



JUSTIFICATION FOR INITIATION AND INTRODUCTION OF INTEGRATED ENGLISH CURRICULUM IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Charles M. Magomaⁱ

Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies,
Kenyatta University, P.O. Box 43844 – 00100 Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract:

This study focused on the justification for initiation and introduction of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya. The study used a qualitative approach to get the views from selected teachers, head teachers and heads of English at Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), Ministry of Education (MoE) and Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC). Basic quantitative techniques such as frequencies and percentages were used to analyse some of the data that were obtained. The study employed questionnaire and interview instruments to collect data from the respondents. The researcher organized raw data collected from questionnaires and interviews. It was realized from the study that integrated English curriculum was introduced to enable teachers use integration as a teaching approach across the two disciplines and between and/or among their constituent parts. Despite this good intention, it was found that majority of the teachers of integrated English 57.4 % did not undergo any type of in-service training before they started the actual teaching of integrated English curriculum. The study recommends that the teachers and their head teachers should be helped to acquire and develop necessary skills on how to integrate English language and Literature. Equally, the study recommends that pre-service training in colleges, universities should be reformed, and an integrated approach adopted.

Keywords: curriculum initiation, curriculum introduction, integrated curriculum; integrated English curriculum, secondary schools

ⁱ Correspondent author: magoma.charles@ku.ac.ke

Background to the Study

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

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

Curriculum Innovation in Kenya

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

The result of the syllabus review of 1984/85 (that resulted in the 8-4-4 system of education) brought about a diversification of the curriculum in schools. Many new subjects were introduced, others gained new names and others underwent changes in their content and objectives. Amongst the subjects affected was the secondary school English language curriculum. English language was integrated with Literature and the resulting subject was renamed integrated English. As a result of these changes, an integrated course of English language and Literature was introduced into the secondary schools in 1986 [Muutu, 1993; Ministry of Education (MoE), 1984]. Otherwise, in the previous system of education, English language and Literature were taught separately

and not necessarily by the same teacher. In fact, Literature in English fell under Group 2 (Humanities) while English language was classified on its own as Group 1 (Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC), 1986).

The integration of English language and Literature in its broad sense meant that the same teacher would teach the two subjects as one subject: English (KIE, 1987). Thus, the teacher of English was expected to have a sound command of the English language as well as possess sufficient understanding, knowledge and skills in Literature. Despite this requirement and expectation that the teachers teach English language and Literature as one subject – English, the two subjects continued to be examined separately. This practice worked against the demand to teach the two subjects in an integrated manner.

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

Despite the recommendation that integration be done away with, the 2002 English syllabus has retained integration. The current secondary English curriculum, in its re-organized form, has adopted an integrated approach not only to teaching, but also to the assessment of English language and Literature (KIE, 2002). This re-organization is meant to improve the standards of teaching and performance in English (MoE, 2006; KIE, 2002). At this point, it is important to note that performance in integrated English has been consistently below average, contrary to expectations, at both the national and provincial levels since 1989 when the first 8-4-4 examinations were conducted. The national mean percentage marks ranged between 24.50 and 42.74 between 1989 and 2010.

According to the Ministry of Education (2006), the re-organized and strengthened secondary English curriculum is supposed to be taught through the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and grammar. The content for language and that of the various genres of Literature (poetry, drama, short stories and novels) is, therefore, covered under these skills. This means that the teacher is expected to focus on both the skill and the content. For example, the teacher is required to use content from oral Literature and poetry to teach the four English language skills.

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

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

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

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

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

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

integration. The teacher should, therefore, endeavour to understand the integrated approach.

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

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

A Strong Case for the Integration of English Language and Literature

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

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

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

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

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

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

Savvidou (2004) suggests that rather than perceiving literary discourse as separate and remote from non-literary discourse, we ought to consider the variety of text types along a continuum with some being more literary than others. According to Savvidou, the separation of Literature from language is a false dualism since literature is language and language can indeed be literary. She points out that it is not difficult to

find instances of standard transactional forms of discourse which make use of a whole array of literary devices. Savvidou further says that the boundaries that are thought to exist between literary and non-literary discourse are not so distinct. Indeed, as Widdowson (1979) suggests, the procedures, which are used to interpret literary discourse, are essentially the same for interpreting any type of discourse.

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

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

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

John (1986) says that a student of linguistics learns about language, while a student of Literature learns language as used in poetry, drama, fiction, or any other genre. Literature should not and cannot be taught solely for a linguistic purpose as people prefer to propose (Obeidat, 1997). Obeidat argues that Literature has more to offer than language would normally do, since it has greater freedom and since it

acknowledges no linguistic barriers that restrain our ability to use language. Therefore, students gain a lot from its quality and excellence.

Indangasi (1988) opines that integration of English language and Literature will compel learners to appreciate the special relationship between the two subjects and consequently the special way in which literary writers use language. Integration of language and Literature aids the learning of vocabulary and reading skills since the latter has a lot of materials (Omollo, 1990; Brumfit, 1985). Indangasi (1988) further asserts that effective teaching of English language can be done through the use of literary texts.

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

For Carter (1986), literary texts are a fertile ground, which allows mutual supportive integration of areas, which are often kept distinct in the English language classroom. He adds that creative writing can spring from the involvement with literary aspects especially when English language and Literature are taught complementarily. Omollo (1990) says that skills such as narration are best enhanced when learners read and appreciate literary works where such style of writing is used. Thus, through constant writing practice, the teacher of English language can ensure that the format of writing is mastered.

Oxford (1996) argues that the integrated–skill approach, as contrasted with the purely segregated approach, exposes English language learners to authentic language and challenges them to interact naturally in the language. Learners rapidly gain a picture of the richness and complexity of the English language as employed for communication. This approach allows teachers to track students' progress in multiple skills at the same time. Integrated-skill approach can be highly motivating to students of all ages and backgrounds.

Welleck and Warren (1949) point out that language forms the raw material for or the vehicle through which Literature is passed. They also assert that in reading literary texts, learners have a lot to cope with the language intended for the native speakers. They gain familiarity with the different linguistic uses, forms and conventions of the written mode. They further emphasize the importance of extensive reading and indicate that learners develop the ability to make references from linguistic cues and deduce

meaning from the context. In this context, KIE (1987:15) recommends that the reading component of the English syllabus should expose the learner to applied language by stating:

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

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

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

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

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

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

learner to many functions of the written language and makes the learner gain familiarity with the many features of the written language and different ways of connecting ideas.

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

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

Method

The study used a qualitative approach to get the views of the teachers, head teachers and heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC in regard to the justification and introduction of secondary integrated English Curriculum in Kenya. Basic quantitative techniques such as frequencies and percentages were used to analyse some of the data that were obtained. The study employed questionnaire and interview instruments to collect data from the respondents.

Results and Discussions

Rationale for Integrating English Language and Literature

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

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

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

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

The Head of English at KNEC explained that:

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

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

According to Sivasubramaniam (2006), Literature fosters an overall increase in reading proficiency and promotes students' academic and/or professional goals. The separation of Literature from language is a false dualism since Literature is language and language can indeed be literary (Savvidou, 2006). Savvidou further says that the boundaries that are thought to exist between literary and non-literary discourse are not so distinct. Indangasi (1988) opines that integration of English language and Literature will compel learners to appreciate the special relationship between the two subjects and

consequently the special way in which literary writers use language. Integration of language and literature aids the learning of vocabulary and reading skills since the latter has a lot of materials (Omollo, 1990; Brumfit, 1985).

Introduction of Integrated English Curriculum

In tracing how integrated English curriculum was introduced in Kenya, the heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC were interviewed by the researcher. According to the Head of English at KIE, the idea of integration arose from the recommendations of the Mackay Report of 1981 which addressed the issue of relevance of our education, that is, self-reliance. During the interview, this Head of English pointed out that the report had noted that specialization of subjects took place at a very early stage. Due to this early specialization, some students dropped literature or English language at Form 3. To avoid this scenario, the idea of integrated English curriculum was mooted.

All the three heads of English at KIE, MoE and KNEC told the researcher that before any curriculum is designed and eventually implemented; needs assessment/consultation must be carried out among the stakeholders. They further pointed out that, as required, needs assessment for the introduction of the first phase of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya was carried out before it was designed and first implemented in 1986.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The KNEC Head of English said that Secondary English Language Project (SELP) was launched at the national level in March 1988, to train teachers on how to implement the new integrated English curriculum. He said that SELP had two main objectives: to

establish a sustainable system of in-service training at the district level and to establish a higher standard of English language teaching in Kenyan secondary schools.

Consequently, according to him, SELP organized in-service training courses for teachers at the national, provincial and district levels. Some of the teachers, including the current KNEC Head of English, were sponsored to undergo further training in Britain. Secondary English Language Project also established teachers' resource centres and trained quality assurance officers and tutors to ensure sustainability of in-service courses in integrated English.

Ogula ([n.d.](#)) confirms that the Ministry of Education conducted various in-service courses for teachers in 1986 and 1987. He, however, says that due to inadequate funds, it was not possible for the MoE to run those courses regularly. Consequently, there was a big gap between the intended curriculum and the curriculum as it was interpreted and taught by teachers. Most of the teachers were not well oriented to implement the new curriculum and also on how to use the new approaches in their teaching.

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

According to Ogula ([n.d.](#)), the inspectors of schools demonstrated commitment to curriculum reform but most of them were ineffective in giving teachers the required guidance. He further points out that the inspectors themselves had not been adequately trained. Worse still, some of the key decision makers used authoritarian methods to secure support for the reformed curriculum instead of engaging in meaningful dialogue with teachers and other educators.

The table below shows attendance of in-service training by teachers to learn how to teach secondary integrated English curriculum.

Table 1: Attendance of In-Service Training by Teachers to Learn How to Teach Secondary
Integrated English Curriculum

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	43	42.6
No	58	57.4
Total	101	100.0

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

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

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

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

Another teacher said that schools did not have enough resources to sponsor them to attend in-service courses at the inception of integrated English curriculum. It is clear from the excerpt that a number of teachers who had the desire and willingness to attend in-service training in integrated English did not get a chance to do so since only a few of the teachers were given the sponsorship by their respective schools to attend the training. Lack of attendance of in-service training has a huge negative implication on the teachers' teaching of integrated English.

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

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

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

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

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

Summary of the Findings

Rationale for Integrating English Language and Literature

1. The study found that the idea of integrated English curriculum for secondary schools was meant to enable teachers use the content in Literature to teach

English language and vice versa. Therefore, integration was/is seen as an approach for teaching across the two disciplines – English language and Literature – and between and among their constituent parts.

2. It came out from the study that integration was necessary since English language is best learnt in a given context. This means that literary materials provide a natural context for the teaching and use of English language.
3. The study established that meaning in English language is found and /or is situated well in literary works which are normally varied and graded according to the level of the learners.

Introduction of Integrated English Curriculum

1. The idea of integration arose from the recommendations of the Mackay Report of 1981 which addressed the issue of relevance of our education, that is, self-reliance. The Report recommended integrated English curriculum as a measure to avoid early specialization by some students who either dropped Literature or English language at Form Three.
2. Needs assessment for the introduction of the first phase of integrated English curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya was carried out before the curriculum was designed and first implemented in 1986. Based on the needs assessment survey that was conducted, integrated English series textbooks were developed to back up and cover the syllabus that had been developed.
3. Another needs assessment survey was conducted in 1999 among the stakeholders before the second phase of integrated English curriculum was designed and implemented in 2002. During this survey, it was discovered that most areas of integrated English language and Literature were difficult for the learners. Further, it was realized that these areas were perceived as difficult primarily due to the approach adopted in teaching them. Consequently, it was felt that there was need to bring in aspects of performance and meaningful experiences, that is, contexts in their learning.
4. It emerged from discussions with the three heads of English – one each from the three Government agencies (KIE, MoE and KNEC) that the panel system was used to design the integrated English curriculum. It was pointed out that the following panel members were involved in designing and introducing integrated English curriculum in secondary schools: KIE curriculum developers, KIE research officers, staff from the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) headquarters, DQAS staff from all the provinces, a representative of

KNEC, representatives of practicing teachers from all the provinces, representatives of diploma colleges; and representatives of universities.

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

Recommendations of the Study

The following are the recommendations of the study:

1. The teachers and other stakeholders should be helped to acquire and develop necessary content, knowledge and pedagogical skills as regards the concept of integration and in particular the teaching of integrated English curriculum.
2. Pre-service training of teachers in universities and colleges should be reformed and integrated English approach adopted. This way, teachers to-be will be familiarized with the integrated approach and their competence in handling integration developed.
3. Practicing teachers and head teachers should undergo proper in-service training as regards the purpose and objectives, and the teaching and evaluation and/or supervision of integrated English curriculum.
4. Stakeholders should facilitate implementation of integrated English curriculum by being in contact with and sending to schools guiding policies on how to effectively teach integrated English curriculum.

References

1. Abagi, O., Owino, W., Sifuna, D. N., Waga, M., Ngome, C., Aduda, D. & Karugu, A. (2000). *Implementing the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya (The Koech Report): Realities, Challenges and Prospects*. IPAR Special Report Series SR 03/2000.
2. Altrichter, H. (2005). *Curriculum implementation – limiting and facilitating factors*. Retrieved January, 2011, from <http://www.kreativinnovativ09>
3. Brumfit, C. J. (1985). *Language and Literature Teaching*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
4. Carless, D. R. (2003). *Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools*. Retrieved November 19, 2009, from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.

5. Carless, D. R. (1999). *A Case study of curriculum implementation in Hong Kong*. Retrieved November 19, 2009, from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.
6. Carter, A. (1986). *Linguistic Models, Language Literariness*. In Carter, R. and Brumfit, G. J. (ed.), *Literature and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 110-132.
7. Carter, R. A. and Long, M. (1991). *Teaching Literature*. Essex: Longman.
8. Collie, J. and Slatter, S. (1987). *Literature in the Classroom: A Resource Book of Ideas and Activities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Davies, A. (1973). *Literature for Children*. Walton Hall, Milton Keynes: The Open University press.
10. Evans, T. (1984). *Drama in English Teaching*. Groom Helm, London.
11. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind, figurative thought and language and understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
12. Indangasi, H. (1988). *Literature and the Teaching of English-The Place of Grammar in the Teaching of English*. Nairobi: British Council.
13. John, J. (1986). *Language versus literature in university English departments*. *English Teaching Forum*, 24(4), pp. 18-22.
14. Kenya Institute of Education (2002). *Secondary Education Teacher Preparation Guide for English*. Nairobi: KIE.
15. Kenya Institute of Education (1999). *Executive Summary on the Needs Assessment for the Secondary School Curriculum*. KIE Report Series No. 64. Nairobi: KIE.
16. Kenya Institute of Education (1987). *A handbook for Teachers of English in Secondary Schools in Kenya*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
17. Kenya Institute of Education (1984). *Kenya Primary Mathematics Project Description*. Nairobi: KIE.
18. Kenya National Examinations Council (2006). 'Radical Changes as K.C.S.E. Exams Begin' in the Daily Nation, Nairobi: Nation Media Group.
19. Kenya National Examinations Council (1986). *Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education Regulation and Syllabuses 1987*. Nairobi: Business Forms and Systems Ltd.
20. Kiminza, O. (2000). *The Curriculum Review Process: An Overview of the Curriculum Rationalization Component under Steps*. A paper presented at the staff seminar held at KIE on 16-19th October 2000.
21. Lazar, G. (1993). *The Input hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Harlow.
22. Ministry of Education (2010). *Summative Evaluation of the Secondary School Education Curriculum*. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

23. Ministry of Education (2006). *Secondary English Teacher's Handbook*. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.
24. Ministry of Education (1984). *8-4-4 System of Education*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
25. Morgenthau, T. (1998). *How to Help Your Child Succeed in School*. In Auchincloss, K. Score Newsweek, 1998 Edition.
26. Muchiri, M. N. (1986). *Integrating English and Literature - Proceedings: Conference on English in East Africa*. Nairobi: British Council.
27. Muthiani, J. (1988). *Grammar through Literature: Using Linguistic Questions- Proceedings: Conference on the Place of Grammar in the Teaching of English*. Nairobi: British Council.
28. Muutu N. E. (1993). *An Investigation into the Current State of the Integration of English Language and Literature Teaching in Secondary Schools in Nairobi Province*, P.G.D.C.D. (unpublished) Project Report, Kenyatta University.
29. Mwanzi, H. O. (1987). *Teaching Grammar Through Literature-* In In-service Materials for District Seminars. Nairobi: British Council.
30. Obeidat, M. M. (1997). *Language vs. Literature*. In English Departments in the Arab World. Vol. 35 No. 1 P. 30.
31. Ogula, P. A. (n.d.). *The Evaluation Experience of Primary and Secondary Education Projects in Kenya*. Retrieved January 26, 2011, from <http://www.fiuc.org/iaup>
32. Okwara, M. O., Shiundu, J. O. and Indoshi, F. C. (2009). *Towards a model of integrated English language curriculum for secondary schools in Kenya*. In Educational Research and Review Vol. 4 (5). Retrieved February 4, 2009, from <http://www.academic-journals.org/ERR>
33. Omollo, D.A. (1990). *An Investigation into the Techniques and Problems of Integrating the Teaching of English Language and Literature in Kenya Secondary Schools'*, M.Ed. (unpublished) Thesis, Kenyatta University.
34. Oxford, R. (1996). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
35. Radhika, O. (1991). *Literature in the Language Classroom*. In The English Teacher Vol. XX October 1991.
36. Republic of Kenya (1999). *Totally Integrated quality Education and Training (TIQET): Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
37. Republic of Kenya (1964). *Kenya Education Commission Report*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

38. Salih, M. H. (1986). *From language to literature in university English departments*. English Teaching Forum, 27(2), pp. 25-28.
39. Savvidou, C. (2004). *An Integrated Approach to Teaching Literature in the EFL Classroom*. In Internet TESL Journal, Vol. X, No. 12 December 2004.
40. Senanu, L. and Drid, O. (1995). *Creative Use of Language in Kenya*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
41. Sereti, J. R. (1993). *Teaching Methodology for Large Classes: English across the Curriculum in Difficult Circumstances* - Proceedings of the Conference on English across the Curriculum: The Kenya Context. Nairobi: British Council.
42. Sivasubramaniam, S. (2006). *Promoting the prevalence of Literature in the Practice of Foreign and Second Language Education: Issues and Insights*, Asian EFL Journal Vol. 8(4) Article 11.
43. Teyle, J. A. and Okatch, B. (1991). *Learning Language and Literature Through Drama* - Proceedings: The Role of Language and Literature in the School Curriculum. Nairobi: British Council.
44. Waithaka, J. M. (1993). *English across the Curriculum - The Ministry of Education's Position* - Proceedings of the Conference on English across the Curriculum: The Kenya Context. Nairobi: British Council.
45. Welleck, R. & Warren, A. (1949). *Theory of Literature*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
46. Widdowson, H. (1979). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: University Press.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).