. The researcher wrote down whatever he observed as the lessons progressed with regard to the classroom implementation of integrated English curriculum. The researcher also took
Note of teacher activities and their impacts on learner activities and progress (see Appendix IV).

Lesson observations gave the researcher an opportunity to experience what actually happened during the teaching and assessment of secondary integrated English curriculum in a natural classroom setting. Observations were also used to counter-check information collected through teachers’ questionnaires and interviews with the head teachers.

3.7.3 Interview

Interviews were conducted individually through in-depth discussion of each item. This was so in order to create a good rapport with the respondents so that frank and honest views and impressions were easily solicited. In-depth interviewing is a data collection method relied on quite extensively by qualitative researchers (Marshall and Rossman, 1995; Mason, 1998).

According to Marshall and Rossman, an interview is a useful way to get large amounts of data quickly. Through it, immediate follow-up and clarification are possible. Marshall and Rossman further point out that when interviews are combined with observation, they allow the researcher to understand the meanings, understandings, knowledge, views, and experiences that people hold for their everyday activities. Interview schedules were used to get more information from 20 school head teachers in Nairobi North District, and three heads of English – one from each of three Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC). These interviews gave an additional dimension to the research. They helped the researcher to approach his research questions from a different angle and in greater depth (Mason, 1998).
Tellis (1997) says that interviews are one of the most important sources of case study information. During interviews, 20 head teachers and 3 heads of English - one from each of three Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC) were asked to comment on, propose solutions to or provide insight into the teaching and assessment of the secondary school integrated English curriculum. During these sessions, the researcher corroborated evidence obtained from other sources.

Stake (1995) points out that during open-ended interviews, the subjects’ schedule must dictate the activity. The researcher planned in advance on how to gain access to respondents (Mason, 1998), and also for sufficient resources while in the field. He clearly scheduled data collection activities, and tried to provide for unanticipated events (Tellis, 1997).

3.8 Pilot Study

The questionnaire for teachers and interview schedule for head teachers were pre-tested with teachers of integrated English and their head teachers respectively in one public secondary school in Nairobi North District. The purpose of piloting the instruments was to test the appropriateness of the items as well as the time required to use each instrument. The items were accordingly improved to enhance their reliability and validity; and also their quality and efficiency. The school and the subjects who participated in the pilot study were not used in the main study.

3.9 Validity and Reliability

According to Cano (http://www.qmuc.ac.uk/psyc/Rtrek/study_notes/web/sn5.htm), reliability and validity address issues about the quality of the data and appropriateness of the methods in carrying out a research project. Validity (also known as credibility and/or dependability) is a central issue in qualitative research (Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qualitative_research). A demonstration of validity is
sufficient to establish reliability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Patton (2001) also points out that reliability is a consequence of the validity in a study.

Ensuring validity in qualitative researches has been a source of criticism because of potential investigator subjectivity (Tellis, 1997). The study took into account the general scientific validity criticisms leveled against qualitative methods revolving around their low levels of objectivity that limit the generalization of data obtained (Mckenzie et al., 1997; Kane, 1995). The study, therefore, guarded against these limitations by using methodological triangulation.

Triangulation is engaging multiple methods of data collection such as, observation, interviews and recordings which lead to more valid, reliable and diverse construction of realities. It enriches the data collected. Triangulation is typically a strategy used in qualitative research to improve the validity and reliability of the findings (Golafshani, 2003). Mathison (1988) elaborates that triangulation is an important methodological issue in naturalistic and qualitative approaches. It is a strategy that is used to control bias and in establishing valid propositions. Patton (2001) also advocates the use of triangulation since it strengthens a study by combining methods.

The need for triangulation also arises from the ethical need to confirm the validity of the process (Tellis, 1997). This could be done by using multiple sources of data (Yin, 1984) to allow for trustworthiness of the data as well as enhance the validity of research findings (Kallon, 1996). The researcher also used simple quantitative statistical tools like frequencies and percentages to enhance the credibility of the results obtained (Mckenzie et al., 1997; Kane, 1995).
The validity of the instruments was tested during the piloting stage. Here, the research instruments were pre-tested to assess the clarity and suitability of the language used to ensure that they were valid and reliable before the actual study was carried out.

Validity and reliability of the data that was collected was ensured through the use of more than one instrument (questionnaire, interview and observation) to provide additional checks corroboration of data sources (Hunt, 1985; Patton, 1990; Shanguya, 1995; Mason, 1998; http://www.qmu.ac.uk/psych/Rtrek/study_notes/web/sn5.htm). The use of multiple methods in research in order to corroborate an account with data sources increases the reliability of the research (Cano, http://www.qmuc.ac.uk/psyc/Rtrek/study_notes/web/sn5.htm). Cano argues that the idea behind triangulation is that the more agreement of different data sources on a particular issue, the more reliable the interpretation of the data.

3.10 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher after piloting and revising the instruments administered the instruments in three phases as follows:

**Phase One:** The questionnaires were administered to 101 teachers of integrated English in their respective schools. To achieve reliable results, the researcher checked out whether there were any errors with the filled in questionnaires before collecting them from the concerned teachers.

**Phase Two:** The researcher interviewed 20 school head teachers and three heads of English language – one from each of the Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC) - at their convenient times. Information that resulted from these individuals helped to verify/counter-check information obtained through the questionnaires.
regarding the introduction and implementation of integrated English curriculum in public secondary schools in Nairobi North District.

**Phase Three**: Classroom lesson observations were conducted to cross-check information obtained through the questionnaire and interview schedule. The researcher observed classroom practice regarding the teaching and assessment of integrated English curriculum.

### 3.11 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

The researcher acquired a research permit from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education (see Appendix X) before proceeding to the study sites. Once the permit was secured, the researcher made visits to the District Education Officer in Nairobi North District, before going to the concerned secondary schools to seek permission for the study from the head teachers. The researcher then enlisted the co-operation and participation of the heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC by highlighting the purpose and importance of the research.

Eventually, a timetable of events during the study was drawn by the researcher in consultation with the various teachers of secondary integrated English and their head teachers to ease work in the field. Data gathering through questionnaires, interviews and lesson observations commenced as soon as it was agreed between the researcher and the concerned KIE, MoE and KNEC heads of English, the school head teachers and teachers of integrated English curriculum.

### 3.12 Summary

This chapter focused on the research methodology used to accomplish the study objectives. It emerges from this chapter that due to the nature of the present study, a qualitative research design was adopted. Further, the process that was used to collect and elicit data for this study is described in the chapter. It is also clear in the chapter
that majorly qualitative data analyses techniques were used to process the data which is normally the case with qualitative studies. The next chapter focuses on data analysis, presentation of results and discussion.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, data were interpreted, analyzed and discussed.

4.2 Data Analysis

The researcher used the Statistical Program for Social Scientists (SPSS) to organize the quantitative raw data collected from the questionnaires. Qualitative data arising from interviews and lesson observations was analyzed by establishing analytical categories from the statements of the respondents. For quantitative data, cross tabulation of responses and calculation of frequencies and percentages was done.

The study sought to answer the following research questions concerning the introduction and implementation of integrated English curriculum in Kenya:

1. What was the rationale for the introduction of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools?
2. How was integrated English curriculum introduced in Kenya?
3. What are the teachers’ reactions regarding the need for the secondary integrated English curriculum?
4. To what extent are teachers clear about the objectives of the secondary integrated English curriculum and how to achieve them?
5. How is integrated English curriculum being implemented in the secondary schools?
6. What challenges are encountered by teachers and Government agencies in the process of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum?
7. How do teachers and Government agencies deal with the challenges that they encounter in the process of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum?

4.3 Results and Discussions

Results are presented as per the research questions of the study.

4.3.1 Background Information

Background information gathered from teachers of integrated English curriculum in Nairobi North District on teachers’ professional training, teaching experience and gender is given in Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below.

Table 4.1: Head Teachers’ and Teachers’ Level of Professional Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Training</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that the teachers of integrated English curriculum and their head teachers were professionally trained teachers. In fact, 93.1 % of the teachers of integrated English curriculum and 95 % of the head teachers had either B.Ed or M.Ed degree.

The implication here is that these teachers of integrated English and their head teachers, as professionals, had an important ingredient that was likely to improve their effectiveness in their respective roles in ensuring successful implementation of the innovation in the classrooms and schools. This is because high quality pre-service
preparation of teachers and their head teachers is absolutely essential for their effectiveness. In fact, trained teachers are likely to interpret and implement integrated English curriculum better as compared to their colleagues who are untrained (Berry, Daughtrey and Wieder, 2010; Boyd et al., 2008)

**Table 4.2: Head teachers’ and Teachers’ Teaching Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Years</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that most of the teachers (71.3 %) of integrated English curriculum (72 teachers) had an experience of 10 years or more. On the other hand, 95 % of the head teachers (19 head teachers) had a teaching experience of more than 10 years. Only one head teacher had a teaching experience of less than three years. The results show that most of the teachers of integrated English curriculum were experienced teachers. Equally, their head teachers were experienced school leaders.

It is worthwhile to note that teachers’ and head teachers’ teaching experience is significant as far as the implementation of any curriculum implementation is concerned. They are the actual implementers of any designed school curriculum. On
the same note, Adeyemi (2008) who examined teachers’ teaching experience and students’ learning outcomes in the secondary schools in Ondo State Nigeria asserts that schools with more teachers with five years and above teaching experience achieve better results than schools having more teachers with less than five years teaching experience.

**Table 4.3: Head Teachers’ and Teachers’ Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that a significant proportion of the teachers (73.3 %) teaching integrated English curriculum in Nairobi North District were female. This finding seems to agree with the situation in the UK where it is reported that teaching is fast becoming an all-female profession with women outnumbering men in the classroom as much as 13 to one (London Evening Standard, 2006).

Concerning head teachers, 75 % of them (15 head teachers) were male whereas 25 % of them (five head teachers) were female. Hence, there were more male head teachers in the study schools as compared to females.

**4.3.2 Rationale for Integrating English Language and Literature**

To understand the rationale for the introduction of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools, the researcher interviewed three heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC. In an interview with the Head of English at the Ministry of Education, it came out that the idea of integrated English curriculum for secondary schools was meant to
enable teachers use content in Literature to teach English language and vice versa. This means that teachers of integrated English are expected to know the content of both English language and Literature, and also have the practical skills necessary to exploit the relationship between the two subjects and their constituent parts.

The Head of English at KIE further pointed out that integration was necessary since English language is best learnt in a given context. According to her, meaningful experiences and literary materials provide a natural context for the teaching of English language. She also argued as follows:

*Good mastery of English language enhances effective appreciation of literary materials. Integration emphasizes mastery of English language or communication competencies; and the best way to acquire these skills is through integration.*

It can be discerned from the quote above that good knowledge of English language can help learners to understand and enjoy literary works. Therefore it seems, from the foregoing excerpt, that pieces of Literature cannot be appreciated well if the learners do not have good mastery of English language.

The Head of English at KNEC explained that:

*With the introduction of 8-4-4 System of Education, integration of English language and Literature was motivated by the fact that the two are one and the same. They use the same materials and complement each other. Accomplished writers use applied grammar at its best. To study Literature, you need grammar. The teaching of grammar and writing is a constituency of Literature. Analysis of written works is done through introducing class readers. Literature, through class readers, helps learners to gather language unconsciously. In fact, the world of Literature gives the context of use.*

According to this Head of English, the thinking was that Literature and English language are two sides of the same coin which basically support each other. Literature thus gives the context of English language use. He pointed out that learning of
English language is found and/or is situated well in literary works which are normally varied and graded according to the level of the learners. In the context of the current English curriculum, integration is seen as a teaching tool, that is, using literary works to teach grammar and vice versa.

According to Sivasubramaniam (2006), Literature fosters an overall increase in reading proficiency and promotes students’ academic and/or professional goals. The separation of Literature from language is a false dualism since Literature is language and language can indeed be literary (Savvidou, 2006). Savvidou further says that the boundaries that are thought to exist between literary and non-literary discourse are not so distinct. Indangasi (1988) opines that integration of English language and Literature will compel learners to appreciate the special relationship between the two subjects and consequently the special way in which literary writers use language. Integration of language and literature aids the learning of vocabulary and reading skills since the latter has a lot of materials (Omollo, 1990; Brumfit, 1985).

4.3.3 Introduction of Integrated English Curriculum

In tracing how integrated English curriculum was introduced in Kenya, the heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC were interviewed by the researcher. According to the Head of English at KIE, the idea of integration arose from the recommendations of the Mackay Report of 1981 which addressed the issue of relevance of our education, that is, self-reliance. During the interview, this Head of English pointed out that the report had noted that specialization of subjects took place at a very early stage. Due to this early specialization, some students dropped literature or English language at Form 3. To avoid this scenario, the idea of integrated English curriculum was mooted.
All the three heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC told the researcher that before any curriculum is designed and eventually implemented, needs assessment/consultation must be carried out among the stakeholders. They further pointed out that, as required, needs assessment for the introduction of the first phase of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya was carried out before it was designed and first implemented in 1986.

The Head of English at KNEC said that needs assessment that was carried out before the introduction of the first phase of the integrated English curriculum, led to the development of a unified English syllabus. This syllabus was meant to help teachers teach English in a uniform way in all schools in Kenya. Based on the needs assessment survey that was conducted, integrated English series textbooks were developed to back up and cover the syllabus that had been developed.

Ogula (n.d.) says that, in line with the recommendation of the Presidential Working Party on the establishment of the second University, development of the curriculum for secondary schools started in 1984. Complete course materials were developed by teams of writers who included secondary school teachers, inspectors of schools, university lecturers, and curriculum developers. Further Ogula points out that the writers were brought together for about two to four weeks. Unfortunately, according to him, syllabuses and other material were not tested before implementation nationally.

According to the Head of English at KIE, needs assessment was conducted among the stakeholders before the second phase of integrated English curriculum was designed and implemented in 2002.
She told the researcher:

_During national needs assessment survey that was conducted in 1999, learners complained that most areas of integrated English language and Literature were difficult. It was discovered that these areas were perceived as difficult primarily due to the approach adopted in teaching them. Thus, there was need to bring in aspects of performance and meaningful experiences, that is, contexts in their learning._

It emerged from discussions with the three heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC the panel system was used to design the integrated English curriculum and that the following panel members were involved in designing and introducing integrated English curriculum in secondary schools: KIE curriculum developers, KIE research officers, staff from the MoE - Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS), DQAS staff from all the provinces, a representative of KNEC, representatives of practicing teachers from all the provinces, representatives of universities, representatives of diploma colleges; and from the British Council.

According to Ogula (n.d.) curriculum development teams, besides those named above, also include examination secretaries and representatives of the Kenya National Union of Teachers. Ogula further argues that the few teachers who get selected to participate in the development of the curriculum and curriculum materials are not representative of the views of the other secondary school teachers. The former are selected because they are deemed better than the latter in their subject.

According to the Head of English at KIE, the integrated English panel was charged with the responsibility of designing the curriculum and also coming up with the right course objectives and content. The panel, according to the Head of KNEC, was tasked
to do the following: Coming up with the syllabus, writing of integrated English books, writing of the English handbook and other materials; and training of teachers at the provinces in conjunction with teachers who had been trained at the national level.

The Head of English at MoE said that KIE developed the integrated English curriculum and produced teaching materials, whereas the staff from the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards assessed the curriculum and the resource materials. They also supervised the implementation of the curriculum at the school level. Kenya National Examinations Council, according to this Head of English, developed sample evaluation tools.

The KNEC Head of English said that Secondary English Language Project (SELP) was launched at the national level in March 1988, to train teachers on how to implement the new integrated English curriculum. He said that SELP had two main objectives: to establish a sustainable system of in-service training at the district level and to establish a higher standard of English language teaching in Kenyan secondary schools.

Consequently, according to him, SELP organized in-service training courses for teachers at the national, provincial and district levels. Some of the teachers, including the current KNEC Head of English, were sponsored to undergo further training in Britain. Secondary English Language Project also established teachers’ resource centres and trained quality assurance officers and tutors to ensure sustainability of in-service courses in integrated English.
Ogula (n.d.) confirms that the Ministry of Education conducted various in-service courses for teachers in 1986 and 1987. He, however, says that due to inadequate funds, it was not possible for the MoE to run those courses regularly. Consequently, there was a big gap between the intended curriculum and the curriculum as it was interpreted and taught by teachers. Most of the teachers were not well oriented to implement the new curriculum and also on how to use the new approaches in their teaching.

Despite SELP’s in-service efforts and programs, only 43 % of the teachers (43 teachers) of integrated English said that they had attended in-service training to learn on how to teach secondary integrated English curriculum before they started teaching the subject. Interestingly, one of these teachers pointed out that the facilitators did not help them much since they just asked them to be innovative in their teaching of integrated English. This teacher is pointing to the fact that the facilitators did not equip the concerned teachers with the required knowledge, understanding and skills for them to help them teach integrated English without many problems. The facilitators themselves seemed to be struggling with the concept of integration. They were not quite clear about integration and how it should operate at the classroom level.

According to Ogula (n.d.), the inspectors of schools demonstrated commitment to curriculum reform but most of them were ineffective in giving teachers the required guidance. He further points out that the inspectors themselves had not been adequately trained. Worse still, some of the key decision makers used authoritarian methods to secure support for the reformed curriculum instead of engaging in meaningful dialogue with teachers and other educators.
Table 4.4 below shows attendance of in-service training by teachers to learn how to teach secondary integrated English curriculum.

**Table 4.4: Attendance of In-Service Training by Teachers to Learn How to Teach Secondary Integrated English Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 42.6% of the teachers attended in–service training to learn how to teach integrated English curriculum while 57.4% of the teachers did not. The results clearly show that most of the teachers did not undergo any type of in-service training before they started the actual teaching of integrated English curriculum.

This research has shown that a bulk of the teachers started teaching the curriculum without proper understanding as regards the implementation of integrated English curriculum. This finding is in agreement with Ogula’s (n.d.) assertion that most of the teachers were not well oriented to implement the new curriculum and also on how to use the new approaches in their teaching. All the same, it is important to note that successful implementation of a curriculum innovation is only possible when all teachers are thoroughly well prepared, trained and supported (Carless, 2003 and 1999).

The results further reveal that 67% of the teachers (38 teachers) who never attended any form of in-service training before they started teaching integrated English curriculum said that they were not offered any chance(s) to undergo such training at whichever level.
One of them said:

*There was a specific number of teachers that was required to attend the training and I was not among them. However, other teachers from English department attended. Had I been given the opportunity or sponsorship, I would have attended the training.*

Another teacher said that schools did not have enough resources to sponsor them to attend in-service courses at the inception of integrated English curriculum.

It is clear from the excerpt that a number of teachers who had the desire and willingness to attend in-service training in integrated English did not get a chance to do so since only a few of the teachers were given the sponsorship by their respective schools to attend the training. Lack of attendance of in-service training has a huge negative implication on the teachers’ teaching of integrated English.

Lack of proper information was also cited as a reason for not attending integrated English courses by 53% of the teachers (30 teachers). They pointed out that there was a breakdown in communication between the MoE and the schools, resulting in the teachers not getting information on in-service training on time. As a result, they could not attend the courses. According to Altrichter (2005), it is important that communication forums for information exchange and collaboration are intensified between the external experts and the concerned teachers.

According to 48% of the teachers (27 teachers), the MoE never at all organized any in-service training on how to teach secondary integrated English curriculum when the program was first introduced. For them, that was the reason as to why they did not hear of any such training. Thirty two percent of the teachers (18 teachers) were either in universities/colleges or out of the teaching profession at the time of introduction of
integrated English curriculum and hence they could not attend the said in-service courses.

Limited time was also reported as a reason as to why they did not attend in-service training. Thirty percent of the teachers (17 teachers) said that due to limited time in their hands, they chose not to attend in-service training so as to concentrate on teaching the new subject. It is interesting to note that these teachers chose to continue teaching a subject they did not understand well instead of going for in-service training to acquire necessary knowledge, skills and teaching methods.

When teachers were asked whether they were encouraged by their head teachers to attend seminars, workshops and conferences so as to understand goal(s) of integrated English curriculum, 78 % of them (79 teachers) answered in the affirmative whereas 22 % of the teachers (22 teachers) said that they were not given such encouragement.

Carless (2003 and 1999) says that however good the rationale for the introduction of a curriculum innovation may be, implementation of the innovation can only be successful if adequate teacher training and support is put in place by the concerned parties. Further research reveals that however simple and straightforward the process of implementing a new curriculum might seem, in actual practice, teachers must be supported (Hord and Huling-Austin, 1986).

4.3.4 Teachers’ Reactions towards Integrated English Curriculum

Teachers’ reactions towards secondary integrated English curriculum were sought through the use of a questionnaire structured into five areas: Level of difficulty of integrated English curriculum, teachers’ attitudes towards secondary integrated English curriculum, need to integrate English language and Literature, integrated English curriculum and learners’ needs and objectives of secondary integrated
curriculum.

i) Level of Difficulty of Integrated English Curriculum

Teachers’ responses in regard to the level of difficulty of the integrated English curriculum were sought and are presented in Table 4.5 below.

**Table 4.5: Level of Difficulty to Implement Integrated English Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated English is difficult to implement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated English is not difficult to implement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that 55.5% of the teachers (56 teachers) indicated that it was difficult to implement secondary integrated English curriculum while 44.5% of them (45 teachers) said that it was not difficult to implement. One of the teachers who found it easy to implement integrated English curriculum said:

*I have been fully trained to implement the integrated English curriculum. Thus, I am fully equipped to implement it. The several years of experience makes it even much easier for me each subsequent year.*

Eighty percent of the head teachers (16 head teachers) said that integrated English was difficult to implement and 20% of them (4 head teachers) indicated that the subject was not difficult to implement.

The fact that 44.6% of the teachers (45 teachers) and 80% of the head teachers (16 head teachers) said that integrated English was difficult to implement, it means that a
substantial number of teachers faced difficulties when implementing integrated English curriculum. This could be the reason as to why in 80% of the lessons that were observed (64 classroom lesson observations), the concerned teachers taught English language and Literature as separate entities. They did not exploit the complementary relationship between the two subjects to teach the integrated English curriculum.

Lack of adequate teaching/learning resources was quoted by 62% of the teachers (32 teachers) and 50% of the head teachers (10 head teachers) as a reason working against easy implementation of integrated English curriculum. English language textbooks and Literature set-books were among the resources that were said by teachers to be inadequate. It was pointed out that in some of the schools, resources and facilities were not available and thus, that negatively affected the implementation of the subject. The researcher, from his classroom observations, noted that in most lessons nearly half of the students did not have the necessary learning materials such as English textbooks and Literature set-books.

Lack of adequate and necessary training on the aspect of integration was given as the main hindrance to effective and easy implementation of integrated English curriculum. Fifty eight percent of the teachers (30 teachers) were of this opinion. One teacher argued:

Some teachers are not trained to teach both English language and Literature but they are expected to teach integrated English curriculum. These teachers find it difficult to teach some areas of the syllabus where they are not competent. These teachers require regular guidance on how to approach integrated English curriculum. Unfortunately, KIE and other experts have not given adequate training on integration. Equally, schools have not provided teachers with enough sponsorship to undertake in-service courses on the aspect of integration. Competent facilitators are also rare to come by.
Eighty five percent of the head teachers (17 head teachers) also pointed out that their teachers of integrated English found it difficult to implement the curriculum because they lacked appropriate training. A head teacher explained:

*Most of our teachers were not trained on how to integrate English language and Literature while in their respective colleges, and even some of them took either English language or Literature. Unfortunately, many current practicing teachers have not attended seminars and workshops to prepare for the challenges of implementing integrated English. Thus, the approach confuses them and their learners. In most cases, they handle the various aspects of integrated English independent of each other, ignoring the recommended integrated approach.*

It is unfortunate that most of the teachers of integrated English had not been trained on how to integrate the two disciplines and their respective constituent parts and yet, according to Thomas (1994) such an innovation necessitated (partially) new expertise. He says that innovation involves a process of relearning competencies and attitudes by the existing teachers if at all they are to function well in their classrooms.

Forty four percent of the teachers (23 teachers) gave limited time allocated to integrated English curriculum as the reason for finding it difficult to implement the program as expected. One of them said:

*Time allocated to integrated English on the time-table is inadequate. More time is needed to achieve objectives of integrated English, some of which are unclear to us teachers. The objectives of the two subjects are different and thus difficult to meet within the allocated time.*

Fifty five percent of the head teachers (11 head teachers) were in support of the teachers that time allocated to integrated English is not adequate to teach as expected effectively. One head teacher said:
The time allocated for integrated English on the time-table is too short for the teachers to cover the two disciplines in an integrated manner. In fact, the syllabus is too wide to be covered within the designated time. This is particularly so given that Literature has a lot of work to be done.

Time requires major consideration when implementing a new curriculum. In fact, it takes a lot time for teachers to understand an innovation and to change their practices accordingly. This is because they will need time to discuss, experiment and learn together so as to gradually acquire key competencies as regards the new curriculum. The teachers will also need time to plan, discuss, reflect and support each other in the implementation of the new curriculum. They cannot just be expected to make instant changes in knowledge, teaching approaches, and attitudes (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2010).

It also came out from the teachers’ views (31 of them) that since the mode of setting examinations still requires that teachers teach both English language and Literature in details, the workload is overwhelming on the part of the teachers. This is more so due to the fact that a teacher has to make reference to both the two subjects every now and again.

The results of studies on curriculum implementation in Hong Kong by Carless (2003 and 1999) confirm the finding of this study that several factors influence implementation of any curriculum innovation. These factors include: adequate and necessary teacher training and support, teacher understanding of an innovation, and the syllabus, time available and availability of resources.
Unlike in the current study where most of the teachers and majority of the head teachers did not embrace integrated English curriculum, almost all staff in Rolfe’s (2009) study on curriculum innovation in Jersey on the transfer of children from primary to secondary schools, embraced the program and were enthusiastic about taking part in it. Unlike in the case of integrated English, teachers saw the innovation as a necessary change and looked forward to teaching outside their specialisation.

ii) Teachers’ Attitudes towards Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

Individual teachers’ attitudes towards change itself and towards the specific innovation intended is an important factor that can contribute to the quality and direction of the change (Altrichter, 2005). Teachers’ attitudes towards secondary integrated English are captured in Table 4.6 below.
Table 4.6: Teachers’ Attitudes towards Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of secondary IEC</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is beneficial to the learners and their teachers.</td>
<td>13 13.1</td>
<td>56 56.6</td>
<td>4 4.0</td>
<td>17 17.2</td>
<td>9 9.1</td>
<td>99 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary IEC is broad.</td>
<td>44 44.4</td>
<td>39 39.4</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
<td>13 13.1</td>
<td>2 2.0</td>
<td>99 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary IEC is easy to teach.</td>
<td>7 7.1</td>
<td>32 32.3</td>
<td>11 11.1</td>
<td>35 35.4</td>
<td>14 14.1</td>
<td>99 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of English language and Literature has led to better performance.</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>27 27.6</td>
<td>16 16.3</td>
<td>28 28.6</td>
<td>19 19.4</td>
<td>98 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language and Literature should continue to be taught in an integrated manner.</td>
<td>13 13.1</td>
<td>28 28.3</td>
<td>3 3.0</td>
<td>30 30.3</td>
<td>25 25.3</td>
<td>99 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language and Literature should continue to be evaluated in an integrated manner.</td>
<td>13 13.1</td>
<td>27 27.3</td>
<td>3 3.0</td>
<td>30 30.3</td>
<td>26 26.3</td>
<td>99 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* IEC- Integrated English Curriculum

Table 4.6 shows that 70% of the teachers (69 teachers) indicated that they either strongly agreed or agreed that the content of secondary integrated English curriculum is beneficial to the learners and their teachers. Only 26 percent of the teachers (26 teachers) indicating that they either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement. From the interviews that were conducted, it was realized that 75% of the head teachers (15 head teachers) strongly agreed or agreed that the content of
secondary integrated English curriculum is beneficial to the learners and their teachers. Two of them said that they were not certain whether it was beneficial to the learners or not. Those head teachers who either strongly disagreed or disagreed that the content of integrated English was beneficial to the learners were 15% (3 head teachers). Thus, a majority of both the teachers and their head teachers were in agreement that the content of integrated English was beneficial to the learners.

Regarding how broad integrated English curriculum is, 84% of the teachers (83 teachers) either strongly agreed or agreed that the curriculum was too broad. Equally, 90% of the head teachers (18 head teachers) were of the same view that the curriculum was too broad. Whereas 15% of teachers (15 teachers) felt that the curriculum was not too broad, only one percent of the head teachers (one head teacher) was of the same view. One teacher and head teacher respectively were uncertain whether the curriculum was too broad or not. Therefore, most teachers and head teachers felt that integrated English curriculum was too broad.

On the item on whether secondary integrated English was easy to teach, 39% of the teachers (39 teachers) either strongly agreed or agreed. However, 61% of the teachers (60 teachers) either strongly disagreed or disagreed or were uncertain whether it was easy to teach integrated English curriculum or not. Only 35% of the head teachers (seven head teachers) said that integrated English was easy to teach. Forty five percent of them (11 head teachers) said that the subject was not easy to teach. Two percent of the head teachers were not certain whether the curriculum was easy to teach or not. The implication here is that most of the teachers and the head teachers found integrated English curriculum hard to teach.
Forty eight percent of the teachers (47 teachers) and 45 % of the head teachers (9 head teachers) respectively indicated that integration of English language and Literature had not led to better performance. Thirty six percent of the teachers (35 teachers) and 35 % of the head teachers (7 head teachers) respectively strongly agreed or agreed that the curriculum had led to better performance. Another 16 percent of the teachers (16 teachers) and 20 % of the head teachers (4 head teachers) respectively indicated that they were uncertain whether integration had led to better performance. Thus, a majority of the teachers and most of the head teachers did not find any direct link, or were not sure of any, between integration of English language and Literature and performance.

Regarding whether English language and Literature should continue to be taught in an integrated manner, 56 % of the teachers (55 teachers) and 50 % of the head teachers (10 head teachers) respectively strongly disagreed or disagreed. Three percent of the teachers (three teachers) were uncertain whether integration should continue or not.

Forty one percent of the teachers (41 teachers) and 50 % of the head teachers (10 head teachers) strongly agreed or agreed that the two subjects should continue to be taught in an integrated manner. The fact that more than half of the teachers and half of the head teachers were against the continued teaching of English language and Literature in an integrated manner raises a lot of concern. In fact, it can be possible that the concept of integration was challenging to both the teachers and schools to effectively put into practice.

Fifty seven percent of the teachers (56 teachers) and 55 % of the head teachers (11 head teachers) strongly disagreed or disagreed when they were asked whether English language and Literature should continue to be evaluated in an integrated manner. On
the other hand, 41% of the teachers (40 teachers) and 45% of the head teachers (9 head teachers) supported the idea of continuing to evaluate English language and Literature in an integrated manner. Three percent of the teachers (three teachers) were uncertain whether evaluation of English language and Literature in an integrated manner should continue or not. Since most teachers and head teachers were against evaluating the two subjects in an integrated manner, this meant that there was a problem in the manner in which teachers taught and evaluated integrated English.

The findings of this study agree with those of Carless (2003) who did a study on curriculum implementation in Hong Kong and found that teacher beliefs and attitudes strongly influence implementation of curriculum innovation.

iii) Need to Integrate English Language and Literature

Results on the need to integrate English language and Literature are captured in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7: Need to Integrate English Language and Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need to integrate the two subjects.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to integrate the two subjects.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that 48% of the teachers (48 teachers) pointed out that there was need to integrate English language and Literature. Equally, 8% of the head teachers (eight head teachers) said that the move was necessary.
One of the teachers who supported integration of the two subjects argued:

Integration has made the teaching of English language more pragmatic. Literature has given variety to English language teaching and learning. It also has exposed students to a variety of language use in different and several contexts. Actually, integration has enabled students to read widely and to equip themselves with a lot of knowledge. Particularly, borrowing of language from Literature and vice versa has enhanced the learners’ level of competence.

On the other hand, a head teacher who was in support of the integration explained:

There was need to integrate English language and Literature because some of the study skills had been neglected in the former syllabus. In the integrated system, all the four language skills, i.e. reading, writing, speaking and listening are incorporated and taken care of. Hence, the learners will now be able to internalize and express themselves better in English language.

Another head teacher supported integration as follows:

Integration of English language and Literature saves learners’ time as well as teachers’ time because most skills are taught together since the two disciplines have a strong corelationship. This is a better approach that exposes learners and teachers to both fields of English language and Literature. In a way, artistic skills used and taught in literature enhance the learners’ language. The approach also helps learners to think broadly and critically through the teaching and analysis of literary texts. Through the teaching and learning of Literature, learners are able to develop and form their own desired characters.

All the same, 53 % of the teachers (53 teachers) and 55 % of the head teachers (11 head teachers) indicated that there was no need for such an action. It can be noted that slightly more than half of the teachers and head teachers did not welcome the idea of integrating the two subjects. Teachers and their head teachers gave a variety of reasons as to why they felt that it was not useful to integrate the two subjects.

Forty one percent of the teachers (41 teachers) who responded to this item felt that it was not useful to integrate English language and Literature because the two subjects
are quite broad to be taught as one unit within the time that is allocated. A teacher said:

_The time given to teach integrated English is not enough to cover the syllabus, leave alone to explore the two subjects in detail. In fact, literature is a broad discipline that needs its own special time. Equally, English language is too broad to be integrated with Literature. Due to lack of adequate time, the holistic approach to Literature is suppressed. It will be in order if English language and Literature can once again be allocated separate times on the time-table and taught as separate entities._

Thirty five percent of the teachers (35 teachers) said that with integration, Literature as a subject had lost glory and flavour. This is because literature is now being taught as part of English language. It no longer stands out as a distinct subject. One concerned teacher argued:

_Literature is now not taught exhaustively and analytically as is expected. Critical thinking and deep analysis of Literature materials and texts has lost meaning since it is English language that is given prominence. Literature is no longer adequately covered. It no longer caters for highly analytical minds. This negates the value of Literature since the objectives of Literature are not met. With integration, our Literature will be forgotten. Literature is interesting when taught as distinct and separate subject._

It was pointed out by another teacher that integration had greatly disadvantaged learners who like Literature since the subject is now taught in a shallow manner. He said:

_Integration has killed Literature. Students only learn half Literature and half English language. Each subject should be taught as its own discipline. Both need to be developed on their own to avoid ending up with half-baked learners in both the two subjects._

Twenty nine percent of the teachers (29 teachers) said that English language and Literature are two distinct disciplines and therefore, each should be taught as its own separate entity.
One of these teachers said:

*English language and Literature should be taught separately to avoid biases of the teachers affecting one of the subjects or both. Biases arise from the fact that some of the teachers were only trained in one of the subjects during their pre-service. In some colleges, while being trained, there was the aspect of minor and major subject between English language and Literature. This means that not both were given equal attention. For some teachers, they did not learn both English language and Literature while in college. For those who learnt both, most of them were not trained on how to integrate the two subjects.*

It was pointed out by another teacher that when a teacher is not trained in a given subject, he/she finds it difficult to develop an interest in that discipline. Eventually, this leads to lack of competence. She said:

*Some teachers are comfortable teaching English language while others are comfortable teaching Literature. Therefore, there is a tendency for teachers to over-teach certain skills in English language or Literature, ignoring the rest, depending on the competence of the teacher.*

A head teacher who was against integration of English and Literature said:

*I do not think there was a desperate need to integrate English language and Literature since the teaching and evaluation became more complicated. I am convinced that English language needs to be taught separately from Literature in English. This way, students will be able to make a choice between the two subjects. As it is today, they do not have any choice and those who do not like Literature find it a burden. Some of the areas in the current syllabus are too difficult for a majority of the students. For instance, they find poetry and the many short stories that they are supposed to read and master to be quite challenging. Learners sometimes get confused. Also, some teachers spend more time on one of the disciplines, depending on their personal interests and specializations, at the expense of the other.*

Another head teacher pointed out:

*It was not important to integrate English language and Literature. This is because some students are better in English language while others are better in Literature. Integrating both would then mean that learners will not be able to clearly choose the discipline to study and to later specialize in during their further studies. Teachers also have different specializations. Most of them have specialized in either of the two subjects. Thus, integrating the*
subjects means that most teachers may not deliver as expected.

In an interview with one of the head teachers, it came out that most of the teachers went through pre-service training where English language and Literature were treated as separate entities. It was also pointed out by this head teacher that the integrated English curriculum is too wide to be completed within the allocated time. According to her, this affects revision for examinations.

Other reasons that teachers advanced for being against integration of English language and Literature include: Literature takes most of the time for English language lessons, thus ignoring English language - an important area of the syllabus; no prior training had been given to teachers; both English language and Literature are subjects with their own rules; integrated English confuses and is cumbersome to the learners; one does not have to know Literature to do English language and vice versa; not all learners can study and interpret literature; integration does not allow for proper testing of the skills taught in English language; students are denied a choice between the two subjects and yet some of them are good in English language but not in Literature and vice versa; and examining integrated English is difficult.

iv) Integrated English Curriculum and Learners’ Needs

Table 4.8 below gives information (as given by the teachers of English) on whether integrated English curriculum meets the learners’ needs.
Table 4.8: Integrated English Curriculum versus Learners’ Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated English curriculum meets learners’ needs.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated English curriculum does not meet learners’ needs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 above shows that whereas 52.5 % of the teachers (53 teachers) indicated that secondary integrated English curriculum met the needs of their learners; another 47.5 % of the teachers (48 teachers) said that the curriculum did not meet the needs of their learners. On the item as to whether secondary integrated English curriculum meets the needs of their learners, 60 % of the head teachers (12 head teachers) felt that secondary integrated English curriculum met the needs of their learners while another 40 % of the head teachers (eight head teachers) indicated that it did not.

One of the few head teachers who said that integrated English curriculum met the needs of their learners pointed out:

*There is now a practical element in the teaching and use of language. The passive approach of teaching English language on its own is no longer applicable. The integrated approach has made teaching and learning of English language both enjoyable and stimulating. The learners get exposed to almost all aspects of English language and Literature and this equips them with the necessary pre-requisite ingredients for future endeavours, and better language results and competence. The approach has enabled the learners to appreciate the close connection between English language and Literature.*

In an interview with a head teacher who argued that integrated English curriculum did not meet the needs of the learners, it was realized that due to the time constraint, learners were under too much pressure to complete the syllabus. As a result,
integrated approach is not widely used by the teachers and their learners. This head teacher added:

With most of the teachers being unfamiliar with integration, the results are anybody’s guess.

Another head teacher who was of the view that the curriculum did not meet the needs of the learners said:

I think that integration narrows learners to studying only a few set-books. To the contrary, they are supposed to read a lot of literary materials more than just a few set-books so as to be ready to handle Literature at higher levels. The approach confuses the learners when all the aspects of English language and Literature are taught together as one subject- English. This confusion contributes to mass failure especially for the weak students.

One of the head teachers argued that performance in Kiswahili which is not fully integrated seems to be much better compared to the performance in English. She further pointed out that integration goes against the spirit of student specialization, that is, choosing to study one subject deeply with a hope of pursuing that discipline to greater heights later in the course of his/her studies.

All the same, 50 % of the teachers (50 teachers) and 30 % of the head teachers (six head teachers) said that their learners liked the integration of English language and Literature. One of the teachers said:

The learners have no choice. In the first place, they were not given room to compare and decide whether to do English language or Literature as separate subjects. They, therefore, have to like integrated English curriculum the way it is so as to pass their examinations. If anything, the practical approach that is employed to teach integrated English is much more interesting and interactive.

During the interviews, another head teacher explained:

Learners like integration because the approach provides more time for interactive and learner-based learning. Learners now read and discuss language and use of literary devices in a practical way. They say English language is no longer a subject full of abstract and boring concepts. Hence, they are more active in the learning process than before. They enjoy themselves
throughout the integrated English sessions.

Forty four percent of the teachers (44 teachers) and 70 % of the head teachers (14 head teachers) indicated that their learners did not like integration of the two subjects.

One of the teachers explained the students’ dislike of integrated English as follows:

Students find integrated English to be too wide, involving and demanding. It demands a lot of their participation and dedication. This disadvantages those students who lack good language command to effectively participate in class. On the same note, those who do not have an aptitude for Literature, find it inaccessible, almost drudgery. Thus, when the two subjects are presented in an integrated manner, the concepts get mixed up and this brings about confusion and lack of clarity of the subject. Comprehension of the subject becomes minimal.

Another teacher said:

With integration, there is no room for enjoyment and creativity that comes with the teaching of Literature as a distinct subject on its own. Extensive reading of Literature as a distinct field is no longer there. The learners do not get enough time to analyze Literature books comprehensively. Consequently, they tend to use the little time allocated to integrated English to learn Literature and thus, ignore English language.

According to another teacher of integrated English:

Integration kills creativity in composition writing since they have to reproduce textual materials. (Composition is nowadays based on literature set text books). Also, students who would like to specialize in one of the two disciplines where they have interest and are good in, are not allowed to do so due to integration. Hence, students post poor results since they are forced to do the two disciplines in an integrated manner.

Majority of the head teachers (14 of them) said that their learners did not like integration of English language and Literature. One of these head teachers argued:

Learners do not like integration of English language and Literature. They claim that the approach is confusing. Most of them are not able to integrate the two subjects in the learning situations. For example, they are not able to connect Literature and grammar. Despite this situation, the current syllabus demands that learners should be able to learn aspects of grammar, writing
skills, sentence structures and even vocabulary from the Literature set-books. Unfortunately, most students still view the two subjects as two separate entities and tend to enjoy approaching each separately. Consequently, in answering questions and/or compositions based on set-books, students ignore the grammatical structures and concentrate on required number of points. Examiners deny such students full marks despite their having the required points.

It was also clear from another head teacher that learners did not like integration. In an interview with him, he said:

*Pressure to complete the wide integrated English syllabus has made the subject less interesting to the learners. The content they are expected to master is simply too wide within the allocated time. As a result, teachers just force their students to write many notes which they do not even read. Also, the learners find it a bother to apply knowledge of literature in English language and vice versa. Some of them like English language while others like Literature. Those who like literature do, whereas those who do not, do not. Those who do not like Literature find it cumbersome and even complain about it. But those who like Literature rely on it to do well in English. If the two subjects are separated, the learners would make more relevant choices based on their interests.*

Whereas in 27 of the lessons that were observed by the researcher learners actively participated and were enthusiastic about the learning of integrated English, in the other 53 lessons that were observed, the learners were dull and disinterested with the subject and/or the learning process. They rarely participated in the learning process. This scenario is a likely pointer that the learners’ needs and interests might have not been met by the content of integrated English in most of the lessons.

v) **Objectives of Secondary Integrated Curriculum**

The researcher sought to know teachers’ reactions as regards significance of clarity of objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum and their own clarity regarding the same objectives. Their respective reactions are captured in Tables 4.9 and 4.10 below.
Table 4.9: Significance of Clarity of Objectives of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of the objectives of integrated English curriculum is significant.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of the objectives of integrated English curriculum is not significant.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 85% of the teachers and 65% of the head teachers (13 head teachers) (see Table 4.9 above) said that clarity of objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum was significant. On the other hand, 14.9% of the teachers (15 teachers) and 35% of the head teachers (seven head teachers) (see Table 4.9 above) indicated that clarity of the objectives was not significant. It is clear that both teachers and head teachers appreciate the significance of clarity of the objectives of integrated English curriculum. This finding is in tandem with Fullan’s (1994) assertion that lack of conceptual clarity can frustrate curriculum implementation.

Table 4.10: Clarity of Objectives of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum to Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives are clear.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives are not clear.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On whether the objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum were clear to
them, 59.4 % of the teachers and 55 % of the head teachers (11 head teachers) (see Table 4.10) said that the objectives were clear to them while 40.6 % of the teachers and 45 % of the head teachers (nine head teachers) (see Table 4.10) said the objectives were not clear to them. This is a sad situation since lack of role clarity and ambiguity about expectations can frustrate implementation of the innovation (Fullan, 1994).

Nine of the interviewed head teachers argued that they were not teachers of integrated English and therefore, they were not expected to have a clear understanding of the objectives of the subject. If anything, they pointed out, the new curriculum was imposed on the majority of the stakeholders. In other words, they felt that teachers of integrated English and other stakeholders were not actively involved right from the inception stage of the curriculum for them to understand it and its objectives properly.

Although more than half of the teachers (60 teachers) and head teachers (11 head teachers) had indicated that they were clear on the objectives of integrated English, only 21 % of the teachers (12 teachers) and 10 % of the head teachers (two head teachers) were able to state at least five objectives of the course.

4.3.5 Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum in the Secondary Schools

The following sub-sections are on the implementation of integrated English curriculum in public secondary schools in the Nairobi North District.

i) Use of Integrated English Approach

Table 4.11 below gives teachers’ views as regards the use of an integrated approach in the teaching of English language and Literature.
Table 4.11: Teaching of English Language and Literature Using an Integrated Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of an integrated approach</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use of an integrated approach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 shows that 86.1% of the teachers (87 teachers) indicated that they used an integrated approach. Almost 14% of the teachers (14 teachers) said that they did not use the approach in the teaching of integrated English curriculum. All the 20 head teachers said that their teachers of integrated English curriculum used the integrated approach.

In almost all the 80 lesson observations, there was no meaningful and significant integration between the teaching of English language and Literature. Each of the subjects was taught as a separate entity by the concerned teachers. However, the observed teachers consistently integrated the teaching of the four English language skills whenever they taught English grammar. Integration of the various genres of Literature (i.e. poetry, short stories, plays and novels) lacked in the Literature lessons that the researcher observed. The teachers handled the various genres in isolation of each other.

Despite the foregoing scenario, teachers majorly assessed their learners using an integrated approach as demanded by KNEC. They told the researcher that they always tried as much as possible to stick to the KNEC examination format so as to familiarize
their students with the format.

Different reasons were given by the teachers who were not using an integrated approach. Thirty eight percent of the teachers (six teachers) found it hard to implement integrated English curriculum as expected because they did not have good understanding of the concept of integration. Lack of adequate understanding on how to use the concept of integration and how to particularly implement integrated English curriculum was not taught during the teachers’ pre-service training. Equally, a number of teachers had not also undergone meaningful in-service training on how to teach Integrated English curriculum.

Thirty eight percent of the teachers (six teachers) found the approach demanding in terms of time. Thus, the time allocated to the subject was not enough to do things as per the demands of an integrated English curriculum. Lack of adequate books and other resources also affected the way teachers implemented the curriculum. Thirteen percent of the teachers (two teachers) were hindered in their effort to integrate the two subjects due to the inadequacy of the required books.

Thirteen percent of the teachers (two teachers) also felt that if they taught the two subjects in an integrated manner, then the students would get mixed up. They pointed out that the learners saw the two subjects as being distinct in a number of ways. Therefore, different concepts in the two areas, if mixed, could totally confuse the learners.

**ii) Team Teaching of Integrated English**

The study was interested in finding out whether teachers applied team teaching in the teaching of integrated English. Teachers’ responses on this item are in Table 4.12 below.
Table 4.12: Teaching of Integrated English as a Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teach as a team.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers do not teach as a team.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows that 82.2% of the teachers (83 teachers) indicated that they taught integrated English as a team and another almost 17.8% of the teachers (18 teachers) said that they did not teach integrated English as team. Whereas 60% of the head teachers (12 head teachers) said that their teachers taught integrated English as a team, 40% of them (eight head teachers) said that their teachers never taught the subject as a team.

Table 4.5 below shows the strategies that were used by the teachers who taught integrated English as a team.
Table 4.13: Strategies used by Teachers Teaching English as a Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symposia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a common scheme of work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing difficult topics</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting exams together</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging lessons</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of topics and teaching materials</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of notes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A set-book at a time in all classes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating learners as a team</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching weak students together</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching live performances together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some teachers share/ exchange classes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to radio programs together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking students’ work as a team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 above shows that 28.9% of the teachers reported working with each other through consultation, in their efforts to effectively implement integrated English curriculum. Another equal number of teachers discussed difficult topics in the syllabus as a way of reaching out to each other in the implementation of integrated English in their respective schools. Twenty six percent of the teachers exchanged their notes in the course of teaching integrated English whereas 24% set examinations together. Other strategies that teachers employed to team-team integrated English are contained in Table 4.13 above.
iii) Attendance of In-service Training Courses

Teachers were asked to state whether they were encouraged by their schools to attend in-service training on how to teach integrated English curriculum. Their responses to this item are in Table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14: Encouragement to Attend In-Service Training on How to Teach Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to attend</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not encouraged to attend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 shows that whereas 65.4% of the teachers (66 teachers) indicated that they had attended in-service training meant to improve their teaching of integrated English curriculum, another 34.6% of them (35 teachers) said that they had not attended any in-service training as regards the teaching of integrated English curriculum.

Ninety five percent of the head teachers (19 head teachers) said that they encouraged and sponsored their teachers to attend in-service training meant to improve their teaching of integrated English curriculum. Only one head teacher said that he never sponsored his teachers for in-service courses due to lack of finances, and also sometimes due to lack of communication regarding availability of such courses.

Sixteen head teachers told the researcher that they had sponsored their teachers for seminars that year. Twelve head teachers had sponsored their teachers for workshops
during the same year. Only three head teachers said that they had sponsored their teachers for conferences that year.

Teachers of integrated English curriculum indicated that they use the strategies given in Table 4.15 below to improve their teaching of the subject.

**Table 4.15: Strategies Used by Teachers to Improve Teaching of Integrated English Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing/ discussing ideas with colleagues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of materials e.g. cassettes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading pamphlets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing with teachers of other schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying and reading reference books</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 shows 60.9% of teachers who had not attended in-service training, discussed or shared ideas with colleagues so as to improve their teaching of integrated English curriculum. To ensure improved teaching of the subject, 26.1% of these teachers shared materials on the teaching of integrated English curriculum. Such materials included video and radio cassettes from KIE.

Workshops were organized by nine percent of the teachers who had not attended in-service training. Another nine percent of the teachers resorted to reading pamphlets with information on how to teach integrated English curriculum. Seventeen percent of the teachers bought and read reference books on how to deal with integrated English curriculum. Four percent of these teachers discussed with teachers of other schools on how to improve their teaching of the integrated English curriculum.
iv) Roles Played by the Head Teachers in the Implementation of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

Almost all head teachers (19 head teachers) said that they played a role in the way integrated English is taught in their schools. Roles played by the head teachers in their respective schools, as given by themselves, are as shown in Table 4.7 below.

**Table 4.16: Roles Played by the Head Teachers in the Implementation of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate acquisition of materials</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send teachers for workshops/seminars</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach the subject</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize English medium of communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate drama, seminars and workshops</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of more funds to English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to make it interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding teachers on teaching methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving students and teachers moral support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring adequate syllabus coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging team-work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows that the majority of the head teachers (17 head teachers) played a role in the acquisition of teaching/learning materials. Sixty five percent of the teachers (66 teachers) indicated that head teachers played a role in the way in which integrated English was being taught in their schools. Forty seven percent of them (nine head teachers) sent their teachers to seminars and workshops to improve their understanding and teaching of integrated English curriculum.
Sixty five percent of the teachers (66 teachers) indicated that head teachers played a role in the way in which integrated English was being taught in their schools. Thirty three percent of the teachers (33 teachers) said that head teachers did not play any role in the way in which integrated English was being taught in their schools. Roles played by the head teachers in their respective schools, as given by the teachers, are as indicated in Table 4.8 below.

**Table 4.17: Roles Played by Head teachers in the Teaching of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing necessary resources</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring teachers for training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging growth of the language</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of the curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging teachers to work together</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying prescribed books</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring there are enough teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating of symposia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as a role model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 shows that 76.3 % of the teachers (48 teachers) indicated that head teachers played a role of providing them with necessary resources such as reference materials and cassettes. Approximately 36 % of the teachers (21 teachers) said that the head teachers played a role of sponsoring teachers for in-service training courses for them to be able to implement integrated English curriculum effectively in their schools.
Almost 12% of the teachers (seven teachers) said that the head teachers supervised and ensured proper implementation of the English curriculum in their respective schools. Head teachers were also said to be playing a crucial role in buying prescribed books. Other roles that they played include: Encouraging the use and growth of English language in their schools, scouting for enough teachers for English, encouraging team-work among teachers of English, facilitating symposia and acting as a role model for both the teachers and the students.

a) Head Teachers’ Prompting of Teachers to Attend Seminars, Workshops and Conferences

Although almost all the head teachers (19 head teachers) reported that they prompted their teachers of integrated English to attend seminars, workshops and conferences, only 77% of the teachers (78 teachers) indicated that they were encouraged by their head teachers to attend seminars, workshops and conferences. Nineteen percent of the teachers (19 teachers) said that they were not encouraged by their head teachers to attend seminars, workshops and conferences.

Thirty six of the teachers indicated that they had attended seminars that year. Forty six teachers said that they had attended workshops whereas eight teachers indicated that they had attended conferences during that year. One of the teachers who indicated that he had been encouraged to attend seminars and workshops said:

\[ I \text{ have attended several of them, not this year but in the previous years. Chances have also been given to other teachers to attend. However, we have not attended any conference. } \]

On average, most teachers indicated that they had attended seminars, workshops and conferences only once in a year. It was also clear from the data that some of the teachers attended seminars, workshops and conferences more often than others. It also came out from the data that some of the teachers never at all attended seminars,
workshops and conferences. Conferences were the least attended by the teachers whereas workshops were the most attended followed by seminars.

Thirty five percent of the teachers (seven teachers) gave lack of funds as the reason as to why they did not attend seminars, workshops and conferences. One of them said:

*Due to financial constraints and given that the seminars, workshops and conferences are expensive, not all teachers are sponsored to attend them. Only a few teachers are selected by the head teacher to attend them. In the actual sense, it is the head of the department or the subject who is sent to such gatherings.*

On lack of funds, a teacher explained:

*Due to the many financial constraints that were experienced this year, seminars and workshops that had been organized were cancelled the last minute at the provincial level.*

Forty percent of the teachers (eight teachers) quoted limited time that was allocated to the subject on the school time-table despite the heavy workload as being one of the reasons for not attending seminars, workshops and conferences. A teacher pointed out:

*Seminars, workshops and conferences are time-consuming. Thus, head teachers prefer that teachers do not attend these meetings such that teaching goes on. They do not like a situation where learners are left unattended to during these meetings. This is due to the pressure arising from the wide integrated English curriculum. There is always a hurry to cover the syllabus.*

Twenty five percent of the teachers (five teachers) said that their not attending of seminars, workshops and conferences was due to lack of information from the school and Ministry of Education officials. They said that administrators never availed the information to them as expected. Some of them felt that the Ministry did not organize seminars, workshops and conferences. One of the teachers said:

*I have never heard of such activities. There has been no information about them. If there have been any, then they were not publicized and teachers encouraged and told the need to attend.*
b) Head Teachers’ Recognition of Teachers’ Efforts

Whereas almost all head teachers (19 head teachers) said that they recognized teachers’ efforts in the implementation of integrated English curriculum, only 83% of the teachers (84 teachers) said that their efforts were recognized by their head teachers when their students did well in integrated English. Another 17% of the teachers (17 teachers) said that their efforts were not recognized by their head teachers.

Sixty seven percent of the teachers (51 teachers) indicated that their head teachers used verbal praise as a way of recognizing their good work. Sixty one percent of the teachers (46 teachers) said that rewards were used to recognize their good performance in integrated English.

Promotion of the teachers who posted good performance in integrated English was also used as a way of recognizing teachers’ efforts. Five percent of the teachers (four teachers) were promoted as a result of good performance in integrated English. One percent of the teachers said that their head teachers used other ways other than rewards, praise and promotion to recognize their efforts in the teaching of integrated English.

iv) Role of Government Agencies in the Implementation of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

The following sub-sections deal with the roles played by KIE, MoE and KNEC, as government agencies, in the implementation of secondary school English curriculum.

a) Kenya Institute of Education (KIE)

According to the head teachers, KIE facilitates the implementation of integrated English curriculum in a number of ways as shown in Table 4.18 below.
Table 4.18: How KIE Facilitates the Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Facilitation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holding seminars and workshops</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of the syllabus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving of teaching materials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of English curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of KIE audio-visual resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing policy guidelines in English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of teachers’ handbook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 shows that 61.1% of the head teachers said that KIE facilitates their schools in the implementation of integrated English curriculum by providing the integrated English syllabus to schools. Another 50% of the head teachers pointed out that KIE provides teachers and schools with a list of approved integrated English books from which to choose the ones to use according to the needs and interests. Forty-four percent of the head teachers said that KIE holds seminars and workshops for the teachers to enable them teach integrated English curriculum effectively.

On the other hand, teachers of integrated English curriculum said that KIE plays a significant role in the implementation of the subject. Table 4.19 below shows the strategies used by KIE to improve the implementation of integrated English curriculum as was given by the teachers.
Table 4.19: Strategies used by KIE to Improve the Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing workshops and seminars</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing syllabus guidelines</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a lot of resource materials</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving suitable books</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airing of radio programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing the syllabus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 shows that majority of the teachers (71.2 %) indicated that KIE plays a significant role of organizing seminars and workshops where teachers are trained on how to effectively implement integrated English curriculum. Thirty seven percent of the teachers (19 teachers) said that KIE provides integrated English syllabus guidelines to ensure that teachers understand how to teach the subject well.

Thirty one percent of the teachers (16 teachers) pointed out that KIE plays another significant role of providing lots of teaching/learning resources for the teachers and their learners to find it easy to study integrated English curriculum. Another nearly nine percent of the teachers (seven teachers) said that teachers’ work is made easy by KIE by being provided with the Orange Book that contains a list of approved books. Teachers said that they select with ease the books to use from the list according to their interests and needs.

KIE’s reviewing of the integrated English syllabus, from time to time, to suit the needs and interests of the teachers and their learners were also seen as being significant by approximately two percent of the teachers (two teachers). One teacher
indicated that KIE plays a significant role through the airing of school radio programs.

Forty seven percent of the teachers (45 teachers) said that KIE held seminars, workshops and conferences to teach teachers on how to integrate English language and literature. Fifty five percent of the teachers (56 teachers) indicated that KIE had not held any seminars, workshops and conferences for the teachers.

Although KIE held seminars, workshops and conferences, according to 45 teachers, the frequency of attendance for each category was very low (between one and two times a year).

b) Ministry of Education (MoE)

From interviews with the head teachers, it was realized that the MOE is important in the facilitation and implementation of integrated English curriculum. Table 4.20 gives what the MoE does to facilitate effective implementation of integrated English curriculum as was given by the head teachers.

Table 4.20: How MoE Facilitates the Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Facilitation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holding seminars/workshops</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Releasing circulars/policy guidelines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of funds for texts/materials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>60.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting performance by theatre groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 shows that from interviews with the head teachers, it was realized that the MOE is important in the facilitation and implementation of integrated English curriculum. It is also clear from the table that 66.6 % of the head teachers felt that the
MoE was important in the provision of necessary textbooks and other materials for the teaching of integrated English. This is particularly so with the introduction of Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE).

Equally, teachers said that the MoE is important in the implementation of integrated English curriculum in the schools. Fifty four of the teachers said that the MoE had held seminars, workshops and conferences to teach the teachers on how to integrate English language and Literature. Forty seven percent of the teachers (47 teachers) said that the MoE had not held any seminars, workshops and conferences for the teachers of integrated English. Eight percent of the teachers (8 teachers) did not respond to this item.

Twenty six teachers indicated that they had attended MoE facilitated workshops. Another 25 of the teachers indicated that they had attended seminars. Conferences were attended by only three teachers. On average, seminars were attended twice per year whereas workshops were attended once per year. Conferences, just like workshops, were attended once per year. All the same, the spread of attendance among individual teachers was not uniform. Some teachers attended more times of each of the categories than others.

Table 4.21 below presents results on the strategies used by the MoE to facilitate effective implementation of integrated English curriculum as was given by the teachers.
Table 4.21: Strategies the MoE uses to Facilitate Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sending guiding policies to schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing seminars and workshops</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring teachers through TSC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspecting and supervision of implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating the syllabus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutinizing and approving of textbooks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing funds to purchase books</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 shows that 58.2% of the teachers (32 teachers) said that the MoE helped them in the implementation of integrated English curriculum by organizing seminars and workshops. Nearly 24% of them (15 teachers) also pointed out that the MoE sent to their schools guiding policies on how to effectively teach integrated English. The MoE was equally said to be instrumental in scrutinizing and approving of integrated English text books and set texts. Teachers said that the MoE facilitates the implementation of the curriculum by carrying out necessary reviews to the syllabus.

The MoE ensures that there are adequate teachers for integrated English in schools. It does this by hiring and posting teachers to schools, through the Teachers Service Commission. The MoE also provides funds for the purchase of books, and carries out the actual supervision of the teaching of the subject in the classrooms.

c) Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC)

Table 4.22 below presents results on ways through which KNEC facilitates the implementation and evaluation of integrated English curriculum.
Table 4.2: How KNEC Facilitates the Implementation and Evaluation of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Facilitation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating students in English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availing KNEC syllabus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training teachers on how to evaluate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Seminars for teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availing examinations sample papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing policy guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of annual report on performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that 10 of the head teachers said that KNEC was instrumental in evaluating the students at the end of the course. The way in which examinations are set determines the manner in which students are taught. KNEC also avails its own integrated English syllabus that aids teachers in their teaching duties.

Ninety eight percent of the teachers (99 teachers) indicated that KNEC had not been instrumental in carrying out seminars, workshops and conferences for teachers on how to teach and evaluate English language and literature in an integrated manner. Only two percent of the teachers (two teachers) indicated that KNEC had held seminars, workshops and conferences to teach teachers on how to teach and assess English language and Literature in an integrated manner.

From the frequencies worked out, it was realized that only one teacher per category had attended KNEC seminars and workshops respectively. No teacher indicated that he/she had attended any KNEC conference. This scenario implies that KNEC did not help teachers as expected to implement integrated English curriculum effectively.

Strategies that KNEC uses to facilitate the implementation of integrated English
Table 4.23: Strategies KNEC Uses to Facilitate the Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing of KNEC syllabuses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing exam sample papers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training examiners</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing of KNEC text books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing reports on KCSE results</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for seminars and workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting exams on integrated English curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 above shows that KNEC facilitates the implementation of integrated English curriculum in a number of ways. Fifty five percent of the teachers (22 teachers) said that KNEC assisted them through provision of examination sample papers which guide them in their daily endeavours. Nearly 28% of the teachers (11 teachers) pointed out that KNEC helps them by training them on how to assess integrated English curriculum.

Approximately 23% of the teachers (9 teachers) indicated that KNEC provided them with syllabuses which they follow in carrying out their teaching of integrated English. A small percentage of the teachers also said that KNEC facilitates their teaching in the following ways: Writing of KNEC text books, providing of reports on KCSE results, organizing for seminars and workshops; and setting of exams on integrated English.

4.3.6 Challenges Facing the Implementation of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

Challenges encountered by teachers and Government agencies in the process of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum are discussed in this section.
Challenges Facing Teachers in the Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

Challenges that teachers of integrated English face as they implement the curriculum are given in Table 4.24 below:

Table 4.24: Challenges Facing Teachers in the Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus is too broad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much workload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate teaching resources</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enough time</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ negative attitude of towards literature</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of integration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing of set books every year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate preparation by some teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate sponsorship for the training</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24 shows that 51.8 % of the teachers (44 teachers) indicated that they lacked adequate teaching resources to implement the subject as expected. Lack of adequate teaching resources was witnessed in a number of lessons where almost half of the students did not have the necessary textbooks and/or other materials. Nearly 35 % of the teachers (30 teachers) said that they faced a challenge in terms of time available to adequately teach all the aspects of integrated English curriculum in the expected manner.

Negative attitude by the students to literature was quoted as being a hindrance to effective teaching of integrated English by 23.5 % of the teachers (20 teachers). In most of the lessons that were observed, the learners had a negative attitude to the integrated English curriculum. They rarely participated in the learning process. This scenario shows that the learners’ needs and interests might have not been met by the integrated curriculum.
Other challenges that were named by the teachers included: Broad integrated English syllabus, heavy work-load for the teachers, teachers’ lack of proper understanding of the concept of integration, changing of set books every year, inadequate preparation for classroom teaching of integrated English by some teachers, lack of adequate sponsors for the training of the teachers; and mother tongue influence.

a) Allocation of Adequate Time to Teach Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

Table 4.25: Adequacy of Time to Teach Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time allocated is adequate.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocated is not adequate.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 shows that 47.5 % of the teachers (48 teachers) indicated that they had adequate time to teach secondary integrated English curriculum whereas 52.5 % of them (53 teachers) said that the time was not enough. Table 4.26 below presents teachers’ responses on whether the time allocated allows them to teach English language and Literature in an integrated manner.

Table 4.26: Time Allocated versus Teaching of English Language and Literature in an Integrated Manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time allocated is enough for integration.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocated is not enough for integration.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.26 shows that 41.6% of the teachers (42 teachers) said that the allocated time allowed them to teach English language and Literature in an integrated manner. On the other hand, 58.4% of them (59 teachers) indicated that that time was not adequate to allow them to teach two subjects in an integrated manner.

The teachers who said that time was not adequate suggested that adequate time for Forms One and Two should be eight (8) lessons per week and 10 lessons per week for Forms Three and Four if at all they were to teach the subject well as expected.

b) Availability of Enough Secondary Integrated English Language Textbooks

Information regarding the availability of adequate secondary integrated English language textbooks was sought and is presented in Table 4.27 below.

Table 4.27: Adequacy of Secondary Integrated English Language Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are enough English language textbooks.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no enough English language textbooks.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.27 shows that 52.5% of the teachers (53 teachers) indicated that they had enough English language text books. Another 47.5% of them (48 teachers) said that they did not have adequate integrated English text books in their schools. Indeed, lesson observations confirmed that in every lesson almost half of the learners did not have the necessary textbooks.

The reasons given for lack of enough English language textbooks in the various schools in Nairobi North District are presented in Table 4.28 below.
Table 4.28: Reasons for Lack of Enough English Language Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate finances in the schools</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement procedures are long and laborious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few language textbooks in the market</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft in schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library is not well equipped</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some students/parents are unable to buy books</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.28 above shows that 66.7 % of the teachers (28 teachers) indicated that lack of enough money led to lack of adequate language textbooks in the schools. Approximately seventeen percent of the teachers (7 teachers) indicated that some parents were unable to purchase books for their children. Long and laborious procurement procedures were said to cause lack of language textbooks in schools by 14.3 % of the teachers (6 teachers).

Lack of stocking the library well also was said by 14.3 % of the teachers (6 teachers) to cause shortage of the language books. Other reasons given for lack of enough English language textbooks include: Few language textbooks in the market; theft in schools; and too many students in the classes.

c) Availability of Enough Literature Books

The study sought information on the availability of Literature textbooks. Teachers’ responses on the item are presented in Table 4.29 below.

Table 4.29: Availability of Enough Literature Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are enough Literature books.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no enough Literature books.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought information on the availability of Literature textbooks. Teachers’ responses on the item are presented in Table 4.29 below.
Table 4.29 shows that although 50.5% of the teachers (51 teachers) said that they had enough Literature books; another 49.5% of them (50 teachers) indicated that they did not have enough books. From lesson observations, the researcher noted that in most of the lessons, almost half of the learners did not have required Literature books.

Eight two percent of the teachers (34 teachers) whose learners did not have enough Literature books said that their schools lacked money to buy the required books. This scenario, therefore, resulted in schools having a few copies of the Literature books. Thirty seven percent of the teachers (15 teachers) said that learners normally did not have personal copies of the Literature books. If anything, they said that the learners stole books from one another, and also school books. One teacher indicated that since Literature was no longer an independent subject, most literature books were no longer being purchased by the schools.

d) Availability of Teachers’ Guides

Information regarding the availability of teachers’ guides was sought and is presented in Table 4.30 below.

**Table 4.30: Adequacy of Teachers’ Guides**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are enough teachers’ guides.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no enough teachers’ guides.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.30 shows that 93% of the teachers (94 teachers) indicated that they had
copies of teachers’ guides while seven percent of them (7 teachers) reported that they did not have teachers’ guides. The researcher, through lesson observations and discussions with the concerned teachers, concluded that almost all the teachers had necessary teachers’ guides.

e) Availability of the Syllabus

The researcher wanted to know whether the teachers had access to copies of the integrated English syllabus. Table 4.31 presents responses on availability of the syllabus.

Table 4.31: Availability of a Copy of the Integrated English Syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A copy of the integrated English syllabus is available.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A copy of the integrated English syllabus is not available.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.31 shows that 95% of the teachers (96 teachers) said that they had a copy of the integrated English syllabus while five percent of the teachers (five teachers) indicated that they did not have a copy of the syllabus. It was observed during class lessons that almost all teachers of integrated English had access to a copy of the integrated English syllabus.

ii) Challenges Facing Government Agencies in the Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum

The Head of English at KIE gave inadequate time and resources as being the main challenges that they face in carrying out their mandate effectively. She said:
Much more time and resources are required for effective orientation of all the teachers in the country. Otherwise, we currently sample a few teachers of integrated English per division, district, province or at the national level and train them on how to effectively implement the integrated English syllabus. The training takes very little time. It is normally one to two days or at most one week due lack of adequate resources and also due to other compelling engagements at the KIE offices. Therefore, due to lack of adequate resources and also due time constraints, most of the teachers of English do not get to be reached with seminars and workshops. Even those who are reached, the courses are not adequate and sustained as they should.

This Head of English added that they also face a challenge in terms of negative attitude to integrated English by the teachers who did not have pre-service training in both English language and Literature. These teachers find it hard to teach the two subjects together as one unit because of their initial orientations. It is even worse with teachers who have not had any kind of in-service training on how to integrate the two disciplines.

The Head of English at KNEC pointed out that teachers (including examiners and markers) have always resisted integration of English language and Literature.

In bringing out the challenges that they face in their duties of ensuring effective implementation of integrated English in secondary schools, he said:

The challenges in designing integrated English examinations are not many. They can be easily overcome. It can be done. However, the main challenges are at the marking stage. Chief examiners, their assistants and markers resisted and continue to resist integration of examinations. The whole lot was used to marking one aspect or the other of the initial integrated English curriculum, that is, composition, grammar or Literature. These people are now not happy with the new demands by the integrated assessment format. This format demands that they assess all the aspects of the examination. Thus, examiners and markers are not as happy as they used to be.
This Head of English further said:

*The teachers find it hard to re-orient themselves to this integrated English examination format. It is only those teachers who mark Paper Two (Comprehension, Literary Appreciation and Grammar) who feel slightly at home but not those for Paper One (Functional Writing) and Paper Three (Imaginative Composition and Essays Based on Set-texts).*

According to the Head of English at MoE, teachers of integrated English still felt that integration of the two subjects was a serious mistake that needs urgent correction. Thus, the teachers had a negative attitude to the MoE officials’ efforts to improve its implementation in the schools. She pointed out that the teachers were reluctant to adopt the integrated English approach in the teaching of the subject. This head of English, like the KIE one, also said that they faced a challenge in terms of time and resources available to train the teachers on how to effectively teach and manage integrated English curriculum. Consequently, the teachers did not know how to deal with the concept of integration since they lacked necessary skills.

**4.3.6 How Teachers and Government Agencies Deal with Challenges They Encounter**

Teachers and Government agencies employ different strategies to solve the problems that they face in the course of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum.

i) **Strategies Used by Teachers to Improve Teaching of Integrated English Curriculum**

Table 4.32 shows strategies used by teachers to deal with the challenges that they face in the process of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum.
Table 4.32: Strategies Used by Teachers to Improve Teaching of Integrated English Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing/discussing ideas with colleagues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of materials e.g. cassettes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading pamphlets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing with teachers of other schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying and reading reference books</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.32 above shows that 60.9% of the teachers discussed or shared ideas with colleagues whereas 26.1% of them shared materials on the teaching of integrated English curriculum. Such materials included video and radio cassettes from KIE. Workshops were organized by nine percent of the teachers. Another nine percent of the teachers resorted to reading pamphlets with information on how to teach integrated English curriculum.

Seventeen percent of the teachers bought and read reference books on how to deal with integrated English curriculum. Four percent of these teachers discussed with teachers of other schools on how to improve their teaching of the integrated English curriculum. The results show that teachers used several strategies to improve the teaching of integrated English curriculum.

**ii) Strategies Used by Government Agencies to Improve Teaching of Integrated English Curriculum**

To ensure successful implementation of integrated English in the secondary schools, KIE conducts seminars and workshops for the teachers of integrated English. During these seminars and workshops, content and pedagogical issues are handled by the experts. This is done by the institute to bridge the gap between pre-service training of
the teachers and the reality in the schools, in terms of the teaching of the integrated English curriculum.

The Institute also has, from time to time, produced necessary teaching learning materials and resources. The KIE expert told the researcher:

*We fill gaps or upgrade teachers’ skills through in-service training. During such training, a teacher without proper grounding in one of the two subjects is brought to a level of feeling comfortable with the subject. We do what is called purposeful in-service, that is, we train teachers in particular aspects of integrated English so as to increase their confidence. The refusal to teach integrated English is due to lack of confidence. No teacher would like to embarrass himself or herself before the students and/colleagues.*

The MoE holds seminars and workshops for the teachers who require content and methodology in any of the two subjects. Experienced teachers and other experts are identified and used to facilitate the seminars and workshops. The Head of English at the MoE said:

*During the seminars and workshops, the experts tell the teachers of the need to have self-drive or initiative to teach integrated English in their schools. They are advised to go out of their way to know and use integration as a technique of teaching English language and literature.*

The MoE carries out classroom teaching supervisions and advises teachers accordingly. During these supervisions, the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) encourage teachers to do a lot of team-work in their teaching, both within their schools and with the neighbouring schools. The MoE expert said:

*We encourage teachers to adopt a “help-me-to-do-it” strategy instead of “do-it-for-me” attitude. This way, they will learn the content, skills and integration and be experts with time.*

Procurement of integrated English textbooks and other materials by schools is also facilitated by the Ministry, particularly these days of Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE).
Kenya National Examinations Council, on its part, ensures successful implementation of the integrated English curriculum through preparing and publishing of regulations and syllabuses for all the subjects, including English. This syllabus is meant to guide the teachers in their successful implementation of the subject. Kenya National Examinations Council also prepares and avails annual performance reports on all the questions done in integrated English.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study. The main purpose of this study was to critically analyze the introduction and implementation of the secondary integrated English curriculum right from its first Phase (1984/85-2001) to its now second Phase (2002 to date).

5.1 Summary of Study Findings
This study sought to answer the following research questions concerning the introduction and implementation of integrated English innovation in Kenya:

1. What was the rationale for the introduction of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools?
2. How was integrated English curriculum introduced in Kenya?
3. What are the teachers’ reactions regarding the need for the secondary integrated English curriculum?
4. To what extent are teachers clear about the objectives of the secondary integrated English curriculum and how to achieve them?
5. How is integrated English curriculum being implemented in the secondary schools?
6. What challenges are encountered by teachers and Government agencies in the process of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum?
7. How do teachers and Government agencies deal with the challenges that they encounter in the process of implementing secondary integrated English curriculum?
5.1.1 Rationale for Integrating English Language and Literature

1. The study found that the idea of integrated English curriculum for secondary schools was meant to enable teachers use the content in Literature to teach English language and vice versa. Therefore, integration was/is seen as an approach for teaching across the two disciplines – English language and Literature – and between and among their constituent parts.

2. It came out from the study that integration was necessary since English language is best learnt in a given context. This means that literary materials provide a natural context for the teaching and use of English language.

3. The study established that meaning in English language is found and/or is situated well in literary works which are normally varied and graded according to the level of the learners.

5.1.2 Introduction of Integrated English Curriculum

1. The idea of integration arose from the recommendations of the Mackay Report of 1981 which addressed the issue of relevance of our education, that is, self-reliance. The Report recommended integrated English curriculum as a measure to avoid early specialization by some students who either dropped Literature or English language at Form Three.

2. Needs assessment for the introduction of the first phase of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya was carried out before the curriculum was designed and first implemented in 1986. Based on the needs assessment survey that was conducted, integrated English series textbooks were developed to back up and cover the syllabus that had been developed.

3. Another needs assessment survey was conducted in 1999 among the stakeholders before the second phase of integrated English curriculum was
designed and implemented in 2002. During this survey, it was discovered that most areas of integrated English language and Literature were difficult for the learners. Further, it was realized that these areas were perceived as difficult primarily due to the approach adopted in teaching them. Consequently, it was felt that there was need to bring in aspects of performance and meaningful experiences, that is, contexts in their learning.

4. It emerged from discussions with the three heads of English – one each from the three Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC) that the panel system was used to design the integrated English curriculum. It was pointed out that the following panel members were involved in designing and introducing integrated English curriculum in secondary schools: KIE curriculum developers, KIE research officers, staff from the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) headquarters, DQAS staff from all the provinces, a representative of KNEC, representatives of practicing teachers from all the provinces, representatives of diploma colleges; and representatives of universities.

5. The study revealed that majority of the teachers did not undergo any type of in-service training before they started the actual teaching of integrated English curriculum. Therefore, a bulk of the teachers started teaching the curriculum without proper understanding as regards the implementation of integrated English curriculum.

5.1.3 Teachers’ Reactions towards Integrated English Curriculum

1. A substantial number of teachers faced difficulties when implementing integrated English curriculum. Eighty percent of the lessons observed (64 classroom lesson observations) showed that the concerned teachers taught
English language and Literature as separate subjects. They did not exploit the complementary relationship between the two subjects to teach the integrated English curriculum.

2. A majority of the teachers and their head teachers were in agreement that the content of integrated English was beneficial to the learners.

3. Most of the teachers and head teachers felt that integrated English curriculum was too broad.

4. Most of the teachers and the head teachers found integrated English curriculum hard to teach.

5. A majority of the teachers and most of the head teachers did not find any direct link, or were not sure of any, between integration of English language and Literature and performance.

6. More than half of the teachers and half of the head teachers were against continued teaching of English language and Literature in an integrated manner.

7. Most teachers and head teachers were against evaluating the two subjects in an integrated manner.

8. Slightly above half of the teachers and their head teachers indicated that secondary integrated English curriculum met the needs of their learners.

5.1.4 Objectives of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

Majority of the teachers and the head teachers said that clarity of objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum was significant. Despite this assertion, the study found that a significant number of the teachers of integrated English and the head teachers were not clear of the objectives of the subject.
5.1.5 Implementation of Integrated English Curriculum in the Secondary Schools

1. Although most of the teachers of integrated English and all the 20 head teachers said an integrated approach was used in the teaching of integrated English curriculum, classroom lesson observations showed no meaningful and significant integration between the teaching of English language and Literature, and also between and among their constituent parts.

2. Teachers assessed their learners using an integrated approach as demanded by KNEC so as to familiarize them with the examination format.

3. Different reasons were given by the teachers who were not using an integrated approach as follows:
   - They did not have good understanding of the concept of integration.
   - They found the approach demanding in terms of time.
   - They were unable to integrate the two subjects due to the inadequacy of the required books.
   - If they taught the two subjects in an integrated manner, then the students would get confused.

4. Most of the teachers of integrated English, and majority of the head teachers said that integrated English was taught through teamwork.

5. Whereas almost all the head teachers said that they had encouraged and sponsored their teachers to attend in-service training meant to improve their teaching of integrated English curriculum, it was established by the study that a sizeable number of teachers had not yet attended any in-service training as regards the teaching of integrated English curriculum.

6. Teachers who had not attended in-service training used the following strategies to improve teaching of integrated English Curriculum:
• Discussing and/or sharing ideas with colleagues in the same school on the teaching of integrated English curriculum.

• Sharing materials on the teaching of integrated English curriculum e.g. video and radio cassettes from KIE.

• Organizing of workshops on the teaching of integrated English curriculum.

• Reading pamphlets with information on how to teach integrated English curriculum.

• Buying and reading reference books on how to deal with integrated English curriculum.

• Discussing with teachers of other schools on how to improve the teaching of integrated English curriculum.

• Almost all head teachers and majority of their teachers of integrated English agreed that head teachers played a role in the way in which integrated English was being taught in their schools. They gave the following as the roles that head teachers played in their respective schools:

  ▪ Acquiring of teaching/learning materials.
  ▪ Sending of teachers to seminars and workshops to improve their understanding and teaching of integrated English curriculum.
  ▪ Supervising and ensuring proper implementation of the English curriculum.
  ▪ Buying prescribed books.
  ▪ Encouraging the use and growth of English language in their
schools.

- Scouting for enough teachers for English.
- Encouraging team-work among teachers of English.
- Facilitating symposia and acting as a role model for both the teachers and the students.

7. Although almost all the head teachers said that they had prompted their teachers of integrated English to attend seminars, workshops and conferences, on average, most teachers indicated that they had attended seminars, workshops and conferences only once in a year. It also emerged from the data that some of the teachers never at all attended seminars, workshops and conferences.

8. Teachers gave the following reasons as to why they did not attend seminars, workshops and conferences:
   - lack of funds
   - limited time that was allocated to the subject on the school time-table despite the heavy workload
   - lack of information from the school and Ministry of Education officials.

9. Head teachers recognized teachers’ efforts in the implementation of integrated English curriculum and particularly when their students did well in integrated English. This was done through: Verbal praise, rewards, and recommending teachers who post good performance in integrated English for promotion.

10. KIE facilitated the implementation of integrated English curriculum by:
   - Providing the integrated English syllabus and a list of approved
integrated English books to the schools.

- Organizing seminars and workshops where teachers were trained on how to effectively implement integrated English curriculum.
- Providing integrated English syllabus guidelines to ensure that teachers understood how to teach the subject well.
- Providing lots of teaching/learning resources for the teachers and their learners to find it easy to study integrated English curriculum.
- Reviewing of the integrated English syllabus, from time to time, to suit the needs and interests of the teachers and their learners.
- Airing of school radio programs.

11. The study established that although KIE held seminars, workshops and conferences, the frequency of attendance for each category was very low (between one and two times a year).

12. From interviews with the head teachers, it was realized that the MoE was important in the facilitation and implementation of integrated English curriculum in the following ways:

- Provision of necessary textbooks and other materials for the teaching of integrated English.
- Holding seminars, workshops and conferences to teach the teachers on how to integrate English language and Literature.

13. The study found that on average, MoE seminars were attended twice per year whereas workshops were attended once per year. Conferences,
just like workshops, were attended once per year. All the same, the spread of attendance among individual teachers was not uniform. Some teachers attended more times of each of the categories than others.

14. The MoE used the following strategies to facilitate implementation of integrated English curriculum:
   - Organizing seminars and workshops.
   - Sending guiding policies to schools on how to effectively teach integrated English.
   - Approving of integrated English text books and set texts.
   - Carrying out necessary reviews to the syllabus.
   - Ensuring that there are adequate teachers for integrated English in schools.

15. Despite the fact that KNEC occupies a central position in the implementation and evaluation of integrated English curriculum, the study established that KNEC had not been aggressively carrying out seminars, workshops and conferences for teachers on how to effectively teach and evaluate English language and Literature in an integrated manner.

16. KNEC used the following strategies to facilitate implementation of integrated English curriculum:
   - Providing examination sample papers which guide teachers in their daily endeavours.
   - Training on how to assess integrated English curriculum.
   - Providing teachers with syllabuses which they follow in carrying out their teaching of integrated English.
   - Providing teachers with reports on KCSE results.
   - Organizing for seminars and workshops; and
• Setting of exams on integrated English.

5.1.6 Challenges Facing the Implementation of Secondary Integrated English Curriculum

1. Teachers lacked adequate teaching resources to implement the subject as expected. Lack of adequate teaching resources was witnessed in a number of lessons where almost half of the students did not have the necessary textbooks and/or other learning materials.

2. Teachers faced a challenge in terms of time available to adequately teach all the aspects of integrated English curriculum in the expected manner. They suggested that adequate time for Forms One and Two should be eight (8) lessons per week and 10 lessons per week for Forms Three and Four if at all they were to teach the subject as expected.

3. Negative attitude by the students to Literature was a hindrance to effective teaching of integrated English. In most of the lessons that were observed, the learners had a negative attitude to the integrated English curriculum. They rarely participated in the learning process.

4. Other challenges that were named by the teachers included: Broad integrated English syllabus, heavy work-load for the teachers, teachers’ lack of proper understanding of the concept of integration, frequent change of set books, inadequate preparation for classroom teaching of integrated English by some teachers, lack of adequate sponsors for the training of the teachers; and mother tongue influence.

5. Teachers gave the following as reasons for lack of enough English
language textbooks in their schools: Lack of enough money in the schools, inability of parents to purchase books for their children, long and laborious procurement procedures, lack of stocking of the libraries, few language textbooks in the market, theft of books in schools; and too many students in the classes.

6. The Head of English at KIE gave inadequate time and resources as being the main challenges that they faced (as curriculum developers) in carrying out their mandate effectively.

7. The Head of English at KNEC pointed out that teachers (including examiners and markers) had always resisted integration of English language and Literature. According to him, teachers found it hard to re-orient themselves to the integrated English examination format.

8. According to the Head of English at MoE, teachers of integrated English still felt that integration of the two subjects was a serious mistake that needed urgent correction. Thus, the teachers had a negative attitude to the MoE officials’ efforts to improve its implementation in the schools. She pointed out that the teachers were reluctant to adopt the integrated English approach in the teaching of the subject. This head of English, like the KIE one, also said that they faced a challenge in terms of time and resources available to train the teachers on how to effectively teach and manage integrated English curriculum. Consequently, the teachers did not know how to deal with the concept of integration since they lacked necessary skills.

9. Teachers employed the following strategies to solve the problems that they faced in the course of implementing secondary integrated English
curriculum: Discussing or sharing ideas with colleagues, sharing materials on the teaching of integrated English curriculum e.g. video and radio cassettes from KIE, organizing seminars and workshops, reading pamphlets with information on how to teach integrated English curriculum, buying reference books and reading on how to deal with integrated English curriculum, and discussing with teachers from other schools on how to improve their teaching of the integrated English curriculum.

10. To ensure successful implementation of integrated English in the secondary schools, KIE conducts seminars and workshops for the teachers of integrated English. During these seminars and workshops, content and pedagogical issues are handled by the experts. This is done by the institute to bridge the gap between pre-service training of the teachers and the reality in the schools in terms of the teaching of the integrated English curriculum. The institute also has, from time to time, produced necessary teaching learning materials and resources.

11. The MoE carries out classroom teaching supervisions and advises teachers accordingly. During these supervisions, the Ministry encourages teachers to do a lot of team-work in their teaching, both within their schools and with the neighbouring schools.

12. Procurement of integrated English textbooks and other materials by schools is also facilitated by the Ministry, particularly these days of Free Day Secondary Education.

13. KNEC, on its part, ensures successful implementation of the integrated English curriculum through preparing and publishing of regulations
and syllabuses for all the subjects, including English. This syllabus is meant to guide the teachers in their successful implementation of the subject. KNEC also prepares and avails annual performance reports on all the questions done in integrated English.

5.2 Conclusion

From the findings of the study, it can be realized that integrated English curriculum was introduced to enable teachers use integration as a teaching approach across the two disciplines and also between and among their constituent parts. Despite this good intention, a majority of the teachers and their head teachers did not undergo any type of in-service training before they started the actual teaching and/or supervision of integrated English curriculum. Therefore, it is notable that a bulk of the teachers and head teachers started teaching and/or supervising the curriculum without proper understanding as regards the implementation of integrated English curriculum.

As a consequence of the foregoing scenario, a substantial number of teachers and their head teachers faced difficulties when implementing integrated English curriculum. Due to these difficulties, most of the concerned teachers taught English language and Literature as separate subjects. They did not exploit the complementary relationship between the two subjects to teach the integrated English curriculum. Therefore, it can be concluded from the findings that there has been no effective implementation of integrated English innovation in Nairobi North District as was/is intended by the curriculum developers.

5.3 Recommendations

Effective implementation of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools requires that all implementers efficiently play their roles as expected of them. Those
involved in the implementation of integrated English innovation include: MoE, KIE, KNEC, universities, head teachers, teachers and even learners themselves. The following are the recommendations of the study:

1. The MoE should help teachers and other implementers acquire and develop necessary content, knowledge and pedagogical skills as regards the concept of integration and in particular the teaching of integrated English curriculum.

2. The MoE should facilitate implementation of integrated English curriculum by sending to schools guiding policies on how to effectively teach integrated English, and ensuring that there are adequate teachers for integrated English in schools (through its specialized agency, TSC).

3. The MoE field officers should carry out regular classroom teaching supervisions and advise teachers accordingly.

4. KIE should review integrated English syllabus and address most of the implementers’ needs, interests, fears and problems as regards the subject.

5. KIE should conduct regular seminars, workshops and conferences for the teachers of integrated English curriculum. During these seminars, workshops and conferences, content and pedagogical issues should be handled by the experts. This will bridge the gap between pre-service training of the teachers and the reality in the schools in terms of the teaching of the integrated English curriculum.

6. KIE should allocate more official lesson time to integrated English curriculum so as to enable teachers have enough time to teach as per the demands of the subject - eight lessons per week for Forms One and Two, and 10 lessons per week for Forms Three and Four.
7. KIE should have adequate and well trained curriculum specialists and resources for the Institute to be able to effectively carry out its mandate of training teachers on the implementation of integrated English curriculum.

8. Given the central position that KNEC occupies in the implementation of integrated English curriculum, it should aggressively carry out seminars, workshops and conferences for most of the teachers, if not all, on how to teach and evaluate English language and Literature in an integrated manner.

9. KNEC should also facilitate teachers in their implementation of the integrated English curriculum by:
   - Providing examination sample papers to guide teachers in their daily endeavours
   - Providing teachers with syllabuses which they can follow in carrying out their teaching of integrated English
   - Providing teachers with reports on KCSE results.

10. Pre-service training of teachers in universities and colleges should be reformed and integrated English approach adopted. This way, teachers to-be will be familiarized with the integrated approach and their competence in handling integration developed.

11. Practicing teachers and head teachers should undergo proper in-service training as regards the purpose and objectives, and the teaching and evaluation and/or supervision of integrated English curriculum.

12. Schools should provide adequate teaching and learning resources should be provided to teachers such that they can teach and evaluate integrated English as expected.
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The following suggestions for further research are made:

1. The findings of this study are limited in terms of the study locale and design. There is need therefore to conduct further research (using either the same or a different design in public secondary schools) on the implementation of integrated English curriculum in different parts of the country and/or the whole country in order to get a clear picture and understanding of this subject.

2. Other studies can be conducted on other forms of integration that are on-going in Kenyan schools.

3. This study was conducted in public secondary schools in Nairobi North District of Nairobi County. A similar study should be carried out in private schools in the same region for purposes of comparison of the findings in regard to the implementation of integrated English curriculum.

4. An in-depth study should be carried out on the impact and influence of the various stakeholders on the process of implementation of integrated English curriculum in Kenya.

5. Further research should be conducted on how the various curriculum innovations have been conceived, introduced and implemented in Kenya.
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APPENDIX I
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to seek information on the introduction and implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum. The information that you will provide will be used for research only. You need not write your name on the questionnaire. Be as objective as possible and complete the questionnaire honestly. Write or tick your response accordingly.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. Name of your school: __________________________________________________________
2. Your highest level of professional training:
   (i) None ( )
   (ii) Diploma ( )
   (iii) B.Ed ( )
   (iv) M. Ed ( )
3. Your teaching experience:
   (i) Less than a year ( )
   (ii) 1-3 years ( )
   (iii) 4-6 years ( )
   (iv) 7-9 years ( )
   (v) 10 years or more ( )
4. Your gender:
   (i) Male ( )
   (ii) Female ( )

SECTION B: ATTITUDES TOWARDS SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM
Please indicate how closely you agree or disagree with the following statements. Use the codes:

SA - Strongly Agree
A  - Agree
U  - Uncertain
D  - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

1. The content of secondary integrated English curriculum is beneficial to the learners and their teachers.
   SA      A      U      D      SD

2. Secondary integrated English curriculum is too broad.
   SA      A      U      D      SD

3. Secondary integrated English curriculum is easy to teach.
   SA      A      U      D      SD

4. Integration of English language and Literature has led to better performance.
   SA      A      U      D      SD English language and

5. English language and Literature should continue to be taught in an integrated manner.
   SA      A      U      D      SD

6. English language and Literature should continue to be evaluated in an integrated manner.
   SA      A      U      D      SD

TEACHER –TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS

7. Do you discuss with other teachers on how to teach the subject better?
   Yes ( )          No ( )

8. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

9. Do you teach the subject as a team?
   Yes ( )          No ( )

10. If yes, how?
    (i)
    (ii)
    (iii)

NEED FOR SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM

11. Do you think that it was important to integrate English language and Literature?
12. If No, give reasons:
   (i)  
   (ii) 
   (iii)

13. Do you think secondary integrated English curriculum meets the needs of your learners?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

14. Do learners like the integration of English language and Literature?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

15. If No, why?
   (i)  
   (ii)  
   (iii)

OBJECTIVES OF SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM

16. Clarity about both goals and objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum is significant.
   Yes ( )  No ( )

17. Are the objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum clear to you?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

18. If yes, write any five objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum.
   (i)  
   (ii) 
   (iii) 
   (iv) 
   (v) 

COMPLEXITY OF SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM

19. Secondary integrated English curriculum is difficult to implement.
   Yes ( )  No ( )

20. If yes, give reasons:
   (i)  
   (ii)  
   (iii)
ROLE OF THE HEAD TEACHER

21. The head teacher plays an important role in the way secondary integrated English is taught in our school.
   Yes ( )        No ( )

22. If yes, what are the roles?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

23. The head teacher gives us what we need to teach the subject well.
   Yes ( )        No ( )

24. If yes, in what ways?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

25. Did the head teacher encourage you to attend seminars, workshops and conferences when secondary integrated English curriculum was introduced such that you could understand its need and goals?

26. Does the head teacher encourage you to attend seminars, workshops and conferences to learn on how to effectively teach the subject?
   Yes ( )        No ( )

27. If yes, how many times have you attended seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   Seminars ___
   Workshops ___
   Conferences ___

28. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

29. Does the head teacher recognize your good effort when students perform well in your subject?
   Yes ( )        No ( )

30. If yes, in what ways?
   (i.) Rewards ( )
   (ii.) Promotion ( )
   (iii.) Praise ( )
31. What are the challenges facing the implementation of secondary integrated English curriculum?
(i) 
(ii) 
(iii) 

STAFF TRAINING

32. Did you attend in-service training on how to teach secondary integrated English curriculum before you started teaching the subject?
   Yes (  )        No (  )
33. If No, why?
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 
34. Does the school encourage you to attend more in-service training on how to teach integrated English curriculum?
   Yes (  )        No (  )
35. If No, what have you done to improve your teaching of integrated English curriculum?
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 

TIME ALLOCATED TO SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM

36. Do you have enough time to teach secondary integrated English curriculum?
   Yes (  )        No (  )
37. If No, what do you think can be adequate time for teaching secondary integrated English curriculum?
   Forms 1 and 2 ____
   Forms 3 and 4 ____
38. Does the time allocated to you allow you to teach English language and Literature in an integrated manner?
   Yes (  )        No (  )
AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCE MATERIALS

39. Do you teach English language and Literature using an integrated approach?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

40. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

41. Do you have enough secondary integrated English language textbooks?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

42. If No, give reasons:
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

43. Do you have teacher guides?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

44. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

45. Do you have a copy of the syllabus?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

46. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

47. Do you have enough Literature books?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

48. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
ROLE OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

49. In what ways has KIE facilitated your receiving and implementation of integrated English curriculum?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

50. Has KIE held any seminars, workshops and conferences to teach you on how to integrate English language and Literature?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

51. If yes, how many times have you attended such seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   Seminars ___
   Workshops ___
   Conferences ___

52. In what ways has the Ministry of Education facilitated your receiving and implementation of integrated English curriculum?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

53. Has the Ministry of Education held any seminars, workshops and conferences to teach you on how to integrate English language and Literature?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

54. If yes, how many times have you attended such seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   Seminars ___
   Workshops ___
   Conferences ___

55. In what ways has KNEC facilitated your receiving and implementation of integrated English curriculum?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

56. Has KNEC held any seminars, workshops and conferences to teach you on how to teach and assess integrated English curriculum?
   Yes (  )        No (  )

57. If yes, how many times have you attended such seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   Seminars ___        Workshops ___        Conferences ___
APPENDIX II
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. Name of your school: _______________________________________________
2. Your highest level of professional training:
   (i) None ( )
   (ii) Diploma ( )
   (iii) B.Ed ( )
   (iv) M. Ed ( )
3. Your teaching experience:
   (i) Less than a year ( )
   (ii) 1-3 years ( )
   (iii) 4-6 years ( )
   (iv) 7-9 years ( )
   (v) 10 years or more ( )
4. Your gender:
   (i) Male ( )
   (ii) Female ( )

SECTION B: ATTITUDES TOWARDS SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM

Please indicate how closely you agree or disagree with the following statements. Use the codes:

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
U - Uncertain
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Agree

1. The content of secondary integrated English curriculum is beneficial to the learners and their teachers.
   SA A U D SD
2. Secondary integrated English curriculum is too broad.
   SA A U D SD
3. Secondary integrated English curriculum is easy to teach.
   SA A U D SD
4. Integration of English language and Literature has led to better performance.

| SA | A | U | D | SD |

5. English language and Literature should continue to be taught in an integrated manner.

| SA | A | U | D | SD |

6. English language and Literature should continue to be evaluated in an integrated manner.

| SA | A | U | D | SD |

**TEACHER –TEACHER RELATIONS**

7. Do your teachers discuss with each other on how to teach the subject better?

   Yes ( )   No ( )

8. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

9. Do your teachers teach the subject as a team?

   Yes ( )   No ( )

10. If yes, how?
    (i)
    (ii)
    (iii)

**NEED FOR SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM**

11. Do you think that it was important to integrate English language and Literature?

12. If No, give reasons:
    (i)
    (ii)
    (iii)

13. Do you think secondary integrated English curriculum meets the needs of your learners?

   Yes ( )   No ( )

14. Do learners like the integration of English language and Literature?

   Yes ( )   NO ( )
15. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

OBJECTIVES OF SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM
16. Clarity about objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum is significant.
   Yes ( )   No ( )

17. Are the objectives of integrated English curriculum clear to you?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

18. If yes, what are some of the objectives of integrated English curriculum?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
   (iv)
   (v)

COMPLEXITY OF SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM
19. Do you think that secondary integrated English curriculum is difficult to implement?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

20. If yes, give reasons:
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

ROLE OF THE HEAD TEACHER
21. Do you play some role in the way integrated English is taught in your school?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

22. If yes, what roles do you play in the teaching of the subject in your school?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
23. Do you give your teachers what they need to teach the subject well?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

24. If yes, what do you provide them with?
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 

25. Did you encourage your teachers to attend seminars, workshops and conferences when secondary integrated English curriculum was introduced for them to understand its need and goals?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

26. Do you encourage your teachers to attend seminars, workshops and conferences to learn on how to effectively teach the subject?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

27. If yes, how many times have your teachers attended seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   Seminars ___
   Workshops ___
   Conferences ___

28. If No, why?
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 

29. Do you recognize the good effort of the teachers when students perform well in English?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

30. If yes, in what ways?
   (i) Rewards ( )
   (ii) Promotion ( )
   (iii) Praise ( )
   (iv) Other specify ________________________________

31. What are the challenges facing the implementation of integrated English curriculum in your school?
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii)
STAFF TRAINING
32. Did your teachers attend in-service training on how to teach integrated English curriculum before they started teaching the subject?
   Yes ( )        No ( )

33. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

34. Do you encourage your teachers to attend more in-service training on how to teach secondary integrated English curriculum?
   Yes ( )        No ( )

35. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

TIME ALLOCATED TO SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM
36. Do your teachers have enough time to teach secondary integrated English curriculum?
   Yes ( )        No ( )

37. If No, what do you think can be adequate time for teaching secondary integrated English curriculum?
   Forms 1 and 2 ____
   Forms 3 and 4 ____

38. Does the time allocated to your teachers allow them to teach English language and Literature in an integrated manner?
   Yes ( )        No ( )

39. Do your teachers teach English language and Literature using an integrated approach?
   Yes ( )        No ( )

40. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
41. Do your teachers have enough English textbooks?
   Yes ( )       No ( )

42. If No, give reasons:
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

43. Do your teachers have teacher guides?
   Yes ( )       No ( )

44. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

45. Does each of your teachers have a copy of the syllabus?
   Yes ( )       No ( )

46. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

47. Do your teachers have enough Literature books?
   Yes ( )       No ( )

48. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

49. In what ways has KIE facilitated your school in receiving and implementation of integrated English curriculum?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

50. Has KIE held any seminars, workshops and conferences to teach your teachers on how to integrate English language and Literature?
    Yes ( )       No ( )
51. If yes, how many times have your teachers attended such seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   - Seminars ___
   - Workshops ___
   - Conferences ___

52. In what ways has the Ministry of Education facilitated your teachers’ receiving and implementation of integrated English curriculum?
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 

53. Has the Ministry of Education held any seminars, workshops and conferences to teach your teachers on how to integrate English language and Literature?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

54. If yes, how many times have your teachers attended such seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   - Seminars ___
   - Workshops ___
   - Conferences ___

55. What ways has KNEC facilitated your teachers’ receiving and implementation of integrated English curriculum?
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 

56. Has KNEC held any seminars, workshops and conferences to teach your teachers on how to teach and assess integrated English curriculum?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

57. If yes, how many times have your teachers attended such seminars, workshops and conferences this year?
   - Seminars ___
   - Workshops ___
   - Conferences ___
APPENDIX III
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEADS OF ENGLISH AT KIE, MOE AND KNEC

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. Name of institution: _____________________________________________________________
2. Gender of interviewee:
   (i) Male ( )
   (ii) Female ( )
3. Your highest level of professional training:
   (i.) Diploma ( )
   (ii.) B.Ed ( )
   (iii.) M.Ed ( )
   (iv.) Other (specify) ____________________________
4. Length of service at your institution:
   (i.) Less than a year ( )
   (ii.) 1-3 years ( )
   (iii.) 4-6 years ( )
   (iv.) 7-9 years ( )
   (v.) 10 years or more ( )

SECTION B: OBJECTIVES OF SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM
5. Clarity about both goals and objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum is significant.
   Yes ( ) No ( )
6. Are the objectives of secondary integrated English curriculum clear to the teachers?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
7. If No, why?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
COMPLEXITY OF SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM

8. Do you think that secondary integrated English curriculum is difficult to implement?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

9. If yes, give reasons:
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

INTRODUCTION AND ADOPTION PROCESS OF SECONDARY INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM

10. Who was/were behind the idea of integrated English curriculum for secondary schools?
    (i)
    (ii)
    (iii)

11. Do you think needs assessment/consultation was properly carried out in the secondary schools before integrated English curriculum was designed?
    Yes ( )   No ( )

12. If No, why?
    (i)
    (ii)
    (iii)

13. Who were involved in designing of secondary integrated English curriculum?
    (i)
    (ii)
    (iii)

14. Were teachers of English involved in designing the integrated English curriculum?
    Yes ( )   No ( )

15. If No, why?
    (i)
    (ii)
    (iii)

16. Was personnel training carried out in Kenya before secondary integrated English curriculum was diffused and implemented in secondary schools?
    Yes ( )   No ( )
17. If yes, at what level and scale was it carried out?
   (i) School (  )
   (ii) District (  )
   (iii) Province (  )
   (iv) National (  )

18. Who were trained on how to implement secondary integrated English curriculum?
   (i)  
   (ii)  
   (iii)  

20. Who conducted personnel training?
   (i)  
   (ii)  
   (iii)  

21. Who sponsored the training?
   (i)  
   (ii)  
   (iii)  

22. How long did the training last? ____________________

23. Was the training adequate?
   Yes (  )  No (  )

24. If No, why?
   (i)  
   (ii)  
   (iii)  

25. Was the time available adequate for the development of secondary integrated English curriculum materials necessary for use in schools?
   Yes (  )  No (  )

26. Who were involved in the development of secondary integrated English curriculum materials?
   (i)  
   (ii)  
   (iii)  

27. What constraints (if any) were experienced during the development of materials for secondary integrated English curriculum?
28. Was secondary integrated English curriculum tried out before its eventual diffusion and implementation in schools?
   Yes ( )    No ( )

29. What strategies were used to diffuse the corrected secondary integrated English curriculum to the implementers/adopters?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

30. Who were involved in the diffusion of the curriculum to the clients for actual implementation?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

31. What challenges do the teachers face as implementers/adopters of the integrated English curriculum in their respective secondary schools?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

32. What strategies do you recommend/adopt to ensure successful implementation of integrated English curriculum in the secondary schools?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

33. What challenges do you face in your duties of ensuring effective implementation of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)

34. What strategies do you employ to overcome the challenges that you encounter?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
APPENDIX IV
LESSON OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

School: _____________________________________________________________
Class:   _____________________________________________________________
Gender: ____________________________________________
Topic: ______________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>OBSERVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learners have enough learning materials.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher has teacher’s guide(s).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher has a copy of the syllabus.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher has what s/he needs to teach the subject well.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher integrates English language and Literature.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher integrates the four skills of English language.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher integrates the various genres of Literature.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teacher teaches English language and Literature separately.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teacher enjoys teaching integrated English curriculum.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teacher faces challenges when teaching integrated English.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teacher assesses each subject separately.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teacher assesses English language skills separately.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teacher assesses literary genres separately.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teacher assesses English language and Literature together as one unit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Integrated English curriculum is interesting to the learners.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V
101/1 ENGLISH PAPER ONE
(FUNCTIONAL WRITING)

2006 SAMPLE PAPER

Question 1
You have just finished your form four examination and you would like to do some volunteer work as you wait for the results.

Write a letter of inquiry to the Medical Officer of Health at your district hospital to find out if the hospital will be interested in your services. Give details about your qualifications, experience and interests. (10 marks)

Question 2
Read the passage below and fill in each blank space with an appropriate word.

One major problem that ______________ the world today is the rapid growth of population often referred to as population _______________

The world’s population has been growing steadily _______________ 800 A.D. and has recently risen to about six million. It is not ________________ much the actual population growth that is alarming. This increase in population _______________ largely due to improved nutrition, better hygiene and, above all, advances in medicine _______________ have brought about a fall in death rate.

China is the _______________ populous nation in the world. Its population continues to grow at 2.5% per annum _______________ the government’s effort to control it.

_______________ year an extra 26 million people have to be provided for. Failure to arrest further increase in population may have disastrous effects on that_______________ economy.

Question 3
(i) In the following riddling session, fill in the responses of the audience. Give the responses in English. (3 marks)

Riddler: I have a riddle.
Audience:
.................................................................

Riddler: Hillocks of the same size.
Audience:
.................................................................

Riddler: That is not correct. Give me a prize.
Riddler: I accept your prize. The answer is, the breasts of a woman.

(ii) The renowned Kenyan author Ngugi wa Thiong’o is visiting your school to give a talk on creative writing. Explain any three things you will do to insure that you benefit the most as you listen to his talk. (6 marks)

(iii) Read the poem below and answer the questions that follow:

The Crow
Crows on the wing!
What grace as they swing,
Rising and diving
Like fish in the billows,
In the willowy air,
Or softly as feathers
From broken pillows.

Crows on the wing;
What a symphony sings
The wind in the wings
As they swoop and they rise
To the sea: to the skies:
As they float in the light
Air, like fragments of night.

Barnabas J. Ramon-Fortune
(a) Describe the rhyme scheme of this poem. (2 marks)
(b) Which words would you stress in the first two lines? (3 marks)
(c) How would you say line eleven of this poem? (2 marks)

(iv) Identify six pairs of words with the same pronunciation from the list below. (6 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>ewe</th>
<th>site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seat</td>
<td>ate</td>
<td>flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sit cause wring
Some ring floor
Worm coarse hue
Sam it who
Whom flour you

(v) You are stranded at a bus stop. You decide to ring your head teacher to report that you cannot arrive in school in time for classes.

Below is part of the telephone conversation. Fill in the other part.

You:

........................................................................................................................................

(2 marks)

School Secretary: I’m sorry to inform you that the head teacher is in a meeting and cannot speak to you at the moment.

You:

........................................................................................................................................

(1 mark)

School Secretary: May I know who your class teacher is please

You:

........................................................................................................................................

(1 mark)

School Secretary: I’m sorry Mrs. Mwangi is already in class. Can you please leave a message?

You:

........................................................................................................................................

(1 mark)

School Secretary: Oh! Mrs. Muli is your housemistress? Just hold on as I connect you to her.

Mrs Muli: Hello. What can I do for you?

You:

........................................................................................................................................

(3 marks)

Mrs Muli: I see, I’ll inform your class teacher about your predicament. Do your best to be here for your next class. Bye for now.

You: Goodbye Mrs. Muli. Thanks for the assistance.
Q1 Read the passage below and then answer the questions that follow:

Use it or lose it. Tropical forests need protection and proper exploitation is the way to do it. But exploitation does not have to involve destruction. And the powerful reasons for seeking to avoid the destruction of the wilderness and the subsequent extinction of animal and plant species.

The strongest argument for conserving biodiversity is to protect the ecosystem, a term that refers to the interaction between animals, plants and their natural surroundings. Diversified ecosystems protect watersheds, local rainfall, food supply and soil hence ensuring the continuity of humanity. One such ecosystem is the Amazon, which is so vast that it increases its own climate. Most rainfall is recycled, and the forest affects light reflection, cloud formation, regional rainfall and temperature. Most important, the rain forest is also a bulwark against global warming. You cannot chop it down or burn it without running large climatic risks.

In countries such as the United States of America and Mozambique, the costs of deforestation are now being felt in the form of altered climates, droughts, flash floods, landslides and soil erosion. The result can be human suffering on a grand scale. Once created, such suffering is not easy to cure. In the long run, reforestation may be the only answer, but plantations do not function as well as a diversified forest that is the product of several thousand years of evolution.

Ten years ago, few people appreciated the effect of wide biodiversity on ecosystems. But now it is easy to see why we should keep more species. Having more species in an ecosystem gives it more stability, allows it to retain more nutrients and makes it more productive. This can be compared to diversifying one’s investments. Species, like shares, differ from one another, and they respond differently to external events. The more the species, therefore, the less volatile and unstable the ecosystem. Moreover, different species thrive in different places by making use of different resources such as soil acidity and temperature.

Some ecologists reckon that the rate at which species are being lost is so high that, if it continues, palaeontologists of the future will look at the fossil record now being laid and liken it to earlier mass extinctions such as the one that killed the dinosaurs. Although those previous extinctions are thought to have been triggered by external shocks such as huge volcanic eruptions, there is a possibility that gross interference with the ecosystem also played a part. Since they are also part of the ecosystem, human beings have a vested interest in ensuring that such extinction does not recur.

There is also opportunity cost to consider: the things extinction could make harder. All crops and domestic animals have wild ancestors. Maize rice and wheat alone provide 60% of the human food supply. Their continued survival depends on the maintenance of the genetic diversity of their ancestors, from which new strains that are resistant to evolving disease and pests can be bred.
Fortunately, the world is increasingly developing an awareness of the value of biodiversity. It has become obvious that resources in the ecosystem can be harnessed without destroying that ecosystem. The forest being seen as a sustainable resource that can yield a crop. It is not a one off “mine” for the timber that, when cleared, is largely unsuitable for farming. New ecosystem-friendly ways of logging are being implemented to replace the previous reckless logging. (Adapted from The Economist May 12, 2001.)

a) What, according to the first paragraph, is the price of destroying the wilderness? (2 marks)

b) Rewrite the following sentence as instructed
The Amazon is so vast that it creates its own climate. Begin: So vast……….. (1 mark)

c) What factors could cause widespread human suffering? (2 marks)

d) Punctuate the following sentences appropriately.

1. Surely you cannot chop it down or burn it without running large climatic risks said the author.

2. The author asked once created is such suffering easy to cure. (2 marks)

e) What does the author think about reforestation? (2 marks)

f) Provide another suitable word that could replace “moreover” in paragraph four. (1 mark)

g) Who are palaeontologists? (1 mark)

h) What is the author’s main point? (3 marks)

i) Rewrite the following sentences in the active voice

   (i) The forest is now being seen as a sustainable resource that can yield a crop.

   (ii) Ecosystem friendly ways of logging are being implemented to replace the previous reckless logging. (2 marks)

j) Explain the meaning of the following words as used in the passage.

   Bulwark

   Gross

   Volatile

   Harnessed (4 marks)

Q2. Read the passage below and then answer the questions that follow.

Ezinma was an only child and the centre of her mother’s world. Very often it was Ezinma who had decided what food her mother would prepare. Ekwefi even gave her such delicacies as eggs, which children were rarely allowed to eat because such food tempted them to steal. One day as Ezinma was eating an egg Okonkwo had come in unexpectedly from his hut. He was greatly shocked and swore to beat Ekwefi if she dared to give the child eggs again. But it was impossible to refuse Ezinma anything. After her father’s rebuke she developed an even keener appetite for eggs. And she
enjoyed above all the secrecy in which she now ate them. Her mother always took her into their bedroom and shut the door.

Ezinma did not call her mother Nne like all the children. She called her by name, Ekwefi, as her father and other grownups people did. The relationship between them was not only that of mother and child. There was something in it like the companionship of equals, which was strengthened by such little conspiracies as eating eggs in the bedroom.

Ekwefi had suffered a good deal in her life. She had borne ten children and nine of them had died in infancy, usually before the age of three. As she buried one child after another her sorrow gave way to despair and then to grim resignation. The birth of her children which should be a woman’s crowning glory became for Ekwefi mere physical agony devoid of promise. The naming ceremony after seven market weeks became an empty ritual. Her deepening despair found expression in the names she gave her children. One of them was a pathetic cry, Onwumbiko—‘Death, I implore you.’ But death took no notice; Onwumbiko died in his fifteenth month. The next child was a girl, Ozoemena—‘May it not happen again’. She died in her eleventh month and two others after her. Ekwefi then became defiant and called her next child Onwuma—‘Death may please himself.’ And he did.

After the death of Ekwefi’s second child, Okwonkwo had gone to a medicine man, who was also a diviner of the Afa oracle, to inquire what was amiss. This man told him that the child was an ogbanje, one of those wicked children who, when they died, entered their mother’s wombs to be born again.

“When your wife becomes pregnant again,” he said, “let her not sleep in her hut. Let her go and stay with her people. In that way she will elude her wicked tormentor and break its evil circle of birth and death.”

Ekwefi did as she was asked. As soon as she became pregnant she went to leave with her old mother in another village. It was there that her third child was borne and circumcised on the eighth day. She did not return to Okonkwo’s compound until three days before the naming ceremony. The child was called Onwumbiko.

Onwumbiko was not given proper burial when he died. Okonkwo had called in another medicine man who was famous in the clan for his great knowledge about ogbanje children. His name was Okagbue Uyanwa. Okagbue was a very striking figure, tall, with a full beard and a baldhead. He was light in complexion and his eyes were red and fiery. He always gnashed his teeth as he listened to those who came to consult him. He asked Okonkwo a few questions about the dead child. All the neighbours and relative who had come to mourn gathered round them.

“On what market day was it born?” he asked.

“Oye,’ replied Okonkwo “And it died this morning?”

Okonkwo said yes, and only then realized for the first time that the child had died on the same market day as it had been born. The neighbours and relations also saw the coincidence and said among themselves that it was very significant.

“Where do you sleep with your wife, in your obi or in her hut?” asked the medicine man.

“In her hut.”

“In future call her into your obi.”
The medicine man then ordered that there should be no mourning for the dead child. He brought out a sharp razor from the goatskin bag and began to mutilate the child. Then he took it away to bury in the Evil Forest, holding it by the ankle and dragging it on the ground behind him. After such treatment it would think twice before coming again, unless it was one of the stubborn ones who returned, carrying the stamp of their mutilation—a missing finger or perhaps a dark line where the medicine man’s razor had cut them.

By the time Onwumbiko died Ekwefi had become a very bitter woman. Her husband’s first wife had already had three sons, all strong and healthy. When she had borne her third son in succession, Okonkwo had slaughtered a goat for her, as was the custom. Ekwefi had nothing but good wishes for her. But she had grown so bitter about her own *chi* that she could not rejoice with others over their good fortune. And so, on the day that Nwoye’s mother celebrated the birth of her three sons with feasting and music, Ekwefi was the only person in the happy company who went about with a cloud on her brow. Her husband’s wife took this for malevolence, as husband’s wives were wont to. How could she know that Ekwefi’s bitterness did not flow outwards to others but inwards into her own soul; that she did not blame others for their good fortune but her own evil *chi* who denied her any?

At last Ezinma was born, and although ailing she seemed determined to live. At first Ekwefi accepted her, as she had accepted others—with listless resignation. But when she lived on to her fourth, fifth and sixth years, love returned once more to her mother, and, with love, anxiety. She determined to nurse her child to health, and she put all her being into it. She was rewarded by occasional spells of health that Ezinma bubbled with energy like fresh palm wine. At such times she seemed out of danger. But all of a sudden she would go down again. Every one knew she was an ogbanje. These sudden bouts of sickness and health were typical of her kind. But she had lived so long that perhaps she had decided to stay. She believed because it was that faith alone that gave her own life any kind of meaning. And this faith had been strengthened when a year or so ago a medicine man had dug up Ezinma’s *iyi-uwa*. Everyone knew then that she would live because her bond with the world of Ogbanje had been broken. Ekwefi was reassured. But such was her anxiety for her daughter that she could not rid herself completely of her fear. And although she believed that the *iyi-uwa* which had been dug up was genuine, she could not ignore the fact that some really evil children sometimes misled people into digging up a specious one.

Q2.
(i.) Explain what happens before this extract. (2 marks)
(ii.) What does the extract reveal about the character of Ekwefi? (3 marks)
(iii.) Explain the meaning of each of the following as used in the extract (2 marks)
   Malevolence
   Listless resignation
(iv.) Add a question tag at the end of the statement
   She did not return to Okonkwo’s compound until three days before the naming ceremony.
Q3. Read the poem below then answer the questions that follow

Though we have parted, on my breast
Your likeness as of old I wear
It bring my spirit joy and rest
Pale phantom of a happier year
To other passion now I thrill,
Yet cannot leave this love of mine
A cast down idol-god-like still’
A shrine abandoned-yet a shrine.

Mikhail Lermontor:

a) What is the poem about? (3 marks)
b) Paraphrase the first two lines of the poem (3 marks)
c) Describe any two features that make this poem rhythmic (6 marks)
d) Explain the meaning of the following:
   Pale phantom
   Cast down idol
   Shrine (3 marks)

e) Why does the poet end this poem with three spaced dots instead of just a fullstop? (2 marks)
f) Describe the tone of this poem (3 marks)
Q4. GRAMMAR

a) Rewrite the following sentences according to the instructions given after each. Do not change the meaning of the original sentence.

(i) If the principal had not taken quick disciplinary action against the rebellious students, the school would have been plunged into chaos. (Begin: But…
(ii) He likes being idle better than working for his living. (Begin: He would rather………………….
(iii) Let us play………………………………………. (Add a question tag) (3 marks)

b) Replace the underlined word in each of the sentences below with an appropriate phrasal verb.

(i) My mother bought a scarf which matches her blue dress. ________________
(ii) With time, she will overcome her grief. ________________
(iii) The shopkeeper discovered she had exhausted her stock of sugar in the evening. (3 marks)

c) Fill in the blanks with the correct form of the verb in brackets.

(i) _______________ (Soak) clothes help remove stains easily.
(ii) Mary was so offended that she ____________ (tear) the letter into pieces.
(iii) I had ____________ (lie) in the sun for one hour before they took me to hospital. (3 marks)

d) Join the following pairs of sentences using the words in brackets and making changes only where necessary.

(i) This is the house. Simiyu built it. (that)
(ii) My friend is coming to say with me. I have been writing to him for two years.(to whom)
(iii) We enjoyed the picnic. The rain was heavy. (in spite of) (3 marks)

e) Complete the following sentences using the appropriate form of the word in brackets.

(i) The winning candidate walked ______________ to the dais. (pride)
(ii) Juma’s wife is very ______________ (quarrel).
(iii) He wants you to ____________ the answer. (clear) (3 marks)
APPENDIX VII
101/3 ENGLISH PAPER THREE

(IMAGINATIVE COMPOSITION AND ESSAYS BASED ON SET TEXTS)

2006 SAMPLE PAPER

Q1. Imaginative composition

Either:

a) Write a composition ending with the words:
   “This experience taught me that helping others is rewarding.”
   Or

b) Write a story to illustrate the saying,
   “Determination is the key to success.” (20 marks)

Q2. The Compulsory Set Text

John Ruganda: The Burdens

“It was difficult for Wamala to rise in the society again because Tinka looked down on his efforts.”

Describe two incidences in the play that support this statement.

(20 marks)

Q3. The Optional Set Texts

Answer ONE of the following three questions.

Either:

a) The short story:
   Macmillan Ed.: Looking for a Rain God

Using Chinua Achebe’s “Uncle Ben’s Choice” as your illustration, write a composition on the qualities of a good story teller.

Or

b) Drama
   Nikolai Golgol: The Government Inspector

You belong to your school debating team, which is supporting the following motion:

“People who live in country towns are more narrow minded and more gullible than those who live in large cities.”

You have decided to use The Government Inspector for your illustration. Taking into account the format of debates, argue your case.
Or

c) The Novel

Peter Abraham’s: *Mine Boy*

The Xuma we meet at the beginning of Mine Boy is not the same Xuma we see at the end of the novel. What experiences, in your view, lead to this change in his character?
## APPENDIX VIII
### KCSE MEAN PERCENTAGE MARKS FOR INTEGRATED ENGLISH BETWEEN 1989 AND 2006 BY PROVINCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>CEN</th>
<th>EAS</th>
<th>NBI</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>WES</th>
<th>NZA</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>28.38</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>28.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>24.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>29.48</td>
<td>33.46</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>41.17</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>32.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>33.90</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>39.97</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>32.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>29.08</td>
<td>27.09</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>28.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td>34.24</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>27.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>31.44</td>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>30.48</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>31.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>32.59</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>42.71</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>34.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>31.39</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>31.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>39.18</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>31.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>37.19</td>
<td>43.64</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>37.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>33.83</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>40.93</td>
<td>34.18</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>34.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>37.18</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>38.96</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>32.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>34.58</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>40.47</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>34.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>40.79</td>
<td>42.63</td>
<td>42.57</td>
<td>47.84</td>
<td>43.62</td>
<td>43.76</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>37.08</td>
<td>42.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>39.12</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td>46.59</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>40.95</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>35.89</td>
<td>39.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KNEC, 2011

**Key:**  
- **YR** - Year  
- **COS** - Coast  
- **CEN** - Central  
- **EAS** - Eastern  
- **NAI** - Nairobi  
- **RV** - Rift Valley  
- **WES** - Western  
- **NZA** - Nyanza  
- **NE** - North Eastern
**APPENDIX IX**

**CATEGORIES OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NAIROBI COUNTY PER DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAIROBI WEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lenana School</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kenya High</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nairobi School</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Hill</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Precious Blood</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nembu</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dagoretti</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moi Girls</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. Georges</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>State House Girls</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hospital Hill</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parklands Arya Girls</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kangemi</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ruthimitu Mixed</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dagoretti Mixed</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mutuiini</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Karen C</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lang’ata</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Olympic Mixed</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nairobi Milimani</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ruthimitu Girls</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>St. Marys Sec Sch.</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAIROBI NORTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moi Forces</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Starehe Girls</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Starehe Boys</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pumwani</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pangani</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ngara Girls</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jamhuri</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eastleigh</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ndururuno</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Our Lady of Fatima</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kahawa Garrison</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ruaraka</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kamiti</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Maina Wanjigi</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kamukunji</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Baba Dogo</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Uhuru</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>St. Teresa’s Boys</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Parklands Boys</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>St. Teresa’s Girls</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Muslim Girls</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Our Lady of Mercy - Shauri Moyo</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pumwani Girls</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAIROBI EAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aquinas</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muhuri Muchiri</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buruburu Girls</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Embakasi Girls</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Our Lady of Mercy</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dandora</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kayole</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dr. Mwenje</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Makongeni</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ofaria Jericho</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Huruma</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nile Road</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X
RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION PERMIT

MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

When Replying please quote
Ref. MOHEST 13/001/ 28C 87/27

Charles Mogaka Magoma
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844
NAIROBI

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on, ‘Curriculum Innovation in Kenya: A Case of the Introduction and Implementation of Secondary Integrated English,’

I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to carry out research in Nairobi North District for a period ending 30th July, 2011.

You are advised to report to the Provincial Director of Education Nairobi and the District Commissioner Nairobi North District before embarking on your research project.

On completion of your research, you are expected to submit two copies of your research report to this office.

M. O. ONDIEKI
FOR: PERMANENT SECRETARY

Copy to:
The Provincial Director of Education
Nairobi

The District Commissioner
Nairobi North District
Nairobi