



## **Full Length Research Article**

### **IMPLEMENTING INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM IN NYAKACH SUB-COUNTY, KISUMU COUNTY, KENYA**

**\*Benard Odhiambo Bonyo, Dr. Benson Charles Odongo and Michael Okello Okwara**

Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Box 210 Bondo

#### **ARTICLE INFO**

##### **Article History:**

Received 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2016  
Received in revised form  
26<sup>th</sup> February, 2016  
Accepted 19<sup>th</sup> March, 2016  
Published online 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2016

##### **Key Words:**

Cloud computing,  
Security,  
Kelihos,  
DDoS.

#### **ABSTRACT**

The use of integration as a pedagogical tool in the teaching of English language and literature subjects is a priority in Kenya. Despite the inception of the integrated English curriculum two decades ago, not all English language teachers use it as conceived by the curriculum developer, Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD). The Purpose of this study was to explore pedagogical experiences of teachers in implementing the integrated English language curriculum in Kenya, Kisumu County. Guided by Fuller's Concern Based Adoption Model (CBAM) theoretical framework, this study utilized Concurrent Triangulation design under a mixed methods approach to establish the level of coverage on components of both language and literature and to determine the integration methods used by teachers of both language and literature in implementing the integrated curriculum. Saturated sampling design was used to select 110 subject teachers, 52 heads of departments and 52 principals currently implementing the integrated English curriculum to fill questionnaires. Purposive sampling was done to select 16 teachers for interviews. The Sub County Quality Assurance Officer was interviewed and document analysis done to corroborate and triangulate data. Quantitative data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20 computer program to generate descriptive statistics while the qualitative data was analyzed using content, narrative, and thematic methods in line with the study objectives. The findings indicated that most teachers implemented certain aspects of the integrated curriculum in using the integrated approach. Subsequently, some teachers taught language and Literature as separate subjects and the various components of both subjects as separate. The study recommended a home-grown, school-based on-going preparation model for professional teacher development to succeed in implementing the official curriculum.

*Copyright © 2016, Benard Odhiambo Bonyo et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.*

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Curriculum integration has many and varied meanings and definitions. The more common examples describe integrated curriculum as interwoven, connected, thematic, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, correlated, linked, and holistic area of study (Kathy, 2000). For example, Knowles and Smith, (2001) says integration in the teaching of literature in language has been placed on the power of literature to integrate curriculum, because linking disciplines through literature provides a richer, more meaningful understanding of subject matter and can facilitate collaborative learning as well as help students become independent problem solvers.

**\*Corresponding author: Benard Odhiambo Bonyo,**  
Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Box  
210 Bondo

Mohammad (2013) realized that in many classrooms, the teaching of literature has remained unchanged with emphasis on teacher-centered and text-directed approaches and methods (e.g., lectures; period and genre surveys; biographical summaries; teacher's explication and 'critical analyses' of canonical texts; stereotyped exam questions requiring stereotyped answers). The methodology has been confined almost to lectures consisting of a long monologue by the teacher on a piece of literature, taking the form of the teacher primarily attempting to explain the meaning of the text preceded by a brief introduction of the author and his works. As a result, students rely almost exclusively on guidebooks and resort to rote learning. In a nutshell, there is little research to guide teachers in making thoughtful decisions to integrate with what, why, when, how and for whom to ensure better grades (Gavalek, J.R., Raphael, T.E., Biondo and Wang, D., 2000). Savvidou's (2004) integrated model is a linguistic

approach that utilizes some of the strategies used in stylistic analysis to explore both literary and non-literary texts from their perspective of form, content and skills (Savvidou, 2004; Okwara, 2010). This involves the systematic and full analysis of stylistic features such as vocabulary, structure, register etc in order to recognize not only how language is used but why it is used the way it is used. The integrated curriculum according to Savvidou (2004) has 6 teaching stages, namely: Stage 1: Preparation and anticipation.

This is the introductory stage where learner's real or literary experiences of the main themes and content of text is elicited. Stage 2 is a focusing stage where learners experience the text by listening and or reading and focusing on specific content in the text. Stage 3 is a preliminary response stage where learners give their initial response to the text orally or graphically. Stage 4 is refocusing and comprehending the surface and literal meaning through intensive reading. Stage 5 which is refocusing and analysis stage deals with the deeper and metaphoric meaning, exploring how the message is conveyed through overall structure, special language use such as figurative language, setting diction etc. Stage 6 is the interpretation and personal response stage which is a conclusive focus to increase understanding, enhancing, enjoyment of the text, and enabling learners to come to a personal interpretation of the text.

Integration of language and literature takes various levels as follows: curriculum level, skills level, resource level, methodology level, techniques level and efforts level (Ongong'a *et al.*, 2010; Okwara et al, 2009; KIE 2002). The curriculum level involves use of knowledge, ideas and concepts primarily from literature that is closely related to language and other school subjects to teach English. The resource level entails combining different learning resources such as graphics, and audio visual aids in teaching. The methodology level combines different language teaching methods, approaches such as grammar-translations, direct, structural, situational, audio-lingual, functional and simulation methods alongside literature models like cultural, language based, personal growth and integration. The techniques level which involves combining techniques of teaching such as use of examples, verbal exposition, questioning, reinforcement, set induction, and stimulus variation. The fifth is efforts level which is the collective support from teachers of subjects other than English adopting English across the curriculum and a multidisciplinary effort at language achievement. Finally, the skills level deals with a combination of language skills such as oral, reading and writing. However, the practice requires integrated assessments of the skills acquisition. During the last review, KNEC (2006) integrated the assessments of all the skills into three papers, functional writing and oral skills, comprehension and literary appreciation and creative writing and essays based on prescribed texts.

### Objectives of the Study

The study had set out to establish the level of coverage of the components of both language and literature and to determine the integration methods used by teachers of both language and literature in implementing the integrated English English language curriculum in Nyakach Sub-County, Kenya.

### Literature Review

Catur (2012) studied 150 primary grade teachers' concerns regarding the implementation of integrated thematic instruction in Kanisius Catholic schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia using a convenience sampling method. The data collection method used was a questionnaire that consisted of three parts: The Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ), the Integrated Curriculum Implementation Scale, and demographic questions. The data analysis employed in this research were descriptive, a one way ANOVA test and multiple regression. The result of the study revealed that the teachers had unresolved awareness and self-informational concerns with a slight tailing up in the impact-refocusing stage. This study also found that teachers' degree of integrated curriculum implementation was high some five years into this reform initiative. While Catur's (2012) Indonesian study was quantitative and looked into thematic level of integration, the current mixed methods study explored teachers' experiences regarding the level of coverage of components of both language and literature in implementing an integrated English curriculum.

Sean and Trudy (1990) executed a study on integrating literature and composing into the language arts curriculum and discovered that elementary schools in Chicago are under pressure to integrate composition and literature into their language arts programs and to make remedial and regular language arts instruction congruent and suggested ways in which traditional language arts programs could become more integrated and remedial and regular programs become more congruent. Unlike this study, the current mixed study sought to explore the experiences of teachers in implementing IELC in Kenya looking at the levels of integration. Snodia's (2013) quantitative study sought to explore primary school teacher's challenges in Zimbabwe in curriculum implementation. Data for the study was gathered through a questionnaire sent to 178 practicing teachers from urban and rural schools and interviews with ten lecturers from four teachers training colleges. Findings suggested that teachers experienced several challenges such as inadequate grounding in the subject to enable them to effectively deliver the subject, a limited conception of curriculum integration and lack of resources to facilitate the implementation of the approach. While this quantitative study looked at Zimbabwe's primary curriculum in Social Studies, the current mixed methods' study sought to establish the levels of coverage of integration of both components of language and literature while implementing an integrated English curriculum in public secondary schools in Kenya.

Adeyemi's (2012) research on the approaches to composition writing in junior secondary schools in Botswana utilized the qualitative technique through interviews, observations, literature reviews, examination of documents and students' artifacts and discovered that one of the curriculum outcomes: to communicate accurately, appropriately and effectively in speech and writing both in and outside of school was not being achieved because teachers mainly used the product oriented approach opposed to integrated approach to teaching composition writing. As a result of the approach, the teachers were confronted with students' inability to write in any

meaningful way as a result of surface level errors, lack of ideas/vocabulary, lack of organization skills and students' inability to compose effectively due to low level of reading skills and writing skills integration. Contrary to Adeyemi's qualitative research, the current mixed methods study sought to establish levels of integration of literature and language in English language teaching in Kenya and used questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. Owiti, Onchera, and Kulo (2013) examined the use of oral literature in the teaching of English grammar in secondary schools in Bondo district-Kenya. The objectives of the study were to: find out teachers' conceptualization of using oral literature in the teaching of English grammar and establish teachers' use of oral literature in the teaching of grammar.

The study was based on the descriptive survey design. The sample consisted of all the 28 secondary schools in the district and 44 English language teachers. Data were collected by use of questionnaires, observation schedule and document analysis schedule. The study established that even though teachers appreciate the benefits of contextualized grammar teaching, majority do not exploit oral literature genres in the teaching of English grammar because they do not know how to integrate the genres in classroom teaching. Similarly, the current study looked at the level at which components of literature (oral literature) and language (grammar) was integrated among teachers in Nyakach Sub County. While Owiti *et al.* study was based on descriptive survey design using questionnaires, document analysis and an observation schedule, the current study employed a concurrent triangulation design and employed questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. Manyasi (2014) reporting on the Integrated Approach in Teaching English language as practiced in Kenya purposed to establish how the integrated approach was used in teaching cultural practices and English language skills in the set book novel: *The River and the Source* by Margaret Ogola. The study used the qualitative research methodology. Ethnography design was used during the study. The study used selective intermittent time mode which called for the researcher's visit to the setting of the study at selected intervals when the particular event occurs and used observation of classroom practice to generate data from ten secondary schools in Narok Town and its environs selected using purposive sampling. Data was analyzed qualitatively and reported in narration according to the research questions.

practice. Unlike Manyasi's qualitative study which looked at the implementation of the integrated English language curriculum with a specific bias on one set literary text using ethnography, the present mixed method study used concurrent triangulation to establish teachers' level of coverage of integration components used by teachers in implementing the IELC.

### Data Analysis/Findings

Data in this study was collected from principals, Heads of language departments, English language teachers, and the Sub County Quality Assurance Officer. The tools used were questionnaires, an interview schedule, and a document checklist. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics with the assistance of SPSS version 20 Program, narrative, content and thematic analysis for qualitative data. The study saturated a sample of 52 principals, 52 heads of language departments, 110 English language teachers, and one quality assurance officer; however, data obtained was from 50 principals, 50 heads of departments, 105 English language teachers, and the Sub County quality assurance officer giving a response rate of above 95%. This response rate was considered adequate enough to have the data analyzed and recommendations made. The findings were organized and presented based on the objective of the study which was to establish the level of coverage of the components of both language and literature in integration Nyakach Sub-County, Kenya. The descriptive statistics were presented on tables using frequency and valid percentages for discussions as shown in Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

### The principals' views on level of coverage

The study sought to find out the level of coverage on the components of both language and literature during the implementation of the integrated English language. This was important because integration is incomplete without components of both language and literature covered during teaching. The principals filled in questionnaires and were interviewed on this and the outcomes revealed that to a greater extent English language teachers integrated both language and literature components to some level as follows: using poems, drama and orature items to teach speaking and listening skills, using novels, short stories to teach reading and writing skills.

**Table 1. Principals' views on Levels of integration in IELC (n=50)**

Variables	Number of Principals					Percent %						
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot
Using poems	0	3	16	24	7	50	0	6	32	48	14	100
Using drama	0	3	22	21	4	50	0	6	44	42	8	100
Improvisation of T/Aids	0	0	19	26	5	50	0	0	38	52	10	100
Resource person	0	1	11	25	13	50	0	2	22	50	26	100
Using novels	0	1	5	24	20	50	0	2	10	48	40	100
Using orature	0	1	11	28	10	50	0	2	22	56	20	100

Source: Researcher

The findings revealed that teachers analyzed cultural practices in isolation without integrating the teaching of literature with the language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. The instructional objectives focused on identifying and illustrating the cultural issues in the novel. Punctuation and grammar was also not taught hence there was a disparity between curriculum developers' expectations and classroom

IELC teachers also use literary aspects from texts to teach grammatical items. Another level of coverage was resource level where subject teachers integrated teaching aids by improvising and inviting resource persons during English language lessons. The results are summarized and presented in Table 1.

## Using poems

Table 1, indicates that 24(48.0%) of the principals agreed that teachers used poems in implementing IELC, 3(6.0%) disagreed, 16(32.0%) were neutral, while 7(14.0%) strongly agreed they were using poems in integrated teaching. Therefore, this means that a significant majority of 62% of the principals acknowledged that their English language teachers integrated poetry into their teaching of oral skills as required but a significant 38% did not use poetry or were unaware teachers used poetry in IELC teaching. Teacher 1 during interviews said,

*“yea aah, we can use aah, may be poems and do comprehension, aah ,we can use the aah, set books, poems to enhance our reading skills aah, we can aah , and even improve on our grammar, to improve on our pronunciation skills ”. Moreover, Another way we teach comprehension is may be by using poetry, yea , and out of that poetry we teach comprehension skills and then a part from comprehension so can skills we also can use poetry, .....to teach summary writing and note making and that kind of aah approach”.*

In corroboration, (KIE, 2005) says that the teacher is expected to focus on both the skill and the content. For example, the teacher is required to use content from oral Literature and poetry to teach the four English language skills. Further, according to the Ministry of Education (2006), the teacher is also expected to teach the features and the content of oral Literature and poetry.

## Using Drama

On using drama, the study sought to establish to what level principals were aware the IELC teachers were using drama in implementing IELC. Table 1 also shows that 21(42.0%) of the principals agreed that teachers employed drama in teaching IELC, 3(6.0%) disagreed, 22(44.0%) were neutral, while 4(8.0%) strongly agreed that their teachers were integrating drama in teaching oral skills. On the whole, 50% of the principals observed that their English language teachers integrated drama in teaching listening and speaking skills and equally 50% disagreed or were not sure. This finding means that principals are not very clear of what is going on in the English language classrooms as the findings indicate there is a close link between those who agreed and those who disagreed or were neutral. These findings indicate a low level of integrating drama into language teaching. During interviews, teachers own confessions confirmed that at least some levels of integration of drama is going on. On integrating drama, Teacher 1 had posed:

*“then sometimes for teaching plays we pick on many parts and dramatize them in class and then by so doing, we help those students on improving may be their grammar”.*

Another interviewee, Teacher 5 on levels of integration observed,

*“Okey one of them is aah when teaching listening and speaking we normally use drama. Now we find that drama cannot just be demonstrated minus speaking okey as others do*

*the drama the other part do the listening part soo and in drama there is no much of writing so it is used mostly in speaking and listening”.*

Similarly, Macharia (2011) investigated teachers’ strategies for managing challenges of integrated English in secondary schools in Kiambu East region, Kiambu County in Kenya and found that lack of knowledge of the concept of integration was a hindrance.

## Levels of improvisation

On improvising and using teaching and learning resources, Table1 again shows that 26(52. %) of the principals agreed that teachers used IELC teaching materials, 19(38.0%) were neutral, while 5(10.0%) strongly agreed they were integrating teaching materials. Therefore, it means that a significant majority of 62% of the principals acknowledged that English language teachers under them integrated teaching materials into their teaching while a good number of 38% were uncertain whether or not improvisation was being done as a component in language teaching. In triangulation, Teacher 12, hinted that without improvisation, a teacher had no business in class because most schools were under resourced. Teacher 12 thus said:

*“Being creative and resourceful helps me improvise without which aah, I have no business going to class”*

And teacher 5 describes what is done to improvise, namely photocopying if books are scarce, thus:

*“...but I can say that eeh the-eee resources are not enough whereby even making us go ahead and even improvise some and even the txt books that are available available, the few of them can also be photocopied at times so that the students get a chance to have the books...”*

In corroboration, improvisation is what Al Magidi (2006) means by saying that it is often a difficult transition for teachers who are accustomed to traditional methods that give them a commanding position from which they dictate to change roles. Indeed, to adopt new approaches such as the integrated approach requires the teacher to direct and guide classroom discourse to ensure learners’ interaction is a new experience.

## Invitation of resource person

Invitation of resource persons is part of resource level integration that schools embrace in integrating the teaching of IELC to resources. Table 1 also shows that 25(50.0%) of the principals agreed that they invited English resource persons, 1(2.0%) disagreed, 11(22.0%) were neutral, while 13(26.0%) strongly agreed they invited resource persons. On the whole, 76% of the principals acknowledged their teachers integrated resource persons into their teaching. During the in the interviews, the Sub County Quality Assurance officer corroborated this by saying:

*“Take lets say English, English is very wide, which specific area is critical area ma e eidwaro carry out e INSET just like*

that, another, that's what is actually there, so after the HOD and other members of the department have realized this is where we have a difficulty. So now is where they go back to the principal, Bwana principal we have an issue here, this and that. So have you identified an expert in that area who can come and talk to the teachers and by extension to the class to students and this is where you realize that most of the speakers go to schools for motivational talks it is because some of those areas it has been realized by subject teachers that they are a bit technical, or there are some challenges, so they want this experts, may be those who have been examiners to come and talk to the candidates and while that is taking place, this teacher, the sub teacher must be in the class through out, that's is when it is effective and meaningful..”

In corroboration, major studies on innovation and school effectiveness show that the principal strongly influences the likelihood of change, but they also indicate that most of the principals do not play pedagogical leadership roles (Fullan, 2001) yet strategic leadership of principals is essential in almost every successful innovation (Cuttance, 2001) this implies that by inviting resource persons, the IELC teachers and principals are extending pedagogical leadership in areas of weakness.

#### Levels of Using Novels

On using novels, Table 1 shows that 24(48.0%) of the principals agreed that teachers used novels in implementing IELC, 1(2.0%) disagreed, 3(10.0%) were neutral, while 20(40.0%) strongly agreed with their extent of using novels in integrated teaching. In a nutshell 88% of the principals agreed that their teachers were integrating novels in teaching reading and writing skills. In support of this finding, one of the interviewees Teacher 5 agreed. Teacher 5 emphasized on the importance of using novels and stated:

“there is also the use of novels when teaching reading and writing we encourage the pupils at an early stage to get used to reading the novels and when teaching they take some points from the novels that they have read soo during teaching the novels are of very much importance”.

Teacher 1 also concurs with the level of using novels. The teacher posits,

“I do a lot of integration. Because sometimes I even use the set books to teach grammar, the novels , yea, to teach aah comprehension, to to teach cloze tests, yea, aah so I believe there is a lot of integration that is done”.

(KIE, 2005). This means that the teacher is expected to focus on both the skill and the content. For example, the teacher is required to use content from novels to teach the four English language skills (Ministry of Education, 2006)

#### Levels of Using Orature

On teaching using orature items, Table 1 again indicates that 28(56.0%) of the principals agreed that teachers used orature items, 1(2.0%) disagreed, 11(22.0%) were neutral, while 10(20.0%) strongly agreed they integrated orature items when teaching listening and speaking skills. Therefore, it means that a significant majority of 76% of the principals acknowledged their teachers integrated orature items when teaching oral skills. During the interviews, Teacher 13 corroborated these findings and observed:

And then also tongue twisters, to aah, tongue twisting, riddles, we also use these in class aah to teach listening and speaking, and pronunciation skills , and we use aspects of oral literature for instance the narratives when we are doing comprehension, when it is time for comprehension, some times we do pick on an oral narrative and we use the oral narrative to answer, to teach comprehension, yea, and even though tongue twisters to teach aspects of pronunciation, yea”

In corroboration, KIE, (2005) expects that the teacher is expected to focus on both the skill and the content. For example, the teacher is required to use content from oral Literature and poetry to teach the four English language skills.

#### Heads of Departments Views on Level of Coverage

The study also sought to find out the level of coverage on the components of both language and literature during the implementation of the integrated English language from the heads of departments through questionnaires and interviews. The outcome revealed that to a greater extent English language teachers integrated both language and literature components to some level as follows: using poems, drama, resource level, improvising, inviting resource persons, and orature items to teach speaking and listening skills, using novels, short stories to teach reading and writing skills. IELC teachers also use literary aspects from texts to teach grammatical items. Table 2 is a summary and presentation of the findings.

#### Using poems

On using poems, Table 2 indicates that 25(50.0%) of the heads of departments agreed that teachers used poems in

**Table 2. Heads of Departments' views on Levels of integration IELC (n=50)**

Variables	Number of heads of departments						Percent %					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot
Using poems	0	9	12	25	4	50	0	18	24	50	8	100
Using drama	0	2	20	22	6	50	0	4	40	44	12	100
Improvisation	1	3	15	25	6	50	2	6	15	50	12	100
Resource person	1	5	11	27	6	50	2	10	22	54	12	100
Using novels	0	0	2	18	30	50	0	0	4	36	60	100
Using orature	0	1	0	24	25	50	0	2	0	48	50	100

Source: Researcher

According to available literature, the content for language and that of the various genres of Literature (poetry, drama, short stories and novels) is, therefore, covered under language skills

implementing IELC, 9(18.0%) disagreed, 12(24.0%) were neutral, while 4(8.0%) strongly agreed they were using poems in integrated teaching. Therefore, the implication is that a

significant majority of 58% of the heads of departments acknowledged that the English language teachers integrated poetry into their teaching of oral skills as required.

During interviews, Teacher 5 concurred with the HODs position by observing,

*Another interviewee on integrating literature, Teacher 6 said, "I almost use all starting for example from poetry I can say I use poem, I teach literary appreciation at the same time I teach pronunciation of words, aah using the same same poem."*

This shows that there is some level of integration in methodology involving literary contents in poetry as indeed confirmed by Teacher 7:

*"We discuss the poems, songs, novels in during speaking and listening lessons, we occasionally sing, recite poems for mastery".*

These findings point to an average level of using poems in integration implying teacher experience some difficulty. The finding is similar to that of Snodia's (2013) quantitative study which sought to explore primary school teacher's challenges in Zimbabwe in curriculum implementation and found that that teachers experienced inadequate grounding in the subject to enable them to effectively deliver the subject, and a limited conception of curriculum integration among others.

### Using Drama

On using drama, Table 2 also shows that 22(44.0%) of the heads of departments agreed that teachers employed drama in teaching IELC, 2(4.0%) disagreed, 20(40.0%) were neutral, while 6(12.0%) strongly agreed that teachers under them were integrating drama in teaching oral skills. On the whole, it means that a majority of 56% of the heads of departments observed that their English language teachers integrated drama in teaching listening and speaking skills. This data reveals that 40% of HODs are uncertain about what goes in the English language classrooms which implies there is inadequate supervision of implementing integration and the curriculum is not given attention. This may affect academic performance. During the interviews, Teacher 8 confirmed,

*"even some times students present a dramatized version of the song".*

*According to KIE (2005) the teacher is required to use content from Literature and poetry to teach the four English language skills.*

### Level of Improvising learning Resources

On improvising and using teaching and learning resources, Table 2 again shows that 25(50. %) of the heads of departments agreed that teachers improvised IELC teaching materials, 3(6%) disagreed, 15(30.0%) were neutral, while 6(12.0%) strongly agreed they were integrating teaching materials. 1 (2.0%) strongly disagreed they use and improvise teaching aids. Therefore, it means that a good majority of 62%

of the heads of departments acknowledged that English language teachers under them integrated improvised teaching materials into their teaching. During interviews, Teacher 2 observed in agreement with these findings: "well, I think we integrate at aah, we integrate more at at resource level, that is media, aah media perform, a lot of work when it comes to this, some come from Former KIE that KICD"

### Another interviewee Teacher 6 observes similarly

*"you can organize a very good lesson, aah u can decide for example to identify-iii sounds and aaaah some aspects of pronunciation, you can still go back to the same same work, and identify for example-ooo rhyming words, aaaah words with similar pronunciation, sooo the literature itself aaaah brings in a rich source of materials that we use to teach language, yes".*

### Invitation of Resource person

Invitation of resource persons is part of resource level integration Table 2 also indicates that 27(54.0%) of the heads of departments agreed that they invited English resource persons, 5(10.0%) disagreed, 11(22.0%) were neutral, while 6(12.0%) strongly agreed they invited resource persons. 1(2.0%) of the heads of departments strongly disagreed. On the whole, it implies that 66% of the HODs acknowledged their teachers integrated resource persons into their teaching. In line with the findings, Teacher 2 says,

*"teachers are also seen as resource persons, and consultants more so a teacher is an over seer" meaning that in this role, resource persons are integrated into the teaching of language".*

These findings are in line with what Lambert and McCombs (2000) alludes when they say the integrated approach requires the teachers to be both instructor and facilitator in the sense that they should guide and direct classroom activities to expedite the communicative discourse of the classroom. Furthermore, inviting resource persons agree with Macharia (2011) finding that the teachers needed coping strategies such as additional education, support from administrators, themselves and inclusion in decision making about the integrated curriculum and positive experiences to foster implementation.

### Using novels

On using novels, Table 2 again shows that 18(36.0%) of the heads of departments agreed that teachers used novels in implementing IELC, 2(4.0%) were neutral, while 30(60.0%) strongly agreed with their role of using integrated teaching materials. In a nutshell, the implication is that a whopping majority of 96% of the heads of departments agreed that the teachers were integrating novels in teaching reading and writing skills. However, Teacher 6, confessed,

*"aah novels, but aah particularly I like using poetry, because within 40 minutes I can use aah poetry effectively teach aspects of grammar or language that I want and at the same time teach aspects of literary appreciation, rarely do I use aah novel".*

**Referring to other teachers, Teacher 6 however says that**

*We use materials from literature to teach aspects of language. For example I may decide to use eeeeh short story, aaah or a particular novel, like currently we are using the novel, aah the River and the Source, I may decide to use it to teach a particular aspect of aaah language, for example, I want to teach aaaah, on nouns, or verbs, yea, after reading the sto-ry, and getting the ploom, exploring the characters aaaah and all the aspects of literary appreciation, I may now take them again to explore the language use, particularly, for example, I may ask them to identify the proper nouns, aaaah I may ask them to identify, may be common nouns, and all that. So we may, I can decide now to use that material to teach, am now teaching literature at the same time am getting aspects of language.*

A representative statement by majority of the interviewees came from Teacher who normalized the teaching of novels because it is a curriculum requirement which is directly examined by the national Examiner: the teacher noted, thus:

*“No single student in secondary school completes education without studying at least two novels and so teachers strive to teac the two recommended novels without option.”*

This finding contradicts Manyasi (2014) report on the Integrated Approach in Teaching English language as practiced in Kenya. The researcher purposed to establish how the integrated approach was used in teaching cultural practices and English language skills in the set book novel: The River and the Source by Margaret Ogola and the findings revealed that teachers analyzed cultural practices in isolation without integrating the teaching of literature with the language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

**Table 3. Subject Teachers’ Views on levels of integration (n=105)**

Variables	Number of Teachers						Percent %					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot
Using poems	1	22	30	36	16	105	1.0	21	28	34.3	15.2	100
Using drama	1	13	45	31	15	105	1.0	12.4	42.9	29.5	14.3	100
Improvisation	5	14	30	49	7	105	4.8	13.3	28.6	46.7	6.7	100
Resource person	0	14	35	39	17	105	0	13.3	33.3	37.1	16.2	100
Using novels	1	6	9	48	41	105	1.0	5.7	8.6	45.7	3.9	100
Using orature	0	1	15	42	47	105	0	1.0	14.3	40.0	44.8	100

Source: Researcher

**Using Orature Items**

On teaching using orature items, Table 2 also reveals that 24(48.0%) of the heads of departments agreed that teachers used orature items, 1(2.0%) disagreed, while 25(50.0%) strongly agreed they integrated orature items when teaching listening and speaking skills. Therefore, it means that a whooping 98% of the heads of departments acknowledged the teachers integrated orature items when teaching oral skills.

**Teacher 6 says in triangulation**

*“look at the lower classes, I use poetry, I use songs (pause) aah when you are teaching English , aah and looking at the kinds of books used in the school”*

**And teacher 11 supports**

*“let me take a passage, I want to use that passage to teach integrated subject may be it is from an oral narrative, u know some students will not see the oro, the grammatical aspects of it, the students, some of them look aaah at , this is a story, Mwalimu came to tell us a story, so it is upon u the tr to synthesis, here I am now integrating English language and and aah literature, in a broader perspective”*

In corroboration, the finding is in agreement with (Gathumbi and Ssebunga, 2005) that the teacher is also expected to teach the features and the content of oral Literature and poetry. By doing this, oral Literature and poetry would have been taught in a natural context, thus making learning more meaningful and interesting.

**The Subject Teachers Views on Level of Coverage**

The subject teachers as curriculum implementers were asked to what level they integrated poems, drama, improvised materials, resource persons, novels, orature and literary aspects. The results are summarized and presented in Table 3.

**Using poems**

On using poems, Table 3 shows that 36(34.3%) of the subject teachers agreed they are using poems in implementing IELC, 22(21.0%) disagreed, 30(28.6%) were neutral, while 16(15.2%) strongly agreed they were using poems in integrated teaching. However, 1(1.0%) strongly disagreed. Therefore, 49.5% of the teachers acknowledged that they integrated poetry into their teaching of oral skills as required. The findings mean that a significant proportion of 50% do not integrate hence there is a low level of integration in this respect.

One interviewee Teacher 8, corroborated the findings and acknowledged thus;

*“Yea, eeeh, I simply take a poem or a, a, a song in oral literature, lets say a dirge, you and eeh you, use it to teach listening and speaking, where we also discuss themes and style and even the vocabulary. Later on I ask students to compose a story and eeeeh write on on eeh, Death...aaah, like The Day my Friend Died” and expect learners to use the vocabulary from the poems. Yea, so class discussion follows recitation of the poem”.*

This implies the use of poems at both the methods levels and subjects’ content level is insufficient. Another interviewee, Teacher 7 was of the same view and observed:

*“We discuss the poems, songs, novels in during speaking and listening lessons, we occasionally sing, recite poems for mastery”.*

Teacher 2 adds,

*“above all we integrate skills aah during aah listening in class, class reading, may be poems, say and a good number of work that can be done in class.*

The above statements show subject teachers integration at the levels of subject content, skills level and methods level. In corroboration, (Ongong’a et al., 2010; Okwara et.al, 2009; KIE, 2003) agree with this finding in the sense that integration of language and literature takes various levels as follows: curriculum level, skills level, resource level, methodology level, techniques level and efforts level.

### Using drama

On using drama, Table 3 shows that 31(29.5%) of the teachers agreed that they employed drama in teaching IELC, 13(12.4%) disagreed, 45(42.9%) were neutral, while 15(14.3%) strongly agreed that they were integrating drama in teaching oral skills. On the whole, it means that a significant portion of 43.8% which is less than half of the subject teachers observed that they integrated drama in teaching listening and speaking skills implying that there are insufficient levels of integrating drama into language teaching by at least 51.2% of the subject teachers. In triangulation, one interviewee, Teacher 5 extrapolates the use of drama in language teaching, thus

*“Okey one of them is aah when teaching listening and speaking we normally use drama. Now we find that drama cannot just be demonstrated minus speaking okey as others do the drama the other part do the listening part soo and in drama there is no much of writing so it is used mostly in speaking and listening ”*

Teacher 11 presents an ensample with the current drama text used in forms three and four nationwide to practically qualify the level of integrating drama in language teaching. The Teacher explains,

*“you go to teach Betrayal in the City, your major concern is that eeh; plot, analysis, styles, characterization, then which types of questions can be set, be set, but this person will find it very difficult, somebody will not think of taking Betrayal in the City to integrate this into, grammar, yea or use it for other other aspects of language, yea, so now the teacher really has to be the real person to help in all these”*

In corroboration available literature indicates that getting texts and simulation for studying drama is a challenge perhaps explaining the average use of drama. According to KIE (2004) it was discovered that the following genres of literature and language aspects were difficult for students because of the approaches teachers adopted in teaching them: poetry, oral literature, plays, novels, summary writing, and grammar.

MoE, (2006) asserts that written Literature such as drama should be covered under the reading skill. The learner should

be introduced to the reading skills: silent reading, interpretive reading, critical reading and study reading, among others taught According to the MoE, these skills prepare the learner for intensive reading through which the learner will be expected to do a critical analysis of the novels, plays, short stories and poems.

### Improvising teaching materials

On improvising and using teaching and learning resources, Table 3 also indicates that 49(46.7%) of the subject teachers agreed that they used IELC teaching materials, 14(13.3%) disagreed, 30(28.60%) were neutral, while 7(6.7%) strongly agreed they were integrating teaching materials. 5(4.8%) strongly disagreed they improvised and used teaching aids. Therefore, 53.4% of the teachers acknowledged they improvised integrated teaching materials into their teaching. This implies that a significant portion of subject teachers which is a simple majority integrate resource use into the teaching of IELC.

It emerged during interviews that other levels of integration occur in the materials for teaching. For instance Teacher 3 said,

*“eeeh, here eeehh we use them because they are in the integrated text books, yea, the new integrated text book by Jomo Kenyatta Foundation has really helped us” but the teacher further noted: “but teachers’ guides and other reference materials for us are there aaah and to some degree, eeh they are are aah integrated but not like the integrated textbooks. On further probing of other resources the teacher exclaimed “ooh, they are other things like KICD CDS but they don’t have any integration at all. They eeh, majorly deal with literary texts”*

According to the Handbook for English teachers (2006), teachers’ improvisation is needed with regard to reading, the two genres; poetry and orature also lend themselves as reading passages and are to be used to teach reading and impart reading skills. It is also expected that the teachers intensively and extensively use conventional and literary passages in magazines, newspapers, class readers and prescribed texts and other texts dealing with relevant emerging issues in teaching reading skills.

### Invitation of resource person

Invitation of resource person is part of resource level integration. Table 3 reveals that 39(37.1%) of the subject teachers agreed that they invited English resource persons 14(13.3%) disagreed, 35(33.3%) were neutral, while 17(16.2%) strongly agreed they invited resource persons. On the whole, it means that a simple majority of 53.3% of the subject teachers acknowledged they integrated resource persons into their teaching. This also implies that since the resource person has monetary implication, it is beyond the subject teacher’s range of choices as pedagogical resources. During the interviews, Teacher 8 agreed with these findings when asked about the efforts of others in teaching integrated English and states thus:

"Oh, yea, the principal, other subject teachers. you see, once, once in a year, we have aaaaah, resource person for language talk from other schools. And they have helped us a lot".

### Using Novels

On using novels, Table 3 also indicates that 48(45.7%) of the subject teachers agreed that teachers used novels in implementing IELC, 6 (5.7%) disagreed, 9(8.6%) were neutral, while 41(39.0%) strongly agreed with their role of using integrated teaching materials. However, 1(1.0%) strongly disagreed. In a nutshell, it means the majority, 84.7% of the teachers agreed that they were integrating novels in teaching reading and writing skills.

Indeed during the interviews, Teacher 7 agreed with this findings and nodded,

"yeas, songs, poems, extracts from novels, short plays, yes, this are easy to use when teaching the 4 language skills I mentioned earlier"

And elsewhere in the same interview the teacher confirms thus:

"We discuss the poems, songs, novels in during speaking and listening lessons, we occasionally sing, recite poems for mastery. My students have come to like role playing, interviewing and acting in class".

These statements reveal the integration of novels not only at methods level, but also skills and subject content level. The finding is in disagreement with Manyasi, (2014) on the Integrated Approach in Teaching English language as practiced in Kenya which purposed to establish how the integrated approach was used in teaching cultural practices and English language skills in the set book novel that revealed that teachers analyzed cultural practices in isolation without integrating the teaching of literature with the language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

**Table 4. Principals' views on Methods of integration used in IELC (n=50)**

Variables	Number of Principals					Percent %						
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot
Recitation	0	8	19	22	1	50	0	16	38	44	2	100
Dramatization	0	6	23	17	4	50	0	12	46	34	8	100
Story telling	0	0	5	37	8	50	0	0	10	74	16	100
Discussion	1	0	6	25	18	50	2	0	12	50	36	100
Debating	1	1	17	22	9	50	2	2	34	44	18	100
Hot seating	8	14	6	17	5	50	16	28	12	34	10	100
Language games	11	11	11	15	2	50	22	22	22	30	4	100

### Using orature items

On teaching using orature items, Table 3 again shows that 42(40.0%) of the subject teachers agreed that they used orature items, 1(1.0%) disagreed, while 15(14.3%) remained neutral, 47(44.8%) strongly agreed they integrated orature items when teaching listening and speaking skills. Therefore, this means that the majority, 84.8 % of the teachers acknowledged they integrated orature items when teaching oral skills translating into higher levels of integration in this regard. During interviews, Teacher 8 was in agreement with the finding and affirmed thus:

"Yea, eeeh, I simply take a poem or a, a, a song in oral literature, lets say a dirge, you and eeh you, use it to teach listening and speaking, where we also discuss themes and style and even the vocabulary. Later on I ask students to compose a story and eeeeh write on on eeh, Death...aaaah, like The Day my Friend Died" and expect learners to use the vocabulary from the poems".

According to the Handbook for KIE (2006), in teaching listening and speaking, the teacher should use content from orature and poetry because these genres provide contents which are oral in nature. Furthermore, the teacher is required to simultaneously teach the aspects and the contents of the two. This ensures that orature and poetry are taught interestingly and in meaningful contexts hence is in line with this finding.

### Principals Views on methods their teachers use

#### Recitation

On reciting poetry, the principals were asked to say whether teachers under them recite poems regularly in class when teaching reading and writing. Table 4 indicates that 22 (44%) agreed, 8(16%) disagreed, 19(38%) were neutral, 1(2.0%) while strongly agreed. To sum up, it means that less than half, (46%) of the principal reported that their teachers had used recitation of poetry in their classrooms to teach oral skills. In triangulation Teacher 4 and 5 observed: Teacher 4 had this to say about recitation:

"I don't know what else you want but I recite poems occasionally in listening lessons.

#### Teacher 5 confessed,

"I can say that the various methods that are employed are not really new aah not really new to the subject are for instance we have the reciting of poems. in the course book, we find several poems involve the students, regular reciting of poems not just read in class , memorize so that they are recite in class.

In line with KIE (2004) the teacher is required to simultaneously teach the aspects and the contents of poetry and literature to ensure that orature and poetry are taught interestingly by recitation of verses and poems.

#### Dramatization

On dramatization, the principals were asked to say whether their teachers were using drama frequently when teaching, reading and writing. Table 4 also indicates that 17(34%) of the principals agreed, 6(12%) disagreed, 23(46%) were neutral, 4(8%) strongly agreed. In a nutshell, this means that 42%,

which is a minority of the principals reported that their teachers were dramatizing during reading and writing lessons. During interviews, Teacher 3 agreed with the principals thus:

*"I also some, I sometimes use questioning and dramatization, and we sing songs though other teachers say we make noise."*

Teacher 4 noted that they, *"ask students to role play or dramatize"*.

The finding is in line with Wen Chien's (2003) results that indicated that Theme-based vocabulary, phrases or sentences could be introduced; ESL activities or games such as Simon says, role-play, information gap, etc. could make the Life Course more interesting. According to the KIE (2010), dramatization is one of the suitable ways to teach oral skills.

### Story Telling

The principals were also asked to state whether their teachers were using story telling during oral lessons. Table 4 again reveals that 37 (74%) agreed, 5(10%) were neutral, 8(16%) strongly agreed. Therefore, it means that the majority 90% of the principals reported that their teachers were using story telling in teaching listening and speaking lessons. According to Teacher 9,

*"Yea, personally in form one and two I use a lot of games, story telling, role playing because learners aren't mature"*

The finding agree with Wen Chien's (2003) study that indicated that Theme-based vocabulary, phrases or sentences could be introduced; the true stories and family tree could be used as supplementary materials for the themes respectively to make English language learning interesting.

## DISCUSSION

The principals were further asked to state if they were aware English language teachers used discussion when teaching set books. Table 4 also shows that 25(50%) of the principals agreed, 6(12%) were neutral, 18(36%) strongly agreed while 1(2.0%) disagreed strongly that their teachers were using discussion when teaching set books. To sum up, 86% of the principals reported that their teachers used discussion as a method.

According to the interviews, Teacher 3 said,

*"Ok, the methods we use, aaah are like class discussion for set books, group discussions, focused group discussions" and Teacher 4 supported the same view and observed: Yea, aaaah concerning the methods we use, I just use normal methods like eeh, lets say like, discussion and lectures as taught in college. Sometimes, aaah, I use questions and answers, or class discussion. The majority of teachers are in agreement with the principals."*

Another interviewee, Teacher 8 outlines the sequence of methods used amongst which discussion comes in. thus he reports:

*Yea, so class discussion follows, recitation of the poem or singing the song and even some times students present a dramatized version of the song.*

### Debating

Another method the principals were asked to comment about was debating. Table 4 reveals 22 (44%) agreed they were using debates, 1(2.0%) disagreed, 17(34%) were neutral, 9(18%) strongly agreed while 1 (2.0%) strongly disagreed that they used debates during oral and writing lessons. To sum up, this means that a good majority, 62% of the principals reported that their teachers used debates in class as opposed to 65% of teachers and 68% of the heads of departments. However during interviews, no teacher mentioned the use of debating as a method they use to implement the integrated syllabus except Teacher 7 who observed:

*"debates should be used more because after the four years, student join college and universities, so you see, it is only fair to do what they will meet in future."*

### Hot seating

Hot seating was another method the principals were asked to comment about. Table 4 again reveals that 17(34%) of the principals agreed teachers were hot seating, 14(28.0%) disagreed, 6(12%) were neutral, 5(10%) strongly agreed while 8(16.0%) strongly disagreed that they used hot seating during oral lessons. To sum up, a significant minority 44% of the principals disagreed while an equal number agreed that their teachers used hot seating in class. This implies that principals may not be keeping abreast with the teaching methods or teachers are actually not using hot using in the IELC. Contrastively, 35.5% of teachers disagreed, as opposed to 80% of the HODs that disagreed. On the whole, it is evident that the majority of teachers do not use hot seating as an integrated method. During the interviews, Teacher 1 said,

*"aah another method that I use to teach character traits is hot seating,.... yea, and then also hot seating and then sometimes for teaching plays"*.

The following excerpt from one interviewee, Teacher 7 who exposed why hot seating was not popular as a teaching method:

*"Very obvious, personally I met the word hot seating in the student's book. Language games are not even there in the integrated textbooks. But I think, it might be about suitability of their use. Perhaps many like me think, at secondary level, those are child-like activities that are done in primary schools. We believe that at secondary level, dictation and lectures, group discussion, and debates."*

### Language games

Another method the principals were asked to comment about was use of language games. Table 4 indicates that 15(30%) agreed they were using language games, 11(22.0%) disagreed, 11(22%) were neutral, 2(4%) strongly agreed while 11(22%) Strongly disagreed they used language games during language

lessons. To sum up, it means that 34% of the principals reported that their teachers used language games in class as opposed to 44% that disagreed. The same finding is in line with the heads of departments and subject teachers' position of whom 80% and 69.5% disagreed they use language games respectively. This implies that majority of the teachers do not implement the integrated approach using language games. In triangulation, some of the teachers interviewed confirmed they hardly used language games for some reasons. For instance, Teacher 7 confessed,

*"Language games are not even there in the integrated textbooks. But I think, it might be about suitability of their use. Perhaps many like me think, at secondary level, those are child-like activities that are done in primary schools"*.

Asked about use of Language games, Teacher 1 however noted they are effective and utilized in teaching spellings as brought out in the following interview excerpt:

*Yea, aah the language games, aah I encourage students to try them out in class; Yea, they are effective in improving spelling skills of the learners, yea*

This finding supports Nduta *et al.* (2011) study that reported that teachers lean so heavily on teacher centered teaching-learning strategies that limited learners' participation in class instead of activities like language games, dramatization, hot seating, debating that must just involve learners for effective student participation.

### HODs Views on Methods Teachers Use in Implementing the IELC

The HODs monitor and supervises the teaching of the integrated language and it was important to get their experiences on the methods their teachers used. The findings as presented in Table 5 indicate that recitation, dramatization, story telling, discussion, debating, were common among the majority of teachers. However, hot seating, and language games were rarely used in teaching the integrated curriculum.

**Table 5. Heads of Departments' views on Methods of integration used in IELC (n=50)**

Variables	Number of heads of departments						Percent %					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot	SD	D	N	A	SA	Tot
Recitation	2	5	12	28	3	50	4	10	24	56	6	100
Dramatization	4	1	17	26	2	50	8	2	34	52	4	100
Story telling	1	2	10	29	8	50	2	4	20	58	16	100
Discussion	0	1	0	23	26	50	0	2	0	46	52	100
Debating	5	5	6	21	13	50	10	10	12	42	26	100
Hot seating	12	28	3	7	0	50	24	56	6	14	0	100
Language games	13	27	3	7	0	50	26	54	6	14	0	100

### Recitation

On reciting poetry, the HODs were asked to state if they recited poems regularly in class when teaching reading and writing. Table 5 indicates that 28(56%) agreed, 5(10%) disagreed, 12(24%) were neutral while 3(6.0%) strongly agreed. However, 2(4%) strongly disagreed. To sum up, 62 % of the HODs reported that they were reciting poetry regularly in their classrooms. Teacher 1 reported the use of recitation thus:

*Later on I ask students to compose a story and eeeeh write on on eeh, Death...aaah, like The Day my Friend Died" and expect learners to use the vocabulary from the poems. Yea, so class discussion follows, recitation of the poem.*

### Dramatization

On dramatization, the HODs were asked to say whether they were using drama frequently when teaching, reading and writing. Table 5 indicates that 26(52.0%) agreed, 1(2.0%) disagreed, 17(34%) were neutral, 2(4.0%) strongly agreed while 4(8%) strongly disagreed. In a nutshell, this implies that a simple majority, 56% of the HODs reported that they used dramatization during reading and writing lessons. Teacher 5 said,

*"we dramatize during the teaching of drama... when teaching listening and speaking we normally use drama. Now we find that drama cannot just be demonstrated minus speaking okey as others do the drama the other part do the listening part"*

### According to Teacher 6,

*"we can do some bit of aaaahhhh, demonstrations, you can demonstrate, eh? we can do aspects of imitation, mhm? recitation, yea, so they will just depend on what you are doing"*

### Furthermore, Teacher 6 continues,

*"after reading the oral narratives, I now for example ask them aspects of performance, how do you perform this and this and this"... aaah, role playing, sometimes they may role play, they dramatize"*.

Therefore, some teachers use dramatization as an integrated approach.

### Story telling

The HODs were also asked to state whether they were using story telling during oral lessons.

Table 5 reveals that 29(58.0%) agreed, 2(4%) disagreed, 10(20.0%) were neutral 8(16%) strongly agreed while 1(2.0%) strongly disagreed. Therefore, 74% of the HODs reported that they were using story telling in teaching listening and speaking lessons.

### Discussion

The HODs were further asked to state if they used discussion when teaching set books. Table 5 again shows that 23(46.0%)

agreed, 1(2%) disagreed while 26(52.0%) strongly agreed that they used discussion when teaching set books. To sum up, it means that a whopping majority 98% of the HODs reported that they used discussion as a method. From the interviews, Teacher 8 had the following to say on discussion:

*“we also discuss themes and style and even the vocabulary. Later on I ask students to compose a story and eeeh write on on eeh, Death...aaah, like The Day my Friend Died” and expect learners to use the vocabulary from the poems. Yea, so class discussion follows, recitation of the poem or singing the song and even some times students present a dramatized version of the song. The same can be replicated in novels where even role plays come in handy, Yea, we really try.”*

**Teacher 5 is swift to outline the methods used in integration and quips:**

*“concerning the methods we use, I just use normal methods like eeh, lets say like, discussion and lectures as taught in college. Sometimes, aaah, I use questions and answers, or class discussion.”*

This is in agreement with Onchera’s (2013) descriptive survey study focused on the pedagogical hindrances to oral communication skills in English in Kenyan secondary schools in Kisii County which found out that most teachers use lecture and Question/ Answer methods more than any other technique.

**Debating**

Another method the HODS were asked to comment about was debating. Table 5 also reveals 21(42.0%) agreed they were using debates, 5(10%) disagreed, 6(12.0%) were neutral, 13(26%) strongly agreed while 5(10.0%) strongly disagreed that they used debates during oral and writing lessons. To sum up, it means that a good majority standing at 68% of the HODs reported that they used debates in class. Contrary to the interview results, Teacher 15 made a representative statement thus:

*‘ face the facts aaah, hardly would any teacher use debates because they are time consuming, and noisy, moreover, it is a general school activity.”*

HODs disagreed that they used hot seating in class. Teacher 12 explained the use of hot seating but said it was not popular:

**She observed**

*Let me comment about hot seating; it is very interesting but it needs children who are not language handicap and so many teachers would not use it”*

**Language games**

Another method the HODs were asked to comment about was use of language games.

Table 5 indicates that 7(14%) agreed they were using language games, 27(54.0%) disagreed, 3(6.0%) were neutral, 13(26%) strongly disagreed they used language games during language lessons. To sum up, it implies that the majority, 80% of the HODs disagreed that they used language games.

**The Subject Teachers Views on Methods used in implementing IELC**

As the actual implementers of the IELC, it was significant to get the views of subject teachers on the methods used in classroom as they implement the integrated English curriculum in classroom. The findings as presented in Table 3 indicate that recitation, dramatization, story telling, discussion, debating, were common among the majority of teachers. However, hot seating, and language games were rarely used in teaching the integrated curriculum similar to the HODs views. They were asked to Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5) and the results are summarized in Table 6.

**Recitation**

On reciting poetry, the subject teachers were asked to say whether they used recitation of poems regularly in class when teaching reading and writing. Table 6 indicates that 58(55.2%) agreed, 11(10.5%) disagreed, 27(25.7%) were neutral, 6(5.7%) strongly agreed, 3(2.9%) while strongly disagreed. To sum up, it means that a simple majority standing at 60.9 % of the subject teachers reported that they had used recitation of poems in their classrooms.

**Table 6. Subject Teachers’ Views on Methods of integration used in IELC (n=105)**

Variables	Number of Teachers					Tot	Percent %					Tot
	SD	D	N	A	SA		SD	D	N	A	SA	
Recitation	3	11	27	58	6	105	2.9	10.5	25.7	55.2	5.7	100
Dramatization	2	13	31	46	13	105	1.9	12.4	29.5	43.8	12.4	100
Story telling	0	0	21	62	22	105	0	0	20	59	21	100
Discussion	1	5	13	40	46	105	1.0	4.8	12.4	38.1	43.8	100
Debating	0	9	27	60	9	105	0	8.6	25.7	57.1	8.6	100
Hot seating	25	36	12	28	4	105	23.8	34.3	11.4	26.7	3.8	100
Language games	40	33	18	9	5	105	38.1	31.4	17.1	8.6	4.8	100

**Hot Seating**

Hot seating was another method the HODs were asked to comment about. Table 5 again reveals 7(14%) agreed they were hot seating, 28(56.0%) disagreed, 3(6.0%) were neutral, 12(24%) strongly disagreed that they used hot seating during oral lessons. To sum up, the majority standing at 80% of the

**Dramatization**

On dramatization, the subject teachers were asked to say whether they were using drama frequently when teaching, reading and writing. Table 6 again indicates that 46(43.8%) agreed, 13(12.4%) disagreed, 31(29.5%) were neutral, 13(12.4%) strongly agreed while 2(1.9%) strongly disagreed.

In a nutshell, this means that a simple majority, 56.2% of the subject teachers reported that they were using dramatization during reading and writing lessons. Teacher 1 reported use of dramatization and observed:

*“ I also insist they use gestures and facial expressions; yea and this help them in understanding aspects like tone, and mood.”*

This implied dramatization. While Teacher 6 insinuated the use of other aspects of drama as observed:

*“aaaah we can do some bit of aaaahhhh, demonstrations, you can demonstrate, eh? we can do aspects of imitation, mhm.”*

### Story Telling

The subject teachers were also asked to state whether they were using story telling during oral lessons. Table 6 indicates that 62(59.0%) agreed, 21(20.0%) were neutral, 22(21%) strongly agreed. Therefore, this finding implies that the majority, 80% of the subject teachers reported that they were using story telling in teaching listening and speaking lessons. Teacher 5 had this to say about story telling method:

*Then we have story telling ,during oral lessons, we encourage the students to give some stories, and in giving the stories because the stories they don't read them directly from the books is some thing that they have read and now they just come to oo eeh, do it before the members, they memorize and and then they tell the stories.*

Similarly, Wen Chien (2003) researched on Integrating English into an Elementary School Life Course in Taipei County, Taiwan and found that true stories, and ESL activities or games such as Simon says, role play could make learning more interesting and be used as supplementary materials for the themes.

### Discussion

The subject teachers were further asked to state if they were using discussion when teaching set books. Table 6 also shows that 40(38.1%) agreed, 5(4.8) disagreed, 13(12.4%) were neutral, 46(43.8%) strongly agreed while 1(1.0%) strongly disagreed that they were using discussion when teaching set books. To sum up, the findings mean that the majority, 81.9% of the subject teachers reported that they used discussion as a method. In triangulation, Teacher 3 sums up on use of methods:

‘Ok, the methods we use, aaah are like class discussion for set books, group discussions, focused group discussions and dictation’

### Debating

Another method the subject teachers were asked to comment about was debating. Table 6 reveals 60(57.1%) agreed they were using debates, 9(8.6%) disagreed, 27(25.7%) were neutral, 9(8.6%) strongly agreed that they used debates during

oral and writing lessons. To sum up, this implies that a good number, 65.7% of the subject teachers reported that they used debates in class.

### Hot Seating

Hot seating was another method the subject teachers were asked to comment about. Table 6 reveals that 28(26.7%) agreed they were using hot seating, 36(34.3%) disagreed, 12(11.4%) were neutral, 4(3.8%) strongly agreed while 25(23.8.0%) strongly disagreed that they used hot seating during oral lessons. To sum up, a simple majority standing at 58.1% of the subject teachers disagreed that they used hot seating in class. This is more than half the teachers. Teacher 16 responds about average use of hot seating:

*” integrating literature and English has been very difficult, a real challenge , a because eeeeh, we don't have eeeeh, bright students,who can look at the the River and the Source,the River and the Source, and be taken eeehto task over an issue in the text.*

While Teacher 3 highlights reasons why use of hot seating is rarely used by teachers;

*“The task is a playful activity, yea, eeehh it can generate into a nosy classroom”*

### Language Games

Another method the subject teachers were asked to comment about was use of language games. Table 6 indicates that 9(8.6%) of the subject teachers agreed they were using language games, 33(31.4%) disagreed, 18(17.1%) were neutral, 5(4.8%) strongly agreed that they used language games during language lessons. However, 40(38.1) indicated they strongly disagreed they were using language games. To sum up, this means 69.5% of the subject teachers which is a good majority disagreed that they used games in class.

Teacher 14 responds about average use of language games

*“but marrying litetrature, integrating literature and English has been a very very very very difficult, a real challenge , a real challenge because eeeeh, we don't have eeeeh, the students mindset, the mindset of the student is that literature is different from language, so that even now if we look at the the River and the Source, that is a very rich book which h any other learner could use to pass in language, because even if I were to set, take the River and the Source, I can say let me take this chapter, chap, page chapter aaaa page 20, then I set a question for debate or create a game between Odongo and Opiyo, any student when they start reading this they understand this is the River and the Source, but because they cant imagine that this one can also be used to develop language, they just refuse to play, they are shy because of low language level”*

While Teacher 1 elaborates the reasons why use of language games is rare in language classrooms;

“Ok, now , the only book I have seen having language game is..... The the the the aah, the integrated aah, the integrated

English textbooks that is the only textbook I have seen have language games, perhaps that's why"

The current study realized teachers shy away from language games either because the cognitive level of learners is low or the games are child-like as echoed by Teacher 11

*"the capacity of most learners within the sub county, the capacity is eeeeh, low, such that if u give them a serious challenging ones , aaah, they don't adapt into that."*

Contrary to Wen Chien (2003) research on Integrating English into an Elementary School Life Course in Taipei County, Taiwan, that found ESL activities or games such as Simon says, role-play could make the learning of life skills more interesting.

### **The level of integration of both the components of language and literature**

The objective of this study was to establish the level at which both the components of language and literature were integrated and the findings revealed that a high level of both components were being integrated. There were cross cutting levels of integration across the four language skills; listening, speaking, reading, writing and of course grammar. However, there were wide discrepancies on principals' views, heads of departments' views and teachers' views on the levels at which both components of language and literature were integrated as presented in the subsequent paragraphs. The majority of principals conceded that IELC teachers were using poems, though a simple majority pointed that subject teachers were using poems. On the levels of integrating improvisation, integration of resource persons, novels, orature and literary aspects, the majority of the principals indicated that the IELC teachers were integrating at high levels. The majority of the heads of departments on the other side rated the use of poems and drama at average levels of integration while presenting high levels of integration of the other components of language and literature such as resource improvisation, invitation of resource persons, novels, orature and literary aspects. On the same levels of integration of components of language and literature, the minority or a simple majority of subject teachers conceded they used poems, drama, improvisation and resource persons to teach literature, to teach language skills and grammar contrary to the principals and HODs' views; For instance, drama and poems were both used to teach oral skills by the minority of IELC teachers which meant there was low level on attempt to integrate methods and content level. The majority of teachers used novels, orature and literary aspects when teaching reading and writing was another attempt at content and skills integration. This meant that according to the majority principals, there were higher levels of integration yet, HODs and subject teachers regarded use of novels, orature and literary aspects at average levels. At content level, the majority of teachers used literary aspects from literary texts to both teach and test grammar. This implied that there were high levels of integration at the evaluation level.

### **Methods used by Teachers of English language to Implement IELC**

One of the objectives of this study was to establish the methods secondary school teachers in Nyakach Sub County

used in implementing the integrated English language curriculum. The principals, the heads of departments and subject teachers were asked to state whether they strongly disagreed, disagreed, or were neutral, agreed or strongly agreed with the use of an array of methods as follows: Recitation, dramatization, story telling, discussion, debating, hot seating and language games. The results indicated that majority of the teachers used recitation, dramatization, story telling, debating more frequently and regularly than the hot seating and language games. A minority of the principals agreed that teachers used recitation and dramatization. However, the majority agreed that used story telling, discussion and debating. More than half of the principals disagreed that IELC teachers used hot seating and language games. As far as the heads of departments were concerned, a satisfactory majority and a simple majority of teachers used recitation and dramatization as integration methods whereas a significant majority agreed they used story telling, discussion and debating. However, the majority of the HODs disagreed that IELC teachers used hot seating and Language games in tandem with the principals' stance. A simple majority of the IELC subject teachers acknowledged that they recited poems and dramatized regularly when teaching reading and writing. The majority of the IELC teachers agreed they used story telling, discussion but a satisfactory majority used debating.

A simple majority disagreed they used hot seating while a satisfactory majority disagreed they used language games. Furthermore, story telling, group and class discussions and debating were frequently used in oral and writing lessons by an equal majority of principals, HODs and subject teachers. However, fewer principals, HODs and subject teachers conceded use of hot seating during listening and speaking and games during language lessons. Over and above, many teachers agreed that they integrated class readers and set books in grammar lessons, puns, tongue twisters and songs during oral and writing lessons. On the integration method, it was evident that components of literary items were used in language skills such as excerpts from novels, short story, poems and written narratives to teach comprehension, summary and note making skills. In addition, oral literature items like oral narratives, riddles and tongue twisters to teach listening, speaking, and pronunciation skills.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations were made:

There is need to improve the capacity of teachers to use integration after graduating from universities and colleges of education. Developing a collaborative, in-service, on-going and school-based English language program, which is well structured and implemented in phases in each school to induct and refresh English language teachers will provide the much needed link between theory and practice. In the absence of such, schools should be encouraged to develop home grown, school based professional development programs that targets areas of weaknesses such as induction and orientation. There is need for adequate adaptation of school facilities, equipment and resources towards integration enhance accessibility to training in their use. Integration requires adequate, specialized,

relevant equipment and teaching/learning resources that is relevant to implementing curriculum needs. Since there are low levels of integrating amongst some components, and confusion on the use of integrated methods and approaches, there may be a dire need to overhaul the curriculum and teach the English language and literature as separate subjects to give each subject a chance and students to excel where their interest and capacity is.

## REFERENCES

- Adeyemi, D.A. 2012. Approaches to Composition Writing: The Case of Junior Secondary Schools in Botswana, *International Journal of Learning and Development* ISSN 2164-4063 2012, Vol. 2, No. 1, Doi:10.5296/ijld.v2i1.1218 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v2i1.1218>
- Al-Magid M. A. 2006. *The effect of teachers' attitudes on the effective implementation of the communicative approach in ESL classrooms*. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of South Africa.
- Catur, R. 2012. *Teachers' concerns regarding the implementation of integrated thematic instruction: a study of primary grade teachers in Kanisius Catholic schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia*. PhD. Thesis, Chicago, Illinois.
- Cuttance, P. 2001. *School Innovation: Pathway to the Knowledge Society*. <http://www.detya.gov.au/schools/publications/index.html>.
- Fullan, M. 2001A. *The Meaning of Educational Change*. New York :Teachers College Press.
- Gathumbi, W. and Masembe, C. 2005. *Principles and Techniques in Language Teaching*. Nairobi, Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Gavalek, J. R., Raphael, T.E., Biondo, S.M., and Wang, D. 2000. Integrated literacy instruction. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, R. Barr (Eds), *Handbook of reading research* : Volume 111. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. <http://www.interestjournals.org/ER>
- Kathy, L. 2000. *Integrated Curriculum School Improvement research Series*. <http://k6boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au/linkages/Guiding/guiding-intro.html#guiding1>.
- Kenya Institute of Education 2002. *Secondary Education Teacher Preparation Guide for English*. Nairobi: KIE
- Kenya Institute of Education, 2002. *Secondary Education Syllabus*. Volume One. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Kenya Institute of Education, 2004. *Report on the Monitoring of the Implementation of the Revised Secondary School Curriculum*. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.
- Kenya Institute of Education, 2005. *Secondary Education Syllabus*. Volume One. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Kenya Institute of Education. 2002. *Secondary Education Syllabus*; Volume One. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.
- Kenya National Examinations Council 2006. 'Radical Changes as K.C.S.E. Exams Begin' in the Daily Nation, Nairobi: Nation Media Group.
- Kenyan Secondary schools in Kisii County, Unpublished Phd Thesis; Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Knowles E, Smith M. 2001. *Reading rules! Motivating Teens to Read*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.
- Lambert, N. and McCombs, B. 2000. Introduction to learner centered schools and classrooms as a direction for school reform in N. Lambert and B. McCombs (Eds), *How students learn*. Pp. 1-15. Washington D.C. American Psychological Association.
- Macharia A. N. 2011. *Teachers' strategies for managing challenges of integrated English in secondary schools in Kiambu East region, Kiambu County, Kenya*, unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Manyasi N. B. 2014. Integrated approach in teaching English language: the practice in Kenya, *International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 2 no. 4 April 2014
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology 2006. *Secondary English Teacher's Handbook for English teachers*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2005. Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 *on a Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research: Meeting the challenges of education, training and research in Kenya in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, Government Printer, Nairobi.
- Mohammad S. A. 2013. Teaching Language through Literature in ESL/EFL Classes: A Critical Study in Utilitarian Perspectives, *International Journal of English and Education*, Volume:2, Issue:3, 2013 361 [www.ijee.org](http://www.ijee.org)
- Nduta, K.M, Okemwa, D. O, Makworo E. O., Okemwa J. 2011 Empowering teachers' of English: enhancing pedagogical skills and performance in Lari district, Kenya. *Educational Research*, Vol. 2(2) pp. 856-863 February 2011
- Onchera, P. 2013. Pedagogical hindrances to oral Communication Skills in English in
- Ongong'a, J.O., Okwara, M.O. and Nyangara K.N. 2010. Using integrated approach in teaching and learning at the secondary school level in Kenya. *Educational Research*, 1(11) 618-623.
- Savvidou, C. 2004. An Integrated Approach to Teaching Literature in the EFL Classroom. In *Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. X, No. 12 December 2004.
- Savvidou, C. 2004. An Integrated Approach to Teaching Literature in the EFL Classroom. In *Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. X, No. 12 December 2004.
- Sean, A.W. and Trudy, P. W. 1999. Integrating Literature and Composing into the Language Arts Curriculum: Philosophy and Practice. *The Elementary School Journal* Vol. 90, No. 3, pp. 251-274: The University of Chicago Press URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1001678>
- Snodia, M. 2013. Challenges of Curriculum Integration at Primary School: the Case of Social Studies in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Research in Education Methodology*, Council for Innovative Research. [www.cirworld.com](http://www.cirworld.com) Volume .2 No. 2, February 2013 ISSN:2278-7690 p.114
- Sonia 2014. The Challenges of English Language Teaching in Rural Areas in India, *International Journal of English and Education* | [www.ijee.org](http://www.ijee.org) ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:3, Issue:2, April 2014
- Wen Chien G. C. 2003. Integrating English into an Elementary School Life Course. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. IX, No. 12, December 2003. <http://iteslj.org/>