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ABSTRACT

The present study was concerned with the current changes in Kenya's education system. One of the recommendations brought along with the implementation of the 8-4-4 system of education was the idea of integrating the teaching of English Language and Literature into one subject — English. The combined course is currently being taught in Kenya's secondary schools.

The study has attempted to investigate the techniques and problems observed in the teaching of the Integrated English syllabus. No research has been done on this aspect of the 8-4-4 syllabus. The study has therefore looked at the presence or absence 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.

Relevant literature was reviewed on the subject to provide the rationale and strategy for the study. The literature review also provided insight and suggestions into the methods used in the study. One of the significant findings from the literature was that integration was not all that new; it has been going on in the teaching of language and literature hence did not start with the introduction of the integrated syllabus.

The sample for the study was composed of 50 randomly selected English teachers within Kisumu District. The data were collected by means of four instruments, questionnaires, interview schedules, observation schedules and recording of live lessons. All the instruments mentioned above were developed after preliminary library research and discussion with various
educators familiar with the instruments. The questionnaire was administered to all the 50 respondents while observation was done in four schools, two public and two private, for comparative purposes. Two teachers (English) from each school had their lessons recorded for one week each. The interview schedules were for some sampled teachers, one curriculum developer and a language (English) inspector, Heads of Schools and Heads of English Departments.

Responses arising from the instruments were analysed to provide data that would help to answer questions raised by the researcher.

The findings of the study are summarised below:

1. Integration was found to be taking place between language and literature and the extent mainly depended on:

   (i) Category of the school (public or private)
   (ii) The class being taught
   (iii) The topic being taught
   (iv) Training (or non-training) of teachers
   (v) In-servicing of teachers.

2. Teachers still rely heavily on expository techniques such as lecture or questions and answer techniques while disregarding other useful techniques such as discussion and small groupwork.
3. Teachers' attitude towards the integrated English syllabus was not favourable as the majority of them were still teaching according to the old syllabus.

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

The study was an attempt to provide those involved in curriculum development and implementation including English teachers with useful information on the teaching of the integrated English syllabus.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

In many African countries today educational systems are undergoing changes of varying degrees in their relentless quest for relevance. Kenya has been no exception to this trend. Since her independence (1963) to date a number of commissions and bodies of enquiry, have been constituted and appointed to look into the education system in Kenya. The Commissions included The Kenya Education Commission (1964) otherwise known as The Ominde Report; The National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies (1967), also known as The Gachathi Report; The Presidential Working Party on the Second University (1981), also known as The Mackay Report; and The Report of the Presidential Working Party on Educational and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond (1988) or The Kamunge Report.

The principal aim of these commissions has been to design relevant education in conformity with the aspirations of the people and the national goals. They were also to design a type of education that would stimulate in the individual, initiative, confidence, resourcefulness and a sense of dedication that are necessary in the development process of the nation.

The study is concerned with the present changes in Kenya’s educational system as regards the teaching of English language and literature. These changes have come about as a result of the recommendations of The Second University in Kenya (1981). Although its main aim was to report on the
feasibility of having a Second University in Kenya, it also recommended the present changes in education being implemented in the country called the 8-4-4 system of education.

The new system of education brought several changes, among them the scrapping of "A" level classes, the extension of primary education to eight years and University education to a minimum of four years. Kenya's rationale for changing to the new system is elucidated by His Excellency President Moi (1986) in his book *Kenya African Nationalism* where he states:

"My Government decided to restructure completely the system of education and training for a number of good reasons the new structure:

(i) will permit an educational system that can respond effectively to the challenges of the times and the needs of the people;

(ii) will replace the elitist educational system with a system which can cope with the rapid growth in population;

(iii) will ensure equal opportunities and promote equity and parity of treatment in sharing educational resources;

(iv) will impart employable, technical and scientific knowledge at each stage, by promoting technical and vocational education;

(v) will improve the rating of true abilities by the operation of continuous assessment;

(vi) will improve the per-capita cost effectiveness of education by reducing the number of unemployable drop-outs, while also improving training;

(vii) will improve the available pool of potential scientific and technological resources for the management of the increasingly complex development of the environment; and

(viii) will foster national unity and respect for Kenya's rich cultural heritage, by enabling Kenyans to learn more about one another's
beliefs and life styles.

These changes were to make the curriculum and the general education system in Kenya more relevant and of immediate use to the learners.

The 8-4-4 system was characterized by changes in the structure and content of the curriculum. The changes in the curriculum included the introduction of heavier doses of vocational and technical education in primary as well as secondary schools. Business Education received more emphasis to give support and orientation to the study of commerce at secondary level. Continuous assessment at every level was to be introduced as a means of measuring success in education. The continuous assessment superseded the old methods based only on examinations which took little or no consideration of a child's progressive growth at school.

Turning to the languages taught in secondary schools, the Ministry of Education recommended the integration of English Language and Literature in English. Thus, Literature and English Language, traditionally treated as related but separate subjects were merged in the 8-4-4 system of education. The same applied to Lugha ya Kiswahili and Fasihi ya Kiswahili (Kiswahili Language and Literature in Kiswahili). This recommendation was implemented in 1986 when the 8-4-4 system of education reached the secondary level. It is the integration of English Language and Literature that is the researcher's main concern in the present study.

The new system of education (8-4-4) continued to place emphasis on English as an international language and a language for wider communication and information sharing within Kenya and the rest of the world. In Kenya the
English Language plays the following roles:

(i) It is the official language of the government. It is the language used predominantly in the national assembly for debates and deliberation. Kiswahili is also used in Government offices, in the mass media, and in commerce and industry.

(ii) It is to some extent a means of communication between speakers of different languages and a lingua franca among the elite.

(iii) It is a means of international communication used by Kenyan representatives in international conferences. It is also a major world language which Kenyans use to disseminate information to other parts of the world.

(iv) It is the medium of instruction from Standard IV onwards, a service subject across the entire curriculum.

English is therefore very important not only in Kenya but also in other parts of the world where it is mother-tongue for so many millions of people and an official language of more than a dozen African countries (Katzner, 1986).

1.1.2 Integration of English Language and Literature in Kenya

The 8-4-4 system of education called for a new emphasis in the teaching approach and the re-organization of some of the subjects in the curriculum to
achieve its aims. There was also the need to create in all subject areas an awareness of the immediate needs of the learner. English Language and Literature which in the former syllabus were separate subjects studied independently of each other were merged into one subject-English. The Ministry of Education Science and Technology recommended this change in the first circular letter (1983) to the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) on integrating Language and Literature and authorised the Institute to start working on the new syllabus relevant for this change. Kinyanjui (1985) notes that preparation for the four year secondary education curriculum has been going on at the KIE since 1984. The curriculum said in part:

"Among the subjects to be offered in forms 1 and 11 English Language will be combined with Literature in English to form one subject - "English"."

The integration of Language and Literature implied that the same teacher was to teach Language and Literature as a compact unit. This demanded that the English teachers have not only a sound command of the English Language but also a sufficient appreciation of the Literature of Kenya, Africa and the rest of the world.

The integrated English Syllabus included among other topics sections on Study skills which according to the course designers "will be very useful for students of English in tackling language and other subjects...". The curriculum designers also re-emphasised the reading component of the syllabus reasoning that both intensive and extensive reading expose learners to applied language and provide a good springboard from which to launch out into Literature teaching. The curriculum designers also called for
re-focusing on the teaching of Drama and spoken dialogue together with the reading of plays as a pivotal role without which integration of Language and Literature would be difficult.

The syllabus also re-emphasized the need for teachers to apply methods and techniques that encourage interaction between the learner and the teacher for increasing practical involvement of the pupils in their learning. The integrated English Syllabus once again criticized overusing the lecture method as it denied the learner the opportunity for practical involvement. In their Handbook for teaching the integrated English syllabus, the curriculum developers discouraged the use of guidebooks in teaching Literature because it was noted that heavy reliance on them implied little preparation on the part of the teacher and by inference the teacher's inability to help a learner develop the necessary skills for responding to a text.

The integrated English syllabus was more practical oriented and learner centred than the old syllabus. Under the new syllabus, the English teacher was once again given the task of encouraging proper methods of study, of aiding them in learning not only English, but improving their English for other subjects. The English teacher was once more given the task of ensuring that at the end of the four years of secondary education, the learner would be able to communicate effectively and confidently in written and oral English.

With the move towards integration, the number of teaching hours of both languages (English and Kiswahili) were affected. The effect was in the form of reducing the number of periods formerly allocated to English Language.
This might have been necessitated by the over-loaded curriculum brought about by the 8-4-4 system of education. New subjects that were taught only in special schools or polytechnics were considered as important for the future industrial development of the nation and were introduced. The number of English Language and Literature lessons were reduced from eight to six lessons per week. Below is a table summarising the changes in the teaching duration.

**Table 1.1: Comparison of Teaching Duration in the Old and New English Syllabus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N of Periods</th>
<th>N of Periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Syllabus</td>
<td>New Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms I and II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature in English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms III and IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature in English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that English Language was allocated eight lessons in Forms I and II and the five lessons in Forms III and IV with three lessons reserved for the study of literature in the old syllabus. Literature was considered as a subject on its own with its own specific objectives. In the new English syllabus for the 8-4-4 programme, English was allocated six
lessons for both English Language and Literature. This applied to all classes.

The drastic reduction in the number of lessons for the new syllabus and the directive that English be taught as one subject with Literature might have certain implications on the teaching of the two. It is the researcher’s intention to study the impact of the reduction of hours on the teaching of English Language and Literature. This reduction in the number of lessons might also place on the English teacher a more onerous task than ever before because if they have to attain the same standards in a shorter time, both the teacher and the learner must work extra hard.

The Ministry of Education in Kenya felt that Literature was best taught when it was integrated with English Language as they noted in the introduction to the English syllabus for Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (1985) that “It is important to note that Literature is part and parcel of language learning”. The language specialist also observed that there was a need for a syllabus that would re-emphasise the development of four language skills namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing, yet this was not something new! The integration of Language and Literature would directly lead to intensive and extensive writing, for example, creative writing as in poetry and short stories, speaking and listening as in dramatization. Thus, there was to be integration through reading, through Oral Literature, through writing and through listening and speaking.

Arden (1988) maintains that integration of English Language and Literature was not so much of a new thing as has been highlighted. Arden
views the recommendation to integrate the teaching of language and
literature as having stemmed from the purposes of teaching English. He is of
the opinion that "the teaching of English is concerned with enabling the
student to read and to write and speak with facility in ways appropriate to a
variety of contexts". Arden rationalises his opinion by posing 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 are supposed to be
answering questions on the context of the passage?"

The rationale for integration is discussed further in the Review of Literature
below, however, at this point one would like to point out that the importance
of English Language in Kenya, its role and teaching are of major concern to
educationists. This is one of the reasons why the implementation of the new
English syllabus cannot be ignored because problems of its teaching and
learning will be reflected in other subject areas which employ the language as
a medium of instruction.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The need for the present study arose as a result of the Kenya Government
directive through the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology to
merge the teaching of English Language and Literature into one subject.-
English. So far no empirical evidence exists on whether the teaching of
English Language and Literature is being integrated in Kenya's secondary schools. This investigation makes an attempt to provide such evidence which is considered to be important for understanding the teaching and learning of English Language and Literature in the 8-4-4 system of education.

It was thought useful by the researcher to carry out an investigation at this stage to determine whether teachers were following the new directive to integrate the teaching of English Language and Literature. The question was whether the teachers were integrating the syllabus, how much integration was taking place and which techniques they were using.

1.3 Research Questions

The present study hopes to provide tentative answers to the following questions:

(i) Is there integration in the teaching of English Language and Literature as is recommended by Kenya's Ministry of Education in the secondary schools?

(ii) What are the methods/techniques teachers employ to teach the integrated English syllabus?

(iii) What are the teachers' attitudes towards the integrated English syllabus?

(iv) What problems or difficulties, if any, confront the teachers in the
teaching of the new integrated English syllabus?.

1.4 Purposes/Objectives of the Study

One of the aims of the present study was to establish whether integration was taking place in the teaching of English language and Literature at the classroom level. The other was to find out the techniques teachers use to teach the integrated English syllabus and their attitudes towards the syllabus. Finally the researcher wanted to find out the kinds of problems if any, the teachers are experiencing in an attempt to teach the two in an integrated way.

In summary the researcher attempted the following:

(i) To observe and note through systematic gathering of data the extent of integration taking place between English Language and Literature in actual classroom teaching.

(ii) To find out the techniques teachers use to integrate the teaching of English Language and Literature and to comment on their suitability in teaching the two in an integrated manner.

(iii) To find out the teachers' attitude towards the integrated English syllabus.

(iv) To discover the problems or difficulties if any which confront the teachers in teaching the integrated English syllabus.
1.5 Significance of the Study

In implementing change in an education system or syllabus there may arise problems. People do not all respond to change immediately nor do they always take to change with ease. The present study is an attempt to verify whether the Ministry of Education’s directive to integrate the teaching of English Language and Literature is taking place at the classroom level. Once this is established, it is hoped that the study will provide suggestions that will be of pedagogic use to teachers in the sense that the problems noted and the recommendations presented by the study may contribute to better and more effective ways of teaching the new syllabus in future.

Since the study involves teachers it is also expected that it may stimulate thinking among teachers and lead them to review their attitudes towards the integrated English syllabus. This may directly benefit the learners who may receive higher quality instruction in the integrated English syllabus than before.

From the findings of the study it is envisaged that the English Language curriculum developers, course designers and co-ordinators may benefit from the study as it will provide data on teaching techniques and on the problems experienced in the teaching of the new integrated Language and Literature syllabus. This might also help them in improving the English syllabus.

The teacher trainers for the secondary level may also benefit from the data obtained on the techniques and problems of integrating the teaching of Language and Literature which they may wish to impart to the teacher trainees.
The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and its inspectorate branch for language education may benefit from up-to-date information on the implementation of the new English syllabus. Emphasis will be on the area concerning the extent of integration taking place between language and literature in actual classroom teaching. This may reveal to them the extent to which their directive has been implemented.

Finally the present study may stimulate more research into the integrated English syllabus which may lead to the development of better methods of teaching the integrated English syllabus in Kenya’s secondary schools.

1.6 Limitations and Scope of the Study

The researcher limited the range of the indepth observation to four schools in one District. The schools represented the two categories of schools, that is, the public and private school categories.

One of the limitations the researcher experienced was the scarcity of literature on the integrated English syllabus in Kenya. The other was timing. The time allocated for the research and the writing of the report did not allow the researcher to carry out an extensive study over a long period of time. Most of the teachers involved in the study were unwilling to spare more than two days for the study. Although acquiescent, the majority of them, especially in private schools, felt that the study was interfering with their teaching.
The researcher did not overlook the observer-observed effect (Hawthorne effect) knowing that teachers may be affected by the presence of the observer. The study did note general problems of teaching English but concentrated on the factors affecting the integration of Language and Literature.

In view of the rationale developed for the study, the goals and the problems outlined in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 will attempt to provide some relevant literature to the study. Chapter 3 will provide a framework for the design of the study while Chapter 4 will present the data as obtained from the field. Chapter 5 will give an interpretation of the results and finally conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research will be presented in Chapter 6.

1.7 Definition of Terms

(a) Integrated Syllabus.

This term refers to a course in which normally separate subject components are brought together and taught in a coherent way.

(b) Integrated English Language and Literature Syllabus

This term refers to the new Syllabus for English designed for the 8-4-4 System of education in Kenya. It recommended the teaching of English Language and Literature as one subject known as “English”.

(c) 8-4-4 System Of Education

This is the structural change in Kenya’s Educational System from seven years primary, four years secondary, two years high school and
thee years minimum University education to eight years primary, four years secondary and a minimum four years University education (8-4-4). This new system was implemented in Kenya in 1984 in standard VII.


5. Ibid.
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CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

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

(i) teaching techniques and methods
(ii) the teaching of English language and literature in Kenya before integrating
(iii) pro-integrationist views
(iv) anti-integrationist views.

2.1 Review of Teaching Techniques and Methods

In the history of education a great deal of research has focused on the practice of teaching as opposed to learning, on the methods used and on the problems that hinder teacher effectiveness. Researchers such as Dewey, Pestalozzi, Montessori and Froebel argued that, “the effectiveness of teaching and learning are determined by the type of teaching methods applied.” (Goddard, 1974)

Hayman (1970) indicated that to teach a curriculum content, a particular way of teaching has to be chosen and that way has a significant effect on the entire teaching and learning situation.

Many educators emphasize the child-centred approach to education. Dewey (1916) inspired this approach and the modern view of the teacher as a helper, challenging the learner to discover things for himself. Despite such
advice by the educators named above, research has shown that teachers in most classroom situations today in Kenya are still controlling, restricting, inhibiting and do most of the talking. Flanders [1970] recorded that 70 percent of the talking in the average primary and secondary classroom is done by the teacher.

Muthwii (1981) researching in Machakos District Kenya concluded that most teachers spend 80 percent of their teaching time lecturing and asking few questions. Male (1988) conducting almost the same kind of survey in Kiambu District in Kenya found out that most teachers use expository methods showing extreme domination by the teachers over the learners in most areas of the lesson.

In Kenya’s education history, the same concern over teaching technique and methodology was voiced in *The Kenya Education Commission* (1964). The report blamed the drill method of teaching, neglect of activity and pupil participation methods for the low achievement in education. The report encouraged teachers to adjust their instructions to the needs of particular children and to use activity methods so as to make education child-centred. The same concern was taken up by The Gachathi Report (1976). It observed that one of the basic requirements in making education relevant to the day to day problem of learners is to enable the student to observe phenomena of the environment, gather data about them, interpret the data and then use them to solve problems. The report suggested that teaching methods should be used to develop ability to gather information by observing the environment or by experiment as well as the ability to draw valid scientific inferences from the observed data. It should be noted at this point that despite the
recommendations from different commissions and even from different educators, teachers have not changed much even after undergoing the relevant training.

These findings prompted the researcher to try and find out how the new English syllabus is taught in Kenya secondary schools and whether the learner-centred methods advocated by Ominde, Gachathi and Mackay are finally being used in our schools.

2.2 The Teaching of English Language and Literature in Kenya Before Integration

As already noted in Chapter 1, English Language plays a very important role in Kenya. The teacher of English must remind himself of the important place he occupies in the life of his students and must at all times endeavour to do his best in his teaching.

Though it has been the country’s aim to provide better education to the citizens, several problems have sprung up that have not only plagued the education system at large but have also impeded the proper learning and mastery of the medium of instruction. Such problems include attitudes towards the language used for instruction and limited resources due to sudden and rapid expansion of Kenya’s education system to cope with the population growth. These factors, writes Mbithi [1984] have caused a drop in standards in all learning areas and more specifically in the areas of English Language.

The teaching of English in Africa has been affected by certain attitudes as is put by Bright and McGregor (1975). They claim that the environment, the
teacher, an awareness of progress and achievement, attractive textbooks are likely to have dominating influence and can create a favourable or a negative attitude towards the language. Other factors like the relative status of the first language and the individual 's need for English can also shape his attitude. It is for such reasons that Bright and McGregor [1975] advised that English teachers should make language teaching more enjoyable and far less dull and exhausting in order for the learners to acquire the English language skills for themselves enabling them to go on learning long after they have left school.

Mcgregor (1971) had earlier on observed that the teaching and learning of English Language to be enjoyable and successful in the schools it was essential that teachers and students understand why English is so important in African education and to understand at least some problems which have contributed to the present language situation in society. Mcgregor (1971) went further to explain that "using the language is not only the aim; it is also the method. We learn English by using it and not by learning about it". This quote demonstrates how the communicative approach is not new but it is only that teachers have not put what the dictum implies into practice. For teachers to succeed they must create learning situations in which pupils immediately use the English Language they have learnt for things which they want and need to do. The same concern was put forward by Mbiti (1984) when he said:

"the development of competence in English language depends to a large extent on whether the students are given sufficient opportunity to become productively involved in practical language using situations".

Many schools in Kenya and elsewhere too have failed to provide such opportunities because the burden of improving the students’ English
Language competence usually rests entirely on the shoulders of the English teacher whereas meaningful contexts which can motivate learners to use language in hypothesising, generalising and sharing ideas about common experiences occur naturally and more often across the curriculum in various subject. Most teachers in Kenya have not fully absorbed the notion of Language across the curriculum. What they feel is well described by Doughty (1974) when he said:

"Subject teachers see language as being outside their field because Language is English and English is a subject with its own responsibilities. One is likely to feel that he is trespassing upon territory that he has no right to enter because it belongs to those of his colleagues who are more qualified to teach it, the English specialists".10

Language teaching should be the concern of all teachers. While it is certainly true that the pupils' use of spoken and written English is a central concern of the English specialist, the English specialist on the other hand does not see himself as the person who should teach a pupil how to write a history essay or spell technical words, these are perceived to be the responsibility of the subject specialist who must cultivate the right and appropriate language for each area. The Ministry of Education in Kenya had earlier on (1980) noted:

"The teaching of English must always, wherever it is carried on, be part of the wider professional task which faces all teachers; that of educating young people about themselves, about others and about their global environment".11

On the same issue Gorman (1970) observed that the task of preparing students at Secondary level to use the medium of instruction with facility in their study of different subjects is not, however, one that concerns the teacher
of language alone. All teachers in secondary schools must be made aware of
the implications of the truism that in any teaching situation all teachers are
teachers of language.

Until its integration with literature [1986] the Ministry of Education
[1980] viewed the teaching of English as based on the four skills of listening,
speaking, reading, and writing. Listening skills was to involve careful
listening. The onus was on the teacher to ensure that he spoke clear, fluent
and grammatically correct English at all times. He had to likewise set a good
example to his class by listening to students' speeches very carefully in order
to respond appropriately to their language demands. Speaking and listening
was practised through debates, drama and class discussions. In it's
recommendations for the teaching and learning of English Language the
Ministry of Education discouraged the drilling of grammar and compelling
the children to speak English always because such practice tended to inhibit
that creativity in the learners which is an essential part of speaking any
language.

For oral practice the Ministry of Education recommended the use of oral
tasks as well as audio-visual aids to stimulate and develop oral ability
without having recourse to the written language. The teachers of English
were expected to be ready to help learners to recognize and produce correct
sounds of English, and equally essential, they had to be fluent in connected
(continuous) speech.

The Ministry of Education had earlier on (1979) recommended intensive
and extensive reading practice, silent reading alone and under supervision,
library work, reading for general information, and speed reading. Blackburn (1980) further stressed that "The ultimate aim of the English teacher must be to teach flexibility of response to the written word." Wide reading contributed to fluency in language and to the understanding of concepts in all fields of secondary education, whether technical, artistic or scientific. The Ministry of Education also recommended the reading of Literature throughout the Secondary education as it was seen to be a source of cultural knowledge where learners noted the values and norms of other people. Appropriate literature of Kenya, Africa and the rest of the world enabled Kenyans to see themselves better in the world as a whole.

Writing was considered as another very important skill. To be able to write fluently and clearly in a way that is appropriate to the stimulus, the learners needed enough practice on writing on different stimuli. The course content was also meant to equip learners with different writing skills such as that of writing narration, description, discussion and exposition which are vital skills for further education.

The teaching of Literature officially began in Form III with setbooks, however, there was often reading of literature in form of class readers in Forms I and II in most Kenyan secondary schools. The definition and role of Oral Literature translated into English has been a major controversy in the curriculum. This has occurred not only in Kenya but also in other countries in East Africa.

Another debate as to whether Literature in a second language should be taught as a subject in the first of the four years of secondary education in
Kenya was resolved when English Language was integrated with Literature into one subject- English in 1986. Until then, Literature was taught and examined primarily as a content or special science subject in much the same way as Geography or History. One argument that has always been put forward regarding the study of Literature at this level is that the teaching of Literature cannot be sensibly divorced or dissociated from the study of language. This is the stand Kenya took during the implementation of 8-4-4 system of education.

Roe (1970), arguing for integration affirms that the teaching of Literature is essentially an extension of a Language skills training programme embracing, however, the study of meaning at a more sophisticated level. The Kenya Ministry of Education recommended as a role of the literature and Language teacher, that “teachers should inculcate enduring human values as a necessary part of the solutions of the problems that face man today” v. This he can do only by sharing with his students the truths that are found in great imaginative literature following sound educational practices. The teacher can start with the local literature paying particular attention to Oral Literature, then he can consider the literature of wider Africa, the Black diaspora and the rest of the world. For such a task to be accomplished the reading of a few setbooks in Form III and IV can never be enough. Language teachers in Kenya are advised to use imaginative and appropriate literature right from the early classes as a major means of learning both Language and Literature.

2.3 Integrating English Language and Literature: Pro-Integrationists’ Views

In this section, views of pro-integrationists are presented. The Kenyan
views are presented first followed by views from other parts of the world for each point.

Attitudes towards the teaching of English Language and Literature in Kenya tend to be blurred and confounded by several phenomena. These include the swing now taking place in Kenya in the form of a new education system. The new system attempted to re-introduce an English syllabus which tried to move away from the formal grammar teaching that has dominated the teaching of English Language for decades despite the official policy of more active methods since the 1960s (see Note 1).

Since the Kenya Government recommended the integration of English Language and Literature into one subject, several English Language specialists and educationists have recorded varying views and reasons in support of such a Language syllabus for learning various skills in language.

Indangasi (1988) argues that the integrated English syllabus has some advantages for those who believe in the intrinsic value of Literature. His main support for integration is that it has made Literature compulsory. This, he argues, will compel pupils to appreciate at a relatively early age the special relationship between Language and Literature and consequently the special way in which literary writers use language.

Adams and Pearce (1974) also maintain that the approach to English which relies on a sharp division between Literature and Language and between the component parts of the latter cannot succeed in practical classroom teaching. The two seems to argue that integration between
Language and Literature makes the teaching of Language more practical than separating the teaching of the two.

Brumfit (1985) is of the same school of thought when he argues that Literature provides learners with a convenient source of content for a course in language learning. His views border very closely on those of Collie and Slatter (1987) and of Carter and Burton (1982). He claims that Literature is one of the three areas on which language learning content could be based (the others are linguistics and civilization). He goes further to assert that "Literary materials are readily available but such reasons are subservient to the argument that there must be a context which is in itself worthwhile if Language teaching is to be really effective."

Many teachers use Literature to assist the development of competence in language. Although the text being used may be literary and some of the responses of the readers discussed in literary forms, the prime intention is to teach language work. Under such circumstances the teacher may use the text to promote reading skills and as a context for exemplification and discussion of linguistic items which have little bearing on the value of the work as Literature.

2.3 Halloway reporting on the Makerere Conference, Uganda, (1963) recognized that the study of literary works played an important part in Language learning. He pointed out in somewhat more general terms that literary studies are valuable because they offer the learner advantages in addition to greater linguistic proficiency. Wiley and Dunk (1985) are of the same opinion as Halloway. In their coursebook Integrated English they stress
the idea that an integrated Language syllabus enables learners to read with understanding and to write and speak with facility in ways appropriate to a variety of contexts. Their main point here is that integration enhances communicative competence in a learner. Such competence, they claim, can be achieved through activities carefully selected from interesting materials. The materials need not be necessarily extracts but should include some complete works to enable the learners to develop their own responses to literary texts and in so doing help them to think about ways in which the structure of the whole contributes to the effectiveness of what is written.

Wiley and Dunk observed that short extracts can on the other hand be used as an approach to offer experience in the close reading of many different kinds of texts and also structured practice in the use of English Language covering a large number of grammatical features often needed by the learner. This is true in the sense that the shortness of the extract makes the learners probe into more aspects of language and literature than they would with a longer text.

Other reasons for integrating the teaching of English Language and Literature are given below.

2.3.1 Literature and the Learning of Vocabulary

Several language specialists believe that the integration of Language and Literature aids the learning of vocabulary. Indangasi (1988) is of the feeling that effective teaching of English can be done through the use of literary texts. His first reason for such an assertion is related to the need for learners to acquire and expand their vocabulary. The teaching of grammar, he claims,
only makes the learner aware of the structure of English Language but does not help in enlarging vocabulary. This is true especially for the vocabulary of everyday language which is the vocabulary of human experience and social discourse. The natural, social and behavioural sciences will no doubt give the learner a technical and specialized vocabulary, but this kind of vocabulary is not usable in normal conversation. It is only Literature which is able to equip the learner with the lexicon for this important mode of human communication.

Muthiani (1988) observed that teachers of the integrated English syllabus should ensure that they teach their pupils 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 meaning in the new context. He recommends that although the teacher may not have time to present all the usages of a word to the learners, he should indicate with a few examples the fact that the word could have a different meaning in a different context.

2.3.2 Literature as a Source of Context for Learning Language Structures

The second point advanced by several language specialists is the fact that literature provides the context for learning language structures.

Literary texts or passages are believed by several language specialists to be a source of context for language learning. Muthiani (1988) is of the opinion that a teacher of Literature and Language should teach language and usage, not as ends in themselves, but as tools for understanding and expression. Muthiani claims the teachers can impart such understanding and improve pupils' expression through the use of literary texts or passages.
where the relevant expressions are used. In that way the learners understand such structures and their meanings in different contexts. Muthiani observes that teachers of Literature should not shy away from teaching grammar from the texts they are using. The same views are held by the English Language curriculum developers at K.I.E when they note that “involvement with literary texts is perhaps one of the best ways to expose students to a variety of structures in English.”

The language specialists further claim that one reason why grammar lessons are tedious and meaningless is that all too often they consist of a teacher explaining a few terms and expressions, and then asking students to write out a few exercises. Learners need to know and identify certain terms, but it is far better to relate the structures to contextualized exercises. The learners need to hear and see a number of examples of the structure in question to aid in understanding what the teacher is putting across and the more examples the better. Illustrations of usage can be drawn from recent comprehension passages, class readers, other literary texts, students’ compositions and even newspapers.

The curriculum developers affirm that the techniques need to change from the former practice relying on textbooks and sterile exercises to the modern way of learning grammar in a meaningful context. They further recommend that students be encouraged to use language, that teachers should use group and pair work which are some of the most effective methods in language learning classrooms.
Mwanzi (1987) is of the opinion that literature is language in context, language used creatively for aesthetic purposes. She views the grammatical structures that artists (poets, novelists, etc.) use as being generally correct. Where for example an artist uses incomplete sentences he does so for aesthetic purposes. Mwanzi, however, feels that integration of Language and Literature can only be done where possible and where both aspects of language and literature can be taught from one source. Where it is not possible the teacher should always take the initiative to teach Language and Literature independently.

Carter (1982) in his attempt to prove that work on lexis can best be undertaken in an integrated English class claims that literary texts are fertile ground which allows mutual supportive integration of areas which are often kept distinct in the English classroom.

It should, however, be noted here that Kenya’s English teaching in the 1970s had moved away from the traditional grammar teaching approach especially in the primary schools where K.I.E. had introduced the Safari English Course book. The teaching of structures was firmly based on the audio-lingual method where structures were presented first in passages (not necessarily literary). It seems therefore, that what was and is today recommended is not what is being practised by teachers in the classrooms.

2.3.3 Integrating Language and Literature as a Source of Context for Teaching English Idioms

The third point in support of integration is advanced by Indangasi (1988) when he affirms that Literature provides the context for learning English idiom.
He believes that literary works aid a learner in mastering English idiom. He further claims that while passages are being used to teach Literature, they also serve as context for learning idiom. The learning of idiomatic expressions is an area where conventional grammar cannot help very much. Indangasi claims that high school students more often than not have to simply memorize the differences in meaning between prepositional phrases such as “put of and put out, take off and take out”, those who are unable to commit their meaning to memory use them interchangeably. This is because an idiom means something but the relation between the idiom and what it means is arbitrary and conventional. One simply has to know what the idiom means being that there is no short cut.

The learners must always encounter an idiom in a context in order to appreciate its meaning. The teaching of grammar might furnish the learner with a theory of idiomatic expressions but it may not give a live context for the study of such expression. Thus, Indangasi believes that literary works can provide the context for learning and enhancing a learner’s knowledge of idiomatic English, a very useful acquisition for learners of language.

Indangasi (1988) is right in pointing out that literary passages are some of the sources that may provide context for learning English idiom. A thorough knowledge of the vocabulary and idiom of English, both of which are best taught when contextualized, are important for development of conversational skills and general expressive abilities. These skills are best acquired through the reading of good prose where the writers have perfected their dialogue techniques especially when they write in a manner that mirrors real
conversation. Such a goal, claims Indangasi, can be achieved by reading and watching plays. It should, however, be noted that learners can also achieve such a goal when they listen to the mass media (radio and television) and even from fluent speakers of the language.

2.3.4 Literature and Reading

The fourth point put forward by language specialists in support of integration is that integrating the teaching of Language and Literature is beneficial as far as reading skills are concerned. The Language curriculum developers in Kenya, however, warn that “the right balance should be established between literary reading and essential communication reading”.\textsuperscript{18}

Collie and Slatter (1987) are of the opinion that in reading literary texts, learners have also to cope with language intended for native speakers and thus they gain familiarity with different linguistic uses, forms and conventions of the written mode. They argue further that in extensive reading (of novels and long plays) learners develop the ability to make inferences from linguistic clues and to deduce meanings form the context, both useful tools in reading other sorts of materials.

Brumfit (1985) gives another point when he reasons that “reading is the most autonomous and individualized ability in language learning and literature is a rich source of materials for reading.”\textsuperscript{19} Brumfit assumes that the reason for teaching Literature is that as many people as possible will read and enjoy great works of Literature, another good reason for integration. He, however, warns that a true literary syllabus should not be simply the use of literary text for language study purposes, but an attempt to develop or extend
literary competence. An ideal Literature syllabus will not only exploit understanding of a language, but will relate to other aesthetic disciplines of art. Brumfit's argument here is that integration should result in the simultaneous development of language and literary skills.

2.3.5 Integrating Language and Literature as an Aid to Writing

Writing is a very important skill in Language study. A number of educationists are of the opinion that integrating the teaching of Literature and Language can enhance writing skills. The curriculum developers define writing as the varieties which include narration, description, exposition, discussion, drama, dialogue, poetry letters (both formal and informal), diaries, notes, lists inventories, instructions, notices, reports, minutes, recipes and dictation. Thus, writing embraces both literary and non-literary varieties.

Carter (1982) argues that literary study should not be isolated from the kinds of questions raised about language use in the Language lessons and that much benefit can be derived in Language lessons from productive interplay with the language of the literary texts. This, he claims, can lead to creativity in writing as a discipline. He says:

"Creativity in writing is a discipline and not at all a matter of rampant free expression. The more detailed the awareness of pupils of the norms and rules and structural properties of Language the more refined their appreciation of Literature and the more developed their creative writing."\(^{20}\)

Carter (1982) further maintains that creative writing can spring from the involvement with literary aspects especially when Language and Literature are taught complementarily. Writing skills such as narration are best enhanced when learners read and appreciate literary works where such style
of writing are used. The same applies to the writing of poems. The learners can be exposed to different patterns of writing poetry through choral reading before they are asked to write their own poems. Dialogues and plays of all types can also be practised and written by learners after having been to a number of plays. Through constant writing practice the teacher of English can ensure that the format of writing is mastered.

2.3.6 Integrating Language and Literature as an Aid to Listening and Speaking

Speech is a very important language skill. Human communication depends a great deal on one's proficiency in and appropriate use of language. The Kenya Language curriculum developers maintain that the main aim of teaching speaking is to gain oral fluency, the ability to express oneself intelligibly, reasonably, accurately and, without undue hesitation. Pro-integrationists believe that integration can enhance the above mentioned abilities through the use of written texts for oral practice.

The curriculum developers at the Kenya Institute of Education maintain that dramatization is another way to give a class practice in speaking. This, claims the curriculum developers, they can do by performing little scenes consisting of short, usually funny sketches or scenes as in a show and short plays. They argue that if a learner has to perform before the class, he is likely to study his part with care to try to understand and learn it by heart. If what he learns are everyday sentences, he will retain some of them and their patterns, and later use them unconsciously in his conversation. They go further to argue that:
"Reading and recitation of poetry have been used widely as techniques to teach stress, intonation and correct pronunciation."

Speaking practices can occur orally either for class performance or for inter-school competition.

Songs are also an aid to pronunciation especially when the songs are aimed at giving the learner a great deal of practice on specific sounds and sound patterns. Songs may include those already written down and recorded on tapes or simply those improvised in class.

Still on integrating Language and Literature, Girard (1972) is of the opinion that literary expression is not only one culture among others, but it is also one of the many forms of language. He goes further to say that an integrated Language and Literature syllabus may lead to more activity, interest and to the full use of voice and body by learners as compared to a dull drills, a practice by teachers that characterizes many English lessons. These drills quickly bore learners and teachers should not underestimate the learner’s ability to feel and take pleasure in language through drama, singing, skipping to rhymes in the playgrounds and enjoying the sound texture of language, of drama or of literature read aloud. Such activities according to Girard (1972) improve the learners’ language and ability to conceptualize through games, songs, concerts, role play and improvisation. It should be noted here that blame lies with the practice rather than Ministry’s Policy which is very clear on contextualization of grammar.

Other linguists such as Brumfit (1985) assert that literary structures influence speech competence which can also develop side by side with story
telling, word games and personal narrative. Collie and Slatter (1987) also maintain the same view when they assert that “Literary texts serve as excellent prompt for oral work”.

In summary the following are the points advanced by pro-integrationists in support of integrating Language and Literature:

1. In Kenya, integration has now made Literature compulsory for all students.
2. Integration aids the learning of vocabulary.
3. Integration provides the context for learning English structures.
4. Integration provides the context for learning English idiom.
5. Integration helps in the learning of the four language skills.
6. Integration provides a source for autonomous learning of language and literature.
7. Integration leads to enjoyment in the learning of Language and Literature.
8. Integration leads to simultaneous development of both Language and literary skills.
9. Integration leads to communicative competence.
10. Integration aids the learning of writing.
11. Integration aids listening and speaking.

2.4 The Anti-Integrationists’ Views

A few Language and Literature specialists feel that Language and Literature should not be studied in an integrated manner. Such specialists are of the view that Language and Literature each have their own intrinsic value that would be lost if the two were taught in an integrated manner.
While Indangasi (1988) believes strongly in the advantages of integrating the teaching of English Language and Literature, he however warns that too much optimism as regards such a syllabus could be dangerous especially where one might be made subordinate to the other he says:

"...if literature is subordinate to Language, if it is used simply as a means for the teaching of English, then its special moral and aesthetic concerns will diminish in importance... ." 23

Such considerations according to Indangasi should be critically viewed before integrating the teaching of the two. There is some truth in this statement especially where English is taught as a second language that if this approach is not handled with care then one of the disciplines may very well suffer dilution.

Burton (1982) advances several reasons as to why Literature should be included in the school syllabus and studied without any "impurities". They argue that Literature offers bountiful and extremely varied body of written material which is important in the sense that it says something about fundamental human issues which are enduring rather than ephemeral; it does so in its own language and from which mere knowledge of ordinary daily language cannot reach. Thus, for a learner to appreciate literature and enjoy it fully, a great deal more must be taken into account and this is why literature should be taught on its own without confusing it with other language or linguistic aspects. He, however, goes further to say that a knowledge of language is a vital basis for interpretation of literary texts.

Brumfit (1985) makes the same observation even though he believes that integration of Language and Literature is sufficiently valuable to want to pass
on the pleasure that reading it offers. He proceeds to suggest that this can be
done most efficiently by treating it as a completely separate subject area from
English Language. The explanation for this according to Brumfit (1985) is
that literature has one major difference from other arts and that it is an art
which invites 'impurities'. What the author means by this is that Literature
comprises several components that if not studied in depth will not produce
the aesthetic responses it is supposed to produce in the learner.

To Brumfit literary texts are "so complex with sensitive characteristics
that may be destroyed or distorted if a schematic and insensitive organization
is imposed on such a rich and subtle work of art". He therefore justifies the
study of Language or Literature in their own right educationally without
attempting to integrate the teaching of the two.

Carter (1982) also argues against integrating the teaching of English
Language and Literature. He comments that such integration can easily lead
to dilution. He further claims that some linguists have objected to integration
because in certain cases it has resulted into undue attention to language use
with corresponding absence of detail in the description of language. He says:

"literature specialists may object to the introduction of 'jargon'
the classification of effects in terms of mechanical categories
instead of felt response, the subjection of creativity to rules and
the reduction of Literature to language at the expense of a wider
context of historical study of author and period, influencing
artistic development and many others".25

What Carter (1982) is trying to put across here is the fact that each of the
disciplines is important in its own way and integration can lead to dilution of
one or both. Literature, he claims, addresses itself to certain matters which are uniquely its own. Its territory is human experience and language in this case is the medium it uses to survey this territory. Teachers have therefore to appreciate what each has to offer by teaching them separately. Carter’s main concern here is the aspects of Literature which cannot be accommodated in the study of Language such as how Literature relates to emotions and feelings while there are Language concerns which cannot be studied in a purely literary lesson context such as acquiring rules of the language.

Carter (1982) further claims that his main objective is to question the effectiveness of integrating Language and Literature in improving the pupils’ expressive ability. According to him this can happen only in cases where the language of the Literary text conforms to correct grammatical usage. He further asserts that there are dangers if integration is not handled with care. He gives examples of such dangers like teacher bias in teaching either more of Literature than Language or vice-versa or the over-emphasis of one to the detriment of the other. Secondly, he advises that pupils should be encouraged to pursue their delight in language in its own right since language provides a set of criteria for understanding literary texts.

Ching (1980) is of the same school of thought as Carter (1982). He is of the opinion that Language is much more than the incidental medium of Literature, it is also a shaping and finishing instrument for it. He maintains that teachers should try as much as possible to encourage a sound knowledge of fundamentals of the present day language which should be brought in after basic language skills have been acquired. Literary works can only be introduced after basic language skills have been mastered.
Girard (1972) on the other hand maintains that there can be no reconciliation between the traditional view of English teaching which regards the teaching of Literature as all important and the current emerging patterns of teaching which are focussed on the effective use of the language as spoken and written. According to him the teaching of Literature should never be integrated with Language because there can never be such a reconciliation without disadvantages.

It is, however, true that Literature has more to offer on its own than when it is integrated with Language. In an attempt to integrate the two the pleasure in reading literary works can be reduced when the teacher begins to stress language aspects found within the Literary work. Teachers can still contextualize the teaching of structures in separate lessons from those of Literature. Such an outcry as "let Literature be taught as Literature and English Language as Language" using literary or non-literary texts to contextualize, are some of the views of the anti-integrationists.

In summary the anti-integrationists maintain that no integration should take place in the teaching of Language and Literature because:

(i) Literature has much to offer in its pure state.

(ii) Integration leads to the dilution of either or both disciplines.

(iii) Integration can take place after a learner has been exposed for sometime to the necessary language skills. Language must therefore be learnt on its own first before literary skills are taught.
(iv) Very little of the intrinsic values of the two come out when they are integrated hence each should be taught on its own.

In view of the above discussion, it should be noted that the integrated English syllabus is not the first strategy or policy in Kenya to attempt to abolish classical uncontextualized grammar teaching. Just as the language teaching policies of the 1960s and 70s recommended but failed to promote active language learning strategies in classrooms, the IES of the late 1980s under the 8-4-4 system has also not succeeded in promoting such activities. From the literature, it should be noted that whereas most countries in the world continue to find this problem in their classrooms, to varying degrees, Kenya (and Africa in general) seems to suffer relatively severely from this problem. This poses a significant challenge to policy designers and teacher trainers for the future and begs the question as to why grammar teaching methodology is so difficult to modify.

1. It should be observed that since the New Primary Approach (NPA) and since the 1964 Commission, the teaching of grammar in context has been the official policy.
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CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

In this chapter an attempt has been made to describe the sample, the research instruments, the procedure for data collection, and the procedure for data analysis. The investigator attempted to find out the techniques and problems experienced in teaching the new syllabus of integrated English Language and Literature in Kenya Secondary schools. The research question was therefore an investigative one with the following objectives:

(i) observe through systematic gathering of data the extent of integration taking place between English Language and Literature actual classroom teaching,

(ii) find out the techniques teachers use to integrate the two,

(iii) find out the teachers opinion on the integrated English Syllabus,

(iv) find out any other problems impeding the teaching of the integrated English Syllabus and make recommendations if necessary.

3.1 The Population

In 1989 the Ministry of Education in Kenya graded schools into two categories:

(i) Public schools which include government maintained, assisted and harambee schools (schools built through funding from the community).
(ii) Private schools which are owned by individuals or groups or by churches and do not receive government aid in terms of funds, teachers or resources. These schools include profit and non-profit making institutions.

The target population for this study were all secondary school teachers teaching the new English Syllabus from Form I to Form III. The researcher did not consider Form IV because it was an examination class. The time during which the research took place found the Form IVs busy with national examinations.

The researcher limited the study to Kisumu District bearing in mind that the study focused on interpretation of the curriculum at the classroom level and a rural district would provide the best focus because the majority of Kenya’s secondary schools are situated in the rural setting. The information obtained form Kisumu District schools would possibly reflect the situation in other schools.

3.2 The Sample

The population from which the sample under study was selected consisted of all English teachers in secondary schools in Kisumu District teaching in public and private schools. The reason for sampling from both categories of schools was to allow for comparisons of the results and to see if the teaching experiences and patterns are the same in the public and private schools or if an overall pattern emerges in all schools bearing in mind that private schools are now on the increase to cater for the high demand in education.
Kisumu District has 58 functional secondary schools, 48 are public and 10 are private. Out of the 48 public schools only one belongs to the category formerly referred to as “National Schools”. This school was not selected for the study. The District has a total of 142 English teachers. The researcher settled for a total of 50 teachers who were to participate in the study by responding to a questionnaire. The number selected permitted a range of opinions held by English teachers on the topic of study. The sample constituted 35.2 per cent of the population and was expected to be representative of the population. No data was readily available on the total number of English teachers in each category of school hence the number of schools per category was used for stratification and for determining how many subjects to be selected per school. The old grading system of schools was used to arrive at a reasonably representative sample as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Schools</th>
<th>N of Schools</th>
<th>N of Teachers Sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harambee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sample obtained indicates that 12 teachers were randomly chosen from maintained schools, 16 from assisted schools, 12 from harambee schools and 10 from private schools.
For purposes of observation the researcher found the above schools too many to observe. It was discovered that observation and recording of live lessons could not be done for the 50 teachers sampled. Stratified random sampling was used to arrive at the schools to participate in the recording and observation. A list of all secondary schools was obtained from the district. The schools were then grouped as public or private. Systematic sampling was then used to arrive at two schools in each category. The first and the last schools were picked from each list. The researcher ended up with four schools to participate in the observation, two from public and two from private schools. (See Appendix A).

Since the researcher had sampled at least one teacher from most of the schools to respond to a questionnaire, it was decided that a second teacher be randomly picked from each of the four schools sampled to provide data for the observation schedule. Nine teachers participated in the classroom observation though the researcher had expected only eight to participate. The ninth teacher came in as an emergency replacement after one of the sampled teachers had to leave to supervise national examinations. Each teacher was observed for all the six English lessons taught in a week in each class. The researcher expected to collect a total of 48 lessons. The lessons were recorded on tape for analysis.

Given the sampling procedure it was expected that the eight teachers (5.5%) would be, to some extent, representative of others not observed. The sampling procedure is shown below.
Table 3.2: The Sample Chosen for Observation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Schools</th>
<th>N of Schools</th>
<th>Sample Chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The ninth teacher was not included in the sampling procedure.

3.3 The Subjects

Fifty teachers responded to the questionnaire. Out of the four schools sampled for purposes of observation the researcher expected two teachers of English per school to answer the questionnaire and participate in the observation. This expectation was realised in most schools. In the schools where there were more than two teachers of English the researcher used random sampling to arrive at two teachers to participate in the observation. Random sampling was also used to pick one teacher from the other schools to respond to the questionnaire. The researcher also interviewed some heads of schools and heads of English Departments.

Outside the school premises the researcher interviewed an official concerned with Language curriculum development from the Kenya Institute of Education. One official in charge of English Language inspection at the Ministry of Education was also interviewed to get views on the implementation of the new syllabus.
3.4 Description of the Research Instruments

The researcher reviewed a number of research instruments and settled on the following: For objectives (i) and (ii), the researcher used an observation schedule and tape recorded the English lessons. For objectives (iii) and (iv) above the researcher used a questionnaire and interview schedule for teachers observed. A second questionnaire was developed for curriculum developers and English Language field inspectors. All the instruments were tried out on a few teachers in Nairobi to test their validity. The results were used to modify the instruments which were used on the respondents.

Nine teachers were observed during their actual teaching and their lessons recorded on tape. The teachers also responded to a questionnaire together with 42 other English teachers. An interview schedule was also developed for the teachers observed which they responded to after the lesson observations. This means that the teachers observed responded to all the instruments while 42 teachers responded to a questionnaire only. Two non-teaching respondents, a curriculum developer and a field inspector, responded to an interview schedule. The following instruments were thus used: An observation and recording schedule, a questionnaire and two types of interviews.

3.4.1 The Observation Schedule.

Observation was found relevant for this study. During the observation the researcher made notes on non-verbal classroom activities going on during the lesson, notes were also made on factors like the number of pupils taught, textbooks used, page references, and exercises given by the teacher. Notes on the above mentioned items assisted the researcher in analysing and recording
factors that influence the teaching of the integrated syllabus and also to note whether integration was taking place. The researcher observed the teachers’ lesson plans and schemes of work to see if there were tendencies of integration shown in the schemes and lesson plans. For the teachers and pupils’ activities a special sheet was prepared as shown in Appendix (B and C). The English lessons were also observed to identify techniques used by the teachers to teach the integrated syllabus. The researcher noted any non-verbal difficulties experienced by the teachers which could not be recorded on the audio tape.

3.4.2 Recording English Lessons

Recording of behaviour has an element of objectivity in that the observer may listen to the same record as often as desired and even make comparisons if need be. For purposes of recording the English lessons good recording equipment was obtained and quality tapes bought to ensure good sound quality. The classroom verbal interaction of the sampled teachers was then recorded and the tapes kept for analysis. Each recorded cassette was marked the date of recording, the names of the teacher, the class taught and the lesson number so as to avoid confusion during transcription.

3.4.3 The Questionnaire

The need for a questionnaire arose because observation could not be done for a large number of teachers due to lack of time and resources. The researcher needed varied opinions from a broad spectrum of English teachers concerning the new English syllabus. A questionnaire of the self-administered type was found the most reliable method to collect such data (see Appendix D). Consideration was also given to the fact that some respondents feel shy in giving truthful answers especially to strangers.
Despite initial misgivings on the part of the researcher, the questionnaire proved a fairly useful tool because of its anonymity. It encouraged greater honesty because the respondents were sure they were not to be held responsible for their answers. The questionnaire also provided private and confidential information as well as a positive atmosphere for the respondents to express their views. This proved very useful in that a study like the present one relies much on recording peoples' views.

The questionnaire developed had two types of items: the structured items which were used where the researcher needed exhaustive and direct responses while the unstructured items were used where flexible responses were required and where it was hoped the respondents could reveal their opinions and attitudes (see Appendix).

3.4.4 The Interviews

An interview schedule for teachers was deemed appropriate for the study in line with the objectives. It was mainly used to counter-check the information collected through observation and questionnaires and to probe the respondents' opinions in greater depth. It was thus used as a validity instrument for the questionnaire and observation schedule. The type of schedule developed was formal with set questions for the respondents and spaces to record their answers. (See Appendix E).

The interview schedule for teachers was divided into two parts. Part One contained the structured items based mainly on the respondents' details and personal experiences in teaching the integrated English syllabus. Part Two contained the unstructured items that required answers on the respondents'
views on integrating Language and Literature, the teaching techniques and problems experienced. The researcher had room to probe and ask for clarification where necessary. After the observation the teachers were informally interviewed depending on what topic they taught and if there was anything that needed to be explained by the researcher. The curriculum developer and field inspector responded to an interview schedule based mainly on implementation of the syllabus and the teachers’ difficulties (see Appendix H and I). Their opinion was also sought on the merits and demerits of integrating the two. Other interview schedules developed can be seen in Appendix F and G.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher had four instruments to administer to the respondents for purposes of collecting data: The observation schedule, recording of lessons, Self-administered questionnaire and interview schedules.

Before any of the instruments was administered the researcher visited the four schools sampled for observation for familiarization purposes and also to gain consent from the school heads to administer the instruments. Consent was easily obtained in three schools but in one private school the manager was first suspicious of the researcher’s identity. This suspicion was alleviated when the researcher produced a research permit. The second visit to these schools was to meet the English teachers and to arrange when to visit their classes for purposes of observation. This was done to avoid any inconveniences to the teacher. The researcher did not disclose the type of research to be conducted nor the purpose. Letters were sent to other heads of schools and other officers where the questionnaire was to be administered
informing them of the intended research in their schools (see Appendix J to L). A visit was also paid to some of the schools where time allowed.

The first instrument to be administered was the observation schedule coupled with the recording of lessons. The researcher at first observed two lessons without any instrument in each of the classes intended for observation. This was done so that the teacher and the pupils could familiarize themselves with the visitor. It was an attempt to reduce the Hawthorne effect on the teacher and pupils. After the familiarization exercise, the researcher went ahead observing and recording the English lessons as they were taught.

3.6 Data Collection

The researcher's intention was to record all the six English lessons taught in one week in each class. The five days of teaching in a week was considered adequate time for certain patterns to emerge in a teachers' teaching techniques and for the teacher to apply varied techniques in different classes. The two days' familiarization visits were not included in the one weeks' serious observation and recording.

The researcher expected to record a total of 48 English lessons, that is, six lessons for every teacher. Several interruptions in the school time-table prevented the researcher from recording the number of lessons required, however, the researcher recorded 45 lessons of the anticipated 48. Only 43 were analysed because the remaining two were poorly recorded and were not audible enough to be transcribed. The 43 lessons provided a comprehensive record of classroom behaviour that was analysed and preserved for subsequent analysis (see Appendix M-N for the transcripts).
The informal interviews for the observed teachers were carried out immediately after recording a lesson. There was a formal interview schedule which was administered after all the lessons required had been observed and recorded in each school. The questionnaire was given last of all instruments to the teachers observed to ensure that the data collected were not contaminated. Having completed the observation and data collection in the sampled schools, the rest of the questionnaires were administered to the remaining sampled teachers. The researcher tried as much as possible to use self-administered procedures. The researcher personally collected the completed questionnaires to avoid low returns.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure

The recorded lessons were transcribed in long hand with the help of the observation notes, then typed, after which content analysis was carried out (see Appendix O–P). The transcripts were read several times to decide which categories to use in analysis and also to note which parts of the transcripts were to be considered as part of the data. The researcher decided that all utterances which were made by the teacher or pupils and did not relate to the lesson were not treated as part of the data. They included jokes, greetings, or instructions like “rub the board”. The researcher settled on the sentence as the unit of analysis. The sentence here was considered as a group of words that convey some meaning.

Two types of lesson categories were developed. One type included language elements occurring in a Literature lesson and the other included literature elements occurring in a Language lesson. The teachers’ classifications were used to determine the naming of a lesson as language or
literature. The categories were coded using alphabetical letters. A-H referred to Literature elements occurring in a Language oriented lesson. R-Z referred to Language elements occurring in a Literature oriented lesson. The scripts were read over again and again and the categories applied to analyse the content. The points at which an element of either Literature or Language occurred was marked with the relevant code and a total of all elements occurring in each lesson was found. Tables of elements occurring in each lesson were then drawn up and interpreted. The coding system and the categories that emerged are further defined and explained in Chapter 4.

4.1 The Data Method

The responses from the questionnaires were coded. Frequency counts of behaviour reported were tallied and calculation of percentages of total responses was done from the frequency distributions. Conclusions were drawn with the help of information obtained from the interviews which supplemented observation and recordings. Some of the responses from the interviews which were thought significant were quoted as views of the respondents.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In the previous chapter, the methodology used in collecting the data was presented. In this chapter, the data established through observation and recording is described first followed by the data obtained from questionnaires and interviews, the data obtained from lesson observation and recording and finally the data from the researcher’s observation notes.

4.1 The Obtained Data

The main objective of this study was to gather systematic data on the integration or lack of integration taking place in the teaching of English language and Literature at the classroom level in Kenya Secondary schools. The table below shows the type of data collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type of Lesson Recorded</th>
<th>Number of Lesson Recorded</th>
<th>Number of lessons Analysed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Public</td>
<td>A₁, B₁</td>
<td>7, 5</td>
<td>7, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Public</td>
<td>A₁, B₁</td>
<td>6, 6</td>
<td>6, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Private</td>
<td>A₂, B₂</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Private</td>
<td>A₂, B₂</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
A. Language oriented lessons in public schools
A. Language oriented lessons in private schools
B. Literature oriented lessons in public schools
B. Literature oriented lessons in private schools

More lessons could not be observed in school 4 because both English teachers left to supervise the national exams. This aspect of the study is discussed in Chapter five.

In all, a total of 24 lessons were observed in the public schools while 19 were observed in the private schools. Twenty-one English Language lessons (£A + A,) were observed, recorded and analysed while 22 Literature oriented lessons (£B + B,) were also observed and analysed to discover whether integration was taking place between Language and Literature.

4.2 Analysis of Responses from the Questionnaire

The questionnaire had five sections; (i) the subject’s bio-data, (ii) the content of the integrated English syllabus, (iii) techniques or methods of teaching the syllabus, (iv) the attitude of teachers and (v) the difficulties experienced in teaching the syllabus.

4.2.1 Bio-data of the Respondents

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 below present information on the sex and age of the English teachers sampled.
Table 4.2: Sex of The Teachers Sampled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that out of the 50 teachers of English sampled, 21 were female and 29 were male.

Table 4.3: Age Of The English Teachers Sampled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age In Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above (Table 4.3), 36 (72%) of the English teachers sampled were in the age range of 20-34 years. Most of the English teachers sampled were therefore below middle age (35 years).
(a) Academic and Professional Qualifications of the Respondents

Table 4.4 presents information on the professional qualifications of the English teachers sampled.

**Table 4.4: Professional Qualifications of The Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualification</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dip. in Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 reveals that 15 (30 per cent) of the 50 teachers sampled were untrained. All the others 35 (70 per cent) were trained. Seventeen (34 per cent) had Diploma in Education certificates, only one out of the 50 teachers had a Masters in Education (PTE). There were 17 (34 per cent) with B.Ed. qualifications.

(b) Other Subjects in which English Teachers are Specialised

Table 4.5 shows other subjects teachers of English have specialised in.
Table 4.5: Other Subjects English Teachers have specialized In.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language + Literature</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language+ Other subjects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature + Others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.5, it can be observed that just over half (56 per cent) of the English teachers sampled have specialized in English Language and Literature. Eight out of the 50 were teaching English Language alongside other subjects other than Literature, while 14 of the 50 teachers (28 %) were teaching Literature and other subjects other than English Language.

The teachers who indicated they were teaching English Language and other subjects listed Kiswahili as the second subject while others who indicated they were teaching Literature and other subjects listed Christian Religious Education, History and other Social Sciences respectively.

In response to the Item which asked the teachers if they teach English Language and Literature in one lesson, 12 of the 50 teachers (24 %) indicated that they integratively teach both in one lesson while 34 (68 per cent) gave a negative response. Four (8 per cent) had no response.

(c) Orientation given to the English Teachers Before the Implementation of the Integrated English Syllabus.

The 50 teachers of English who responded to the questionnaire felt that
special training was essential to orientate them for the teaching of the new integrated English syllabus. The responses of the 50 teachers indicated that 32 (64 per cent) have never been involved in any orientation or in-service course on the teaching of the syllabus. Only 12 of the fifty (24 per cent) had been in-serviced to teach the integrated English syllabus. The remaining gave no response. The 12 in-serviced teachers were then asked to comment on the usefulness of in-service courses they attended. Two out of 12 teachers indicated that the courses were very useful, 6 of the teachers thought the courses were just useful and four indicated that the in-service courses were not useful.

The interviews with the field inspectors and the curriculum developers at the K.I.E. confirmed what the teachers of English had indicated about in-service courses. Asked about what orientation was given to English teachers before the implementation of the integrated English syllabus, they confirmed that there was not much orientation given, however, some attempts were made by The British Council and the K.I.E. to alert teachers to the new syllabus through District Education officers and seminars at District level. The curriculum developers added that a one day orientation seminar for English teachers in every district was held. A follow-up seminar of two days was held by the British Council in every district for English teachers. It was discovered that not all the English teachers in the district attended this seminar.

An interview with the two officials also revealed that there was an acute shortage of manpower both at the inspectorate and the K.I.E.. This has made it difficult to reach all the teachers of English in each district. The inspector
emphasized that few English teachers have been able to attend in-service courses organized by either K.I.E or the British Council. The officials blamed the school Heads and Heads of English Departments who, they said, kept on sending the same teachers to the in-service courses.

(d) *Involving Teachers in Developing the English Language Curriculum*

Responses on the involvement of teachers in curriculum development at K.I.E indicated that two (4 per cent) of the sampled teachers participated in curriculum development. The remaining 48 (96 per cent) do not play any direct role in subject panel activities.

The curriculum developer indicated that not all teachers of English were able to participate as they were already represented in these subject-panel activities by a few chosen teachers from the districts. He further stated that non-members from any school or institution are invited to participate by writing their opinions and suggestions to K.I.E. All the 50 teachers sampled indicated that they would have liked to be involved in the development of the English curriculum.

(e) *Textbooks Teachers use to Teach the Integrated English Syllabus*

The sampled teachers were asked to list the textbooks they use to teach the integrated English syllabus. Four (8 per cent) indicated that they use the *Integrated English Course* Books 1-4 produced and recommended by K.I.E. for the integrated English syllabus. The rest listed textbooks like *Practical English*, *English in Practice*, *English for Life*, *Mastering English Grammar*, and set books such as *Things Fall Apart*, *Betrayal in the City* and Oral Literature texts.
The teachers who were not using the integrated English textbooks maintained that even the textbooks they were using were useful because they contained passages that could be integrated. The teachers however, stated that a great deal of skill was needed to use them in an integrated manner. They went further to state that the Integrated textbooks were always not in the bookshops regardless of the numerous attempts they had made to acquire them. Some of the teachers claimed they were not aware that the book was already marketed and was being used.

4.2.2 *Teaching English Language and Literature as an Integrated Course in Secondary Schools*

The Table below summarises the teachers’ opinion towards integrating language and literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those In Favour</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Not in Favour</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 indicated that as many as 22 (44 per cent) of the 50 teachers sampled were in favour of integrating language and literature while 27 (54 per cent) indicated they were not in favour of integration. One gave no response. Over half of the sample (54 per cent) were not in favour of integrating the two. This was confirmed by the English Language Inspector.
When asked to confirm if the directive to integrate the two has been implemented in the schools, the response was that “the teachers were teaching English as is outlined in the syllabus”. The inspector however, stressed that teachers tended to overemphasize areas they had specialized in. For example, a teacher specialized in Literature and not in Language would tend to overemphasize the Literature part of the syllabus. The inspector went on to observe that in some schools he has visited the teachers had continued to teach as before, separating the two on the time-table.

The teachers gave the following reasons for not favouring integration:

(i) Teachers were likely to omit some important details and topics in both Language and Literature.

(ii) The pupils would not be able to learn Language or Literature in depth especially for their post-secondary education where the two subjects are still studied as separate disciplines.

(iii) There would be too much to teach by one teacher who after all may not be good in both English and Literature.

(iv) An integrated English syllabus needed very careful organization and lesson preparation by the teacher which was unlikely if the teacher has a big workload.

(v) There was not enough time to teach the integrated English syllabus effectively.
(vi) There was only one kind of Integrated textbook by K.I.E. instead of the many that were all relevant in the old syllabus.

(vii) If English Language and Literature were learnt separately the importance of each is likely to be maintained to allow for full contribution.

(viii) The pupils and teachers who were used to this traditional approach are likely to be confused by the new approach.

(ix) Language and Literature are two different subjects with different foundations and objectives hence should be taught separately but could be co-ordinated where necessary”.

The above are some of the reasons stated by teachers against integration.

The teachers who were pro-integration listed the following reasons:

(i) The syllabus will encourage the pupils to study Literature which in the old syllabus was optional, and made them better equipped in terms of spoken English.

(ii) Content and objectives of the two are almost similar therefore they should be complementarily taught.

(iii) Integration makes the teaching of Literature easier because the
students are able to identify literary terms since they will have come across them in their daily language usage such as aspects of characterization.

(iv) The method allows for contextualization of grammar making its teaching more practical.”

Thirty of the 50 teachers (60 per cent) of the teachers interviewed indicated that grammar is best taught in context. The same teachers went on to say that integration was a more practical way to teach grammar and is more in line with the 8-4-4 system of Education.

4.2.3 Self-reports on Techniques/Methods used by Teachers to Teach the Integrated English Syllabus.

The teachers were asked to indicate whether they would like changes in techniques of teaching the new integrated English syllabus as opposed to the old syllabus. 22 (44 per cent) wanted changes in techniques while 24 (48 per cent) indicated they were prepared to use the old technique(s) in teaching the new syllabus. The respondents who wanted a change recommended the following techniques for the integrated syllabus in order of importance to them.

(i) Discussion
(ii) Class presentation by individual pupils
(iii) Dramatization and role play
(iv) Groupwork
(v) K.I.E. Tapes
(vi) Exemplification/Exposition
(vii) Story-telling
(viii) Question and answer
(ix) Oral Work and Written Exercises.

None of the respondents listed the lecture method but the observation revealed that it was the most used technique.

Asked to list the techniques they frequently use when teaching the new integrated syllabus, 43 of the 50 teachers (86 per cent) listed the above techniques and gave the following reasons for using them:

(a) "Integration appears complicated and therefore many pupils have a difficult time and need to do a great deal of work on their own.
(b) the techniques listed are more effective in that most of them need both students' and teachers' participation,
(c) the techniques make learning for the pupils much easier and enjoyable because they participate more in their learning than they used to do before when learning was passive,
(d) the techniques help the learners to see how certain aspects of grammar are used practically,
(e) the techniques like discussion, groupwork and exemplification help the teacher to switch from Language to Literature”.

What is significant in this study is the fact that the same teachers who recommended new techniques admitted that they rarely use some of the techniques they recommended.
The respondents gave the following reasons:

(i) The classes were too large hence the techniques cannot be used effectively (yet it is recommended that groupwork is best suited for large classes).

(ii) There was hardly any time for techniques like discussion and Language games when there were only six lessons to cover both Language and Literature.

(iv) Heavy workload on the teacher made it difficult to prepare lessons using some of these techniques.

(v) Using a technique like lecture renders the pupils passive learners and occasionally they do not take in what is taught”.

Such responses as indicated above makes the researcher doubt the validity of self-reports, however, the shortcomings were disclosed in the classroom observation report.

Table 4.7 presents responses on how frequently the respondents use some of the techniques that were listed by the researcher.
Table 4.7: Techniques Used By English Teachers According to Self Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Question and Answer</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discussion</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lecture</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assignment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group Work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inquiry Approach</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Story Telling Narration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dramatization</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Drills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Language Games</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Field Trips and Projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Role play simulation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Use of Resource People</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that English teachers do not adequately use certain techniques as is recommended by K.I.E. Responses indicated that only six (12 per cent) use role play or simulations frequently, the remaining teachers either use it occasionally or not at all. Only two teachers (4 per cent) indicated that they use resource people often, 23 (46%) use them occasionally while 25 (50 per cent) do not use them at all according to their own self reports. Field trips are used often by nine (18 per cent), 22 (44 per cent) use it occasionally. The remaining percentage indicated they do not use it at all.

The most frequently used techniques according to Table 4.7 are lecture (60 per cent), Question and answer (74 per cent), Discussion (64 per cent) and Assignment (60 per cent). These data contradict to some extent the
respondents' views on the techniques that they rarely use such as lecture, language games, groupwork and discussion.

(a) Self-reports on Resources Used for Teaching the Integrated English Syllabus

The English teachers sampled were asked to indicate how often they use certain resources in teaching the Integrated English syllabus. This was to check if the respondents were experiencing any problems with teaching resources for the new syllabus. Their responses are given in the table below (4.8).

Table 4.8: Self Reports on How Often English Teachers Use different Types of Teaching Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Resources</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Text Books</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Class Readers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tape Recording</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pictures and Photographs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Radio Lessons</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diagrams and Sketches</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Models</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Maps and Globes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Films and Videos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Real Objects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Language Laboratories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Others (specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.8 it can be seen that textbooks were the most frequently used resource (82 per cent). Twenty-one (42 per cent) indicated that they use
the class-readers often while 18 (36 per cent) use tape recordings often. Nine (18 per cent) indicated they use diagrams and sketches more often. No respondent indicated the use of language laboratories (observations show there were none in the schools) and only one respondent indicated he uses real objects often. Two out of 50 indicated they use films and videos often. Four respondents indicated they use maps and globes often, the others indicated they use them occasionally or not at all.

Asked what problems they faced concerning English teaching/learning resources, all the respondents indicated lack of written materials especially textbooks for the integrated syllabus. The respondents indicated that most of the resources like tape recorders, radios, and television sets were not available in the schools. The respondents also complained of inadequate training by the colleges to enable them acquire skills to handle certain equipment such as projectors, video cameras and other electronic equipments. In order to alleviate their problems they suggested the following:

(i) "that K.I.E. should publish more textbooks, guides and/or handbooks and make them readily available to teachers and pupils

(ii) that teachers get involved in research work on readily available and cheap resources within their communities (such as resource persons) and develop them for use in the classrooms

(iii) that workshops be organized to train teachers how to use and manage resources
(iv) that the Ministry of Education should endeavour to establish at least a learning resource centre in each district if not in each school. This would give teachers access to teaching/learning aids”.

4.2.4 Self-report on the attitude of English Teachers Towards the Integrated English Syllabus

In order to determine the attitudes of English teachers towards the new integrated syllabus, a Likert type of trial test of attitude was used that required the respondents to tick one of the five alternatives namely: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Uncertain (U), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). Their responses are presented below (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Frequency Distribution of Teachers’ Attitudes Towards the Integrated English Syllabus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The content of the new English language syllabus is relevant to learners.</td>
<td>20 40</td>
<td>24 48</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 The integrated English syllabus is relevant to the needs of Kenyan society</td>
<td>17 34</td>
<td>23 46</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 The new integrated English language and literature syllabus is broad.</td>
<td>37 74</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 The new integrated English language and literature syllabus cannot be covered in the time allocated.</td>
<td>31 62</td>
<td>11 22</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5 The old techniques used to teach the two subjects are still the best to use in teaching the integrated English syllabus.</td>
<td>16 32</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>4  8</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>3  6</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 To teach the new syllabus effectively one has to use techniques in which the pupils do much of the work.</td>
<td>12 24</td>
<td>20 40</td>
<td>4  8</td>
<td>3  6</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 The new integrated English syllabus is easier to teach.</td>
<td>15 30</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>3  6</td>
<td>21 42</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 The integrated English syllabus is more interesting to the pupils.</td>
<td>15 30</td>
<td>18 36</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>3  6</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 A great deal of practical work is needed to teach the units.</td>
<td>20 40</td>
<td>16 32</td>
<td>8 16</td>
<td>4  8</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 English language and literature should be taught separately.</td>
<td>13 26</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>8 16</td>
<td>16 32</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>2  4</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 I enjoy teaching the integrated English language and literature syllabus</td>
<td>12 24</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>13 26</td>
<td>11 22</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>2  4</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Interpretation of the Tables on Attitude Towards Integration

The responses as portrayed in Table 4.9 indicates the different reactions by
English teachers towards the new integrated English syllabus. Forty-four (88 per cent) of the respondents thought the content of the new syllabus was relevant to learners, 40 (80 per cent) thought it was relevant to the needs of the Kenyan society. This means that the majority (above 80 per cent) of the respondents thought the syllabus was relevant. This contradicts their earlier response on their opinion on the integrated syllabus.

Forty-seven (94 per cent) of the 50 respondents indicated that the course was broad and 42 (84 per cent) thought it could not be covered in the time given. On the techniques to be used 26 (52 per cent) agreed that the old techniques used to teach the two subjects were still the best to use in teaching the integrated English syllabus. This was more than the number (24) who had earlier on stated that they did not recommend changes in techniques for the new syllabus. Negative attitudes were indicated in four items. Thirty-seven (74 per cent) strongly agreed that the time allocated for the syllabus was too short, 25 (50 per cent) thought the new syllabus was difficult to teach compared to the old one. Thirty (60 per cent) strongly agreed that the syllabus was interesting for the pupils. Asked whether a great deal of practical work is needed to teach the units 20 (40 per cent) strongly agreed, 16 (32 per cent) agreed they enjoy teaching the syllabus while only 8 (16 per cent) were uncertain.

Values or scores for positive statements were: Strongly Agree (SA = 5) Agree (A = 4) Uncertain (U = 3) Disagree (D = 2) and Strongly Disagree (SD = 1). The order was reversed for the negative items taking into account adjustments for the negative items. Mean scores were computed for all the
respondents for each of the items. It happened that the neutral score was 3 and this was used to determine the attitude of the respondents. Any mean score of less than 3 was regarded as negative or unfavourable attitude while mean scores of more than 3 were regarded as positive or favourable attitude towards the item. The teachers’ attitude is given on Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Attitudes Towards Integrated English Syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information on the above Table (4.10) indicates that the teachers generally had a positive attitude towards the integrated English syllabus.

4.2.5 Self-reported Difficulties/Problems Experienced by Teachers in Teaching the Integrated English Syllabus

To find out more about the teachers’ perception of implementation of the new integrated English syllabus the teachers were asked to list problems they encountered in teaching the syllabus. The English Language inspector and a curriculum developer were also interviewed on the same. They commented
that the teachers mainly lack information on the new syllabus. The teachers listed the following problems:

(i) Lack of integrated English textbooks and other resources.
(ii) Lack of training in part of the syllabus before its implementation.
(iii) Inadequate time to cover the two subjects properly.
(iv) The sample questions from the Kenya National Examinations Council were not integrated making the teachers confused as to whether they should have integrated the two or teach as before.
(v) There were hardly any in-service courses to update the teachers on the new methods to enable them cope with the new English syllabus and other innovations.
(vi) Large classes and poor learning/teaching facilities are a drawback to the effective handling of the integrated syllabus.
(vii) Funds are lacking to carry out certain activities such as Oral Literature participation and research.

All in all, the integrated English syllabus has not been fully implemented in all schools according to the self-reports.

4.3 Data Obtained from Lesson Observations

Observation and recording of lessons was done in four schools. Two of the schools were public while two were private. The recorded lessons were transcribed, typed and the typescripts subjected to indepth content analysis. Two sets of categories emerged from the reading and analysis of the content of the lessons:
(i) Categories for a Language oriented lessons
(ii) Categories for a Literature oriented lesson.

These categories were then coded as follows:

    Codes A-H - for Language oriented lessons and
    Codes R-Z - for Literature oriented lessons.

The codes were used to identify aspects of integration. The two sets of codes were separated to make a distinction between categories for Language oriented lesson and those for Literature oriented ones.

4.3.1 Definition of Categories Coded A-H

The categories under these codes (A-H) were used to identify any elements of Literature occurring in an English Language lesson. For example if during English Language lessons the teacher or pupil referred to or discussed an aspect of Literature such as ‘imagery’, this was coded and later counted as an aspect of integration. The categories under these codes included all references made by the teacher or pupil to any of the following aspects of Literature. Where they were found they were underlined, identified (see Appendix P) and coded using the above codes. The researcher then counted the number of times each category appeared and a total number of frequency occurrence of each category was found for each lesson.

A. Plot
   All reference made to for example the chronology of events or major event in a piece of writing.

B. Theme
   All references made to the main message(s) in a story or extract.
C. Characterization All references made to character descriptions, traits and relationships between characters.

D. Style and Techniques All references made to writing techniques for example imagery, and writers’ use of language.

E. Dramatization All references made to aspects of mood and attitude, author’s feelings and learner’s response to such feelings.

F. Dramatization All references made to aspects of dramatization like role play, improvisation, movement, gesture, facial expressions, song and dance, types of drama or functions of drama.

G. Oral Literature All references made to different genres, elements, functions and role of Oral Literature.

H. Oral Performance Actual performance of Oral Literature by the teacher or pupil during a Language lesson.

4.3.2. Definition of coded Categories: R-Z

The codes R-Z were used on all the Literature oriented lessons. The categories underlying these codes were used to identify any element of English Language occurring in a Literature lesson. For example if during a Literature lesson the teacher made reference to an aspect of English Language such as ‘nouns’ this was coded and later counted as an aspect of integration.

The categories underlying these codes included all references made to the following aspects of English Language.
R  Application of Language  All references made to application of Language aspects such as composition writing, transformation exercises and rewriting exercise jumbled sentences and joining sentences.

S  Situational exercises  All references made to situations where pupils and teachers practice use of grammatical structures like reported speech, direct speech, superlatives, dialogues, etc.

T  Speech work  All references made to English Language sounds including aspects of stress, pitch intonation and pronunciation aspects.

U  Writing  All references made to writing errors for example spelling mistakes and punctuation signs (symbols)

V  Parts of speech in grammar All reference made to the terms used to describe different parts of speech such as nouns, pronouns, articles, etc.

W  Functions of words in  All references made to identify and describe grammar word functions such as subject, object, clause, preposition, etc.

X  Reading Skills  All references made to reading skills such as reading speed.

Y  Vocabulary  All references made to definitions, dictionary usage and word formation.

Z  Study skills  All references made to study skills aspects such as note taking, note making, use of Library references and other resources.
4.3.3 Observation of Lessons

To find out the extent of integration taking place between English Language and Literature the categories defined above were applied using the codes to identify where integration was taking place. The type of code applied depended on whether it was a Language lesson or a Literature oriented lesson. The teachers' decisions were used to demarcate whether a lesson was Language oriented or Literature oriented. Each category appearing was coded only once even where the same idea was repeated except where the teacher referred to a different element of the same category. Under such circumstance certain categories were considered twice.

A total number of frequency of occurrence of each categories was found for each lesson. These were entered on Table 4.11.

**TABLE 4.11: Total Number of Elements of Literature or Language Found in Each Lesson.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson N</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher N</th>
<th>Type of Lesson</th>
<th>Topic/Central Activity of lesson</th>
<th>Total N of elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>111 N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>111 N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>111 E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>ADJECTIVES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>NOTE TAKING</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>TOPIC SENTENCE</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson N</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Teacher N</td>
<td>Type of Lesson</td>
<td>Topic/Central Activity of lesson</td>
<td>Total N of elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>IRREGULAR VERBS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>111 E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>CONTINUOUS WRITING</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>READING &amp; COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>111 C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>GRAMMAR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11 A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>ORAL / AURAL WORK</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11 A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>ORAL ENGLISH LESSON</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>CLASS READING</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11 B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>CLASS READING</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>111 C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11 S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11 W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>11 B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11 N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>REMEDIAL WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>11 N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>COMPOSITION</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>111 W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>NOVEL</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>111 S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>111 W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>ORAL LITERATURE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>REMEDIAL WORK; EXPRESSIONS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>111 W</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>111 A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>PARTICIPLE PHRASES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>11 B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>11 B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>111 A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>SUMMARY &amp; COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>111 A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>POETRY</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>11 B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>WRITING DIALOGUE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>11 B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend.

A₁  - Language oriented lesson in Public schools.
A₂  - Language oriented lesson in Private schools.
B₁  - Literature oriented lesson in Public schools.
B₂  - Literature oriented lesson in Private schools.

From Table 4.11 it can be noted that only two lessons out of the 43 had no aspect of integration. This means that 95 per cent of the lesson observed exhibited some extent of integration. The two lesson (14 and 32) were both language oriented.

A fairly high rate of integration was evident in lessons from the public schools as is noted from the high frequency totals. The totals are given in Table 4.12 below:

**Table 4.12: Frequency counts of Elements of Integration in Public and Private Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Type</th>
<th>Lesson N</th>
<th>N of Integration Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|             | 2        | 22                        |
|             | 3        | 16                        |
|             | 4        | 4                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Type</th>
<th>Lesson No.</th>
<th>No. of Integration Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11 LESSONS</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Private schools)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 LESSONS</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Private schools)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 LESSONS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for public schools ($A_1 + B_1$) = 155 + 118 = 273 elements.
Total for private schools ($A_2 + B_2$) = 45 + 107 = 152 elements.

Table 4.12 shows that 155 elements of Literature were found in the Language lessons while 118 Language elements were found in the Literature lessons. Only 45 elements of Literature were found in Language lessons in the private schools while 107 elements of Language were found in the Literature lessons in the same schools.
A summary of the frequency of occurrence of each category was also found for each lesson. This information is given in Table 4.13 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Lesson No.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Language Oriented Lesson</th>
<th>B. Literature Oriented Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.13, it is evident that category Y (Aspects of Vocabulary) had the highest occurrence (64). This meant that 64 references were made to aspects of vocabulary during the Literature lessons. Category Y was followed by W (functions of words) which occurred 57 times. Category D (style and techniques) occurred 48 times an indication that 48 references were made to aspects of style and techniques during the Language lessons. Categories C (Aspects of Characterization) and V (Parts of speech in grammar) each occurred 46 times. Category E (mood and attitude) occurred 40 times while F (Aspects of Dramatization) occurred 32 times. The remaining had occurrences of below 30 with category H having no occurrence. This meant that no actual performance of Oral Literature took place during the Language lessons.

The different types of elements (categories) occurring in each lesson was worked out to determine the range of integration taking place in each lesson. The range was used as a measure of the quality of integration taking place and was worked out using an eight point scale as shown below:

**Range of Integration**

1-2 Categories — Low Integration

3-5 Categories — Fair (moderate) Integration

6-8 Categories — High Integration.

A summary of the range of integration found in each type (group) of lesson is given in Table 4:14 below:
Table 4.14: Range of Integration in Each Group of Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Lesson</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 shows that only three lessons had a high range of integration. Nineteen were fairly (moderately) integrated while 21 had a low range integration. Almost half of the lessons (21) had low range of integration with more of the lessons (8) being of the A₂ group (grammar lessons in public schools). Two of the highly integrated lessons were Literature oriented and both were taught in the public schools (B₁ group). All the highly integrated lessons were taught in the public schools while 13 out of the 21 lessons which had a low range of integration were taught in the public schools. The majority (13 out of 19) of the fairly integrated lessons were taught in the public schools with only 6 being taught in the private schools. The public schools had 8 lessons with low range, 13 fair and 3 with a high range while the private schools had 13 lessons with low range of integration 6 fair and none with a high range. This reveals the extent of integration that occurred in each type of school.

A summary of the total number of occurrences for each category is given in Tables 4.15 and 4.16 below:
Table 4.15: Elements of Literature Found in the Language Lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Out of 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 200 100%

Table 4.15 indicates that a total of 200 elements of integration were found in the Language oriented lessons. The most occurring was category D (48 times) followed by C (Aspects of characterization 46 times) H (Actual performance of Oral Literature) had no occurrence.

Table 4.16: Elements of Language Found in The Literature Lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Out of 225</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 225 100%

A total of 225 elements of Language were found in the Literature lessons (Table 4.16). The most occurring category was Y (Aspects of vocabulary)
which occurred 64 times (28.4 per cent) of the total number of occurrences. This was followed by category W (Functions of words) which occurred 57 times (25.3 per cent) of the total occurrences. Category Z (Study skills) had the least occurrence of three 1.4 per cent).

Table 4.17 below gives a summary of the number of integration elements found in each type of school.

Table 4.17: Total Number of Language and Literature Elements Found in Each Type of School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency in Public Schools</th>
<th>Frequency in Private Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Out of 425</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(15.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 425 elements of integration were found in the 43 lessons of which 200 were Literature elements and 225 Language elements. The
Literature elements accounted for 46.9 per cent while the Language elements accounted for 53.1 per cent of the total. This was a marginal difference.

The majority (155) of the 200 Literature elements occurred in the public schools while only 45 occurred in the private schools. The same pattern was repeated for the Language elements where 121 of the 225 Language elements occurred in the public schools while 104 occurred in the private schools. A total of 276 elements occurred in lessons observed in the public schools while only 149 occurred in the private schools. This shows that the lessons observed in the public schools were better integrated than those observed in private schools. (More comparison is given on Table 4.29)

4.3.4 The Language Oriented Lessons

In discussing the nature of integration taking place two concepts were identified as a guide to describing integration between Language and Literature (Table 4.14). These were: (i) Range (breadth) and (ii) Extent (intensity).

The range of integration depended on the number of different categories occurring and was described as low, fair (moderate) and high. The 'extent' of integration was used to describe the total number of occurrences per lesson or the intensity of the integration. For example, a lesson with one element occurring 20 times was considered as having a high extent of integration with a low range of integration. 'Extent' of integration thus, defined the 'quantity' of integration while range described the quality of integration.
Nineteen of the 21 Language oriented lessons observed showed some aspects of integration taking place. Two lessons (14 and 32) indicated no aspect of integration. The extent of integration, however, varied from one lesson to the other.

The 21 Language oriented lessons had different topics or central activities. Seven of the lessons were taught on pure grammar, six were on comprehension, two were on class reading, composition, remedial oral practices and study skills respectively. The range and extent of integration taking place in each group of lessons are discussed below.

(a) The Grammar Lessons

The grammar lessons (7) accounted for 32.6 per cent of all the Language oriented lessons.

Table 4.18 below gives the distribution of the Literature elements found in these lessons.

**Table 4.18: Distribution of The Literate Elements in The Grammar Lessons.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>TOTAL % out of 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(76.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The seven grammar lessons had a total occurrence of 17 Literature elements (Table 4.18). This was only 8.5 per cent of the total occurrence (200) of Literature elements. Category D (Aspects of style and technique) exhibited the highest occurrence (13) 76.5 per cent of the total (187) occurrence for the grammar lessons. Categories C (Characterization) and F (Dramatization) each occurred twice. Lessons 14 and 32 had no elements of Literature occurring in them.

The lessons had a low range of integration and were the least integrated of all the Language oriented lessons. Reasons for such low occurrence will be discussed in Chapter five section 5:1:1.

(b) The Reading Comprehension Lessons

The six reading comprehension lessons accounted for 28.1 per cent of the Language lessons. Table 4.19 below gives the distribution of Literature elements in these lessons.

| Table 4.19: Distribution of Literature Elements in the Comprehension Lessons |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lesson | Categories | 10 | 13 | 26 | 29 | 35 | 40 | TOTAL% out of 80 |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | |
| A | | 4 | | | | | | 4 (5.0) |
| B | | 1 | | | | | | 4 (5.0) |
| C | 17 | 6 | | | | | | 24 (30.0) |
| D | 12 | 2 | 10 | | | | | 25 (31.1) |
| E | 6 | 1 | 10 | 3 | | | | 23 (28.8) |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 35 | 14 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 80 | 100 |
From Table 4.19, it can be seen that the reading comprehension lesson had a higher total of occurrence (80) compared to the grammar lessons. The total (80) accounted for 40 per cent of the total number of occurrence of Literature elements (200) in all the lessons. Category D (style and techniques) occurred 25 times (31.3 per cent) and was the highest followed by category C (characterization) which occurred 24 times (30 per cent). Categories A (Plot) and B (Theme) each occurred 4 times (5 per cent) and were the lowest.

This group of lessons exhibited a high extent of integration with a total of 80 occurrences an average of 13 occurrences per lesson. This was higher than the grammar lessons which had an average of only 2 elements per lesson. This high extent of integration was expected owing to the fact that the pupils were discussing passages some of which were literary in nature. A comparison between the lessons reveal that two of the lessons (10 and 13) had a fair range of integration while the rest had a low range of integration.

(c) The Class Reading Lessons

The class reading lessons based on a class reader and accounted for 9.9 per cent of all the language oriented lessons and 4.7 per cent of all the lessons observed. Table 4.20 below gives the distribution of Literature elements in these two lessons.
### Table 4.20: Distribution of Literature Elements in the Class Reading Lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Category</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% Out of 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two class reading lessons had a total of 32 occurrences accounting for 16 per cent of the 200 occurrences in the Language lessons. From Table 4.20, it can be noted that the two lessons had a fair range of integration and a high extent with an average of 16 elements per lesson. The high occurrences resulted from the fact that the teacher was using a class reader to teach reading skills.

(d) *The Oral Lessons (Remedial)*

The two lessons dealt with dialogue and conversation and as a result a great deal of drama aspects were recorded as shown below:
Table 4.21: Distribution of Literature Elements in the Oral Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Out of 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two lessons had a total of 40 occurrences, 20 per cent of the total number of occurrences (200) for the Language lessons. Lesson 17 was better integrated (24 elements) than lesson 20 which had only 16 occurrences of category F. Lesson 17 exhibited a fair range of integration.

(c) *The Study Skills Lessons*

Two Language oriented lessons were on study skills. The two lessons accounted for 9.9 per cent of the language oriented lessons and 4.7 per cent of all the lessons. The distribution of integration elements were as shown in Table 4.22) below:

Table 4.22: Distribution of Literature Elements in the Study Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Category</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total % Out of 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the 21 Language oriented lessons has revealed that the comprehension and the class reading lessons had high extents of integration while the pure grammar lessons were less integrated compared to the other lessons.

4.3.5 The Literature Oriented Lessons

Twenty-two of the 43 lessons observed were Literature oriented. Eleven of the lessons were taught in public schools while 11 were taught in private schools. The lessons accounted for 51.1 per cent of all the lessons observed. The 22 Literature lessons had a total of 225 Language elements occurring showing that there were more language elements in the Literature lessons than vice-versa.

Among the Literature oriented lessons category Y (vocabulary) had the highest occurrence of 64 elements (48.8 per cent) category W (function of words in grammar) occurred 57 times (25.3 per cent) while category V (parts of speech in grammar) occurred 46 times (see also Table 4.16).

The Literature lessons were based on Poetry (12 lessons), Oral Literature (9 lessons) and Setbook - Things Fall Apart (one lesson). It is evident that 54.4 per cent of the Literature oriented lessons were on poetry. Table 4.24 below shows the total number of Language elements found in the poetry lessons.
(a) *The Poetry Lessons*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson N</th>
<th>No. of Lang Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24 reveals that five out of the 12 poetry lessons had occurrences of above 10 elements. The poetry lessons had fair range of integration as they accounted for 50.4 per cent of the total number of occurrences in the Literature lessons.

The total number of occurrences for the 12 lessons was 114 elements, an average of 12 occurrences per lesson. Table 4.25 below gives the distribution of Language elements in the poetry lessons.
### Table 4.25: Distribution of Language Elements In the Poetry Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% out of 114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category Y (vocabulary) was the most frequent occurring, 42 times (29.2 per cent) followed by category W (functions of words in grammar) which occurred 35 times (24.3 per cent). The other categories occurred less than 20 times with category S (situational exercises) not occurring at all.

The extent of integration differed as shown in Table 4.25. Lesson 37 had the highest occurrence (19 elements) but a low range of integration with only two categories occurring. Lessons 15, 25, 34 and 43 had fair ranges of integration. Lessons 16, and 28 had a low range of integration compared to the other lessons.

(b) The Oral Literature Lessons

Nine (20.9 per cent) of all the lessons observed were on Oral Literature. The lessons accounted for 40.9 per cent of the Literature oriented lessons. Two of the nine oral Literature lessons were taught in private schools while 7 (77.8 per cent) of the oral Literature lessons were taught in the public schools.
Table 2.26 below gives the distribution of the Language elements in the nine lessons.

**Table 2.26: Distribution of Language Elements in The Oral Literature Lessons.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Out of 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nine Oral Literature lessons had a total of 96 elements, 23.4 per cent of all the Language elements in the Literature lessons. This indicates that some extent of integration took place with an average of 11 elements per lesson.

The most frequent occurring was category V (parts of speech in grammar) which had 22 occurrences (22.9 per cent). The least occurring was category X (reading skills) which occurred only once (Table 4.26). The low occurrence of categories X and Z was considered significant and will be discussed in Chapter 5.

A comparison between the nine lessons reveal that Lesson 2 had a high range of integration with seven different categories occurring. It had also the
highest extent (22 elements). Lessons 3,4,7,8 and 21 exhibited fair ranges of integration while Lessons 19,30 and 31 had low range of integration.

Generally the Oral Literature lessons exhibited fair extent of integration.

(c) *The Setbook (Things Fall apart)*

Only one lesson was on a setbook. The lesson accounted for 4.5 per cent of the Literature oriented lessons and only 2.3 per cent of all the lesson observed. The distribution of Language elements in this lesson is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Lesson 27</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Out of 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single lesson on a setbook exhibited fair range of integration with 4 different categories occurring. The extent was also fair with 15 elements occurring in the lesson. Category V (parts of speech) was the most frequent occurring (7 times) followed by category W (function of words) which occurred 5 times (33.3 per cent). Category S (situational exercises) occurred twice (13.3 per cent) and category Y (vocabulary) occurred only once (6.6).
The fact that only one lesson was recorded on a set book was unexpected and probable reasons are given in Chapter 5.

The Literature lessons had a marginally higher number of integration elements occurring in them than the Language lessons. The highest number of different categories occurring was in Lesson 2 which had seven different categories occurring with a total of 22 occurrences. Generally the Literature oriented lessons were slightly more integrated compared to the Language oriented lessons (see paragraph below).

4.3.6 Other Findings

Considering the total number of occurrences of elements in each lesson it is noted that six lessons had totals above 20 (Table 4.11). Four of these high totals (35, 24, 22 and 20) occurred in the Literature oriented lessons. This still indicates that a marginally higher number of Language elements occurred in the Literature lessons. Twenty-two Literature lessons had scores above 10 while 20 of the Language lessons had scores above 10. There were two Language lessons with no elements of integration, thus it can be pointed out that Literature lessons were more open to integration than the Language lessons.

Observation was done in three classes in each school. Table 4.28 below gives the distribution in each class.
Table 4.28: Distribution of The Lessons Observed Per Class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Out of 43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15(34.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 111</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Form IV was not observed because they were busy preparing for Exams.

As can be observed (Table 4.28), the same number of Language lessons were observed in the three classes while eight lessons of Literature were observed in Form I and seven in Forms II and III; The total number of occurrences of different categories, however, differed in each lesson per class as is shown in Table 4.29 below:

Table 4.29: Total Number of Elements Found Per Class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Class (Form)</th>
<th>Total For Lang. Oriented Per Class</th>
<th>Total For Lit. Oriented Per Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%out of 425</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(35.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.29, the following results can be drawn:

(i) Integration between Language and Literature was higher in public schools (273 or 64.2 per cent of all occurrences) and lower in private schools (152 or 35.8 per cent).

(ii) Integration was highest in Form I in the public schools (119 occurrences) and lowest in Form I (19 occurrences) of private schools.

(iii) Form I Language oriented lessons in public schools had the highest number of occurrences (61) followed by Form III Literature oriented lessons in private schools. This was considered significant and will be discussed in Chapter 5.

(a) The Teachers Observed and their Qualifications in Relation to Integration of Language and Literature

A total of nine teachers were observed. The researcher had intended to observe only eight teachers. The first teacher to be observed left for supervision of National Exams after teaching only two lessons. A substitute teacher was then found. Below is the total number of occurrences in the lessons taught by each teacher.
### Table 4.30: Number of Occurrence Per Teacher's Lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Lesson No.</th>
<th>No. of Lang. Elements</th>
<th>No. of Lit. Elements</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(Av. 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>(Av. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(Av. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(Av. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(Av. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(Av. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(Av. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Half trained Diploma

Trained and Inserviced Graduate

Trained and Diploma

Trained Graduate

U.T "A"Level

U.T "A"Level

Trained and Inserviced Graduate

Noted that Teacher 3 had a very high number of occurrence (48) among the 59 lessons. This also indicates the level of interest the teacher put on language lessons. This was the highest number of occurrences (48) among the 59 lessons. This was the highest number of occurrences (48) among the 59 lessons.
From Table 4.30, it can be observed that Teacher 2 had the highest total number of occurrences (95) in five lessons giving an average of 19 occurrences per lesson. The Literature lessons had a high number of Language elements (58) occurring in them while the two Language lessons had a total of 37 occurrences. This was considered a very high level of integration.

Teacher 4 had a total of 82 occurrences in 6 lessons, an average of 14 occurrences per lesson. This also indicated fair level of integration by the teacher. Teacher 4 had the highest number of occurrences (76) among the Language lessons.

Teacher 6 recorded a total of 59 occurrences in seven lessons, an average of nine occurrences per lesson. This was considered low compared to teachers 2 and 4. The Literature lessons had 35 occurrences while the
Language ones had 24 occurrences giving an average of eight occurrences per lesson. One lesson indicated no integration in this group of lessons.

Teacher 5 on the other hand had a total of 48 elements in six lessons, an average of 8 elements per lesson. Teacher 3 had a total of 40 elements of integration in five lessons also giving an average of eight elements per lesson. Both teachers indicated ‘fair’ extent of integration.

Teacher 8 had a total of 34 occurrences in three lessons. Two were in Literature with 32 occurrences an average of 16 occurrences per lesson. The Language lesson had only two elements showing that it was less integrated compared to the Literature ones.

A low range of integration was recorded by Teacher 7 who had a total occurrence of 28 elements in five lessons an average of eight elements per lesson. Teacher 1 taught only two lessons with an average of four elements occurring in each lesson. This was the lowest average.

The Questionnaire revealed that teacher 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were professionally trained while teacher 6 was half-trained (she dropped out of College after one year). Teachers 7, 8 and 9 were untrained. On top of the training Teacher 2 and 4 had attended in-service courses to teach the integrated syllabus, however, Teacher 4 indicated that he had attended one for only a day while teacher 2 indicated that he had attended one for one day and another one at K.I.E for three days. It may be deduced from Table 4.30 that the teachers who went through the in-service programme achieved higher scores than those who were not in-serviced.
Teacher 2 had the highest extent of integration (95). Possibly because of exposure through in-service the same applied to Teacher 4.

The Table (4.30) therefore gives evidence of some correlation between, in-service and the extent of integration.

Teacher 1, though trained had the lowest extent (8) with an average of only four elements per lesson. The results of teacher 1 were ignored because there are other factors which were not studied that determine the level of integration taking place.

Table 4.31 below gives a summary of integration levels of in-serviced versus non in-serviced teachers.

**Table 4.31: Integration Levels of In-serviced Versus Non-Inserviced Teachers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Average No. of Elements for In-Serviced Teacher</th>
<th>Average No. of Elements for Non-in-Serviced Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The in-serviced teachers had very high averages (19,14) compared to the non in-serviced (4,6,8,5,11,7). This indicates that in-servicing of teachers had
a positive effect on the ability of the teachers to integrate the teaching of Language and Literature.

The qualifications (professional) of the teachers were also considered as a variable on the level of integration. Table 4.32 gives the comparison.

**Table 4.32: Teachers Professional Qualifications and Their Level of Integration.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Av. No. of Elements for Graduates</th>
<th>Av. No. of Elements for S1 Dip</th>
<th>Average No. of Elements For UTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.T = Untrained Av.= Average

Table 4.32 reveals that the trained teachers scored higher averages of elements of integration than the untrained teachers. Teacher 1 though trained scored the lowest average. This result was unexpected, bearing in mind that he was a trained teacher though he had not attended any in-service course. Probably if he had taught more lessons the researcher would be in a better position to comment on his performance in relation to his training. However, it can be generally concluded that training had a positive effect on the level of integration. Other trained teachers scored higher (95, 82, 48, 40, 59) which
resulted in higher averages while the untrained teachers had lower scores (28, 31, 34) which consequently resulted in lower averages.

Academic qualifications, however, had no effect on the level of integration as can be seen from Table 4.30. The Diploma trained teachers scored almost as high as the graduate trained teachers. Although a graduate trained teacher scored the highest (95) Diploma trained teachers also scored 82 and 59 respectively. From the above observation it can be noted that generally trained teachers integrated their classes more than untrained teachers but it is worthy of serious note that two graduate teachers performed worse than the diploma teachers and worse than one untrained teacher.

Table 4.33 below gives a comparison between teachers using the integrated textbooks and those using other textbooks not integrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classroom observations revealed that only three teachers were using the integrated textbooks though the questionnaire revealed that two more
teachers (not observed) were using the Integrated textbooks by K.I.E.

Table 4.33 shows that two teachers (2 and 5) who were using the integrated book scored relatively high levels of integration (95 and 48), however, teacher 1 had the lowest extent (8) though he was using an integrated textbook. On the other hand teachers who were using other non-integrated textbooks also scored relatively high levels of integration (82, 59). Since the sample observed was relatively small (9) the researcher did not conclude whether the type of textbook used had any influence on the level of integration because of the mixed results. Maybe if more lessons were observed, the results would have been different (see suggestions Chapter 6).

4.4 Data From Researcher’s Observation Notes

Observation of English lessons in progress were carried out in order to get first hand information on the procedures used by the English teachers to teach the integrated English syllabus. The other aim was to record the lessons for analysis on the extent of integration.

4.4.1 Preparation by the English Teachers for the English Lessons

The researcher requested each teacher to give her the schemes of work and the lesson plans before observing each lesson. This was done to check if the lessons were being consciously integrated or not. It was discovered that none of the nine teachers observed had a scheme of work. The researcher wanted to affirm whether the schemes of work and the lesson plans pointed towards an integrated approach. In the public schools the teachers argued that they made one scheme of work for each class at the beginning of every year. The schemes are then kept by the Head of the English Department. Asked
why they did not keep copies, the teachers argued that they had the textbooks from which they wrote the schemes.

The two private schools observed had no up to date schemes of work in English. In one school the researcher was shown an outdated scheme of work made in 1986. The teachers reasoned that they did not make schemes because their jobs were temporary. The teachers claimed they can be hired or fired any time by the management hence there was no point in making schemes of work because one could end up not using the schemes. Asked what they use to plan on what to teach next they claimed they followed the textbooks.

Out of the nine teachers observed only two taught with a formal lesson plan. The others had sketches in the form of notes to follow during their lessons. This was confirmed when they were interviewed. The teachers claimed that formal lesson plans were cumbersome to make every day for all lessons especially for teachers who were having a heavy workload. Some teachers (4) claimed they dictate notes to the pupils later. The notes were, however, not shown to the researcher; most often than not pupils were observed making their own notes.

In three of the four schools observed, the Time-table still indicated separate lessons for Language and Literature especially in the upper Forms (III and IV). The researcher observed that only two schools had bought copies of the integrated English book recommended by K.I.E. This was quite unexpected especially when it is considered that the programme started four years ago. Asked why they did not have the recommended textbook some teachers reasoned that the schools had no funds since they had just spent
money buying other textbooks just before the new syllabus was introduced. Others claimed the book was not available in the bookshops.

The researcher observed that at certain times the teachers teaching the integrated English were not consciously integrating the two. This happened in cases where a teacher set out to teach pure Literature but in the process remembered some mistakes pupils made in English then began to expound on them. Under such circumstances the teachers were not consciously integrating the teaching of the two subjects since they did not have the material in their earlier plan for the lessons.

The researcher also observed that the teachers were not using a variety of resources to teach the integrated syllabus as is required.

4.5 Summary of the Data Observed

This Chapter has outlined the data obtained in the study to bring out a number of features:

1. The degree of integration observed in the language-based and literature based lessons.
2. Similarities and differences in the extent of integration occurring in public and private schools.
3. An analysis of the extent and range of integration carried out by observed teachers in various schools and classes.
4. The techniques frequently used by teachers to teach the integrated syllabus.
5. The attitude of teachers towards the integrated syllabus.
6. Finally the problems experienced by teachers during the teaching of the syllabus.

A detailed discussion will be provided in Chapter 5 followed by recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

In this Chapter, the findings of the study are discussed and presented in two parts:

(i) Findings from the lesson observations
(ii) Findings from the questionnaires and interviews.

5.1 Findings from the lesson observations

Forty-three lessons were observed, recorded and analysed to verify the extent of integration between Language and Literature in secondary schools. A total of 423 elements of integration were observed. This indicated that to some extent integration was taking place between Language and Literature. There was a marginal difference (25 elements) in the two types of lessons. More elements of Language were found in the Literature lessons (225) than the Literature elements (200) found in the Language lessons. This is because Literature draws more from Language than vice-versa. Language involves a wider range of activity and references than Literature. Literature occupies a territory of some size and importance within the total realm of Language but not the whole field. Literature is thus constructed out of Language and probably that is why more Language elements appeared in the Literature lessons than the number of Literature elements that appeared in the Language lessons.

The public schools were found to have scored a higher total number of elements of integration (276) than the private schools which scored 149
elements. This might have occurred because the private schools are staffed mainly by untrained teachers (16 of the 18 untrained teachers were from private schools) who lack the knowledge of how best to present their information. The untrained teachers lacked experience in methodology especially in the teaching of English as a second language. Their enthusiasm was not always a satisfactory substitute for experience, particularly when it came to planning sound teaching programmes and presenting good models of spoken and written English.

The private schools also lacked textbooks for English, not only the integrated English course book but even other supplementary course books which were present in public schools. Most of the private schools had delegated the duty of buying the selected books to parents. The schools had poor facilities such as lack of desks and audio-aids like radios. This condition was heightened by cases of over-enrolment (more than 50 students) in classes. The public schools received government aid and were in most cases better equipped compared to the private schools observed. This might have contributed to the difference in scores.

5.1.1 The Language Oriented Lessons

The 21 language oriented lessons observed had a total of 200 literature elements. Most of the lessons were characterized by drills except for the Comprehension and class reading lessons. Teachers, it seemed had not picked up the message of contextualizing their grammar work. It was discovered during the interview that the teachers were aware that grammar work was best taught when contextualized but did not put their knowledge into practice regardless of the recommendation by educators.
While the comprehension lessons were well integrated, the other language based lessons were poorly integrated. Comparatively the Comprehension lessons had a higher extent of integration (80 elements) than other lessons in this category. This indicates how appropriate teachers found it to integrate Language and Literature in Comprehension lessons. It was discovered that while discussing the passages teachers had to consciously or unconsciously discuss aspects of characterization, style, plot and theme. The high occurrence of integration in the Comprehension lessons were expected especially in cases where the passages were literary in nature. The literary passages called upon the teacher to decipher all literary terms for comprehension to take place, thus resulting into full integration.

The comprehension passages with interesting plots and themes were better integrated and were more enjoyable to the learners. This stimulated active participation which also made both teacher and learner to deviate a great deal into literature.

Another group that were well integrated were the two class reading lessons. The fact that there were only two lessons on reading was considered low bearing in mind that the reading skill is a very important skill as background for future academic pursuits. The low number of lessons could have resulted from lack of libraries in most public schools and the total absence of any sort of reading materials in the private schools. The private school teachers observed claimed that the management is not responsible for buying classreaders for the learners. Asked whether they had recommended any to be bought by the learners, the teachers reasoned that that was the duty of the management. The manager, it was learnt, was a B.Sc degree holder and
as such was unlikely to have interest in knowing the relevant readers to be bought for each class.

On the issue of integration, these reading lessons were fairly integrated (32 elements) mainly because the reader being used was a short story which was literary. This rationalises the high frequency of occurrence in the number of Literature elements in the lessons.

Two lessons were on study skills. This number was comparatively low bearing in mind that such skills have been greatly stressed in the integrated English syllabus. The two lessons were not well integrated as has been observed in Chapter IV. This might have been as a result of the objectives the teacher set out to achieve. In the two cases the teacher was only interested in pinpointing the topic sentence of every paragraph and how to use the sentences to write notes on the paragraph. Not much comprehension was done prior to the picking of the sentences. This limited the number of literature elements that could be brought in by the teacher. As there was very little comprehension done, the learners failed to understand the passage and could not therefore pick the correct sentence.

The high occurrence of elements of integration in the oral lessons was attributed to the fact that in discussing the use of dialogues, the teacher brought in aspects of dramatization like tragedy, farce, comedy, the role of drama and many others. The two lessons started as purely language based but ended up being more of literature than language. This accounted for the high occurrence of literature elements in these lessons.
The pure grammar lessons as has been pointed above were the least integrated as indicated by the low rate of occurrence of literature elements in these lessons. It was observed that the teachers of these lessons were mainly using the old grammar approach and did not contextualize their teaching of grammatical structures.

A review of the seven grammar lessons revealed that all of them had low range of integration (Table 4.19). During the observations it was noted that very few teachers were able to integrate grammar lessons with literature yet 30 (60%) of the teachers indicated that grammar was best taught in context. Teachers observed were still using the grammar approach despite several recommendations against this approach. Majority of the teachers were observed describing grammatical terms instead of using contextualized examples. Thus, the teaching of grammar was in most cases abstract and it would seem at this point that grammar teaching has not benefited from a modern approach. This is an area of serious concern at a time when the public maintains that English Language standards are deteriorating compared to what it used to be. While blame is put on the implementers further blame should be put at the trainning level where the student teachers are groomed on the best teaching methods for any given situation (notice that there are other factors contributing to the falling standards in English like the backwash effect of examination which cannot be discussed here).

The two composition lessons also registered low range of integration. The number of composition lessons were rather low compared to those of grammar and comprehension. The teachers argued that they teach and give
composition exercises fortnightly because of the amount of work involved in correcting the exercises especially for large classes.

The relatively low occurrence of literature elements in these lessons was attributed to the fact that teachers hardly endeavour to demonstrate the different styles of writing such as narration using already written texts such as *Things Fall Apart*. Teachers, it seemed, have ignored their role in teaching writing which should be to extend and deepen the experiences which children bring to school and to provide situations and activities which capture the learners' interest and imagination. More so they should expose the students to experiences which they can work on intellectually and on which they can focus their feelings.

The low occurrence of elements of integration in the grammar lessons might be attributed also to the fact that teachers have not fully grasped the meaning of integration. While there is integration at the skill level there is little at the subject level especially in the grammar lessons. Teachers also found it difficult to integrate the grammar lessons with literature because they are still using the old grammar methods where grammar was taught without context.

5.1.2 The Literature Oriented Lessons

Twenty-two Literature oriented lessons were observed and their range of integration determined. The lessons scored a total of 225 language elements. The lessons included the poetry lessons, the literature lessons and the setbook lessons.
Nine of the literature lessons were on poetry contrary to what has been the traditional practice where teachers feared the teaching of poetry claiming that it was complex (Ministry of Education, 1980). It was not rare to find that a student who enjoys literature changes his mind in pursuing it when he learns that poetry will be part of the course. Well-handled poetry can prove relevant and useful for the growth of the individual and the society at large.

It also appears that the attitude towards poetry has changed a great deal. Most teachers it seems now prefer to teach poetry rather than other aspects of Literature. When interviewed the teachers observed indicated that they find it more appropriate to integrate the teaching of Language and Literature using a poem. The type of language poets use make it possible for a great deal of vocabulary and speech work to feature as the learners read the poem aloud.

The special language of poetry occasionally provides rich grounds for learning certain grammatical structures and expressions. However, it was noted during the observation that poetry was not taught for its intrinsic value but was used more or less as a technique for integration. The enjoyment and appreciation that should characterize any poetry lesson was lacking throughout the observation. In poetry there is the need for both teacher and student to have enough rapport with each other. They need to be able to sing, laugh, and debate and allow mind and mind to meet and explore their varying mental and emotional responses to the poem at hand. All these were lacking in the lessons.

In the lessons observed the appreciation of poetry was turned into an amazingly technical exercise where teachers ensured that they extract both
grammar and literature elements making the teaching of Literature quite mechanical. It was also observed that with integration there is hardly enough time to enjoy and critically appreciate Literature through class discussion. In most cases the learners were just passive recipients of the teachers' interpretation of the poems thus defeating the purpose of teaching Literature.

The seven Oral Literature lessons also exhibited fair range of integration. Only two of these lessons were taught in private school. When interviewed, a teacher commented that teaching Oral Literature was a waste of time since the content is too obvious to the learners. Instead of teaching Oral Literature the teachers recommended poetry which they thought was difficult for the learners. It was concluded that since the teachers were untrained and were just fresh from school, they were not aware that to teach African Oral Literature for the sheer sake of enjoyment is a great service to a living and active culture of African people. This attitude might have accounted for the high number of poetry lessons in the private schools where the teachers demonstrated very little satisfactory understanding of the lessons.

The public school teachers on the other hand indicated they enjoyed teaching Oral Literature. The teachers reasoned that Oral Literature was easy to teach since it needs little preparation because most of the content is known to the teacher. The teachers therefore took little time to prepare schemes of work or lesson plans. This view has been adopted by their students who have been known to opt out of Oral Literature classes thinking that it is an easy option to pass in the exams. Many African students assume that being African they know intuitively how an African thinks and why he behaves the way he does and therefore they do not need hours and hours of classroom
teaching on the subject. This is a false and indeed dangerous assumption because Oral Literature is a subject of immense historical and philosophical dimensions. It is due to such lack of understanding that both teachers and learners tend to study Oral Literature in isolation from the real life of the people without realizing that they are also performers and actors and members of the oral tradition and the African Culture.

The teachers also claimed that they enjoyed teaching Oral Literature because several activities like grammar, speech work and dramatization can be easily incorporated into it. This makes the exercise of integration between Language and Literature to be easy and that is probably why the Oral Literature lessons recorded a fair range of integration.

The single setbook lesson on *Things Fall Apart* was designated as fairly integrated. The fact that only one lesson was observed on a setbook was attributed to the fact that the teachers had to teach setbooks in first term to beat the mock deadline in second term. The research was carried out in third term. The lesson though fairly integrated was however, dull and lacked life. The teacher ignored aspects that needed class discussion. It was more or less a class reading session than a setbook discussion with the teacher pointing out a fact here and there as students read. The researcher expected a lively discussion of the characters, style, themes and other aspects of literary appreciation. The researcher concluded that literary appreciation is a "dead" subject in the classroom and blamed the teachers for it who in turn blamed lack of time to cover the syllabus appropriately.
It was observed that most of the classes failed to equip the learners with skills which are useful and relevant to the community. Enjoyment which leads to more frequent practice and a more receptive mind which in turn leads to a more rapid learning of skills was lacking. Unless the teachers are properly prepared to administer a carefully worked out literature programme there might be no point in teaching Literature.

5.1.3 Comparison of The Results

A Comparison was made concerning the extent of integration from each class in private and public school. The elements of integration were found to be highest in form I (119) of public schools and lowest at Form III (69). In private schools it was highest in Form III and lowest in Form I (19). The conclusion drawn from the above data was that in some public schools teachers have not totally dropped the old system whereby the setbooks were taught in Form III onwards. The teachers tended to specialize in teaching Language and Literature seperately at Form III. This could have accounted for the low frequency of elements of integration at Form III. (Table 4.29)

The occurrence of more elements (60) in Form III in private schools was attributed to the fact that the majority of the pupils had no setbooks for Oral Literature or poetry and in most cases the teacher had to read out and explain every sentence for the students to understand. This technique brought in several Language elements.

Lack of attention to lesson preparation and schemes of work was another observation made in private schools. The preparation of schemes of work was seen by the private school teachers as a waste of time because one might not
be able to teach what he or she prepared for due to the temporary nature of their work. This opinion was seen by the researcher as quite unprofessional bearing in mind the importance of having a scheme of work and the fact that it serves the purpose of establishing continuity.

The other reason the teachers gave for not preparing schemes of work was that they have not been trained on how to prepare a scheme of work or how to make lesson plans. The researcher thought the untrained teachers could try to learn from their trained counterparts if they were willing enough to do so.

The presence of integration was established with Form I Language oriented lessons in public schools scoring the highest occurrences (61) elements (Table 4.29). The reasons for such high occurrences in public schools could be that:

(i) public school teachers are mostly trained professionally while most teachers in private schools are "A" level certificate holders with no professional training hence have no knowledge of how to integrate the two successfully;

(ii) public school teachers have attended in-service course on teaching the integrated syllabus therefore they have the knowledge and the ability to integrate the two;

(iii) public schools have more resources for teaching and learning the integrated syllabus such as the integrated textbooks, tape recorders, radios and others.
Teachers from the private schools however, exhibited an ability to integrate the Literature lesson as evident in Table 4.32. The difference in the number of Language elements found in Literature lessons in public schools and private schools was relatively small (11 elements). The Language oriented lessons, however, exhibited a big difference in the number of Literature elements found in the public schools' lessons and private schools' lessons. The public schools had a total of 155 Literature elements while the private schools had only 45 Literature elements. One of the factors that could have contributed to this big difference is the total lack of resources like textbooks and other supplementary coursebooks in private schools. The private school teachers also complained that they hardly ever receive circulars from the Ministry of Education or Kenya Institute of Education.

Data analysis (Table 4.31) also revealed that the trained teachers exhibited higher scores than the untrained teachers. The trained and in-serviced teachers had even higher scores (95, 82) than the trained but not in-serviced teachers. This reveals the fact that professional training has some positive effects on the extent of integration between Language and Literature. The trained teachers could have scored higher because they are aware of the right methods and techniques to use during their lessons. The trained teachers also possess the knowledge of how to vary their techniques to suit the demands of the pupils. It was therefore assumed that they had the knowledge of how to go about integrating the two.

A look at the Literature oriented lessons revealed that they were better integrated than the Language oriented lessons. The researcher attributed this to the fact that teachers have always tried to bring in Literature into
Language especially during comprehension and class reading sessions, however, inservicing is still necessary to make teachers aware of better ways to integrate the two and not make integration accidental as was exhibited by the teachers during the observation.

When it comes to the teaching of Language the problem goes beyond integration. The outcry that the level of English Language has deteriorated did not begin with the idea of integration. The teaching of English Language has for long suffered from poor methods such as the use of mechanical drills to teach Language structures. Very little contextualization was being done and even with integration not much improvement was observed. The researcher concluded that further researches should be done at all levels to determine why teachers do not follow what is recommended by the syllabus designers.

The following conclusions were drawn from the above discussion:

(i) The category a school belongs to (public or private) affects the extent of integration taking place between Language and Literature

(ii) The topic or type of lesson taught has some effect on the extent of integration

(iii) The teacher, trained or untrained has some effect on the extent of integration

(iv) In-servicing of teachers has a positive effect on the extent of integration between Language and Literature.
conclusion when he found that “teachers’ academic levels greatly influenced their quality of teaching. Those with higher qualifications were found to be more flexible and resourceful in their teaching than those in lower grades.”

It was observed from the study that the level of training had very little effect on the ability of the teacher to integrate the two. The trained teachers (graduates and diploma) had high scores of integration (95 and 82) compared to their untrained counterparts who scored 34 and 31 (Table 30). This shows how training played an important role on the teachers’ ability to integrate.

An inquiry revealed that the integrated English syllabus has not yet been introduced as a course of study at the University and other training colleges by the time the research was carried out, however, it is now understood that courses are being prepared on the integrated English syllabus for colleges. Pre-service on the syllabus should be carried out at all levels.

5.2.2 Orientation Given to English Teachers Before or After Introducing the Integrated English Syllabus

It was noted that only 12 (24%) of the 50 teachers sampled had been inserviced and only two of them were observed. The inserviced teachers had higher scores (95, 82, etc.) than the non-inserviced.

All the respondents were in agreement that more in-service courses were necessary to prepare teachers for the integrated English syllabus. The teachers therefore lacked exposure to new methods of teaching, new ideas on content and a variety of resources for their teaching. Ominde notes this clearly in his Report (1964);
"Unoriented teachers (those not inducted into the new outlook) tend to teach as they were taught and in view of the rapid strides being made in teaching methods...they defeat the purpose......"

In addition to in-service education, teachers need more frequent and close guidance or supervision by qualified and competent inspectors in this field. This was once stressed by the District Commissioner, Marsabit when he said that "keeping in touch with teachers is the only way teachers' problems could be monitored and where possible solved." Such co-ordination can be encouraged through the Ministry of Education and Inspectorate. Thus, training is very important in order to have competent Language teachers. It should be noted that a Language teacher is a specialist, not just one who knows and speaks the Language well. General training, while important, is not sufficient. Specific training is necessary for all who teach in English.

5.2.3 Subjects English Teachers have Specialized in

Fifty six per cent of the teachers sampled were specialized in teaching both English and Literature and the researcher observed only teachers who had specialized in both. No data were obtained on teachers who were teaching either literature and other subjects or language and other subjects. The inspector of English however indicated in the interviews that teachers who are not specialized in both tended too overemphasize the areas they were specialized in hence creating imbalances in teaching the integrated English syllabus. The majority of the teachers interviewed (7 of the 9 observed) felt that it was unfair to force teachers to teach something they are not competent in.

It is understandable that a teacher who is not specialised in one area cannot teach it as effectively as one who is. Whether specialization had any
effect on the level of integration was not established and the researcher will, however, suggest further research in this area so that empirical data are found to support or disapprove the hypothesis.

5.2.4. Textbooks and other resources used in teaching the integrated syllabus

Data collected revealed that only two schools observed were using the integrated textbook and none of the schools had the complete series book 1-4. Six of the nine teachers observed were still using textbooks recommended for the old syllabus. Most teachers (private schools) were unaware of the existence of the integrated text.

The findings revealed that one teacher using the integrated text scored the highest (95 elements) while at the same time another teacher using the text scored very low range of integration (4) and another scored 48 which was a fair range integration. Because of the small sample of teachers observed the researcher could not say with certainty whether the type of textbook was a factor or not. The other teachers observed argued that the other books had passages or materials that could be easily integrated.

The researcher however notes at this point that whatever effort is being made in writing or selecting textbooks, it is worthless unless the users and implementers of the curriculum implement it according to the given guidelines. It is upon the curriculum developers to create full awareness in the implementers about what is going on, what textbooks are recommended and how they are to be used.

A brief review of the integrated textbooks did not reveal much differences with other textbooks and most teachers were of the opinion that
even the other English textbooks could be subjected to integration if need be.

5.2.5 Techniques used in Teaching the Integrated English syllabus

All the instrument used in the study revealed that teachers were still relying on traditional teaching approaches such as lecture and question and answer techniques. The researcher would like to point out here that the purpose of utilizing one instructional method or a combination of more than one instructional method is to aid the teacher present his material on an organized and hence systematic manner. Teachers were found to be lacking in variety of techniques and tended to overuse the expository techniques at the expense of other techniques. No single method in instruction can be used independently of the others. All techniques should be used from time to time so that the weak points of one are compensated for by the strong points of the other.

In their responses the teachers recommend techniques like groupwork, dramatization and class presentations. One reason they gave for recommending the above was that integration appears complicated and pupils therefore need to do a great deal of work on their own. The researcher is of the opinion that the more difficult a syllabus is to follow the more the pupils need the help of the teacher, therefore a technique like discussions would be the most recommended.

The teachers listed language games, lecture, group work and discussion as techniques they rarely used. They claimed the classes are too large for the above techniques to be used effectively. The researcher thought groupwork is the most effective technique to be used in large classes because grouping
makes the teacher pay attention to a smaller group thus, helping them more than he would in a large class.

The researcher would also like to comment that the games or drama are an excellent way to foster authentic natural and creative language use. Games, once understood have a natural order which children quickly understand. They also enable the child to control the situation and leave the teacher free to do some remedial work with slower pupils. The teachers also blamed time as another factor preventing them from using techniques like discussion and language games. The teachers claimed that the time now allocated for studying the integrated syllabus (6 lessons per week instead of 8) was too short to cover the syllabus adequately. Mtunda (1984) had earlier emphasized realistic timing as one of the essentials of preservice education and training. He said;

"The curriculum should be realistic in terms of time. Each subject in the curriculum should necessarily be covered in the amount of time decided upon by education authorities. It is of no use drawing up a long list of topics which may not be covered in the amount of time available."

This warning is very timely as far as the Integrated English syllabus is concerned. With the present time, teachers will continue hurrying over the syllabus for examination purpose.

The teachers discredited the lecture method for making learners passive yet the classroom observation revealed that the nine teachers observed used lecture, and question and answer techniques more frequently than any other techniques. Such techniques have the disastrous result of cutting off the
learners from their own-self motivated desire to learn and tend to make them depend on the teacher absolutely. Another observation made was that much of the questioning of the pupils by teachers required pupils to reflect back what is in the teacher’s mind (the right answer) and thus force pupils’ concentration onto signals of approval or disapproval by the teacher rather than using language to genuinely enquire into the subjects at hand.

Techniques like field trips and project were ruled out by most teachers because of lack of funds. This was considered as laxity on the part of the teachers or lack of creativity because pupils can do a project within the school or go for fieldtrips within walking distance from the school and learn from the community. It appears as if the teachers have completely ignored the communities in which the schools are situated or lack the awareness that the community has a great range of resources that could be used to promote the teaching of the integrated syllabus.

During the study it was observed that there was over-reliance on textbooks as source of information. Teachers were found either holding textbooks, reading books or referring learners to read books at home during their free time. It appeared as if all that were to be learned in Language merely existed in print form. At the same time it was observed that pupils were carrying out learning activities based on exclusively published sources such as stories, folklore, poems and songs. Over-reliance on published sources particularly textbooks seemed to have distracted attention of the English teachers from the unpublished sources.
5.2.6 Attitude of English teachers towards the Integrated English Syllabus

Forty-four per cent of the respondent were in favour of the integrated syllabus while fifty-four per cent were not (Table VI.8). This response contradicted what was found out from the trial test attitude (Likert Scale) which indicated that teachers had a positive attitude towards the syllabus. The inspectors confirmed that Language and Literature were still being taught separately in some schools. Such an attitude could have been perpetuated by the following:

(i) The integrated syllabus was introduced before the teachers were adequately prepared to teach it

(ii) The amount of time allocated for the syllabus was not enough to allow adequate coverage of the content

(iii) Some of the school authorities did not show a keen interest in the syllabus

(iv) The teachers felt that the syllabus content was not appropriate because the two subjects are still distinctly separated in the syllabus and even in the examination samples provided by the Kenya National Examination Council.

The teachers therefore did not see why they should be taught in an integrated manner. The teachers’ comments were further proof that the philosophy of the integrated English syllabus is not clear to the teachers. The same teachers also argued that with integration there will be too much to be
taught by one teacher who might not be good in both English Language and Literature. This was seen by the researcher as one factor that would impede the process of integration especially where the teacher is not conversant with both disciplines.

The teachers who favoured the integrated syllabus argued that with integration all pupils will study Literature and make them better equipped in spoken English. The opinion was not shared by the researcher who doubted whether pupils who study Language and Literature as a combined course are better speakers of English than those who study it as separate subjects. The view that integration allows for contextualization of grammar was accepted as a genuine sentiment, however, grammar can also be contextualized using non-literary materials. The teachers interviewed were of the opinion that the old syllabus of separate subjects were more effective than the integrated one. In their lessons, however, the researcher found some extent of integration (425 elements) taking place. It is therefore evident that while in most cases teachers are resorting to teaching Language and Literature separately, they are in the process consciously integrating the teaching of the two.

5.2.7 Difficulties Experienced by Teachers in Teaching the Integrated English Syllabus

The difficulties listed by the respondents were also observed by the researcher during classroom observations. The respondents listed lack of integrated English textbooks and other resources. The observation revealed that only two schools had managed to purchase the recommended books. In addition, the private schools may have sound buildings, but the teachers often have a hard task convincing governing bodies that more than this is required
and persuading them to spend money on recommended textbooks and supplementary reading materials. The lack of supplementary readers and library resources was particularly acute in private schools. The researcher is also of the feeling that the introduction of the 8-4-4 system of education that requires laboratories, Home Science blocks, workshops and other resources, could have drained the schools and parents of funds to purchase the relevant textbooks.

The teachers complained of lack of adequate in-servicing courses to update them on the new syllabus. It is, however, understood that such courses are underway organized by the Inspectorate and K.I.E. The few teachers who have been in-serviced complained of the quantity and quality of the in-service course they were given and at the same time complained of lack of professional guidance and supervision in the teaching of the integrated syllabus. The curriculum developers should ensure that the in-servicing personnel are adequately prepared and knowledgeable enough in the integrated syllabus before they are dispatched to in-service teachers.

Other problems observed and listed by the teachers included:

(i) too many pupils and less textbooks that cannot be adequately shared among the learners
(ii) teachers' attitude towards the integrated syllabus: It is an accepted fact that a teacher needs to use all the skill he has, all his energies and all his abilities of voice, mind, action and will. All the above can be hampered by a negative attitude.
(iii) communication (lack of fluency) problem among some teachers.

Some teachers in private schools were found to be lacking in fluency especially in spoken language and as such were having problems in communicating to the leaners

(vi) much of the domination of classroom talk by the teachers seemed to be impeding the practical aspects of the integrated syllabus.

(v) there was also the lack of syllabi and related guiding materials for teaching the integrated syllabus especially in the private schools

(vi) most teachers lacked lesson plans and schemes of work. This made their lessons disorganized and difficult to follow

(vii) most teachers also lacked knowledge and awareness of the integrated English syllabus

(viii) teachers also complained of lack of time to cover the syllabus adequately.

The time factor was considered as of great importance in deciding whether a method is suitable for a particular group of learners or course. However, it is not usually the length of the course that is the main factor, but the amount of material taught. It should be clearly understood that the learning of Language takes as much time and practice as learning any other skills and therefore adequate time should be provided to ensure that all the skills are mastered.
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CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, an attempt was made to discuss the problem and objectives of the study, review of related literature and methodology for carrying out the research. The data obtained and their interpretations were also discussed.

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the presence or absence of integration between Language and Literature, the techniques used and the problems experienced in integrating the two. A questionnaire, interview and observation schedules and recording of lessons were used as instruments to collect data. Responses arising from the instruments were analysed to provide information that would help to answer questions raised by the researcher.

6.1 Summary of Findings

In this section, a summary of the results of the study are presented in accordance with the objectives of the study.

6.1.1 Extent of Integration Taking Place Between Language and Literature

The first objective was to determine through systematic gathering of data the existence or absence, and the intensity of integration taking place between Language and Literature. Data analysis revealed that integration was taking place at varied levels. A total of 425 elements of integration were
found in the 43 lessons analysed. It was also observed that more Language elements (225) appeared in the Literature lessons than Literary elements (220) in the Language lessons. It was concluded that integration was taking place and the Literature lessons were marginally better integrated than the Language lessons.

The public schools were found to have scored more elements of integration (273), compared to the private schools (152). The conclusion drawn was that public school teachers had more knowledge and were more willing to integrate than the private teachers. It was also noted that the public schools had:

(i) teachers who were professionally trained
(ii) teachers who were not only trained but in-serviced to teach the integrated syllabus
(iii) relevant textbooks
(iv) better facilities such as good desks and libraries.

6.1.2 Techniques Teachers Use to Teach the Integrated Syllabus

The second objective was to investigate the techniques teachers were using to integrate Language and Literature.

From the class observations during the investigations, it was revealed that the instructional strategies which are most frequently used during the teaching of the syllabus were expository techniques such as lecture and heuristic techniques such as question and answer based on the textbooks. The teachers complained of overcrowded classes with large numbers of students yet none of the teachers observed used groupwork - the best method to be used for large classes.
The other techniques like fieldtrips and resource persons were never used at all during the lessons observed. Few of the teachers observed used discussion but for only a small part of their lessons. It was concluded that teachers had ignored or were not trained on how and where to use all the teaching techniques.

From the methods and techniques used by the teachers it was also concluded that the teachers lack information on the integrated English syllabus and as such, they found it hard to handle the syllabus. In-service courses were found to be necessary to make the teachers aware of the different teaching techniques and where they are most applicable in teaching the integrated syllabus.

6.1.3 Attitude of Teachers Towards the Integrated English Syllabus

The third objective was to investigate the teachers' attitude towards the newly integrated English syllabus.

Data analysis revealed that 54 per cent of the respondents were not in favour of the syllabus. The teachers' responses to the general statements on the integrated syllabus were favourable, however, most of them disagreed that the combined course was easier to teach than the separate subject course. Fifty six per cent of the teachers felt that the syllabus was too demanding while about half said that they do not enjoy teaching it. Most important is the fact that 54 per cent of the teachers felt that Language and Literature should be taught separately.
Although teachers felt that the content was better than the former approach, most of them had an unfavourable attitude towards the integrated approach. This can be attributed to various problems such as the fact that majority of the teachers (76 per cent) had not been in-serviced to teach the combined course. The teachers also needed more time to cover the syllabus as the time allocated for the integrated syllabus was reduced by one third.

It was concluded that teachers' negative attitude stemmed from the problems arising from the new syllabus.

6.1.4 Problems or Difficulties Experienced by Teachers in Teaching the Integrated English Syllabus

The teachers listed the following as problems affecting their teaching of the integrated syllabus:

(i) The teachers felt that the time given for the integrated English syllabus was not enough to enable them to teach it effectively. Due to this problem, they could not use the recommended methods or improvise some resources

(ii) Some of the teachers complained that since they were trained and specialized in one area (literature or language) they found it difficult to teach the other area which they had no interest in

(iii) Some teachers complained of lack of knowledge on the integrated English syllabus leading to poor preparation of lessons
(iv) The teachers complained of lack of integrated textbooks, syllabuses and related guide materials particularly in the private schools.

(v) Lack of funds to equip the schools with adequate resources was also observed.

Through observations the researcher concluded that the teachers who are supposed to teach were not teaching effectively as they should because of the problems listed above.

6.2 Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the findings of the study:

1. To some extent the teaching of Language and Literature is being integrated in Kenya’s secondary schools although the old separate English and Literature classes still dominate. The extent of integration was found to depend on:

   (i) Training and in-service of teachers;
   (ii) The type (category) of the school whether public or private;
   (iii) The level of class being taught;
   (iv) The topic taught and;
   (v) To some extent the textbook used.

2. English teachers continue to use predominantly expository techniques while learner centered methods such as groupwork, dramatization, simulations and games, discussions, fieldwork, and many others are not
being used in the teaching/learning of the integrated English syllabus. Lecture method and question and answer techniques seem to dominate.

3. The English teachers were not adequately prepared to teach the new syllabus. Only 24 per cent of the sample of English teachers had attended the in-service courses.

4. The majority (54 per cent) of the English teachers are not enthusiastic about the new English syllabus. They appear indifferent, some are negative and lack commitment to the teaching of the syllabus. They are generally still in favour of the old approach. The syllabus is considered heavy by the teachers compared to the time allocated for its teaching.

5. Teachers are experiencing problems regarding teaching and learning resources. The integrated English textbook has not reached many schools and in most cases it is not in the shops. Most teachers complained that the Handbook (Teachers Guide) costing kshs 82.00 is prohibitive. There is very little reliance on the environment or community based resources - the reason for this seems to be lack of time and initiative. Teachers are eager to cover the syllabus in order to meet the demands of examinations.

The findings, however, reveal possible ways that would help curb the drawbacks:

(i) Several English teachers are prepared to integrate and they have been trying to do so, in the presence of an adequate model;
(ii) The teachers need guidance on how to integrate English Language and Literature;

(iii) Most heads of schools are willing to give teachers support in implementing the syllabus by providing textbooks and other facilities whenever funds are available.

6.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following are suggestions and implications regarding the integration of Language and Literature. It was found out that teachers were against the integrated English syllabus due to the problems they were facing. The success of the course requires that serious attention be given to certain aspects of the curriculum. In view of the above:

1. The Ministry of Education should ensure the training of English teachers both in pre-service and in-service courses in particular areas such as the inquiry-centred approaches to teach the integrated English syllabus. Many teachers might not know how to use them hence over-reliance on expository methods. The researcher recommends that:

(a) in-service courses be longer (residential) and better organized;
(b) those to in-service teachers be experts in the teaching of the integrated English syllabus;
(c) Universities and other teacher training colleges should make the integrated course part of their training for student teachers of English;
2. Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) personnel, the District Education Officers, parents and the public at large should work together to ensure that the immediate demands of the course (such as adequate instructional materials, teaching load and funds) are catered for. The above can be done by:

(a) parents and schools providing funds to purchase instructional materials such as textbooks;

(b) KIE involving teachers in curriculum development at the classroom level;

(c) the Ministry employing more personnel and providing enough means for the inspectors to visit the schools more often to carry out evaluation for diagnostic purposes to ensure that the newly integrated English syllabus takes root as all other new subjects in the 8-4-4 system of education;

(d) supervising teaching resources to ensure that teachers are using the relevant integrated English textbooks as this was found to be lacking in the schools. There is need for adequate supervision and guidance especially at the early stages of implementation.

3. The National Examination should be designed in such a way that it reflects integration, not separating Language and Literature in different papers. Assessments should also reflect integration. This could be done by:
(a) revising the syllabus to reflect integration between Language and Literature;

(b) revising the examination format to combine the two in an integrated manner.

4. The curriculum developers should ensure that more lessons are provided for the integrated English syllabus to enable the teachers to involve the learners in more activities or use inquiry approach if need be.

5. The Ministry of Education and KIE should consider not only the control and flow of information within schools but also between schools. The above could be done by:

(a) making available the means by which schools can find out what is available elsewhere and having done so have at least a reasonable chance of being able to obtain these resources;

(b) providing a network system involving the schools and the centres that support the schools such as Teachers Advisory Centres.

6. Teachers should be trained and encouraged to improvise resources to teach the integrated English syllabus. Teachers and pupils should also be encouraged to use the environment as a major resource. In many cases funds are not required in the use of the immediate environment both in the school and in the neighbourhood. Students can collect materials on their own such as Oral Literature as envisaged in the syllabus.
7. Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) should carry out evaluation study in the schools in order to identify any factors hindering the implementation of the integrated English syllabus especially after the four year circle. This is in line with the advantages and need for curriculum evaluation in education. Both formative and summative evaluation are essential to avoid mistakes. It is therefore important for K.I.E to evaluate the integrated English syllabus in order to make corrections early enough in every stage of its development.

8. Summative evaluation should also be conducted after overall implementation of the syllabus to check whether general and specific objectives have been attained.

6.4 Suggestions for Further Research

Due to the limited scope of this study the researcher was not able to carry out extensive research. However it was hoped that the study would raise challenges that would lead to further research in many areas that were not covered. The following are areas for further research:

1. Research related to the nature of the present study should be conducted to cover secondary schools in different geographical areas of Kenya in order to discover other problems that impede the implementation of the integrated English syllabus.

2. Further research with a larger sample should be done to determine whether the use of an integrated English textbook improves the level of integration.
3. A study should be carried out to determine whether the teachers’ attitude towards the integrated English syllabus affects their teaching effectiveness or pupils’ performance in English.

4. Research should be done to establish the pupils’ view and attitudes towards the integrated syllabus.

5. Further research should be carried out to determine whether teachers specialized in both Language and Literature are better at integrating Language and Literature than those specialized either in Literature and another subject other than Language and another subject other than Literature.
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APPENDIX A
LIST OF SCHOOLS

Public
(1) Ahero Girls Secondary School
(2) Nyabondo Boys Secondary School

Private
(1) Alpha Secondary School
(2) Lions Secondary School
APPENDIX B

LESSON OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

Teacher: School
Male/Female: Class

Date:

Observer:

1. Preparation of Teacher:

1.1 Scheme of Work:

(a) Is there a scheme of work? Yes ( ) No ( )
(b) Are themes clearly defined? Yes ( ) No ( )
(c) Are the objectives clearly defined? Yes ( ) No ( )
(d) Is time allocation for different topics shown? Yes ( ) No ( )
(e) Is time allocation for different skills topic enough? Yes ( ) No ( )
(f) Do the skills/topics follow one another? Yes ( ) No ( )
(g) Is there some sense of integration of Literature and Language shown? Yes ( ) No ( )

(h) Are the teaching/learning spelt out? Yes ( ) No ( )
(i) Are enough resources given? Yes ( ) No ( )
(j) Are the teaching/learning resources suitable for the skills/topics chosen? Yes ( ) No ( )

1.2 Any Alternative?

(a) If the teacher does not have a scheme of work what does he/she use to guide him/her in planning his/her teaching activity?

1.3 Lesson Plan

(a) Does the teacher have a lesson plan? Yes ( ) No ( )
(b) If yes answer the following.
(c) Are the objectives well stated? Yes ( ) No ( )
(d) Does the plan show any integration? Yes ( ) No ( )
(e) Are there literary aspects to be taught during the lesson? Yes ( ) No ( )
(f) Are there any other evidence that the teacher is using an integrated approach? Yes ( ) No ( )

Explain: 

1.4 Material and Resources

(a) Does the teacher use the integrated English textbook? Yes ( ) No ( )
(b) Does he use any other textbook? Yes ( ) No ( )
(c) If yes specify: ________________________________
APPENDIX C

LESSONS OBSERVATION NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>No. of Pupils:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher...</td>
<td>Topic:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' Activities</th>
<th>Students Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The purpose of this research investigation is to find out how English Language and Literature is taught in Kenya's secondary schools.

Your co-operation will be greatly appreciated in helping to accomplish the research effectively.

Please give up-to-date information only and as such will be kept very confidential.

The questionnaires are not to be returned by the teachers.

I will return the completed questionnaires to the teachers.

I would also like to personally interview the teachers, if possible.

The questionnaires can be returned to any of the following addresses:

1. The Principal, School of Education, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
2. The Editor, Journal of Education, P.O. Box 40, Nairobi, Kenya.
3. The Research Officer, Kenya National Council for Administration of Education, P.O. Box 230, Nairobi, Kenya.
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LITERATURE/ENGLISH TEACHERS

The purpose of the present investigation is to find out how English Language and Literature is being taught in Kenya's Secondary schools.

Your honesty and co-operation will go a long way in helping to accomplish the goal of this study and to improve the teaching of English and Literature in Kenya. You are requested to give personal opinions and answers.

Information obtained will be used for research only and as such will be kept very anonymous.

Tick the relevant answers or fill in blank spaces. Please give up-to-date information.

No answer is necessarily correct or wrong. Feel free to give the answers you consider appropriate.

The researcher will personally collect the completed questionnaires.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Researcher.
PART I

1. RESPONDENTS' DETAILS

1.1 Name of School?
1.2 Category of school? Public ( ) Private ( ).
1.3 Sex? Male ( ) Female ( ).
1.4 Tick in the appropriate box your age bracket
1.5 Age: Between 20-24 years ( )
   ( )
   ( )
   ( )
   Over ( )

1.5 Academic Qualification.
(Tick in the appropriate box your highest academic qualification)
   level ( )
   level ( )
Graduate ( )
Post Graduate ( )

1.6 Are you a professional trained teacher?
Yes ( ) No ( )
If yes what is your highest professional qualification?
S1 ( ) Diploma ( ) BEd ( ) M.A ( )
Others ____________________________
Indicate college or University where obtained ____________________________

1.7 What subjects have you specialized in? (Write major ones first)
1. _______________________________
2. _______________________________
3. _______________________________

1.8 Before the integration of English Language and Literature which subjects were you teaching? (Please tick appropriately)
   1. Both Language and Literature ( )
   2. Language and other subjects ( )
   3. Literature and other subjects ( )
   4. Any other, specify _______________________________
1.9 Do you teach English and Literature in one lesson?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
If not how many lessons of each do you teach per week?
   English Language ( ) Lessons per week
   Literature ( ) Lessons per week.

1.10 How many lessons in total do you teach per week?
   Form I ( ) English ( ) Others
   Form II ( ) English ( ) Others
   Form III ( ) English ( ) Others
   Form IV ( ) English ( ) Others

"In view of the lessons allocated to me per week I feel"
   (i) Overworked ( )
   (ii) Just adequately ( )
   (iii) Underworked ( )

1.11 When did you last attend in-service course?

In what subjects areas?

1.12 Have you taken an in-service course in the integrated English Language and Literature syllabus in Kenya?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

1.13 Complete the following table for details of course attended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Month</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eg very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inspectorate</td>
<td>well attended</td>
<td>useful, not useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.14 Was the course attended in methodology, content or both? (tick appropriately)

(i) Methodology ( )
(ii) Content ( )
(iii) Both (i) & (ii) above ( )

If both, what new information on teaching and learning the integrated English syllabus did you learn?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If Methodology list all the techniques recommended for the teaching of the new syllabus e.g. use of groupwork

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1.15 Do you think special training is essential for teachers of the new integrated English syllabus?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes, what areas or points need to be emphasized?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1.16 Are you involved in Language curriculum development at K.I.E?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes, what role do you play?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If no, would you like to be involved in future?
PART II

CONTENT, OBJECTIVES, TECHNIQUES AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES

2.1 Are you fully clear about aims of the integrated English Language and Literature syllabus?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If no, what would you like to know about them?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

2.2 Which textbooks do you use?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

Are they specifically structured or written for teaching integrated English?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Explain:

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

2.3 The integrated English coursebooks (By K.I.E) is based on the 'unit' approach. Do you prefer to use them in the forms the units are arranged or would rather re-arrange them?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

2.4 According to your knowledge are the units integrated?

Yes ( ) No ( )

2.5 Are you in favour of the integrated approach to the teaching of Language and Literature?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes, give your reasons -
If no, give your reasons.

2.6 Would you suggest a change in the teaching techniques for the integrated English syllabus?

Yes ( )  No ( )

If yes, which techniques would you recommend to be used by the teachers?

2.7 List the techniques you frequently use when teaching the integrated English syllabus.

2.8 Why do you use these methods/techniques more frequently than before integration?

2.9 What are some of the recommended techniques which you rarely use? Give reasons why you rarely use them.

2.10 List any other difficulties you encounter in teaching the integrated English syllabus.
PART III

ATTITUDE OF ENGLISH TEACHERS TOWARDS THE INTEGRATED ENGLISH SYLLABUS

You are requested to indicate how far you agree or disagree with the statements given below by putting a circle around the letter which best indicates how closely you agree or disagree with the feelings expressed in each statement. Use the codes given below

(i) (SA) - Strongly agree
(ii) (A) - Agree
(iii) (U) - Uncertain (not sure or neutral)
(iv) (D) - Disagree
(v) (SD) - Strongly disagree

CONTENTS

3.1 The content of the new English syllabus is relevant to learners.
( SA A U D SD )

3.2 The integrated English syllabus is relevant to needs of the Kenyan society.
( SA A U D SD )

3.3 The new integrated English syllabus is broad
( SA A U D SD )

3.4 The new integrated English and Language Literature syllabus cannot be covered in the time allocated.
( SA A U D SD )

3.5 The old techniques used to teach the two subjects are still the best to use in teaching the integrated English syllabus.
( SA A U D SD )

3.6 To teach the new syllabus effectively one has to use techniques in which pupils do much of the work.
( SA A U D SD )

3.7 The new integrated English syllabus is easier to teach.
( SA A U D SD )

3.8 The Integrated English syllabus is more interesting to the pupils.
3.9 A great deal of practical work is needed to teach the units

3.10 English Language and Literature should be taught separately

3.11 I enjoy teaching the integrated English language and Literature syllabus

3.12 Show (with a tick ( ) whether you use the following methods/techniques in teaching the integrated English syllabus. Indicate in the appropriate column how frequently you use each method/technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD/TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>OCCASIONALLY</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dramatization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Question and Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inquiry Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Use of resource people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Role play/Simulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Language Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Story telling/Narration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Field trips and Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Others (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate with a tick ( ) how often you use the following resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>OCCASIONALLY</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Text books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Class readers
3. Radio lessons
4. Tape recordings
5. Films and Videos
6. Pictures & Photographs
7. Diagram and Sketches
8. Models
9. Maps and Globes
10. Real objects (specify)
11. Language laboratories
12. Any others (specify)

3.14 What problems if any do you experience concerning resources for the new integrated English syllabus?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3.15 Do you think English teachers should/can be involved in research work and prepare materials for teaching/learning of the integrated English syllabus?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Explain your answer -

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3.16 Give any suggestions, comments or feelings about the new integrated English syllabus. Give also your opinion on how its teaching could be improved.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS

1. Name: School:
   Sex: Category:

2. State highest academic qualification

3. What is your highest academic professional qualification?

4. Do you feel that you are getting professional guidance in the teaching of the integrated language and literature syllabus?

(b) Is it enough? Yes ( ) No ( )

5. Who provides the professional guidance?

6. Through what method is the professional help provided?

7. Have you been involved in the design and development of English syllabus at K.I.E.? Explain your role

8. What do you think about the training received as far as language and literature are concerned?
9. Do you think that the integrated English syllabus is:

   Enjoyable to students?-

   _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________

   (b) Popular with the school authority? Explain

   _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________

10. What techniques do you mostly apply to achieve the objectives of the new syllabus?

   _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________

   (b) What hinders you from using other techniques?

   _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________

11. List any other problems you have experienced concerning the teaching of the integrated English Language and Literature syllabus.

   _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________

12. What can you say about the resources and facilities for teaching the new syllabus?

   _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________

13. Give any other comment in relation to

   (i) methods techniques

   _________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________

   (ii) Training of teachers

   _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E

(iii) Resources -
APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS

School: Category:

Date: Sex:

1. How long have you been head of department?
   
2. What are your feelings about the new English syllabus?
   
3. Are the teachers teaching it as a combined subject?
   Explain:
   
4. Is the number of teachers and time allocated enough to handle the course? 
   Teachers 
   Time 
   
5. What comments would you make about the following 
   (a) Preparation given to teachers to handle the course 
   
   (b) Teaching resources for the course 
   
   —
6. Have there been any problems related to the teaching of the integrated English syllabus?

7. Which ones have been reported to you?

What solution have you offered?

8. What does the Headmaster feel about the integrated English syllabus?

(b) Parents

(c) In what ways does the administration support the implementation of the new English syllabus?

9. What techniques would you recommend to be used in teaching the new English syllabus?

10. What improvements would you like to see as far as the teaching of the integrated English Language and Literature is concerned?
11 Give any other relevant comment concerning the integration of Language and literature in relation to 
(a) content 
(b) Methodology 
(c) Resources
APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEADMASTER/HEADMISTRESS

1. School

2. Period of administration

3. Students' population. Male () Female ()

4. Number of Language teachers Male () Female ()

5. What comments would you make about the availability of English Language teaching/learning resources ?

6. To your knowledge what problems are the language teachers experiencing in implementing the integrated English language syllabus in your school

   (b) Which ones have been reported to you ?-

   (c) What solutions have you been able to offer-

   (d) Which improvements would you like to see as far as implementation of English curriculum in the school is concerned ?-
APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE FIELD INSPECTORS

1. When did you become the English Language Field Inspector?

2. What is the role of the subject inspector in implementing the curriculum?

3. What reasons can you advance for integrating English language and literature in Kenya?

4. What preparation were given to the teachers before implementing the integrated English language and literature?

5. Have you been able to interact with English Language teachers since the new programme began?

6. Are you aware of any problems English teachers are experiencing in teaching the new syllabus?

7. What are the inspectorate's plan for alleviating these problems?
8. Do you have any other comments on the implementation of the Integrated English syllabus in secondary schools?
APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE CURRICULUM DEVELOPER

1. How long have you been involved in English Language curriculum development at K.I.E

2. Are the teachers involved in curriculum development?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes how are the schools represented?

3. Why did K.I.E recommend a move to integrate English language and literature into one syllabus?

4. What constraints if any were experienced during the development of materials for the new integrated English language and literature syllabus?

5. What preparations were the teachers given before introducing the integrated English language and literature syllabus?
   (b). were all teachers prepared? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If yes were they prepared in both content and methodology or only one of the above?
6. What techniques of the new English syllabus do you recommend?

7. Why wouldn't you recommend others?

8. Is K.I.E aware of any problems currently affecting the teaching of the new English syllabus?

What plan do you have to alleviate the problems to improve the teaching and learning of English?

9. Do you have any other comments on the implementation of English Curriculum in Secondary schools?
LETTER TO HEADS OF SCHOOLS

Kenyatta University
P.O Box 43844
NAIROBI

27 September 1988

The Headmaster / Headmistress

I am pleased to inform you that your school has been selected to participate in an Educational Research.

The participation of the school will not interrupt classes or any other activities at all. It will only take a little of the selected teachers time to fill a questionnaire and respond to an interview schedule. The researcher will also make personal classroom observation and record live English lessons.

Information given will be used purely for research purposes and will be treated in strict confidence.

The researcher will report to the Headmaster sometimes in October-November to carry out the research.

Your assistance will be highly appreciated. Enclosed is a copy of the research permit from the Office of the President.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

OMOLLO D.A.
Kenyatta University
Department of Com-Tech.
District Educational Officer
Kisumu District
P.O.Box 1914
KISUMU

Dear Sir/Madam,

**REF: EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

I am pleased to inform you that some secondary schools under Kisumu District have been selected to participate in an educational research. The participation of the schools will not interrupt classes or any other school activities at all. It will only take a little of the selected teachers time to fill a questionnaire and respond to an interview schedule. The researcher will also make personal classroom observation and record live English lessons.

Information obtained will be used purely for research purpose and will be treated in strict confidence. Your assistance will be highly appreciated. Enclosed is a copy of the permit from the Office of the President.

Thank you.

Your faithfully,

OMOLLO D.A.
APPENDIX L

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dept. of Comm.Tech.
Box 43844
Nairobi. KENYA

The Headmaster
Lions Secondary School
Box 2028
KISUMU

Dear Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

I am writing to introduce to you, the bearer of this letter - Ms. Dorothy Omollo in order that you can allow her to carry out research at your school as well as giving her the necessary assistance in doing so.

Ms. Omollo is a postgraduate student pursuing an M.Ed. degree course in the Department of Educational Communication and Technology here at Kenyatta University. Your school is one of the five that she has selected to conduct her research at.

I hope you will give this request your favourable consideration.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ndichu Gitau
SENIOR LECTURER & DEPARTMENT'S PROGRAMME CO-ORDINATOR.
APPENDIX M

LITERATURE ORIENTED LESSON

School: Nyabondo  Class: 1W
Category: Public  No. Of Pupils: 32
Teacher: (Mr. Agalo)  Topic: Oral Literature

Ref: Oral Literature for Secondary Schools (Odaga and Akivaga)

T  Today we have a visitor with us.
She would like to know how we learn English in the 8-4-4 curriculum

So she is just a friend not an enemy.
(Silence)

Now last time I was dealing with Dilemma stories; and then today we
are going to turn to proverbs.

So you all write proverbs...
(Goes to the Board and writes 'Proverbs').

And you know as usual, sometimes I will dictate and you people I will
require you to write out the notes. So as you have just settled I talked about
etiological tales, I also talked about dilemma stories, monster stories,
(inaudible) stories and then legends and myths. so today I'll talk about
proverbs and the first thing we will do is to define what a proverb is.

And I read:
Proverbs are a collection...

Proverbs are a collection of the experiences of people, (repeats) Experiences
some of which have been learned the hard way.

Experiences some of which have been learned the hard wary.

Are you alright?

PS  Yees.

T  O.K. We continue.

They reveal what it is that people adore. (repeats the sentence).
I know some of you don't know the spelling or meaning of the word adore.
Is it a verb or a noun?

A noun.

Really? What is a noun?

Name of something.

Yes, a noun is a naming word.

How many types do we have?

Yes - Wycliffe?

Two types.

Yes, very good two types; which one and which?

P Proper nouns.

Yes, what else?

P Common nouns.

Very good. Now is adore a naming word?

No.

T Well, adore cannot be a naming word. What could it name? If it is not a naming word then it is a what...?

P A verb.

Very good very good. Can somebody come and write the word on the BB?

P (Stands and goes to write the word 'Adore').

T What is it that people adore and what they despise? I have written the spelling also on the Board. The spelling of despise is also on the BB. Next sentence!

P (Continues to take notes)
They also reveal what a people’s attitude towards life is (repeats sentence).
I will now try to explain. You see I have said proverbs are a collection of experiences of people. Experiences some of which have been learned the hard way. Some experiences we encounter when we have problems or they also reveal what people adore, what we like in the society. Different societies. I mean what Kenyans as a society like is not the same as what Ugandans as a society live.

May be there are certain things that Luos do and are, liked by the Luos while to the Luhyias they are sort of cumbersome, for example if somebody told you that in other societies, women ... that women marry men instead of men marrying women.

Would you agree?

No.

How would you take it? Instead of you taking the lady to your home place it is the lady taking you to her place. How would you like it?

Would you like it?

Noo.

But in other societies that is what they adore

that is what they like though we despise it.

Now, I'll give you another definition of what a proverb is. So you write next to the first definition I gave you one: This one will be two.

Or you can use a hyphen. Like this (-). Indicates on Board.

By the way what is the use of a hyphen in English?

It separates words.

Does it separate or it does the opposite?

Yees.

Yes what? Erick?
P It joins words.

T Yes, it joins two compound words. Who can give us an example on the board.

Ice-man (writes on BB).

T Very good. Ice-man are two words but since they refer to one person or a title of a person you use a hyphen to join the two.

Good! Let's continue.

Two! A proverb is a short Pithy saying. (repeats the sentence) In daily use. (writes on the BB) A short pithy saying in day to day use.

explain what I mean by Pithy.

You see - it is a saying and a saying is a group of words that are used generally or day to day by a group of people.

When I talk of 'pithy' I mean though it is a general word, or a general group of word used daily they must convey a particular meaning, it contains a hidden what?

PS Meaning.

T Yes, meaning. It is a saying that is pithy and contains a hidden meaning. There is a message or there is a moral that is supposed to be passed when we use proverbs.

Now I want to talk about classification of proverbs.

One: We have political proverbs.

Two: Bravery versus coward proverbs.

You write this: Look at the Board everybody. (writes) Bravery - that is two.

There are proverbs that talk about bravery and cowardice.

The third one is friendship versus enmity proverbs. And then number four: Domestic affairs proverbs.
Bravery

Friendship and enmity

Domestic affairs.

do you understand what I mean by Domestic.

PS Yees

T What do I mean?
Yes?

P Things that happen around the home.

T Yes, very good, they are things that happen around the home.
Do you get it everybody?

PS Yees.

T When we talk about domestic we mean things that happen around the?

P Home

T The home! or many things that happen between a husband and wife!

P (Laughter)

T Or may be between a father and a mother maybe a father and a daughter; brother and a sister. We refer to those ones as domestic affairs.

You know there are proverbs that you can tell your father.

There are also proverbs that you can tell your peers or age group or your classmates. There are a group of proverbs that you can tell your grandfather. There is also a group of proverbs that you can even tell the President.

Is that correct?

PS Yees.

T It is not that the kind of proverbs you say to your brother are the same kind of proverbs you say to your age mates.

You must differentiate according to age and relationship.
The last group of proverbs are cautionary proverbs (writes on BB)

Cautionary comes from the word caution. These are proverbs you use when you want to caution somebody against doing wrong. Cautionary proverbs.

you write again: paragraph:

A proverb teaches, cautions or advises us about something and is transmitted from one generation to the other.

'Proverbs are usually used in society to teach young and old alike.

(Repeat sentence).

Another point; proverbs communicate an idea more deeply than ordinary language.

(Writes the sentence on BB)

What I mean is this. If you want to convey a message to a group of people or if you want to convey a particular message to a particular person. There are several ways of communicating a particular message. You can use proverbs. You can use ordinary language. But if you use proverbs you will find that the idea that you wanted to communicate will stick seriously or deeply into the mind of the person you are communicating to. That is why we say proverbs communicate deeply than ordinary language.

Do you understand what I mean by Domestic?

PS Yees.

T What do I mean?

Yes?

If you use ordinary language the idea will be got but if you use proverbs you'll find that you have communicated better.

Another point.

Proverbs will communicate to you a people's condition and philosophy of life.

The last point now before I come to examples of proverbs.
proverbs draw their materials and images from a particular environment in any society.

(writes point on BB)

For example: It follows that proverbs from the Maasai will differ in their use of images from the Luos.

I don't know whether you are trying to get what I mean.

You see the Maasai as a people are very different in their ways and culture from the Luos. The way the Luos live is different from the way the Maasais live and behave. It therefore follows that their proverbs will have different images from those ones of the Luos because of cultural differences.

Now next time we shall cover examples of proverbs. I will give you some examples. Each of you will in turn give one example like that until we have understood what proverbs are and their position in the society.
T (Enters class with a list).

Before we resume our lessons could the following girls see the matron or their respective housemasters (Reads out names)

Well, that done, let us go back to our passage of yesterday. As I was telling you this is not a passage we are reading for the first time. It's a passage that is familiar to use and that we have even attempted to appreciate it. We see a lot of information revealed to use from the way the author uses his words. We succeeded in trying to understand the effect of using one word to stand for the other. What is the general names of such words?

Synonyms.

T Very good Arasa; these words are called synonyms. These can be nouns, adjectives or any other parts of speech. When an author writes this way what did we say he is trying to do? What is he trying to do? Juliet?

He is being ironical or sarcastic.

T Very good, this means he is being ironical in his writing or sarcastic. What else did we discover about the passage? What revelations did we come up with?

P The mood in the extract and the feelings of characters.

T Yes we talked about the mood and the feelings of characters what was the morning mood like?
It is written that it was humid because of the stifled human beauty of the God-given atmosphere.

Good and what did we say the author's action were?

He was cynical.

Very good, the author became cynical towards the readers. What would you say Tramper's feelings were?

He was sad, disgusted agonised.

All these words were used to portray Tramper's feelings about the environment. Now let us have another go at the passage. Maybe we might come up with more information. Let us look at the sentences in the middle of the paragraph! and the first paragraph then we shall draw a conclusion. The first sentence reads... Tramper looked cynically around the room and rose with disgust. What tense is being used in the paragraph? What tense?

Past tense.

Good, it is past tense meaning all the actions we are reading about is all in the past and are merely being reported. He shuffled in the stifling humid air of the morning. This statement further explains the unpleasantness of the situation. Tramper is not at peace with his surrounding at all. We are even told that even his youthfulness could not help him as he walked dejectedly. This is the furthest we went and we concluded that a person's actions and the atmosphere can give us a clue to his state of mind and the mood in which he is.

Now! we were trying to argue the point of how grammatical a statement should be after substitution. We came up with the ideas that when substituting we can reorganize the sentences in such a way that they became grammatical. This is quite fine! We cannot leave statement whereby it doesn't make any sense. When we do this, it will mean we shall have distorted what we want to cure, and therefore we wouldn't be doing any justice to our study of grammar. Any other problems?

Yes Bitaki.

Is the statement also ironical?

Yes, yes, quite! She is wondering whether the statement where we looked at the nature... the nature of the weather outside, the nature of the atmosphere and discovered that it was not in any way expressing the happiness the sentence...the sentence they wanted to convince us of.
From the analysis - an appreciation of that paragraph we found out that -
it was as though everything was opposing Tramper and therefore the
reference to the beauty of the atmosphere, knowing that there was no
beauty there and not forgetting the fact that it was talking about the opposite
and we came up with words that meant the opposite like agony, said,
disapproval and the others and therefore giving us the negative side of it.
Now Bitaki is wondering whether the statement was ironical and I say she
is very much right! Very much right! The irony of using language (writes
on BB and underlines Ironical). The statement is very much ironical and
irony itself is a very strong stylistic device which if used properly by the
author can be quite effective.

Let us go to the next paragraph.
(Reads the second paragraph)

(Pause)

T Look at the description of that boy!
How would you like to be (inaudible)
How would you like?

PS (laughter)

T Can you all picture him in your mind? Can you?

PS Yes.

T Ya, that is what we shall be required to do. Once I embark on a
description of somebody, then you must retain that information in your
mind such that if I ask you now did you see puss-in-boots, Yees, yes,
he passed here as usual with his sneering grin. He hasn't changed his
facial appearance. He is still grinning at nothing and still wearing that
stupid foxy sneer on his face. That means you know the boy. You
know the boy. So, likewise here, the description given is to make you
come closer to the character given in the passage. What impression does
he create in you? By that I mean do you like him?

PS No.

T Somebody, Salome?
You are?

P Omwanga.

T Omwanga!
P  I don't like him!

T  Why condemn him and he doesn't exist? Why don't you like him?

P  Because of his appearance.

T  She says puss-in-boot's appearance puts her off the first time she comes across him.

PS (Laughter)

T  The appearance! and I go along with you. First of all the boy looks cunning and shy. You agree with me?

PS  Yees.

T  Here we can even tell the character of somebody first by description. He hasn't talked. So far we have heard nothing from this character. Let us forget about this conversation and let us try to predict what kind of a boy he is going to be; just by his appearance. We had been told he wore a foxy sneer! a foxy sneer on his face; There is a phrase that goes in English: As cunning...?

PS  As a fox.

T  As a fox! and puss-in-boots is ... we have been told that sneer on his face is perpetual. He wore a foxy sneer on his face. In other words the author in the passage was preparing you for a character you will meet and maybe you will be in a position to understand his behaviour and his action by first of all giving you his appearance and here the author has hinted to us that puss-in-boots is a cunning fellow. And it's as though he doesn't believe in anything, and he is ready to criticize, anything wearing a sneer on the face. Supposing I ask you there will be an Agricultural Show in Kisumu, would you like to accompany me? Then you just sneer at me, another way of telling me 'oh' go to hell who cares about shows; then I wear that kind of sneering expression. That's the kind of appearance we have been given of puss-in-boots. As if he is in a position to defy everything. So this one suggests defiance, the foxy sneer on his face...suggests defiance. Do you know the meaning of defy? (Writes on BB)

defy - defiance

You don't comply, you want to break everything that should not be broken. For example I said that going outside the school compound is not allowed, then you say 'let us wait and see, who does he think he is?' Let him try and stop me! You are defying the orders. So likewise here, puss-in-boots sneering foxy appearance suggests that he is going to be a defiant boy, somebody who is going to oppose virtually everybody.
And then look at his fixed grin! He doesn't smile but he grins. Talk about that instead of grinning he was smiling. Why did the author decide to use grinning instead of smiling?

Caroline?

P Grinning is not very polite.

T Good, she says grinning has very little politeness in it. In fact it has what we might call as mockery. It mocks! It mocks. Also we had been told that he grinned with his teeth (writes the word grin on BB). This is an equivalent way of snarling. You know when you annoy a dog, it snarls, it shows you the fangs. You have provoked me beyond a certain limit then you have got yourself to blame. So likewise here puss-in-boots' appearance, grinning with his teeth once again suggests hostility. He could be a hostile boy. We found out that he is defiant. He is defiant. Once again his behaviour and appearance suggests that this is a boy who nurses hostile ideas in his mind. And to crown it all, look at the manner he had been described again here. (Writes foxy sneer and underlines)

He had hard penetrating eyes. Hard, very hard. (Writes hard on BB). How can eyes be hard? You want to tell me that there are some people who have metallic eyes?

PS Noo!

T However,...?

P He means he had a stone face! (laughter)

T Stone face! Olga has just made an observation that his face seemed as if it had been curved out of granite (laughter). Very hard. To be curved out of granite suggests lack of warmth (writes out of granite on BB).

This suggests such a hard boy!

Hardened boy. And his face does not show that kind of welcoming facial expression, his face is just blank. Blank and putting you off. Wearing a stone face. You come to my place instead of telling you 'Have a seat' there and my face lighting up with smiles nice facial expression! Puss-in-boots will just give you that kind of scarecrow stare and no life is shown on his face, just blank like you are talking about something curved out of stone. Like a wall. The equivalent way of talking to something without life. So it also suggests lifelessness. (Writes on BB, lifelessness)
And once again hostility because that face shows that there is no warmth. I don't mean that if you touch it this way (places palm on desk) you will feel some warmth. By saying that that granite face won by puss-in-boots suggests lack of warmth, I mean lack of feelings. he has no feelings for anybody. Then as if that is not enough, we are told that his eyes were hard and penetrating such that if he looks at you, you feel something, something cold in your spine. If it was hot it turns chilly. You can imagine puss-in-boots looking at you like some kind of x-ray. He can see the number of vertebrae in your spine!

(Laughter)

Penetrating and therefore creating that sense of uneasiness. Once he gives you that kind of penetrating stare you feel uneasy. Therefore when Omwanga said she doesn't like the boy though she never gave any reasons. I agree with her. Personally the boy puts some fear of God in me if I can imagine him, can you?

PS Yes.

T We talked about the boy being cynical. The first time he meets Tramper he tells him, "I thought you had ceased to exist I thought you had ceased to exist!" In other words I thought you were dead! Why are you still alive? It were better if you were dead! Tramper says and I am not going to use their language because it is cumbersome. Tramper says I am just putting one foot in front of the other meaning I am walking aimlessly, I've got nothing to look forward to. I am just existing without knowing why I am existing. So Tramper answers puss-in-Boots, "I am still existing, I am not yet dead but why I don't know, Why I am existing I don't know." That one is suggested by the fact that he is just putting one foot in front of the other. That is a metaphoric use of language because, it doesn't mean lifting one foot like this and you put it in front of the other. It simply means existing without an aim. He didn't have an aim, just putting one foot in front of the other. Some students who are not interested in education might say when asked "How is Nyakach Girls? Then she might say, who cares about Nyakach, I am just putting one foot in front of the other meaning I am just pushing things, pushing time.

Now look at puss-in-Boots here, look at the kind of information coming out of his mouth. It's a message that can be termed absurd. Something that is not constructive, something that is not good at all, something that is not positive, something that is not bred, for example here, after saying I thought you had ceased to exist, he goes ahead and asks him what are you planning to do on the surface of the earth? I hope you will continue walking until you come to the end of the earth and drop in some forms of abyss. Before that one once again here 'once again' he suggests that puss-in
Boots outlooks on life and he sees life as totally meaningless very much meaningless, why? Because he is always thinking about death, he is always thinking about death. And me, I can almost therefore see a boy whose mind is demented do you know what I mean? For example we can be hearing about people attempting suicide, somebody hanging himself and being saved by the wife. The other day the same same person took a bottle of pesticide, was rushed to the district hospital. The other day he tried to drown himself, but the river was not deep enough (P. laughter). So he couldn’t die and that person is always thinking about death. You might even question even his stability. Whether he feels very alright in the mind and likewise here, we are questioning puss-in-Boots’ attitude towards life. He sees life as totally meaningless.

Look at the other one. Somebody says that when one of the boys said I am wondering why I was born, the other one says ask your mother why she gave birth to you. Why she gave birth to you. She is the one that contributed to this misery that has befallen you, and she should have thought twice before bringing you forth. Once again the conversation here, in other words we are trying to look at question four critically, analyse the boys’ conversation, what is revealed through the conversation? That conversation of course, tells you about the negative attitude towards life by boys, especially puss-in Boots. He seems to be very much cynical about life (repeats statement), and therefore it simply shows that they are not happy with the world they live in (repeats statement). Everything in their world, is a world that does not offer anything, world that is hostile, not only is the room hostile but also both the air outside is hostile. And it seems, it seems that their background is not such a pleasant background, and therefore we would expect them to be characters who happen to have background that is characterised by poverty. Once somebody starts saying now I have nothing to live on, everything to me is finished, and I am wondering why my mother gave birth to me, simply shows the extent to which now.. you see.. life is like a bleak life, a life that has nothing in store for you, a life that means nothing, a life that is 'Cecina, are you alright?..! I believe you are.... Tramper crowns it all by saying everything to him had been cursed. There is nothing that he touches and it bears positive facts. Everything to him was cursed. And what he says is that when his mother was giving birth to him somebody switched off the lights, and therefore he was born in darkness and once you are born in darkness you are born in sin, therefore you live with sin and suffering until the last day of your life. So Tramper says. Somebody switched off the lights and therefore he was born in darkness and he is still in darkness. He even seems to suggest that... Now tell me something, those boys, where do you think they come from? From any part of the earth? Where do you think they come from? Europe, Asia, Africa?
PS  Europe.

T  Not exactly, I can see some of you are not satisfied, somebody else?

Yes.

Africa

T  Africa, Yes. What makes you think they couldn't come from anywhere else?

PS  (Laughter)

T  Why are you laughing? She is claiming that these boys must have originated from Africa. Catherine, what evidence is there that these boys could have originated from Africa?

PS  Because from that paragraph we are told that their colour is black, like they come from Africa.

T  She says, through their conversation here Tramper says that his colour is black.. his colour is black, and therefore we can go ahead and say these boys - they have their own origin in Africa. Or if they are not in Africa presently then they must have gotten that origin from there. Their ancestors must have been black people. And therefore Tramper here associates his colour with misery. he associates his colour with misery. When he was just about to be born the light went out; the lights went out. He therefore blames the darkness and seems to suggest that it is this darkness that gave his skin the pigmentation that it has. That maybe if the lights were on full blast he could have been a white skinned person.

Question?

T  Ask.

Don't you think the boy might have come from India since there are people with black skins from India referred to as black Indians?

(Continues to talk, not audible)

T  I see, you have observed things very keenly; I have kept it pending when I agreed with you that their place of origin could be Africa, could be because right now they could be in Arica, fine. But all that has challenged me is that the manner of behaviour of the boys themselves is very much un-African; from the manner of their conversation here, we
tend to think that they could be black people somewhere else. You said that they could be Indians?

PS Yees.

T There are Indians who happen to have very dark skins, quite dark. Now that she has asked for it, I feel I have no option but to give it to her. This extract was got from a novel that happens to talk about the blacks in the Carribeans, so you were very right that it is not necessary that they be people who live in Africa. These are people who live somewhere in an Island in the Carribean. Those Islands there, Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad, another one? from your Geography? None? etc. We also look at the language they use, the language they use here in their conversation. It shows - shows that they are not English people, am I right? You wouldn't expect an English - Englishman to talk in this kind of language.

The distortion of language shows that they are not quite conversant with it. They have no proper command of the language telling us once again the way life is not quite pleasant to them. The way they cannot fit in the society within which they are living likewise they cannot fit in that foreign language. Language suggests that they are foreigners, therefore. They could be using a language, a language which is imported and they therefore are not conversant with it. Just to bring your attention again, just as the environment has proved hostile to them so is the language which has also proved to be a stumbling block. Then you can imagine the kind of situation they are in. The situation is bad and even the language is bad. They therefore have become a people who of course, cannot be proud of anything. There is nothing which they can put their fingers on and pinpoint that I am proud of this. For example both boys loath their dark colour especially Tramper, everything to him is black colour with evil and bad omen, and sin. Who said that sin is black?

God.

T God! It means since we are all black we are sinners?

It is generally believed that where there is God there is light. (laughter)

T Why do people compare sin and black colour?

Tramper says everything is so black, is it a sin to be black?

It is not a sin but I think it is a wrong attitude formed by black people.
Don’t let us take those words so literally but to understand this we need to understand the position of Africa geographically. Then, tell me, Africa has been dissected by the Equator almost into two equal halves. Comparatively which one is darker?

I think Europe is darker since literally there is very little sunlight most of the days.

Yes, literally Europe is darker compared to Africa, let us correctly get this analogy of the dark continent. Darkness here is used metaphorically to indicate suffering, misery and purposelessness of life.

Question. What does darkness symbolise to puss-in Boots? does it show that he is disgusted with his colour?

That’s a good question. We don’t really have much evidence from the extract to allow us to talk much on colour. We are not given any reason on the passage to allow us to comment that any other colour of skin is superior. But, but from the boys’ reaction we see that they are not very pleased with being black. Of course, they can do very little to change their colour but they generally feel that it is because of their dark skin that they are suffering. It is responsible for their condition.

We are only trying to put our general knowledge into use here about the history of the blacks. Otherwise we cannot go further than this unless you can point other evidence from the passage. And... it is always good to stick to the passage. Occasionally, we can be carried away by our general knowledge which can lead to misinterpreting the passage. Good, so far so good.

Any other questions?

Question?

A good question, but not straightforward. As I’ve suggested there is no evidence to show us that one boy is white. In fact it would be safe, very safe to suggest that both boys are black. The fact that Tramper says that the lights went off when he was being born and therefore he was born in darkness does not mean that puss-in Boots is white because maybe he was born with the lights on.

Any other questions?

Well, if there are no more questions, let us stop there for today. (Leaves class).
APPENDIX O
IDENTIFICATION OF LANGUAGE ASPECTS OCCURRING IN A LITERATURE ORIENTED LESSON

School: Alpha
Category: Private
Teacher: 2 (Mr. Ngari)
Class: IIIN
No. of Pupils: 38
Topic: Poetry

Ref. Poems from East Africa: Cook and Rubadiri

(Enters the classroom with chalk and copy of poems from East Africa. Proceed to write a poem on the BB)

 Writes: English.

A taxi driver on his death. Timothy Wangusa

When with prophetic eye I peer into the future
I see that I shall perish, upon this road.
Driving men that I do not know,
This metallic monster that now I dictate.
This docile elaborate horse,
That in silence seems to simmer and strain shall surely revolt some tempting day. Thus, I shall die not that I care, for any man's journey.
Nor for the proprietor's gains
Nor yet for love of my own
Not for these do I attempt the forbidden limits for these defy the traffic - man and the cold cell.
Risking everything for the little, little more they shall say, I know who will pick up my bones.
Poor chap, another victim to the ruthless machine.
Concealing my blood under the metal.

T Now this is the poem I want us to discuss. I believe you have all copied it as I was writing on the board - ya?

PS Yees.

T That kind of behaviour could be a behaviour that may be traced all the way back from the kind of job that they do. Their job habit, they are not happy with the job. Just as our taxi driver who is not happy with the kind of job he is doing our normal matatu drivers and conductors are not happy with their jobs and they try to make themselves feel alright by harassing you. Note that they are not unhappy with you but they are unhappy with their jobs. So, once they come they come full of big made
words. It would be very much a good thing if you try to understand them and therefore avoid more cumulative situations, the way you have seen this poem, the taxi driver on his death. The behaviour of the taxi driver is a behaviour that has been created by the kind of job he does.

So we notice here that even poetry and other written things deal with our everyday life. There is no time that somebody will ever write anything that you have never heard of or that you don’t know or you have never imagined of because the material that the poet came up with to build the poem here is from the observation of society. It is through the observation of society and therefore he was compelled to write something concerning the society.

Notice also the way the poet uses language to portray the feelings of the taxi driver towards his job. What tense does the taxi driver use, especially in the first episodes of the poem? What tense? Yees?

P  He uses future tense.

T  Very good. He makes reference to the future which he foresees using his prophetic eyes. Why does he use the term prophetic? ... prophetic comes from the word to prophesy. First what does it mean? What is the meaning of the word prophesy?

P  To foretell what will happen.

T  Ya; ya; when we prophesy like the Old Testament prophets they foretold the birth of Jesus Christ long before he was born, isn’t it?

P  Yees.

T  So to prophesy means to foretell what will happen in future. Good! The poet uses futuristic words like ‘shall’ when he refers to his future death on the road. What other evidence can you gather from the poem to show that the poet is talking in future tense?

P  he says 'this docile elaborate horse, that in silence seems to simmer and strain shall surely revolt some tempting day'. He is here foretelling the day the metallic monster will revolt and cause his death.

T  Good attempt. Very good explanation. The poet foretells the day the car will revolt and refuse to obey the driver’s orders. That will be the day of his death. What other tense do you see used in the passage?
What other tense?

(Silence)

Does the poet use only future tense?

PS  Noo.

T  Then tell me what other tense he uses?

P  Present tense.

T  Present tense? Read out the sentences where it is used.

P  The driver says "This metallic monster that I now dictate" referring to what he is doing at present.

T  Yes, at present or presently the poet is dictating to the machine but he later prophesies that one day the vehicle will rebel and kill him. The vehicle is even referred to as "Ruthless machine" showing the characteristic of the machine. The machine is "ruthless" and can be quite destructive, a ruthless metallic animal.

Now for today I want you to write your account; any experience you had in a taxi. Try to describe the behaviour of the driver and compare it with what Wangusa says in the poem. You can write out your encounter in the form of a composition. In your next class we shall continue to appreciate the poem further. Have a good day.

T  (Leaves the classroom)
APPENDIX P

IDENTIFICATION OF LITERATURE ASPECTS IN A LANGUAGE ORIENTED LESSON

T So the fruits they are given are half rotten.
(Writes on the BB)
Fruits are rotten.

Ps Noo.

T So those are the five major complaints the boys had about their school. The Chairman noted these complaints down. Now to have a general view of this passage; what would you say was the theme of this meeting? What was the message?

P They wanted to raise complaints about the school.

T Yes, one main aim of holding the meeting was to air their complaints about the poor diet they were getting from the school.

The plot of the story is very simple; how many stages do we have? How many?

P Two.

T Can you identify them?

P The first stage is where they are meeting and discussing the complaints with the Chairman. The second one is where they go to the teacher to help them.

T Very good. The plot takes place only in the two scenes. Now supposing we wanted to dramatise this episode how many characters would we need?

P Several.

T What do you mean by several?

P We would need a whole class even though others will not talk.

T Yes, very good. We would need the whole class to form the cast. Now let us try to list some of the behaviours of the main characters in the passage. First of all who are they?
What are the main characters?

P Musa.

T Yes, Musa is one of them (writes 'Musa' on BB). Next?

P Johny Matata.

T Yes, Matata and who else?

P Chairman.

T And Chairman. Let us begin with Johny Matata. What would we say are some of his character traits? I hope you understand what I mean by character traits, don't you?

Ps Yees.

T Ok Matata; who is giving us the first one?

P He is noisy.

T Yes, Matata is a very noisy character. What else?

P He is a dictator.

T A dictator? Does Matata dictate and to who?

P He refuses the others a chance to talk - he wants to talk all the time.

T Then we say he is domineering. He has dominated the meeting, you understand?

Ps Yees.

T Ok, how about the Chairman? The Chairman?

P He is helpful.

T How? How is he helpful?

P He helped the class to sort out the problems by calling a meeting.
Then we talk of 'he is responsible'. Actually the prefect is quite responsible, he even takes notes for the class during the meeting.

How about Musa? What can you say about Musa?

P  He is courageous.

T  Yes, he is the one who presented their problem to the teacher.

Now, if the students were requested to write about their complaints in the form of a letter to the Headmaster, what style or form of a letter would they use? (Silence).

Don't tell me you have forgotten that we dealt with letter-writing only last week. What style? Yes Abura.