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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of the integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English at the KCSE in Masinga division, Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives: to establish how the teaching techniques employed in teaching the integrated English affects the students’ performance, to determine how the content of the integrated English syllabus influence the performance of English at KCSE level and to establish the extent to which internal assessment of English influences performance of English.

The study adopted the descriptive survey method of research. The target population was public secondary schools in Masinga division. The target population of this study was 23 schools, 41 teachers of English and 690 students. Questionnaires were used as the research instruments. There were questionnaires for the teachers of English and students. The data collected was analyzed using the descriptive statistics.

The main findings of this research are that both the students and teachers had a positive attitude towards the integrated English curriculum. The teachers of English felt that the design of the English curriculum had an effect on the performance though with varied reasons. Although the teachers employed the right teaching techniques and had the necessary professional documents and adequate teaching learning resources, the students still performed poorly. The study revealed that students can only do simple reading and listening with little ability to use these skills to correctly infer and interpret meaning of process information from a variety of sources. Speaking accurately, confidently, fluently and appropriately in a variety of contexts seems to be the most difficult of all. The regression analysis found that teaching techniques employed in teaching, content of Integrated English syllabus and the internal assessment and evaluation influence performance of English at KCSE level.

It is recommended that students should be encouraged to establish a reading culture. All public secondary schools should maintain a reading culture where the students can communicate fluently in English. Schools should set aside enough time and resources to effectively and efficiently in-service areas of grammar in literature and literature in grammar.
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1.1 Background to the study

English is one of the languages adopted by the United Nations as means of communication worldwide (Oxford, 2001). Education systems over the world recognize the important role that language plays in the act of teaching and learning. Lopez (2000) looks at these acts as being dialogic and communicative in nature. Everywhere in the world, education systems lay special emphasis on communication and language regarding them among the most important components of the school (Lopez, 2002).

English Language plays a vital role in the language situation in Kenya. In addition, English is the official language of communication in Kenya as well as the medium of instruction in Kenya primary four through secondary education, colleges and universities (Okwara, Shiundu & Indoshi, 2009). This means that English is a subject across the entire school curriculum. Moreover, English as an international language is one of the leading media for communication in international conferences and meetings. Consequently, those who master the language are likely to reap many academic, social and professional benefits (Othuon & Tella, 2011).

Prior to 1985, at secondary school level, English and literature were taught as two separate subjects. The integrated approach to teaching English was introduced in secondary schools in 1985. According to the new integrated English curriculum, English language is used to teach literature in English while literature can also be teach language. The integration manifests itself both in teaching and examination (Ong’ong’a, Okwara & Nyangara, 2010).
There are various levels of integration. First, is the curriculum level which involves use of knowledge, ideas and concepts primary from literature which is closely related to language, and from other school subjects to teach English. Second, is the skills level which focuses on the condition of reading, writing, listening and speaking skills during English language and teaching. Third, is the resources level which is a combination of different languages teaching methods. Finally is the effort level which is the support from teachers of subjects other than English in maintaining correct language usage by students (Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), 2002).

The integrated approach to teaching and learning has been lauded in educational literature as an approach which avoids fragmentation of knowledge and leads to holistic understanding of concepts. It is also considered to be a superior organization for cognitive learning since the human brain rejects learning that is fragmented. The integrated approach is also said to lead to better learning of students. Lake (1994) states that integrated curriculum is a movement by schools away from teaching isolated facts towards a more constructivists view of learning which values in-depth knowledge of subjects. The movement towards integrated curriculum is a move away from memorization and recitation of isolated facts and figure to more meaningful concepts and connection between concepts (Oxford, 2001).

Integration means that candidates have to master four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. They should use these skills at the same time. Listening and speaking well effectively helps the learner to receive and respond to information. Once a learner is able to receive and respond to information accurately, then she can develop the skills of receiving the information through writing. Learners are expected to master the skills used in daily life like report writing, etiquette, writing
minutes and letters. The syllabus requires learners to relate what they learn in English and literature to what happens in life.

There have been views for and against the integrated approach in teaching language and literature. Many publications in the 1960’s attest to the complete separation of language and literature teaching. Topping (1968) rejects the use of literature in the second language classroom on the grounds that it does not improve language proficiency, does not improve students’ cultural exposure and is not wanted by the students anyway. Arthur (1999) mentions the reluctance of language teachers to include literature in the syllabus, while Allen (1976) notes the deep division between linguistics and literature. Whether or not literature has a place in language has remained a contentious issue.

The acknowledgment by both language and literature teachers that their disciplines can complement rather than oppose each other naturally leads to the idea of integration and the education benefits to be gained from it. The possibilities for the integration of language and literature studies are captured succinctly by Carter (1985) and Tomlinson (1985) in two articles in the English as foreign language (EFL) Gazette under the shared heading of language through literature and literature through languages. The phrase suggests to contrasting pedagogical foci (language and literature) as the vehicle through which they might be presented to learner (language and literature). Integration of language and literature in the teaching of English seems to be generally accepted. For instance, textbooks written with candidates for the United Kingdom based advanced level (A-level) examination in mind adopt an approach in which integration is explicitly stated as the underlying methodology (Keith & Shutter Worth, 2000). Similarly, in South Africa a widely used series of secondary school text books (English in context) intended for pupils studying English
as a main language, integrates the teaching of language and literature (Hendry, Dyne & Burger, 1994).

The integration of English language and the literature in English has come under intense criticism from researchers, teachers, laymen and the media. The syllabus has been said to be too wide to cover within the little time allocated to English on the timetable. According to Onjoro (1990), it is difficult to squeeze so much into so little time given the attendant host of debilitating circumstances such as poor training of the teachers. This has led to poor coverage of the syllabus, which has been said to contribute to poor performance at Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE).

After interviewing teachers of English, students and other stakeholders in connection with, the integrated English syllabus, the 1999 Commission of Inquiry into the Education System in Kenya, which was chaired by Koech formed the opinion and made a recommendation that the integration of language and literature should cease. They suggested that English language and literature in English be taught and examined as separate subjects (Republic of Kenya 1999). This has not been implemented.

Language, through literature, has included use of literary texts as resources for grammar teaching and raising language awareness. Literature, through language, has included the pre-literary activities such as cloze tests, multiple choice questions; jigsaw reading and practical stylistics. The consensus is that the integration of language has positive effects on the teaching and learning of both components (Cartel and Long 1991; Stern 1991 and Mc Rae 1991).

The teaching of English in Kenyan Secondary schools has gone through changes in the last few years in an attempt to improve the quality of its teaching. The 8-4-4
system of education brought radical changes in the educational structure and also in the curriculum and teaching approach. It brought about the integrated course of English and literature, which was introduced into the Kenyan secondary schools in 1986 (KIE, 2002). The rationale behind the integration was based on the premise that good mastery of the language enhances effective appreciation of literary matters. With time, it was realized that the syllabus was overloaded with few periods allocated to the English subject hence the innovation where time allocation was reviewed. Form one and two lessons were increased to six from five while in form three and four lessons were increased to eight from seven lessons a week since 2002.

However, despite this innovation, performance continued to be poor. Ng’ong’a (2002) observed that Kenyan school leavers continued to perform poorly in English due to poor strategies when using the integrated English curriculum. The latest innovation was the 2002 review that saw the reorganization of topics, complete integration of English and literature and introduction of the compulsory set books (KIE, 2002). These were to remove bottlenecks to better performance like workload and areas considered too difficult for students at secondary level, for example, fieldwork in oral literature (KIE, 2002). Despite these innovations, improvement in the performance of English is still minimal. Since 1985, substantial blame at secondary school level is put on the integrated approach to the teaching of English designed and implemented in schools [KIE 2002]. The nature of English curriculum has been blamed for the low standards although no structured survey has been undertaken to establish the link between the nature of English curriculum and the students’ performance (Tella, Indoshi &Othuon, 2010).
The national mean score for English is determined every year. For comparison purposes, a few years are taken at a time. Table 1.1 and table 1.2 show the national result as from 2000-2009

Table 1.1 KCSE National English mean score from 2000-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1.2

**KCSE National English mean score from 2006-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.76%</td>
<td>39.70%</td>
<td>33.78%</td>
<td>33.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KNEC reports 2006-2010.

Table 1.1 and 1.2 above show how the English subject has been poorly performed at the national level. Between 2000 -2003 the overall means score was a dismal D. The desired learner achievement level stands at grade B while the minimum learner achievement ideally would be a grade C (Ng’ong’a, 2002). A national mean of grade D is an indication of extreme low level of performance. The year 2002 was the year in which the latest innovation of integrated English curriculum was implemented; while from 2006-2009, the overall mean percentage stood below the accepted average mark that would be 50%.

The poor performance in English can be attributed to a number of factors such as inflation of languages other than English like sheng and uncontrolled use of “mother
tongue” in some of the schools, poor language skills among teachers of English and an overloaded workload for the teachers of language. It is important to note that substantial blame has been heaped on the nature of integrated English curriculum (Tella & Othuon, 2011). The poor performance in English at the national level has led to debates among curriculum developers arguing for the possibility of reversing the Integrated English curriculum to a situation where literature and language are taught as distinct subjects.

The performance of English at KCSE level in Masinga District has stood between a mean of 4.0 to 4.5 according to the district education office as indicated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.212</td>
<td>4.8645</td>
<td>4.5109</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Masinga DEO’s Office

The table 1.3 shows that the mean score dropped for three consecutive years. Even the rise in the fourth year is not significant. This means that the performance has been low since integration took place. There have not been any corrective measures taken to remedy this situation apart from the workshops in English attended by the teachers of English mostly on how to evaluate and mark, like is done in other subjects. No research has been carried out before in Masinga district on the influence of the new integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English at KCSE level. Causes of poor performance in English have not been established.
1.2 Statement of the problem

Excellent performance in English is necessary because it is the medium of instruction, a compulsory and examinable subject in the Kenya secondary schools’ curriculum, and Kenya’s official language. Despite the value attached to the language, the poor performance of students in the English subject in public examinations in Kenya between 2002-2009 has been a major setback.

The design of the integrated English language curriculum has been blamed for failing standards of student’s competence in the subject. The nature of the English curriculum has been blamed for the low standards although no structured survey has been undertaken to establish the link between the nature of English curriculum and the students’ performance (Tella, Indoshi & Othuon, 2010)

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of the new integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English subject at the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Masinga Division.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

(i) To establish how the teaching and learning strategies used by teachers in teaching English affects the performance of English.

(ii) To determine how content of the integrated English syllabus influence performance of English at KCSE level in Masinga Division.

(iii) To establish the extent to which internal assessment of English influences performance of English at KCSE level in Masinga Division.
1.5 Research questions

The study was guided by the following questions

(i) How does the teaching and learning strategies used by teachers influence students’ performance in English?

(ii) How does the content of the English syllabus influence students’ performance in English?

(iii) How does the internal assessment of English influence the performance of English at KCSE level in Masinga Division?

1.6 Significance of the study

The education policies have been changing from time to time due to findings that emanate from research. The findings would help curriculum developers identify the factors in the new integrated English curriculum that contribute to poor performance in English performance and hence find solutions to the poor performance. In addition, the study would be valuable by highlighting the important factors that the integrated approach can play in improving performance thus strengthen the methodologies that contribute to good performance. The findings of the study would enable stakeholders to critique the integrated English curriculum.

1.7 Limitation of the study

The research was not able to control the attitudes of the respondents as they respond to the questions. This is because the respondents may at times give socially acceptable responses which may affect the validity of the findings. To resolve this, respondents were assured that their responses in the research instruments would be used purely only for the purposes of the study and nothing else. To ensure no loss of
questionnaires, a time limit was given to the respondents and they were also told the importance of answering all the questionnaire items explained.

1.8 Delimitations of the study
The study confined itself to the public secondary schools in Masinga division since they are assumed to have the same characteristics. The study did not involve all the public secondary schools but only concentrated on a few because these schools are relatively new with no previous results to compare with.

There are other factors that influence English performance for example the place of indigenous languages in communication the influence of street language like ‘sheng’, the role of other subject teachers in the use of the English language among others. However, in this study the researcher majored on the influence of the new integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English because there are factors within the new integrated curriculum that would be a hindrance to comprehension of the content for the student and the teacher.

1.9 Assumptions of the study
In the proposed study the following assumptions were made

(i) That all students selected for the study have gone through the same level of teaching and covered the same syllabus

(ii) That all schools targeted in the study have copies and guidelines of the integrated English grammar and literature.

(iii) That all the targeted teachers of English have undergone training in teaching methodologies of English grammar and literature.

(iv) That all the targeted teachers of English have knowledge of the objectives of the integrated English curriculum.
1.10 Definition of significant terms
For the purpose of this study the following definitions of terms were adopted.

**Assessment and evaluation** refer to activities used by the teacher to test the comprehension of the subject by the learner.

**Attitudes** refer to having interests and emotions towards the English subject.

**Curriculum** refers to all experiences meant to help the learner acquire desirable knowledge skills and attitudes.

**Curriculum implementation** refers to a stage when curriculum, materials are made available to the beneficiaries (Learners and teachers). The act of putting into practice set of procedures, policies or projects to meet certain objectives.

**English language** is used to teach literature in English and literature also teaches language in English.

**Integrated curriculum** refers to a merger between English language and literature where language is used to teach literature and literature teaches language.

**Perception refers** to the process of apprehending by means of the senses or the mind.

**Performance refers** to the accomplishment of a given task measured against present known standards of accuracy.

**Teaching and learning strategies** – procedures used by the teacher to transfer subject matter to the learner.

1.11 Organization of the study
The study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one focused on the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, and significance of the study, limitations and delimitations, basic assumptions, definition of the significant terms and organization of the study.
Chapter two looked into literature that is related to the study. It was divided into eight areas; the concept of integration and integrated English, pro-integration and anti-integration views, secondary school curriculum, English, English secondary school curriculum, integrated approach in teaching and learning, integrated English course content and methodologies, theoretical framework and conceptual framework.

Chapter three covered research methodologies which include, research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments; instrument validity and reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. Chapter four dealt with data analysis and discussion of research findings while chapter five focused on summary of findings, conclusions, policy recommendations and suggestion for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to review relevant Literature on the influence of the new Integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English at the National level. The review focuses on seven areas: The concept of integration and Integrated English, pro–Integration and anti integration views, secondary school curriculum, English secondary schools curriculum, integrated approach in teaching and learning, integrated English content and teaching methodologies and assessment and evaluation. The final part will focus on theoretical framework of the study and conceptual framework of the study.

2.2 The concept of integration and integrated English
The integrated curriculum organization is rooted in the progressive education movement of 1930s. It is lauded as a move away from the memorization and recitation of isolated facts to a more constructivist’s view of learning which values in-depth knowledge of subjects. This is seen as a curriculum organization geared towards teaching for transfer and thoughtful learning (Perkins, 1991). The introduction of the integrated English curriculum was done alongside the 8-4-4 system of education introduction in 1985. The Kenya Institute of Education (KIE, 2002) defines integration as merging two autonomous but related entities; so as to enrich each other. KIE further explains that through exposure to literature, learners improve their language skills. Furthermore, an improved knowledge of the language enhances the learners’ appreciation of literally material (KIE, 2002).

Integration means that candidates have to master the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Listening and speaking effectively helps the learner to
receive and respond to information. As a result the learner can develop the skills of receiving the information by reading and responding to information through writing. Learners are expected to master the skills used daily in life like minute writing, memos, etiquette, negotiation skills among others. The syllabus requires learners to relate what they learn in English and literature and what happens in life (KIE, 2002).

2.3 Pro-integration and Anti-Integration views
Curricula designers realize that learning is more affective when content from one field is related meaningfully to content from other fields Bishop, (1985) Shiundu &Omulando (1992) agree with this assertion by observing that integration emphasis horizontal relationships among various contents, topic and theme. the same views shared by Sifuna (1990) who asserts that in contrast to the fragmentary nature of the traditional subject divided curriculum, integration is a re-grouping of ideas and knowledge between subjects and disciplines so as to provide a new and intellectually reputable curriculum.

Arden (1988) in a Ministry of Education presentation maintained that integration of English language and literature in English was not a new concept. He asserts that the teaching of English is concerned with enabling the students to read, utilise and speak with fluency in ways appropriate in a variety of contents. He wonders whether it is possible to teach poetry or prose and ignore vocabulary. His emphasis is that the two components of English actually complement each other.

Giroux (1988) maintains that the approach to English teaching is something practical when the integrated approach is used. He asserts that literature provides learners with a convenient source of context for a course in language learning. Most teachers, it is observed use literature to assist in the development of competence in language and
vice versa. Indangasi (1991) says that literature and languages are of natural benefits in the classrooms situation because they reinforce each other. This implies that the two actually complement each other despite their subject boundaries, which according to him are the motivating factor for their integration.

However, there scholars who argue that the two components have their distinct characteristics hence the need to preserve each components identity. Their contention is the belief that the two lose their unique qualities when taught as an integrated manner. Wanjala (Literacy Giants, KCB programme August 2007) argues very strongly against integration. He points out that it took concerted efforts of university scholars like Taban Lo Liyong, Ngugi wa Thiong’o among others to bring literature to the core of university education. He wonders why after such a long struggle, the Ministry of Education MOE has embarked on deliberate attempts to kill literature. He points out that the state of affair in secondary schools curriculum will render the department of literature in teachers training colleges and university redundant. This trend would not only impact negatively on the employment opportunities but also undermine the reading culture which literature tries to in calculate

Kabaji (2003) argues that, the former education system in Kenya where literature was separated from English language had the advantage of exposing students to a wider variety of literacy to student at university. But the 8-4-4 system exposes student to only one play, one novel, and anthology of short stories, oral literature and snippets of poetry. In this opinion, therefore the new approach disadvantages literature in terms of scope and time. For him it was apparently tragic for literature and English language to have been integrated to secondary school level in the 8-4-4 system.

Parting ton (2003) writing on the same subject does concur with Kabaji and goes onto
label the IEC as the false forcing together of language and literature under the umbrella of English (the East African standard newspaper) this he says squeezed he provision of KCSE literature into a short space timetable.

2.4 Secondary school curriculum
The secondary school curriculum of the 8-4-4 system of education was introduced 1985 and since then the curriculum has undergone several reviews in 1992 it was further revised and the content reduced from thirty five to twenty one subjects and examinable subjects from Eight to Seven(KIE, 2002). It main objectives are to prepare the learner for self-reliance, training and further education syllabus was developed and last curriculum was implemented on a national skills in a face in/out strategy which was adopted from January 2003(KIE 2004).

2.5 English curriculum in secondary schools
English as a medium of instruction in Kenya is a very important subject but in curriculum and also as a service subject. The aim of the secondary school English curriculum is to increase total competence in listening speaking reading and writing in language KIE, (2004)

The first two classes are the most critical of the whole four-year course because learners are either made or broken by the experience. During form three -form four course the skills acquired in the first two years of secondary cycle are refined as the learner develops confidence in handling different types of materials in English.

The English language has four components; composition comprehension summary writing and grammar. The literature in English has five components; drama, novel, oral literature, poetry and short story KNEC (1999) the nine components are examined at Kenya certificate of secondary education (KCSE) level out of total marks
According to the integrated approach the following are pursued as the objectives of English language teaching for secondary schools in Kenya. At the end of the secondary school English course, the learner should be able to: Listen attentively for comprehension and respond appropriately; Use listening skills to infer and interpret meaning correctly from spoken discourse; listen and process information from a variety of Sources; Speak accurately, fluently, confidently and appropriately in a variety of contexts; use non-verbal cues effectively in speaking; read fluently and efficiently; Appreciate the importance of reading for a variety of purposes; develop a lifelong interest in reading a wide range of subject; read and comprehend literacy and non literacy materials; read and analyze literacy and non literary works from Kenya, East Africa, Africa and the rest of the world, and relate to the experience in these works; Make an efficient use of a range of sources of information including libraries, dictionaries, encyclopaedias and the internet; Use correct spelling, punctuation and paragraphs; use a variety of sentence structures and vocabulary; communicate appropriately in functional and creative writing; Write neatly, legibly and effectively; use correct grammatical and idiomatic forms of English; think creatively, critically; appreciate the special way literary writers use language; appreciate the universal human values contained in literacy works. KIE, (2002)

2.6 Integrated approach in teaching and learning
The teaching learning approach in integrated approach should be multidimensional. The choice and the use of leaning strategies will be determined by the nature and type of learners, the availability of teaching learning recourses and the experiences situations and experiences interesting (Bishop 1985).
Integrated English envisages a situation where the teacher is the facilitator and the learner are the contributors in learning. Integrated approach calls for modern day teaching strategies such as the discovery method, where learners discover for themselves the concepts or knowledge necessary to learn. Other strategies include problem solving, discussion, dramatization; storytelling and role play among others

Although there is no one specific methodology for the integration of language and literature, in nearly all literature the approach is linked in vitality to teaching methodologies that is student based, activity based and process oriented. Bassinet & Grundy (1993) refer to the desirability of seeing the learners as resources and working from the learners and working from the learners’ store of experience and intuitive poetic awareness. The same principals have been anticipated by many writers in a variety of forms Drew (2001) and Katonah (2001) both emphasize the idea of the a hands on approach to studying literature Harel et al (2005) urge the use of student cantered learning and group work. Barkhuizen (1994) who provides evidence from classroom research that it is the approach that is, in fact, preferred by learners’ echoes this preference.

2.7 Integrated English curriculum content and methodologies

Okwaro (2009) states that English is a service subject across the entire school curriculum. Despite the importance English has, it has been performed poorly at examinations and in both spoken and written forms. In a study by Magoma (1999) teachers of English felt that the content of English was too much and they felt burdened by the work they had to cover. Therefore, they advocated for the separation of English and literature. The implication here being that the content to be covered dictates the methodologies to be used in teaching process.
The ministry of Education (1992) advocates for the use of techniques that are learner centred and they include: group work, dramatization, simulations and games, discussions and field work. These are techniques that according to teachers of English are time consuming. Teachers also complain to have too much work to mark student’s work. In addition, a number of teachers were trained to teach English with another subject, for example, Geography, CRE or Kiswahili among others as revealed in a study by Okwaro (2009). Hence teachers are overworked as they teach the second subject, leaving inadequate time to teach integrated English curriculum. The Ministry of Education curricular (2002) directs that teachers of English should have at least 28 lessons per week.

2.7.1 Teaching methods for teaching IEC

Before teachers decide on the teaching methods, the content of the lesson must be well understood. Teaching methods and learning activities that teachers plan to use should be those which will bring about the students’ behaviours stated in the objectives of daily lesson plans. Moreover, a variety of teaching methods which create interest and stimulate student participation would be most appropriate. This is because just as students have different personalities and temperaments they also have different learning styles.

The Integrated English curriculum adopts an integrated approach to teaching of language. Integration means that no language skill should be taught in isolation. Listening, speaking, reading and writing skills should complement each other.

Listening and speaking skills play a primary role in social and acidic life of a person. One who listens and speaks effectively is able to receive and respond to information appropriately. These two skills also contribute significantly to the development of
reading and writing skills, it is recommended that they be evaluated. Evaluation can be done through dictation, listening, and comprehension, role-play, making speeches, reciting poems or even interpretive reading of extracts from books (KIE 2002).

Speaking is an integral part of listening since speaking involves responding to what has been heard. This interaction presents the learners with a lot of difficulties. The teachers of English should aim at helping learners attain fluency and accuracy in speech. When learners fail to listen and speak fluently and accurately the fail to communicate, leading to a breakdown in communication. Consequently poor performance in exams is witnessed as learners cannot express themselves (Gathumbi and Masembe, 2005).

The chief objective of teaching grammar is to help students understand how language works and to use it correctly and appropriately in different contexts. Grammar can be defined as the way words are combined to form larger and meaningful units. It is proposed that in order to help the learner acquire a thorough mastery of the language as a whole, grammatical structure should be presented in context. A grammar item should be presented to the class in which it appears. The aim of the presentation is to get the learner perceive the structure – its form and meaning – in both speech and writing. Teachers therefore need to be very creative and innovate as they think of the best ways of utilizing both literary and non-literally material to help the learner acquire grammatical competence. The teacher must determine the best ways of using language films and games, video tapes, role-play, writing compositions and drama to enhance the acquisition of grammatical proficiency.

The ability to read fluently is both vital for school and for life. Good reading skills will improve performance in all school subjects. Reading helps in information
gathering and learning of concepts. Through reading, the learner is exposed to new vocabulary, new sentence structures, and different registers. Reading also acquaints the learner with good models of language use. The teacher should devise strategies that will make reading interesting and fulfilling. It is recommended that reading skills be developed through the study of literature. The learner should also be encouraged and facilitated to read extensively. The use of reading to enhance the development of other language skills such as listening, speaking and writing is imperative. What the reader reads could form the basis of their oral presentations or essay writing (KIE2002).

Reading in a formal school system is the core of the syllabus where there is little reading; there will be no development of the reading skills. Performance depends on the quality and quantity of reading (Gathumbi and Masembe, 2005). Poor reading culture in many schools has contributed to poor performance of English.

Writing is an advanced language skill that has wide ranging implications for the way we think and learn. Writing also encourages us to be organized, logic and creative in thinking. Learners should be helped to acquire skills that will enable them to express their ideas clearly and effectively in writing. In order to be successful in any academic discipline, the ability to write well is essential. In influences our chances of success, personal development and our relations with other people.

Reading and writing are very closely related. Learners should be encouraged to read critically, observing how language is used. Class readers and literature set books should be used as sources of writing tasks. Other resources such as pictures can be used to generate ideas for writing. Diagnostic and remedial exercises could be used and each individual learner’s needs identified and addressed (KIE 2002). In addition,
learners should be encouraged to read critically, observing how language is used. Writing tasks should be based on the learner’s interests and experiences. Group discussions and other pre-writing activities may be used to demystify writing (KIE 2002).

Testing and evaluating methods employed in schools play an important role in students’ performance. According to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), a test is a psychological and educational procedure designed to elicit certain behaviour from which one can make inferences about certain characteristics of an individual. Tests are used as diagnostic tools to establish learners’ strengths and weaknesses in order to make instructional decisions. Testing plays a major role in the students’ examinations performance. It can be used to identify strengths and weaknesses.

2.8 Summary of Literature Review
This section has explored literature related to the study under seven subtopics; the concept of integration and integrated English has been defined as merging English language and literature as a complementary measure. Pro- integration scholars fully supported the merger of the two subjects while anti integration scholars vehemently opposed the integration. Teachers’ perceptions, preparation and qualification and integration at the classroom teaching/learning has been discussed. A number of studies have being done on integrated English curriculum, but have not addressed the influence of IEC on English performance. These are such as Okwaro M (2009) towards a model of Integrated English curriculum for secondary schools in Kenya and Othuon & Tella (2011) in ‘Student perspectives on the integrated English curriculum’. This is the gap the study intends to fill.

2.9 Theoretical framework of the study
The study was based on the Rand Change Agents curriculum implementation model
(1973-1978). This model emphasizes organizational variables that either encourage or discourage change at all stages. The Rand Agents Curriculum implementation model suggests that there are 3 stages in the change process.

1. The initial stage – change should be legitimate in the light of organizational goals and the people involved informed. The curriculum leader needs to inform teachers about the change and how it might take place.

2. The implementation process where success of implementation is determined by the abilities of the teaching and administrative staff.

3. The incorporation stage where the changes implemented became part of the established programme. In-service and follow up activities are essential during the incorporation stage.

The study adopted this theory because the issues raised about the teacher such as abilities, preparation and use of evaluation procedures are key to successful implementation of an innovation such as IEC. Successful implementation would be marked by attainment of objectives which are reflected in improved performance.

2.10 Conceptual Framework
Orodho (2005) defines conceptual framework as a model of representation where a researcher conceptualizes or represents relationships diagrammatically. Figure 1.1 is a model showing the variables under study and outlining their relationship. The variables are integrated English course content and teaching methodologies, assessment and evaluation procedures and teaching styles.
Figure 1.1

Integrated English course content and teaching methodologies

Teaching and learning strategies

Teaching styles
- learner centred

Evaluation and assessment

Implementation of the Integrated English curriculum
- Reading skills
- Listening and speaking
- Writing
- Grammar and language use

Performance indicators
- Learners write legibly
- Learners communicate effectively and accurately
- Learners read fluently and efficiently
- Learners think critically and creatively
- learners use correct spelling punctuation and paragraphing
- Learners appreciate universal human values contained in literally work

Excellent performance in English at KCSE Level

The variables are integrated English course content and teaching methodologies, assessment and evaluation procedures and teaching styles.

Good teaching and learning strategies, good teaching styles and proper and adequate evaluation and assessment procedures as stipulated in the IEC would result to effective implementation of the IEC which will in turn determine the attainability of the subject objectives, leading to excellent performance in English at KCSE level.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on research methodology describing procedures and techniques that will be used in carrying out the study. It deals with the following aspects: research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instruments validity, instrument reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design

The study employed the descriptive survey method of research. This method allowed for the investigation of the educational problem by obtaining facts and opinions about the current condition of the variables. Kelinger (2000) defines descriptive survey design as the study of large populations to discover the relative incidents, distribution and interrelation of sociological and physiological variables. Kombo and Tramp (2006) stated that the main aim of descriptive research is the description of state of affairs as they exist. The researcher studies events as they occur naturally without manipulation of subjects. In addition, it involves elements of comparison and relationships between variables. The design is suitable to the study because the target population of school teachers and students has already been exposed to the integrated English curriculum and the students’ performance has been determined. Therefore, the researcher cannot manipulate them, hence the choice of the design.

3.3 Target population

Borg and Ball (1996) define target population as all the members of the real or hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which the researcher wishes to generalize the results of the research study. The target population of this study
included the following; 23 schools, 41 teachers of English and 690 students. The categories of the secondary schools are given in the Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1**

Secondary school categories in Masinga Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of school</th>
<th>Boys boarding</th>
<th>Girls boarding</th>
<th>Mixed day</th>
<th>Mixed day &amp; boarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of sampled schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 **Sample size and sampling procedure**

A sample size is a subject of the population of which the research intends to generalize the results (Wiersma, 1986). According to Gay (1996), 10% of the total population is representative, and allows all members of the population to have an equal and unbiased chance of appearing in the sample. The piloting sample of two schools was drawn from the mixed secondary schools in the district as they are more. All the 21 schools remaining after piloting were used for the study because the population is small and manageable. Purposive sampling will be used for the teachers of English because they are most knowledgeable in the field of study. Students were selected using simple random sampling procedure. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define purposive sampling as a non-probability sampling technique that allows a researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objective of the study.
3.5 Research Instruments

Data was collected by use of questionnaires. Questionnaires were used because they are straightforward and less time consuming for respondents. Best (2004) stated that questionnaires are instruments for gathering important information about the population since they have responses which are easy to quantify for the purpose of analyzing. All questionnaires included structured and open ended questions. Best and Kahn (2001), define structured questionnaires as those that call for short responses and certain restricted information from the respondent while open form questionnaire calls for free responses in the respondents words hence providing for a greater depth of response. Questionnaires were self-administered to the teachers of English and students.

The questionnaires for the teachers of English were divided into four sections. Section A provided demographic information, section B focused on responses, section C focused on the integrated learning techniques and finally section D focused at the perception of the new integrated English approach. The questionnaire for the students consisted of two sections; section A covered demographic information while section B focused on the students’ perceptions of the new integrated English curriculum. For content analysis and document analysis, observation checklist and document analysis guides were used. The observation checklist has items related to teaching/learning procedures and also evaluation methods. A document analysis guide on documents such as schemes of work, lesson notes, assessment records and secondary school syllabus was used to verify data given by the respondents in the questionnaires.
3.6 Instrument validity

Validity is concerned with accomplishment of measuring the intended (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996). In addition, Borg & Gall (1996) argue that validity is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure. To enhance validity the instruments were given to my two research supervisors who read and gave feedback on content validity of the instruments. A pilot study was conducted in order to establish the suitability, clarity and relevance of the research instruments. Two schools were randomly selected from the eighteen schools in the division for the pilot study. After piloting, the items that were found vague and irrelevant were rephrased and replaced.

3.7 Instrument reliability

Best and Kahn (2001) consider reliability of the instruments of research to be the degree of consistency that the instrument demonstrates. Reliability is confirmed if the scores attained from the instruments are essentially the same scores that would be obtained if the instrument were re-administered to the same respondents. A perfect test will have reliability co-efficient of 1.00. To check instrument reliability, this study used internal consistency reliability method, specifically split-half reliability, which is, dividing the test into two halves and correlating the scores on the two halves. This method was used because it may be difficult to administer the test at two different times since time is limited. To test the reliability of instruments internal consistency reliability methods was used.

3.8 Data collection procedures

The research instruments were personally administered by the researcher. The pilot study preceded the main study. Each of the schools sampled for the study was allocated time for a visit, administration of the instruments and collection of the same.
A research permit was obtained from the National Council of Science and Technology and from the Masinga District Education Offices. Permission to conduct research was also sought from the head teacher of the school concerned. Two visits were made to each of the schools the first to create rapport and the other to administer the questionnaires. The questionnaires were collected immediately they were completed.

### 3.9 Data analysis techniques

The questionnaires, observation checklist and document analysis guide were collected and checked for completeness. The responses in the instruments were coded, processed and tabulated using Statistical Package for Social Sciences Version 12.0 (SPSS). Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the responses while inferential regression was used to further analyse the variables to evaluate their relationship with each other. To analyze quantitative data, frequency distribution tables, percentages and frequencies were used. For qualitative data, theme analysis was used by themes. Furthermore, the data were interpreted in relation to the research questions. Words were used to describe the situation.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter is a description and analysis of data presentation, interpretation and discussion. The study was to investigate the influence of the new integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English subject at the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Masinga Division. The analysis is organized based on the four research questions for the study and presentations made based on the questionnaires administered.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate
This is the proportion of questionnaires returned by the respondents out of those that had been distributed. Questionnaires were administered to teachers of English and students. Analysis and interpretation of data was on the basis of these questionnaires. The questionnaire return rate is shown in table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Questionnaire return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Targeted sample</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.1, 100 percent of the teachers and 85.7 percent of the students returned their questionnaires. This was because dealing with teachers was easier than dealing with students as the researcher could only get to the students through other teachers but dealt directly with the teachers. Although the students were guided through the
questionnaires, 12 of them did not fill in their questionnaires even after several visits to their schools. Teachers of English were involved in the study as they were more conversant with the topic under study. This return rate is considered good to provide the required information for data analysis.

### 4.3 Demographic data

The teachers were asked to indicate their age, gender, academic qualifications and the number of years of service and those they have been teaching English. The results are shown in the table below.

**Table 4.2**

**Distribution of teachers by gender and age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 25 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.2, the number of female teachers who participated in the study was slightly higher than the number of male teachers although only by a small margin which is assumed not affect the findings due to gender bias. A majority of the teachers were young, with more than 50 percent of them are between 25 and 34 years, the ages
at which the combination of youthful energy and experience is expected to be at its peak.

The students were also asked their gender, which was cross-tabulated with the type of their school. The result is shown in the table below.

**Table 4.3**

**Distribution of schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 79 per cent of the students were from mixed schools which form a majority of the schools used in the study. More girls (62%) than boys (37.5%) were used in the study as 1 percent of the schools used were purely girls’ schools. It is expected that this will not negatively affect the findings of this study.
Teachers’ academic qualifications

The teachers’ academic qualifications were captured as these provide the study with information on how likely level of understanding of the subject matter by the teachers themselves.

The findings showed that majority of the teachers (87.71) were holders of Bachelors of Education degree with 14% with Masters’ degree. This shows that majority of teachers had minimum qualifications to teach English in secondary schools.

4.3.3 Teachers’ work experience

The teachers were asked to indicate the number of years they had served as teachers in their career. The working experience of a teacher is very important in his/her career in that it helps blend theory with practice or experience for optimal working conditions and best results. The results are as shown in Table 4.4
Table 4.4

Distribution of teachers by teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years of service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.4, a majority of the teachers (62%) have worked for less than five years. It means that they may not be in a position to compare the previous curriculum with the integrated one. Experience is also lacking among them. Blending theory with practice may not be optimum.

4.4 The schools involved in the study
The study was carried out in public secondary schools.

4.4.1 Types of schools
The teachers were asked to state the type of the school in which they teach.
Table 4.5

Types of schools used in the study for teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed school</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Categories of schools

The teachers were also used to state the category of the school. The results are as shown in Table 4.10.

Table 4.6

Categories of schools used in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of school</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day and boarding</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.6 shows that about half of the schools are purely day schools. Students in day schools especially in rural settings rarely get enough time to practice grammatical use of the English language. Discussion time for literature material and content is limited. It is also common knowledge that day schools admit students from the communities around them where the entry behaviour is low compared to boarding schools. Teachers in day schools therefore need to work extra hard to achieve what those in boarding schools may easily achieve.

The teachers were then asked the subjects they were trained in. Teachers who train in English and Literature can comfortably handle literature in English. Those who combine English with another teaching subject

**Table 4.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience in teaching English and literature</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English/Literature</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.7 shows that (85.7 percent) of teachers are trained to teach both English and Literature. Only (14.3 percent) of teachers were trained to teach English and a
subject other than Literature. A majority of them (61.9 percent) have been teaching for less than five years, and may therefore not be having a lot of experience in the teaching profession. Five of the teachers have been teaching for at least 11 years. They have had all the experience required by a teacher to be able to master the content and methodology. All the teachers who participated in the study have been trained in the subjects that they teach.

4.4 Data presentation by research questions
Although all teachers were not trained in the same colleges or universities, the methodologies of teaching any one subject are basically the same. It is here that they are taught the resources required and how to mix them for better results. Sometimes, the experience one has gained in the teaching profession enables one to know how much to use of each resource to improve performance. The category of the school also plays a big role in determining which resources will be necessary and those that will not be. The strategies a teacher uses are outlined in the professional documents that the teacher prepares. These are the lesson notes, schemes of work and lesson plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>textbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio/video tapes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books, novels and newspapers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbooks &amp; AVs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.8 a good performance rating was recorded with those who mostly used audio and video tapes during teaching and to a lesser extent those who used a combination of books and novels. Those who use only textbooks reported a performance which is below average and they form only 9.5 percent of the teachers involved in the study. About half of the teachers (52.3 percent) reported an average performance after using a combination of books, novels and newspapers or textbooks and audio visuals.

The teachers were asked to indicate the extent of adequacy of supply of these teaching and learning resources in their institutions on the scale ‘very adequate’, ‘adequate’ and ‘inadequate’. The result is shown in the table below.
The table 4.9 shows that no teacher believed that the resources were very adequate for use in teaching and learning. A majority of the teachers (76.2 percent) only thought the teaching resources were adequate, while the remaining 23.8 per cent believed the resources to be inadequate. All the teachers involved in the study prepared lesson plans and schemes of work, with some preparing lesson notes at least once in a while. These are the professional documents that are required to guide teacher in his or her work. Three of the teachers (14.3 per cent) never prepared any of these important documents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance rating</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.10, quite majority of the students (87%) disagreed with their teachers that there is anything like good performance in the English subject at KCSE level in Masinga division. Whereas about 38 per cent of the teachers believe the performance is good, only about 7 per cent of the students support this. Although all the students like English as a subject, only about 7 per cent think the performance in the subject is good, with about 88 per cent thinking that it is only average. Only about 52 per cent of the teachers believe that the performance is average. The percentage of the students is in line with the national average performance in the subject. This shows that although the teachers prepared lesson notes, lesson plans and schemes of work, they are not sufficient to make students to pass their exams. They only outline the
intentions of the teacher and may or may not be executed. The findings of this study also show that some documents like the lesson plan are only prepared when it is inevitable, like when expecting Quality and Standards personnel from the Ministry of Education.

The teachers were also asked the methods they employed in teaching grammar, literature and poetry. This forms part of the strategies employed by the teachers to make students to perform better in these areas in English. The result is shown in the table shown below.

**Table 4.11**

**Integrated approaches in teaching and learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Poetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Question answer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Role play</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Dramatization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most teachers seem to be employing different methods in teaching the different areas of grammar, literature and poetry. Whereas all the three use discussion, over 90 per cent of the teachers employ question answer method for grammar, another (90.5 per
cent) use role play and discussion for literature while for poetry, (71.4 per cent) use
dramatization also. The other four use question and answer method. Two teachers did
not respond to this question.

**Table 4.12 Adequacy of teaching method used**
The teachers were asked to rate the adequacy of given teaching methods using the
scale ‘very adequate’, ‘adequate’ and ‘not adequate’. Each of the given techniques has
its own level of involving the students during the lesson. The rating of each by a
teacher is a measure of how much the teacher values that particular method. The
results are as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Not adequate</th>
<th>No reply</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question and answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.12 shows that teachers (61.9) per cent believe that the lecture method is
not an adequate method as a technique in teaching English. It is the least supported
method. The most effective technique is discussion which is advocated for by teachers (71.4 per cent), the next best being the question and answer method. The others in decreasing order of importance are dramatization, role play and resource persons. This is why all teachers, asked how they involve their students when teaching, said that they do so by engaging them in discussions with a combination other methods like asking questions, reading, dramatizing and role play, which is a good way of involving the students in the teaching and learning process.

The students were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with given statements on which teaching methods made them understand best. The results are given in the table below.

**Table 4.13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ perception on integrated approach in teaching and learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>best understand with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech drills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13 indicates most students (70.8 per cent) seem to support class demonstrations. Group discussions come next with 42 students (about 58 per cent) strongly agreeing that it is the best to enable them to understand. The method least with the least support from the students is the discovery method with a mere 9 students (about 13 per cent) strongly agreeing to it. Speech drills are rated as the next worst. The other methods have average ratings.

Almost all teachers understand the integrated English curriculum to be the combination of literature, grammar and oral skills in one unit, although in different words. They were asked to rate their attitude towards the integrated English curriculum. The result was cross-tabulated with their explanation on whether the integrated English curriculum had any significant effect on the performance of English at KCSE level, as shown in the table below.

**Table 4.14**

**Effect of Integrated English Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>explanation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No reply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students think Students able to relate both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>they are same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14 shows that all the teachers agreed that the integrated English curriculum had had a significant effect on the performance of English at KCSE level, but with different reasons depending on the attitude. Ten of the teachers (47.6 per cent) had a positive attitude towards the integration, nine (42.9 per cent were neutral) but two (9.5 per cent) had a negative attitude and did not explain why they thought the two should not have been integrated in the first place. A total of five respondents did not give an explanation for their attitude.

The teachers were also asked to rate the level of difficulty of given areas in learning English for students. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 4.15.

**Students’ perception on integrated English course contents**

From the table 4.15 of the areas examinable in English, the area that the students find

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th></th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th></th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th></th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral literature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the easiest is oral literature. It is the only area it was the only area with a rating of ‘very easy’ and the rest fall under ‘easy’. This is understood as oral literature has to do with stories and folklore. Drama closely follows oral literature possibly because it has to with acting, an area that students like. The area that is rated as the most difficult is reading novels. Many students do not have that reading culture and will only read novels because they have to and not because they want to. It is part of the syllabus and compulsory. Students also find grammar and poetry difficult. The teachers were asked whether the nature of the integrated English curriculum poses a challenge to the learner. The second, third and fourth questions dealt with the extent to which listening and speaking skills, reading skills and writing skills influenced the performance of English at KCSE level in Masinga Division. Analysis of the three used the same tables and was therefore done concurrently.

The students were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with given statements which form the basic objectives in the teaching and learning of English in secondary schools.

5 Level likert scale was used to interpret the findings where the key is as follows

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Uncertain, 4=Disagree and 5=Strongly Disagree
Table 4.16:

**Students’ achievements of the objectives of integrated English syllabus.**

The findings of the table were formulated as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Achievement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can listen attentively for comprehension and respond appropriately</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use listening skills to infer and interpret meaning correctly from spoken discourse</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can listen and process information from a variety of sources</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak accurately, fluently, confidently and appropriately in a variety of contexts</td>
<td>1.641</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can read fluently and efficiently</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use non-verbal cues effectively in speaking</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have appreciated the importance of reading for a variety of purposes</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have developed a life-long interest in reading on a wide range of subjects</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can write neatly, legibly and effectively</td>
<td>1.781</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the statements in the table 4.16 is meant to test the level of achievement in the three areas of listening and speaking, reading and writing. The researcher rate the opinion of students for each statement is a measure of how much of the same the students have understood and average mean of the opinion will be used to interpret the findings, a standard deviation indicates the level of dispersion amongst the respondents.

From the statements testing for listening and speaking skills, a majority of the students can only do simple listening (m=2.23 sd=0.543), with little ability to use these skills to correctly infer and interpret meaning or process information from a variety of sources (m=1.76 sd=0.456). Speaking accurately, fluently, confidently and appropriately in a variety of contexts seems to be the most difficult of them all (m=1.641 sd=0.352). This explains why many students in day schools are unable to communicate in fluent English but combine it with Sheng here and some Kiswahili there.
Table 4.17

Students’ achievements of the objectives of integrated English syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Achievement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can read and comprehend literacy and non-literary materials</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can read and analyze literary works from Kenya, East Africa, Africa and the rest of the world and relate to the experiences in these works</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made an efficient use of range of sources of information including libraries, dictionaries, encyclopaedias and the internet</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use correct spelling, punctuation and paragraphing</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use a variety of sentence structure and vocabulary correctly</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can communicate appropriately in functional and creative writing</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use the correct grammatical and idiomatic forms of English</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.17 also shows that many of the students are only able to do simple reading, without necessarily having to comprehend the subject matter. Although quite a number of the students have developed a life-long interest in reading on a wide
range of subjects (m=1.562 sd 0.765) and also appreciate the importance of reading for a variety of purposes (m=1.211 sd 0.781), very few of them have made deliberate efforts to make an efficient use of a range of sources of information including libraries and the internet. Reading, analysing and relating to the experiences in literary works from Kenya, Africa and the rest of the world scores poorest here (m=2.56 sd 0.556).

The study also tested on the students’ writing skills in this table. Surprisingly, only about half the students said that they can write neatly, legibly and effectively, meaning that a majority of the students have only the basic writing skills. (m=2.641 sd 0.354) of the students can use correct spelling, punctuation and paragraphing. The worst performed here are correct use of grammatical and idiomatic forms of English and communicating appropriately in functional and creative writing (m=1.678 sd 0.465). The students were asked to indicate the extent of satisfaction of what was learnt under given topics and the adequacy to enable one to tackle the national examination. The result is as shown below.
Table 4.17

Adequacy of the new curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral literature</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays (Drama)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short stories</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.17, the best thing that the students have learnt to do is to do simple reading and simple listening. Speaking and writing score less than 50 per cent. The
students are not satisfied with the work they have done in these two areas in preparing for the KCSE examination. It is because of this reason that a good number of the students are not confident with their skills in grammar and literature. They are least confident with poetry, short stories, novels and plays in that order. This means that they are not very confident with the literature bit of the integrated curriculum. It also implies that the literature bit is likely to pull the overall grade downwards. Literature is therefore not well tackled as part of the integrated curriculum.

Table 4.18

The students were also asked to indicate the level of satisfaction of given evaluation (assessment) methods

The results are as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>19 26.4</td>
<td>43 59.7</td>
<td>2 2.8</td>
<td>4 5.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>15 20.8</td>
<td>45 62.5</td>
<td>9 12.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciting poems</td>
<td>10 13.9</td>
<td>37 51.4</td>
<td>13 18.1</td>
<td>3 4.2</td>
<td>3 4.2</td>
<td>6 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatizing</td>
<td>22 30.6</td>
<td>27 37.5</td>
<td>10 13.9</td>
<td>6 8.3</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>6 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze test</td>
<td>8 11.1</td>
<td>29 40.3</td>
<td>19 26.4</td>
<td>9 12.5</td>
<td>3 4.2</td>
<td>4 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumbled exercise</td>
<td>8 11.1</td>
<td>32 44.4</td>
<td>20 27.8</td>
<td>4 5.6</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>7 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language games</td>
<td>9 12.5</td>
<td>24 33.3</td>
<td>21 29.2</td>
<td>9 12.5</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>8 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing reading</td>
<td>11 15.3</td>
<td>35 48.6</td>
<td>16 22.2</td>
<td>3 4.2</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>6 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>23 31.9</td>
<td>34 47.2</td>
<td>5 6.9</td>
<td>2 2.8</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>7 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>33 45.8</td>
<td>31 43.1</td>
<td>4 5.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the Table 4.18 it is evident that about 26% of the students are extremely satisfied with dictation, about 60% are satisfied, about 3% are uncertain, about 6% are dissatisfied and about 6% gave no response. Punctuation is key in grammar and the above results show that 31% of the respondents are extremely satisfied with evaluation of punctuation, 46% are satisfied, 15% are uncertain, about 1% is dissatisfied while about 7% gave no response on punctuation. The results indicate that most students are satisfied with the way comprehension is tested with about 46% of the respondents expressing extreme satisfaction with evaluation of comprehension, about 43% are satisfied, about 6% are uncertain while about 6% gave no response on the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Exercise</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note taking</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary writing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph writing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional writing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from the results that the respondents the level of satisfaction with the evaluation of language is low. Out of the twenty parameters in question, none has a satisfaction level above 50%, comprehension with 46% extremely satisfied with its evaluation has the highest percentage. The bulk of the percentages lie in uncertainty and dissatisfaction with the evaluation.

**Table 4.19**

The students were then asked ways in which performance in English could be improved.

The responses are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating in English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading novels</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and theatre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of past papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing compositions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating in English and reading novels</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above, it is clear that most students (about 56 per cent) feel that being able to communicate in English and reading novels is a sure way of improving the performance in examinations. This should be so because it enables the students to clearly understand and comprehend written material and content. This is also a clear indication that communication in English and provision of novels in schools is not emphasised. Most teachers tend to go straight to revising past papers, which explains why only a small percentage of students want the teachers to be revising past papers. Twenty two per cent of the students (about 31 per cent) did not respond to this question.

4.7 Investigating the influence of new integrated English Curriculum on students performance in English Subject

4.7.1 Correlation of factors

The Pearson correlation was done to examine whether the proposed factors in the conceptual framework could be relied upon for the study. A Pearson correlation indicates that each of the independent variables were not related with each other and therefore could be measured for their relative importance using the regression analysis, which was run to the variables are integrated English course content and teaching methodologies, assessment and evaluation procedures and teaching styles. Good teaching and learning strategies, good teaching styles and proper and adequate evaluation and assessment procedures as stipulated in the IEC would result to effective implementation of the IEC which will in turn determine the attainability of the subject objectives, leading to excellent performance in English at KCSE level.
Ranking factors influencing schools performance using Multiple Regression as indicated in the Conceptual Model

Conceptual framework in this study is informed by Rand Change Agents curriculum implementation. The study adopted this theory because the issues raised about the teacher such as abilities, preparation and use of evaluation procedures and use of evaluation procedures are key to successful implementation of an innovation such as IEC. The summary of the variables under as depicted in the conceptual model are performance in English at KCSE level as dependent variables and teaching and learning strategies, teaching styles, content of syllabus and evaluation and assessment producers used in the school as independent variables.

**Table 4.20 Correlation of Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Performance in English at KCSE</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Learning Strategies</th>
<th>Content of syllabus</th>
<th>Internal assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in English at KCSE</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Strategies</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of syllabus</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal assessment Methods</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.(1-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in English at KCSE</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Strategies</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of syllabus</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.22

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.15610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This adjusted R Square value indicated success of the model, because learning and teaching strategies, content of the English syllabus and the internal assessment accounts to 0.72 models, 72% of the integrated English curriculum.

Adjusted R Square value is calculated taking into account the number of variables in the model and the number of observations (participants) our model is based on. Table 4.22

Table 4.23

Model Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>29.537</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.769</td>
<td>11.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>41.433</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.971</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant),
b. Dependent Variable:

ANOVA coefficient indicates that the result can be replicated in another environment since the results not by chance p<0.005 Teaching and Learning strategies, Teaching styles, Content of syllabus and Evaluation and assessment procedures used in the school
Table 4.24

Interpretation of each of the English ranked in the order of merit using the BETA value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-4.800</td>
<td>3.561</td>
<td>-1.348</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>2.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus Content</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching styles</td>
<td>-4.800</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and assessment</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Integrated English Performance KCSE

The Table 4.24 produced three Regression indicators for interpretation, Beta (standardized Beta coefficients is a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. A large value indicates that a unit change in this predictor variable has a large effect on the criterion variable. The t and significant (sig) values gives a rough indication of the impact of each predictor variable, a big absolute t value and a small p value suggests that a predictor variable is having a large impact on the criterion variable. The study established that teaching and learning strategies had the highest beta value of 0.799 or accounted for 79.9% of the English KCSE performance. The teaching methodologies and styles used by the teachers had a beta value of 0.524 or accounted for 52.4 % of the English KCSE performance. The content of the syllabus had the highest beta value of 0.567 or accounted for 56.7% of the English KCSE performance. The internal evaluation and assessment had the least beta value of 0.211 accounting for 21% of the English KCSE performance.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

5.1 Introduction
This chapter gives a summary of all the previous four chapters. Chapter one on introduction, chapter two on review of related literature, chapter three on research methodology and chapter four on tabulated results and findings. It is divided into sections that include summary, discussion, conclusion and recommendation.

5.2 Summary of the study
The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of the integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English at the KCSE in Masinga division, Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives: to establish how the teaching techniques employed in teaching the integrated English affects the students’ performance, to determine how the content of the integrated English syllabus influence the performance of English at KCSE level and to establish the extent to which internal assessment of English influences performance of English.

The study adopted the descriptive survey method of research. The target population was public secondary schools in Masinga division. The target population of this study was 23 schools, 41 teachers of English and 690 students. Questionnaires were used as the research instruments. There were questionnaires for the teachers of English and students. The data collected was analyzed using the descriptive statistics.

5.3 Summary of the findings
The study established that quite a big majority of the students seem to disagree with their teachers that there is anything like good performance in the English subject at KCSE level in Masinga division. Whereas about 38% of the teachers believe the performance is good, only about 7 per cent of the students support this. Although all
the students like English as a subject, only about 7 per cent think the performance in
the subject is good with about 88 per cent thinking that is only average. Only about 52
per cent of the teachers believe that the performance is average. The percentage of the
students is in line with the national average performance in the average. This shows
that although the teachers prepared lesson notes, lesson plans and schemes of work,
they are not sufficient to make students to pass their exams. They only outline the
intentions of the teacher and may or may not be executed. The findings of this study
also show that some documents like the lesson plan are only prepared when it
inevitable, like when expecting quality and standards' personnel from the Ministry of
Education.

The teachers were asked the methods they employed in teaching grammar, literature
in grammar which forms which form part of the strategies employed by the teachers
of English to make students’ perform better in these areas in English. Most teachers
seem to be employing different methods in teaching the different areas of grammar in
literature and literature in grammar as recommended. Over 90 percent of the teachers
employ question – answer method when teaching grammar in literature, another 90.5
per cent use role play and discussion for literature while for poorly, 71.4 percent use
dramatization. In addition, 61.9 per cent believe that the lecture method is not an
adequate method as a technique in teaching English. It is the least supported method.
The most effective technique is discussion which is advocated for by 71.4 percent of
the teachers, the next best being the question and answer method. The others in
decreasing order of importance are dramatization, role play and resource persons.
This is why all teachers when asked how they involve their students when teaching
said they do so by engaging them in discussions with a combination other methods
like asking questions, reading, dramatizing and role play, which is a good way of
involving the students 70.8 percent seem to support class demonstrations group discussions come next with about 58 percent strongly agreeing that it is the best to enable them to understand. The method least with the least support from the students is the discovery method with about 13 percent strongly agreeing to it. Speech drills are rated as the worst. The study concur with Bassinet & Grundy (1993) who referred desirability of seeing the learners as resources and working from the learners and working from the learners’ store of experience and intuitive poetic awareness. The same principals have been anticipated by many writers in a variety of forms Drew (2001) and Katonah (2001) both emphasize the idea of the a hands on approach to studying literature Harel et al (2005) urge the use of student cantered learning and group work. Barkhuizen (1994) who provides evidence from classroom research that it is the approach that is, in fact, preferred by learners’ echoes this preference. Similarly the ministry of Education (1992) advocates for the use of techniques that are learner centred and they include: group work, dramatization, simulations and games, discussions and field work. These are techniques that according to teachers of English are time consuming. Okwaro (2009).

Almost all teachers understand the integrated English curriculum to be the combination of literature, grammar and oral skills in one unit, although in different words. All the teacher agreed that the integrated English curriculum had had a significant effect on the performance of English at KCSE level, but with different reasons depending on the attitude 47.6 percent were neutral but 95 percent had a negative and did not explain why they thought the two should not have been integrated in the first place. Of the areas examinable in English that is; composition comprehension, grammar, poetry, oral literature, the novel and drama, teachers of English asserted that the students find oral literature. It is the only area it was the only
area with a rating of very easy and the rest fall under easy. This is understood as oral literature has to do with stories and folklore. Drama closely follows oral literature possibly because it has to do with acting, an area that students like. The area that is rated as the most difficult is reading novels and plays. Many students do not have that reading culture and will only read novels because they have to and not because they want to. It is part of the syllabus and compulsory. In addition, students also find grammar and poetry difficult. Considering that comprehension, reading of novels and plays, grammar and poetry form the bulk of the integrated English syllabus; the level of the students rating on these areas explains the dismal performance of the subject.

The students were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with given statements which form the basic objectives in the teaching and learning of English in secondary schools. Each of the statements was meant to test the level of achievement in the three areas of listening and speaking, reading and writing. A majority of the students can only do simple listening with little ability to use these skills to correctly infer and interpret meaning or process information from a variety of sources. Speaking accurately, fluently, confidently and appropriately in a variety of contexts seems to be the most difficult of them all. This explains why many students in day schools are unable to communicate fluent English but combine it with Sheng here and some Kiswahili there.

Many of the students are only able to do simple reading, without necessarily having to compare the subject matter. Although quite a number of the students and also appreciate the importance of reading for a variety of purposes, very few of them have made deliberate efforts to make an efficient use of a range of sources of information including libraries and internet. Reading analyzing and relating to the experiences in literacy works from Kenya, Africa and the rest of the world scores poorest here. On
writing skills, surprising, only about half the students said that they can write legibly, neatly and effectively, meaning that a majority of the student’s have only basic writing skills. About a third of the students can use correct spelling, punctuation and paragraphing. The worst performed here was the correct use of grammatical and idiomatic forms of English and communicating appropriately in functional and creative writing.

The Integrated English curriculum adopts an integrated approach to teaching of language. Integration means that no language skill should be taught in isolation. Listening, speaking, reading and writing skills should complement each other. Similar sentiments are echoed by Gathumbi and Masembe, 2005, who mentions that speaking is an integral part of listening since speaking involves responding to what has been heard. This interaction presents the learners with a lot of difficulties. The teachers of English should aim at helping learners attain fluency and accuracy in speech. When learners fail to listen and speak fluently and accurately the fail to communicate, leading to a breakdown in communication. Consequently poor performance in exams is witnessed as learners cannot express themselves, in addition, Kenya Institute of Education encourage learners to read critically, observing how language is used. Writing tasks should be based on the learner’s interests and experiences. Group discussions and other pre-writing activities may be used to demystify writing (KIE 2002).

The students taking part in the research felt that the best thing they have learnt to do is simple reading and simple listening. Speaking and writing score less than 50 per cent. The students are not satisfied with the work they have done in these two areas in preparing for the KCSE examination. It is because of the reason that a good number of the students are not confident with their skills in grammar and literature. They are
least confident with poetry, short stories, novels and plays in that order. This means that they are not very confident with literature in English of the integrated English curriculum. It also implies that the literature in English is likely to pull the overall grade downwards. Literature in English is therefore not well tackled as part of the integrated curriculum.

The students were also asked to indicate the level of satisfaction of the given assessment and evaluation methods of English. It is evident that about 26% of the students are extremely satisfied with dictation, about 26% are satisfied, about 3% are uncertain, about 6% are dissatisfied and about 6% gave no response. Punctuation is key in grammar and the results show that 31% of the respondents are extremely satisfied with evaluation of punctuation, 46% are satisfied, 15% are uncertain, about 1% is dissatisfied while about 7% gave no response on punctuation. The results indicate that most students are satisfied with the way comprehension is tested with about 46% of the respondents expressing extreme satisfaction with evaluation of comprehension, about 43% are satisfied, about 6% are uncertain while about 6% gave no response on the same. It is evident from the results that the respondents the level of satisfaction with the evaluation of language is low. Out of the twenty parameters in questions, none has a satisfaction level above 50% comprehension with 46% extremely satisfied with its evaluation has the highest percentage. The bulk of the percentage lies in uncertainty and dissatisfaction with the evaluation.

When asked how the performance in English could be improved, most students (about 50 percent) feel that being able to communicate in English and reading novels is a sure way of improving the performance in examinations. This should be so because it enables the students to clearly understand and comprehend written material and
content. This is also a clear indication that communication in English and provision of novels or class readers in schools is not emphasized. Most teachers tend to go straight to revision past papers. The Pearson correlation was done to examine whether the proposed factors in the conceptual framework could be relied upon for the study. A Pearson correlation indicates that each of the independent variables were not related with each other and therefore could be measured for their relative importance using the regression analysis, which was run to the variables are integrated English course content and teaching methodologies, assessment and evaluation procedures and teaching styles.

Good teaching and learning strategies, good teaching styles and proper and adequate evaluation and assessment procedures as stipulated in the IEC would result to effective implementation of the IEC which will in turn determine the attainability of the subject objectives, leading to excellent performance in English at KCSE level. Conceptual framework in this study is informed by Rand Change Agents curriculum implementation. The study adopted this theory because the issues raised about the teacher such as abilities, preparation and use of evaluation procedures and use of evaluation procedures are key to successful implementation of an innovation such as IEC. The study established that teaching and learning strategies had the highest beta value of 0.799 or accounted for 79.9% of the English KCSE performance, followed by the teaching methodologies and styles used by the teachers accounting for 56.7%, then the content of syllabus accounting for 52.4% and finally the internal evaluation and assessment which accounted for 21.1%. According to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), a test is a psychological and educational procedure designed to elicit certain behaviour from which one can make inferences about certain characteristics of an individual. Tests are used as diagnostic tools to establish
learners’ strengths and weaknesses in order to make instructional decisions. Testing plays a major role in the students’ examinations performance. It can be used to identify strengths and weaknesses.

5.4 Conclusions
The integrated English curriculum has a lot of influence on students’ performance in English. All teachers who participated in this study agreed that the IEC had had a significant influence on the performance in English. They believed that the two that is grammar and literature should not have been integrated in the first place. Though the teachers employed the appropriate techniques and teaching methods to teach English, the performance in English still remained dismal. It’s interesting to note both the teachers and students had positive attitude towards English. These points to the content of the Integrated English curriculum as the culprit for poor performance. Most noted that reading novels and plays most difficult. Many do not have a reading culture. Considering that comprehension, reading of novels and plays, grammar and poetry which form the bulk of the integrated English syllabus, the level of the students rating on these areas explains the dismal performance of the subject.

In addition, the students cannot speak accurately, fluently, and appropriately. Majority of the students’ admitted to possessing basic writing skills. The students are not confident in grammar and literature in grammar. This implies that the literature in English is likely to pull the overall grade downwards.

5.5 Recommendations
Based on the findings on the study the following recommendations were made:-

All public secondary schools should invest in a reading culture and a culture where students communicate fluently in English. The ability to communicate and reading
Culture is a sure way of improving the performance in examinations. It enables the students to clearly understand and comprehend written material and content.

Schools should set aside enough time and resources to effectively and efficiently in-service teachers of English in areas of grammar in literature and literature in grammar. Inter-school conferences should be encouraged to demystify the curriculum. This will enable teachers of English keep abreast with the latest trends of learning in areas students consider difficult.

Curriculum developers should look into the assessment and evaluation of Integrated English curriculum.

**5.6 Suggestions for further research**

The following were suggestions for further research.

i. Since this study was conducted in Masinga division, further research should be conducted involving a larger sample of schools to validate the findings of this study and shed more light on the influence of the integrated English curriculum on students’ performance in English at KCSE level across the country.

ii. A study to establish how teachers of English bridge the gap of what is taught at the university concerning English and the integrated English curriculum.

iii. A study to determine the influence of other teachers’ use of English language on the performance of English.
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APPENDIX A:
INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO THE RESPONDENTS

University of Nairobi,
Department of Educational Administration and Planning,
P.O. Box 92,
KIKUYU.
The Principal,
…………………………………………Secondary School

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: INVITATION FOR YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

I am a post graduate student in the University of Nairobi, pursuing a Master of Education in Curriculum Studies. I am conducting a research study on “The influence of the New Integrated English Curriculum on Students’ Performance in English at Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Masinga Division, Kenya”.

You and some of your students have been selected to take part in this study. I would be grateful if you would assist me by responding to all items in the attached questionnaire. Your response will be treated with the confidentiality deserved since the questionnaires are designed for this research only. No name shall be required from any respondent or institution.

Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully

Caroline Naomi Mbithe
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR THE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

You have been selected as a teacher of English to take part in this research. The research purpose is to examine the influence of the new Integrated English curriculum on English performance at K.C.S.E Level. Please respond to all items in the questionnaire as honestly and correctly as possible by ticking in the correct bracket.

SECTION A: Demographic Data

Please respond to each item by ticking next to the response that is applicable.

1. Please indicate your gender

   Male  (  )

   Female (  )

2. What is your age bracket?

   a) Below 25 years (  )

   b) 25-34 years (  )

   c) 35-44 years (  )

   d) 45-54 years (  )

   e) Over 54 years (  )

3. What are your highest academic qualifications?

   a) M.E D  (  )

   b) B.E.D  (  )

   c) P.G.D.E (  )

   d) B.A  (  )

   e) Diploma (  )

   f) Others/specify
4. For how long have you been teaching in the teaching profession?
   a) Below 5 years (   )
   b) 6-10 years (   )
   c) 11-20 years (   )
   d) 20 and above (   )

5. a) What are your teaching subjects? .................................................................
   b) Are you trained in the subjects that you teach?
      Yes ( )
      No (  )

6. How long have you been teaching English in your teaching career?
   a) Below 5 years (  )
   b) 6-10 years (   )
   c) 11-15 years (   )
   d) 16-20 years (   )

7. What is the type of your school?
   a) Mixed school (   )
   b) Boys school (   )
   c) Girls school (   )

8. What is the category of your school?
   a) Day school (   )
   b) Boarding school (   )
   c) Boarding and Day (   )

9. How would rate your school performance K.C.S.E English examination at the national level?
a) Very Good  ( )
b) Good  ( )
c) Average  ( )
d) Below average ( )
e) Poor  ( )

SECTION B RESOURCES

10. State the resources available in your school for teaching and learning………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Indicate the extent to which the provision of teaching learning materials for English is adequate.
   a) Very adequate  ( )
   b) Adequate  ( )
   c) Inadequate  ( )

12. Which professional documents do you prepare in preparation for teaching
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

13. a) How often do you prepare lesson plan/notes in English?
   a) Everybody  ( )
   b) Once in a while  ( )
   c) Never  ( )
b) If the answer in 13 is C please give reasons………………………………
………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………

14. a) Which are the teaching methods that you use when teaching the integrated English curriculum?

b) Which part of the integrated English do you enjoy teaching?

c) For the answer in question 4(b) above, give reasons why you like to teach those mentioned areas.

15. How adequate would you consider the following techniques in teaching English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Not adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question and answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. In what way(s) do you involve your students when teaching?
SECTION C: Integrated Learning Techniques

17. Please define the integrated English Curriculum?

18. a) Rate your attitude as a teacher of English towards the integrated English Curriculum
   a) Positive
   b) Neutral
   c) Negative
   b) Please explain your answer above ……………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

19. a) In your view has the integrated English Curriculum had any significant effect on the performance of the English subject at K.C.S.E Level
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
   b) Please explain your answer above…………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

20. In your initial training, how were you trained to teach the English subject?
   a) English and Literature as two distinct subject (   )
   b) English language and literature an integrated subject (   )
21. Have you as a teacher of English attended an in-service seminar/course on the teaching of the integrated English Curriculum?
   Yes (   )
   No (   )

22. Did the workshop/seminar enhance your understanding of the integrated Curriculum? .................................................................

..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

23. a) Do you feel confident enough when handling the integrated curriculum
   Yes (   )   No (   )
b) Please explain your answer.................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

SECTION D: Integrated English Strategies

24. a) Rate the attitude of your students toward learning English in your School?
   a) Positive (   )
   b) Neutral (   )
   c) Negative (   )
b) Please explain your answer above..................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

25. In your opinion what are the areas that student find difficulty in learning English
26. The following are areas examined in English. Tick the relevant column the extent to which your students find each of them in learning English. The alternatives are; V.E Very easy E-easy D-difficult V.D-very difficult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas Examined</th>
<th>V.E</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>V.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. In your opinion does the composition or nature of the integrated English Curriculum pose a challenge to the learner?

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

28. a) In what ways can the performance of English be improved in your school?

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

79
b) What do you think can be done to enhance the teaching of the integrated English course in your school?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

29. a) How do you evaluate your students?

   F1

   F2

   F3

   F4

b) Are the evaluation procedures mentioned in 29 (a) compatible with the evaluation guidelines provided by KNEC?

Thank you
APPENDIX C:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE STUDENTS

The purpose of the study for which this questionnaire is to examine the influence of the integrated English curriculum on English performance at K.C.S.E level all responses will used for the purposes of this study any. Please fill in the blanks or tick where appropriate be honest possible.

Section A Demographic Information

1. Please indicate your gender
   1. Male   [   ]
   2. Female  [   ]

2. What is the type of your school?
   a) Mixed school  [   ]
   b) Boys school   [   ]
   c) Girls school  [   ]

3. What is the category of your school?
   a) Boys boarding school  [   ]
   b) Girls boarding school  [   ]
   c) Mixed boys and girls boarding school  [   ]
   d) Mixed boys/ girls day school  [   ]

4. How would you rate your school performance in KCSE English performance in the last two years?
   i. Very good  [   ]
   ii. Good       [   ]
iii. Average [ ]
iv. Below average [ ]
v. Poor [ ]

5. a) Do you love the English subject?
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) NO [ ]

   b) IF the answer is no in 6a, explain your answer

SECTION B: Student’s perception about the new, integrated English curriculum.

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement below which form the basic of objective in the teaching and learning of English in Secondary School. Tick once against each statement.

KEY: SA-Strongly Agree, A-Agree, U-Uncertain, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can listen attentively for comprehension and respond appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can use listening skills to infer and interpret meaning correctly from spoken discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I can listen and process information from a variety of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can speak accurately, fluently, confidently and appropriately in a variety of contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can read fluently and efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can use non-verbal cues effectively in speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have appreciated the importance of reading for a variety of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have developed a life-long interest in reading on a wide range of subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I can read and comprehend literacy and non-literary materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can read and analyze literary works from Kenya, East Africa, Africa and the rest of the world and relate to the experiences in these works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have made an efficient use of range of sources of information including libraries, dictionaries, encyclopaedias and the internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I can use correct spelling, punctuation and paragraphing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I can use a variety of sentence structure and vocabulary correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I can communicate appropriately in functional and creative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I can write neatly, legibly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I can use the correct grammatical and idiomatic forms of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I can think creatively and critically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I have appreciated the special way literary writers use language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I have appreciated the universal human value contained in literary works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate the extent to which you are satisfied that what you learned under each of these topics is adequate to enable you tackle the national examination
| 20 | Listening | Extremely satisfied | Satisfied | Uncertain | Dissatisfied | Extremely dissatisfied |
| 21 | Speaking   |                      |          |          |             |                      |
| 22 | Reading    |                      |          |          |             |                      |
| 23 | Writing    |                      |          |          |             |                      |
| 24 | Grammar    |                      |          |          |             |                      |
| 25 | Oral       |                      |          |          |             |                      |
|     | literature |                      |          |          |             |                      |
| 26 | Poetry     |                      |          |          |             |                      |
| 27 | Plays      |                      |          |          |             |                      |
|     | (drama)    |                      |          |          |             |                      |
| 28 | Short stories |                  |          |          |             |                      |
| 29 | Novels     |                      |          |          |             |                      |

Indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements. Tick once against each statement.
Key: SA – Strongly Agree, A- Agree, U – Uncertain, D- Disagree, SD- Strongly Disagree

Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I best understand when the teacher used</th>
<th>Sa</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dramatization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Study trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Discovery method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Debating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Speech drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Radio and video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Language games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate the level to which the following evaluation (assessment) methods prescribed in the syllabus satisfied you.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 Dictation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Listening comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Reciting poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dramatizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cloze test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Jumbled exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Language games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Timing reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Comprehension reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Sentence construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Gap-filling exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Punctuation exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Note taking and note making exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Summary writing exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Paragraph writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Composition and essay writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Exercise on functional writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Exercise on functional writing e.g. letters, diaries, memos, minutes etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Context question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. In what ways can the performance of English be improved in your school?

.......................................................... ..........................................................

.......................................................... ..........................................................

Thank you for your cooperation
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