



RESEARCH ARTICLE

EDUCATIONAL ROLES OF TEACHERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE CURRICULUM IN NYAKACH SUB-COUNTY, KENYA

***Bonyo, B. O., Odongo, B. C. and Okwara, M. O.**

Curriculum studies, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, P.O. Box 210, Bondo-Kenya

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 07th February, 2016
Received in revised form
23rd March, 2016
Accepted 15th April, 2016
Published online 31st May, 2016

Key words:

Integrated English language curriculum,
Roles,
Methods,
Approaches.

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). This is why teachers' pedagogical experiences in implementing it become paramount. 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 determine English language teachers' expected role in the implementation of the integrated curriculum. The study targeted a population of 211 comprising principals, heads of departments, subject teachers and education officers. 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 on the teachers' experiences. The researcher piloted the instruments through test-retest where correlation coefficient (ρ) was worked out in two schools outside the sub-county to determine reliability and validity while the research purpose was clarified to participants for authenticity and trustworthiness. 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 objective. The study findings indicated that most teachers knew their roles in implementing the integrated curriculum but needed continuous professional development in implementing the integrated approach because some teachers taught English language and Literature as separate subjects implying confusion at their role. 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, 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.

Citation: Bonyo, B.O., Odongo, B.C. and Okwara, M.O. 2016. "Educational roles of teachers in the implementation of the English language curriculum in Nyakach sub-county, Kenya", *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (05), 32039-32048.

INTRODUCTION

There has always been a search for current methods of optimizing learner experiences (Verma and Krishnaswamy, 2012). This has elicited scholarly debates leading to innovations like integration and the whole language approach concepts (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). According to Vieluf (2012) innovative instructional practices place new demands and pressures on the teachers which involve acquiring knowledge, skills, attitudes and values including a degree of flexibility that is often uncomfortable to an insecure teacher.

**Corresponding author: Bonyo, B.O., Curriculum studies, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, P.O. Box 210, Bondo-Kenya*

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. However, with respect to their innovative role, teachers can make integration fail if they do not clearly understand what is expected of them in terms of behavioral changes and a conceptual basis of the practices; the necessary knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and attitudes to carry out their new role; and the required equipment and materials to carry out their new role (Vieluf, 2012). According to Clemente (2001), in Mexico, teachers' support plays an important role in any language teaching approach. Integration of subjects

implies an adjustment of teaching methods which require teachers out of necessity to have an attitudinal paradigm shift (Sivasubramaniam, 2006). The introduction of any new approach to language teaching is usually problematic because it entails a paradigm shift for all the stakeholders involved, especially teachers (Al Magid, 2006). Careless 1998 in Hall and Hewings (2001) notes that when teachers are favorably disposed to an approach they are also likely to support its implementation, but when they are unfavorably disposed they may prove resistant to the support required to implement the approach. Teachers' support towards language integration in regular classes would be negative if they are not involved in formulating it (Brandon *et al.*, 2006). However, teachers who are generally perceptive and sensitive to required adjustments are better able to make the paradigm shift required to become facilitators of classroom discourse (Brandon *et al.*, 2006).

Al Magid (2006) continues 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 that requires the teacher to direct and guide classroom discourse to ensure learners' interaction is a new experience. Porter (2001) implies that if implementation of any innovations was to be successful, educational managers need to ensure that there are varied and systematic support services and structures available to the teacher. Subban and Sharma (2005) state that teachers believed the support of the principals and other school leaders were critical in order for them to implement new practices such as the tireless encouragement from the heads and the school authorities to implement integration (Longo, 2006). According to Fullan, (2001) 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 yet strategic leadership of principals is essential in almost every successful innovation. On the roles of school leaders, Cuttance, (2001) observes that administrators need to promote collaboration and cooperation among subject teachers rather than competition. The school head should ensure that their language teachers are trained in integrated curriculum. Matshidisho (2007) says the principal's role in the implementation of the curriculum in South Africa is to make resources available, motivate teachers, create policies, conduct class visits, give teachers guidance and coordinate the availability of the facilitators for workshops.

Teachers, therefore, have to avoid the traditional authoritarian role for learners to have opportunities to manage their own learning (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Where the integrated approach is concerned, the teacher is seen as a facilitator, a manager of classroom activities, a guide, an adviser, a monitor and a co-communicator for the benefit of his/her learners. (Larsen-Freeman 2000 and Pica 2000) add new roles in the integrated approach where the teacher is seen as an overseer, a consultant, a co-learner, an informant, a resource, a co-coordinator, a curriculum designer, classroom researcher, and a sharer of responsibility in the classroom. The role of the teacher changes from the source of all wisdom to facilitator of learning and guide toward greater autonomy for the learners, which means that the teacher must not dominate all the

activities in the classroom as in the traditional way (Fink, 2003). 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 (Lambert and McCombs, 2000).

In Kenya, the use of integrated English language in secondary education can be traced to Mackay report of 1981 when the Presidential working party on the establishment of second University in Kenya recommended a change that was to introduce integration in the primary and secondary curriculum. 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). Subsequently, KIE (2003) recommended separation of English Language and Literature, arguing that the combination of the two subjects tended to seriously overshadow English language. Earlier than this, the Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya (RoK, 1999) had also recommended that the integration of the two subjects be stopped. Despite the recommendation that integration be done away with, the KIE (2002) English syllabus review which was the last time the curriculum was reviewed has retained integration (Sunday Nation, June, 2015).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study adopted a mixed research approach and used a concurrent triangulation design in studying pedagogical experiences of teachers in Nyakach Sub-County in Kenya regarding the implementation of integrated English language curriculum. The area has registered dismal performance in the national examinations due to difficulties in implementing the official curriculum- IELC (Sub-county education reports from 2010-2014; KNEC Reports from 2011-2014) and this yielded the selection of the sub county for this study. Saturated sampling was used to select 105 teachers of English, 50 heads of language departments and 50 principals in the sampled schools from a population in 52 public secondary schools. Saturated sampling was also used to select the Sub County Quality Assurance Officer. Data was collected from all the 205 teachers using questionnaires, and from 16 teachers using an interview schedule and a document analysis checklist to triangulate the information. All the instruments had been pre-tested and piloted in a neighboring Sub-county for validity and reliability. The Concurrent triangulation design was appropriate for the study because it guaranteed data that was collected concurrently and simultaneously beyond one source (Joffrion, 2010).

The reasoning behind it is that both quantitative and qualitative study may be insufficient by themselves but either would fill the gaps of the other to provide various evidences for corroboration. Moreover, Creswell (2014) notes that mixed methods involve collecting both qualitative and quantitative statistics and was suitable for this study because it permitted the use of deductive and inductive strategies. The data was analyzed separately but converged during the discussion to

bring a comprehensive case that either quantitative or qualitative approaches were insufficient to present. Quantitative data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program version 20. The data was tabulated and calculation of central tendency percentages presented. Qualitative data was analyzed by establishing analytical and thematic categories from the statements as verbatim responses were quoted from coded pseudonyms to triangulate questionnaire data and maintain confidentiality and anonymity. Member checking was done for the grey areas to achieve authenticity and credibility from the interview data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study sought to establish the role played by principals, heads of departments (HODs) and teachers in implementing integrated English language curriculum. The principals and the HODs took the lead in supervision, providing teaching materials, motivating, monitoring, and encouraging teachers to attend seminars organized and approved by the Kenyan Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. The principals and the HODs were asked to Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), remain Neutral (3), Agree (4), or Strongly Agree (5). The results are shown in Table 1, 2 and 3.

implementation of the integrated English curriculum was their role. This means that 90% which forms the majority of the principals agreed that supervision was their role. Asked about the principal's role in language teaching, Teacher 16 said,

"of course the principal supervises all teachers not only the English language teachers".

However Teacher 9 insinuated that the principal knew nothing about the teaching of integrated curriculum and observed thus:

"That one, aah, he cannot check what goes on in class because he is too busy to want to know".

In corroboration, Matshidisho (2007) says the principal's role in the implementation of the curriculum in South Africa is among other things to conduct class visits, give teachers guidance and coordinate the availability of the facilitators for workshops as a supervisory duty. Another study by Kabiro (2011) on the roles of principals in curriculum implementation in Muranga, Kenya reported that the specific roles of the principals were among others, guiding the teachers and supervision.

Table 1. Roles of Principals in implementing IELC (n=50)

	No of Principals						Percent					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Frequency												
Supervision	0	2	3	29	16	50	0	4	6	58	32	100
Monitoring	0	0	2	30	18	50	0	0	4	60	36	100
Encourage&support	0	1	6	21	22	50	0	2	12	42	44	100
Provision of T/Aids	0	1	5	29	30	50	0	2	10	58	60	100
Motivation	0	0	4	30	16	50	0	0	8	60	32	100

Table 2. Roles of HODs in implementing IELC (n=50)

	No of Heads of Department						Percent					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	SD	D	N	A	SA	Totals
Frequency												
Supervision	0	0	0	23	27	50	0	0	0	46	54	100
Monitoring	0	0	1	25	24	50	0	0	2	50	48	100
Encou &support	0	0	5	24	21	50	0	0	10	48	42	100
Provision of T/Aids	0	1	5	36	8	50	0	2	10	72	16	100
Motivation	0	1	5	29	15	50	0	2	10	58	30	100

Table 3. Role of Subject Teachers in implementing IELC (n=105)

	No of Response						Percent					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	SD	D	N	A	SA	Totals
Frequency												
Concern	0	1	8	71	25	105	0	1.0	7.6	67.6	23.8	100
Improvisation	0	2	16	48	39	105	0	1.9	15.2	45.7	31.1	100
Using teaching aids	3	1	31	45	25	105	2.9	1.0	29.5	42.9	23.8	100
Praising	0	2	13	60	30	105	0	1.9	12.4	57.1	29.5	100
Self evaluation	0	1	13	60	31	105	0	1.0	12.4	57.1	29.5	100
Intrinsic Motivation	0	0	4	69	32	105	0	0	3.8	65.7	30.5	100
Attending Sem/work	1	3	21	47	33	105	1.0	2.9	20.0	44.8	31.4	100

Role of principals

Supervision

Table 1 shows that (58%) of the principals agreed that supervision was one of their roles, (4%) disagreed, (6%) were neutral while (32%) strongly agreed that supervising the

Monitoring

Another role of the principals was the monitoring of curriculum implementation. This is an important role given that being an agent of the Teachers Service Commission in Kenya, the principals write frequent reports on teachers and an annual appraisal report on teacher's overall conduct in a particular year. Table 1 shows that (60%) of the principals

agreed that monitoring was one of their roles, (4.0) % disagreed, while (36.0) strongly agreed that monitoring of the integrated English curriculum implementation was their role. On the whole, it implies that the majority of the principals standing at 96% envisioned monitoring the implementation of IELC as their role. In corroboration with interviews outcome, Teacher 14 agreed that without monitoring especially from the principal, there would be little language teaching. Teacher 14 said,

“ yea, aah without anyone monitoring these English language teachers, they would not cover all the daily lessons as you know English is in the time table daily”.

Teacher 13 equally supported Teacher 14’s view and posited:

“implementing this thing is challenging, integration? Integration is challenging, you need to monitor teachers all through otherwise they will malinge”.

This finding resonates with (Larsen-Freeman 2000 and Pica 2000) who asserted that where the integrated approach is concerned, the teacher is seen as a manager of classroom activities, a guide an adviser, a monitor and a co-communicator for the benefit of his/her learners and the principal takes the lead in all that.

Encouraging Teachers

The principal has a role to encourage teachers as a manager who knows the teachers weaknesses and strength. The principal is in a better position to encourage capacity building for teachers with the potential to grow professionally. Table 1 again shows that (42.0%) of the principals agreed that encouraging teachers to attend seminars and workshops on IELC was one of their roles, (2.0%) disagreed, (12.0%) were neutral while (44.0%) strongly agreed that such role of encouraging teachers implementing the integrated English curriculum to attend seminars was their role. Overall, 86% of the principals implying the majority agreed that encouraging teachers was their role. During the interviews, Teacher 15 opposed the principals’ views by stating that the principals actually did the opposite. This was the stance of Teacher 15:

“No, No, No, indeed the current crop of principals do the exact opposite in that role. Majorly they want spanner boys who run their small errands at the expense of empowering teachers with knowledge”

However, according to

‘it is the role of the principals to ensure that English language teachers attend the seminars at least once in a while’

This finding is in agreement with the roles of school leaders as observed by Schwartz (2005) that administrators need to promote collaboration and cooperation among subject teachers rather than competition and that school heads should ensure that their language teachers are encouraged to train in integrated curriculum. Indeed, according to Longo (2006), the tireless encouragement from the heads and the school

authorities has also been cited as instrumental in the creation of positive teacher attitudes towards integration.

Provision of IELC Materials

As both the accounting officer and the manager, it is the duty of the principal to provide sufficient teaching materials and sources to the teachers. Table 1 also shows that (58.0%) agreed that principals provide teaching materials to IELC teachers, (2.0%) disagreed, (10.0%) were neutral, while (30%) strongly agreed. In a nutshell, this means that the majority, standing at 88% of the principals, agreed that provision of teaching materials was their role. During the interviews, the Sub County Quality Assurance Officer saw this as the major role of the principals. The officer noted:

“ it may be it may be it may be broad like the principal what is he supposed to do like availing those resources, I think that one is aahh is is important.”

Similarly, Matshidisho’s (2007) argument that the principal’s role in the implementation of the curriculum is to make resources available is in agreement with this finding. Likewise, Mogaka, (2001) findings implied that principals had to avail all resources needed by teachers without which an integrated curriculum cannot work. Another study by Kabiro (2011) on the roles of principals in curriculum implementation in Muranga, Kenya reported that the specific roles of the principals were provision of resources, motivation, and guiding the teachers.

Motivation of IELC Teachers

On motivating IELC teachers, the principal has the sole mandate of incurring expenses and controlling use of school funds. As the custodian of the school kitty, and being the manager, it is within the principal’s mandate to motivate the teachers in any way deemed fit. Table 1 once again shows that (60.0%) of the principals agreed they do motivate teachers implementing IELC while (8.0%) remained neutral about such a role. (32.0%) strongly agreed that that was their role. Therefore it means that the majority, 92% of the principals, agreed that motivation of teachers was their role. This implies that the principal’s support for motivation is necessary for the implementation of integrated English language curriculum. Upon interviewing on the types of motivation, those who agreed reported that they had rewarded, promoted and praised English language teachers who implemented the curriculum accordingly. The responses of the principals were similar and represented by Teacher 9 observed:

They have been rewarding language department by recognizing their efforts and commending them, issuing certificates of best regards and occasionally monetary gains.

This finding is in line with Subban and Sharma (2005) statement that teachers believed the support of the principals and other school leaders were critical in order for them to implement new practices. Moreover, Matshidisho (2007) concession that the principal’s role in the implementation of the curriculum is to motivate teachers resonates with the current view and in line with another study by Kabiro (2011) on the roles of principals in curriculum implementation in

Muranga, Kenya who reported that the specific roles of the principals were provision of resources motivation, and guiding the teachers. This implies that the school principal's as managers must fully support the implementation, take lead and be actively involved in the preparations of the schools to implement the syllabus as prescribed.

Role of Heads of Departments

Supervising the implementation of IELC

On the other hand, the study sought to find out the role Heads of Departments (HODs) played during the implementation of the integrated English language. The HODs supported the principal in supervision, monitoring, providing teaching materials, encouraging teachers to attend seminars, and motivating. The study also sought to determine the roles of the Heads of Departments (HODs) as experienced teachers in English language teaching. Table 2 also shows that (46%) of the HODs agreed that supervision was one of their roles, (54%) strongly agreed that supervision of the implementation of the integrated English curriculum was their role. This implies that all the HODs, standing at 100%, experienced their supervisory role. Teacher 13 corroborated this finding by emphatically declaring the role is enshrined as a head of department's duty. Teacher 13 opined,

"Yea, one of the most important roles of HOD is to supervise the others and their manner of implementing the language curriculum".

Another interviewee Teacher 1 confessed that were it not for the HOD guidance, then learning integration would have been difficult. Thus Teacher 1 said'

"I believe it's just casual, they are just casual discussions and proper guidelines from the H, oo, the head of departments on how to eeh implement the integrated approach"

Monitoring of IELC Teachers

The heads of departments are in a position to assist the school administration and indeed as the bridge between principals and teachers, they have the authority to make requisitions most of which they must monitor their utility. Table 2 reveal that 25(50%) of the HODs agreed that monitoring IELC implementation was one of their roles, 1(2.0) % were neutral, while 24(48.0%) strongly agreed that supervision of the integrated English curriculum was their role. On the whole, over 98% of the HODs considered monitoring the implementation of IELC as their role. The interviews revealed that a number of teachers had to be monitored to work. According to Teacher 14,

" yea, aah without anyone monitoring these English language teachers, they would not cover all the daily lessons as you know English is in the time table daily".

Teacher 13 equally supported Teacher 14's view and posited:

"implementing this thing is challenging, integration? integration is challenging, you need to monitor teachers all through otherwise they will malinge"

Another interviewee, Teacher 12 lamented how the monitoring role was a difficult task that the HODs had to contend with. The teacher observed:

"Yea, to monitor adult is a very hard thing but we have to do it whenever duty calls because human beings must be followed to achieve desired results."

In corroboration, Porter (2011) doubts the monitoring role of the school administrators and observed that other school leaders such as the HODs play a key role in a workable inclusive approach in their schools. However, Subban and Sharma (2005) state that the teachers believe in the support of other school leaders but not monitoring, as being critical in order for them to implement new practices.

Encouraging and supporting teachers to implement IELC

On encouraging teachers to attend seminars organized and approved by the Kenyan Ministry of Technology. Table 2 reveals that 24(48.0%) of the HODs agreed that encouraging teachers to attend seminars and workshops on IELC was one of their roles, 5(10.0%) were neutral while 21(42.0%) strongly agreed that such encouragement of teachers to attend seminars on implementing the integrated English curriculum was their role. On the overall, it means that the majority, 90% of the HODs agreed encouraging teachers was amongst their roles. In the interviews, one interviewee concurred that this is one of the roles of the HODS. Teacher 1 said,

"it is also the role of the head of department to push the principal, to ensure that members of the department attend the seminars at least once in a while"

During the same interviews, HOD 1 observed that the seminars were infrequent though they were there and confessed being in the fore front to have organized one which was postponed to the following year; this is what he said;

"the the eee seminars and workshops aaaah? No, in Nyakach Sub County, no, actually I am the one who is, who was organizing one towards the end of the year, it was supposed to be sponsored by Jomo Kenyatta Foundation, yea, we were partnering with Jomo Kenyatta foundation but it didn't work so it may be at the end of this January, but eeeh most of this Se seminars and workshops are the ones for NES, the ones for..... British council, mhm ...the ones for eeeeeeh, another group, there are 3 groups, ok, yea."

The statement is an evidence of a head of department encouraging the seminars and their attendance. These sentiments agree with Macharia's (2011) study among Kiambu IELC teachers that respondents with negative attitude towards an integrated approach attended seminars and workshops while the heads of departments encouraged them to do so. Moreover, Subban and Sharma (2005) state that teachers believed the support of other school leaders were critical in order for them to implement new practices.

Provision of teaching materials

On providing teaching materials, the head of department is duty bound to avail the resources from the principal by placing

requisitions and advising the principal on resource needs in the school. Table 2 shows that 36(72.0%) agreed that heads of departments availed teaching materials to IELC teachers, 2(2.0%) disagreed, 5(10.0%) were neutral, while 8(16%) strongly agreed with their role of providing teaching materials. On the whole, it means that the majority of the HODs standing at 96% agreed it was HODs role to avail the teaching materials to the teachers from the school principal. During the interview, the Sub County Quality Assurance officer observed that the HOD should ‘be *availing the resources.*’ While Teacher 1 complemented:

“we keep on asking the administration to buy for us the textbooks through the head of department, yea”.

This finding agrees with Kabiro (2011) who reported that the specific roles of the HODs were provision of resources motivation, amongst others.

Motivation

On motivating IELC teachers, the heads of departments as immediate supervisors are expected to motivate teachers under them using various ways to implement the integrated curriculum. Table 2 indicates that 29(58.0%) of the teachers agreed HODs do motivate teachers implementing IELC while 5(10.0%) remained neutral about such a role. 15(30.0) strongly agreed that that was their role. However, 1(2%) disagreed. In a nutshell, this implies that, 88% which is the majority of the HODs agreed that motivating subject teachers was among their roles. During the interviews, one interviewee supported the findings that the HODs motivation was an integral part of the working relationship without which everything goes haywire in the language department. In triangulation, Teacher 13 said thus

“Aaah, yea, this is a major, role, role of the head of departments because, the HOD as head, he cannot afford to work without eeeeh, encouraging us to waa, work through various me, means. He must, he must find out ways eeeeh, to boost aaaah, our morale even when the principal fails to support him, yea aaah”

Teacher 12 however, disagreed that most of the HODs motivated them and negated their role because;

“Some of the HODs are too full of authority which they misuse and demoralize teachers implementing IELC”.

Similar to teacher 13 and questionnaire data, Macharia (2011) findings considered that the heads of departments motivated respondents with negative attitude towards an integrated approach to attend seminars and workshops.

Role of subject teachers

The study sought to establish the roles played by teachers in implementing integrated English language curriculum. The teachers were the actual implementers of the IELC. They were asked to Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), remain Neutral (3), Agree (4), or Strongly Agree (5). The results are shown in Table 3.

Concern

Table 3 shows that 71(67.6%) of the integrated English language teachers agreed that being concerned at their teaching of IELC was one of their roles, 1 (1.0%) disagreed while 8(7.6%) remained neutral while 25 (23.8%) strongly agreed that being concerned at the implementation of the integrated English curriculum was their role. This implies that slightly over 91.4% that is the majority of the teachers were concerned at their teaching role. During the interviews, Teacher 5 observed:

“Okey, I can say that am very much concerned in the teaching of the Integrated English as we were encouraged during our aaah university studies”. Moreover Teacher 6 emphasized, “one of the major challenges that we face , may be that is not ua area, main area of concern but I will start with that, our organization, the organization of curriculum, is organized in such a way that it makes it a bit difficult for the teacher to integrate”. Teacher 8 acknowledged; “Yea, it is you as a teacher to be concerned on how best you want to integrate because it is a unique curriculum”.

Therefore, teachers have a role to be concerned at the manner the integrated language curriculum is being implemented. According to Vieluf (2012) innovative instructional practices place new demands and pressures on the teachers which involve acquiring knowledge, skills, attitudes and values including a degree of flexibility that is often uncomfortable to an insecure teacher hence their reason to be concerned.

Improvisation

Table 3 further reveals that 48(45.7%) agreed that IELC teachers improvised teaching materials, 2(1.9%) disagreed, 16(15.2%) were neutral, while 39(31.1%) strongly agreed with their role of improvising teaching materials where appropriate ones were unavailable. Therefore, it means that a significant majority standing at 82.8 % agreed that improvising was their role as presented in Table 3. According to interviews on the teachers’ role in improvisation, Teacher 1 acknowledged thus;

“So there’s certain things that we do; first of all: we make use of the chalkboard, that’s one thing we ensure we do. Aah what you believe is critical should be written, on the board and then aah another thing is that we ensure the little that is there is shared among the students; and then also aah, another thing that we do is that we keep on asking the administration to buy for us the textbooks through the head of department”.

Furthermore, Teacher 1 had this to say about other teachers, *“ok, what I think I don’t do that others are doing and I think I should emulate is aah, just as I have said, to teach integrated English is sometimes challenging, now when it comes to improvisation, yea, I don’t believe, I have done my best, I still think there is a lot aah that I can still do”.*

Likewise teacher 3 conceded it is the teacher’s role to improvise resources. Teacher 5 agreed that it is the teachers’ role especially whenever they are not enough. This is what Teacher 5 observed,

"I can say that eeh the-eee resources are not enough whereby even making us go ahead and even improvise some and even the text books that are available, the few of them can also be photocopied at times".

Teacher 9 added;

"we are facilitating set books, discussions and discussions on contemporary issues, monitoring students etc etc, improvising resources also".

However, some interviewees opined that in as much as it is their role to improvise, it may be difficult because of time constraints. For instance Teacher 7 reiterated thus,

"...as I said earlier, really no one has time to improvise but again there are others that aren't improvisable, if there is such a word (laughing). In a nutshell, teachers improvise a lot because they take it as their role".

Blumberg and Everett, (2005) see the value of integrated teaching of literature and language because teachers share classroom activities, share worksheets and resources with each other to facilitate their students' learning. This is especially true when one compares the integrated approach to the traditional methods of L2 teaching.

Use of teaching materials

Table 3 also shows that 45(42.9%) agreed that teachers used IELC teaching materials, 1(1.0%) disagreed, 31(29.5%) were neutral, while 25(23.8%) strongly agreed with their role of using integrated teaching materials. However, 3(2.9%) strongly disagreed it is their role to use integrated teaching materials. Therefore, 66.7% acknowledged using integrated teaching materials was amongst their roles. This means that a significant majority actually used the resource materials in actual integration while teaching. During the interviews it was apparent that some teachers never integrated the teaching materials in teaching. For instance Teacher 4 observed:

Okey, oh, they are there but our students fear using them because they are surcharged once they lose them, once they lose them. But teachers' guides and other reference materials for us are there. Also, aaah, there used to be radio broadcast lessons but the radio stopped working.

Teacher 5 comments thus:

"Ok, as concerns the resources, I can say that the resources are not so many and I can say that the ones which are readily available are the text books, which txt books are also not eeh enough, soo, it involves sharing of the txt books eeh, whereby some students don't get a chance toooo, aah get the resources as concerns the-eee, the integration, so we find that some of them might malinge claiming that there are no resources"

The implication in these two teacher statements is that the use of teaching materials may not be in significant portions due to factors beyond the scope of this study. In corroboration, this is the scenario that is observed by Mbogori (2006) according to

whom the implementation of the integrated English course faced various difficulties as most teachers were not trained adequately to handle integrated language course and text books were the only resource materials (Mbogori, 2006) yet the use of textbooks as instructional resource for teaching English explain student achievements in teaching Language and Literature as an integrated course.

Praising

Table 3 further shows that 60(57.1%) agreed that IELC teachers praised their colleagues who strive to implement the integrated language curriculum, 2(1.9%) disagreed, 13(12.4.0%) were neutral, while 30(28.6%) strongly agreed with their role of praising other IELC teachers. Over 85.7% agreed praising colleagues was one of their roles implying that the majority of teachers subscribed to the notion that praising other teachers' efforts in integration was one of their roles. In triangulation, teachers appreciated others during the interviews. According to the interviews, Teacher 5 asserted;

"I promote and praise other teachers on the same area for the good effort that they try to do in promoting the same".

Teacher 1 had this to say in recognition and praise of other teachers' efforts at integration:

"Oh yes, a part from this aah, what I got from the university college, aah when I joined the school, I also got the aah some English teachers who had some experience, aah, they were more experienced than I was. I believe that even though I had not attended any workshop, but they were also been there at least to give guidelines, in yea, and to, on how to teach English in an integrated way. So, aah, the workshops had not been there, the seminars had not been there but at least I can rely on the experience of the the teachers who had been there whom I found in the working station".

This agrees with McIntyre and Byrd (2000) who points out that the teacher cannot give what they do not have implying that appreciating others is inherent virtue that teachers readily offer to each other.

Evaluation of IELC

Table 3 also shows that 60(57.1%) agreed that IELC teachers evaluated their teaching of IELC, 2(2.0%) disagreed, 5(10.0%) were neutral, while 8(16%) strongly agreed with their role of evaluating their teaching. Therefore, this implied that the majority standing at 86.6% considered evaluating their teaching as their role. During the interviews, Teacher 2 had this to say,

"we integrate exam papers during assessments and even at some point we form small groups within schools, aah whereby we set this exams",

And Teacher 4 concurred,

"Yes, aaah, I would say that our role is just like any other teachers, teaching, preparing lesson plans, evaluating learners or u meant on English methods or integration?"

Therefore it means that the majority of teachers who were interviewed agreed that evaluating the integrated approach to language teaching is one of their roles. This finding resonates with Megha and Pratibha (2013) who did a historical review of studies on the role of teachers' in curriculum development for teacher education in India and established that teachers also play the role as evaluator for the assessment of learning outcomes. So teachers must possess some qualities such as planner, designer, manager, evaluator, researcher, decision maker and administrator and as such is crucial in curriculum development process that ends in implementation.

Intrinsic motivation

Table 3 further shows that 69(65.7%) of subject teachers agreed that they motivated themselves by integrating language curriculum, 2(2.0%) disagreed, 4(3.8%) were neutral, while 32(30.5%) strongly agreed with their role of intrinsic motivation. Therefore, the implication of this finding is that a significant majority 96.2% considered self motivation one of their teaching roles as they attempted integration. During triangulation, Teacher 4 seemed to imply that teachers must deal with negative attitude and implement the IELC even when they don't know what they are doing. In this regard, Teacher 4 says:

"Okey, I can say that the-e-e integration of the English has aah changed my attitude a lot and I implement it even if I don't know it well but I try my level best to do the much I can"

This means that IELC teachers are self motivated to go out of their way to implement the IELC against the odds. According to the Sub County quality officer, the teacher,

"should also be able to motivate the learners, yea and then in motivating the learners, the teacher motivates himself"

Accordingly, Macharia (2011) had studied Kiambu teachers in Kenya on ways of managing the challenges of implementing the IELC and found that motivated teachers managed IELC through extra teaching in the early mornings, evenings, weekends, Saturdays and school holidays. These were some of the strategies IELC teachers adopted to manage the challenge of time.

Seminar attendance

Table 3 finally indicates that 47(44.8%) agreed that it was IELC teachers' role to attend seminars and workshops on the integrated language curriculum, 3(2.9%) disagreed, 21(20.0%) were neutral, while 33(31.4%) strongly agreed with their role of attending IELC seminars. Overall, 76.2% agreed attending seminars was their role. This finding means that a significant majority considered it their role to attend the seminars and workshops. According to the interviews, Teacher 3 who acknowledged it is the teachers' role to attend the seminars and workshops had this to say,

"Ok, roles, roles, you you mean aah responsibilities? Yea, like any other teachers, I attend meetings, and workshops".

However, the majority of teachers interviewed had not attended a single seminar because they had neither heard of them or were no longer beneficial. Teacher 1 had this to say,

"No, I have not heard of any, the only one I have heard of is one called SMASSE, and it is one for science and mathematics teachers",

while Teacher 6 reckoned,

"we do have them, but to us, they are not really beneficial, may be".

Yet another interviewee, Teacher 6 confessed,

"I have never attended any, so I must confess my head of department has helped a lot in directing on the right thing to do".

Teacher 11 observed:

Mhm aah I like something about se, these seminars especially about the British toolkit eeh mhm, organized by the British council. It is more of brings us back to (phone ringing-interruption) the British toolkit talks of ooh, integration in a wider spectrum, yea and eeh, whenever they come, u can see how we marry these two things.

This means that teachers were equipping themselves with skills and willing to attend the seminars whenever there is an opportunity but in deed there were none as observed by Mbogori (2006) according to whom the implementation of the integrated English course faced various difficulties as most teachers were not trained adequately to handle integrated language course. This finding implies that the involvement of teachers in seminars, workshops and language conferences would facilitate their performance in classroom delivery yet few attend them because the seminars are hardly organized. These statistics support the view of Macharia (2011) that research findings indicated that the most employed strategies in handling lack of knowledge of the concept of integration and difficult content were attending seminars and workshops and holding consultations with colleagues as a duty to fill the gap of Knowledge. Indeed this finding is in line with Hong and Liying (2009) report on factors affecting teachers' key role in curriculum implementation among teachers in North Western part of China which found that professional development needs negatively predicted teachers' curriculum implementation and they ought to attend them.

Summary and recommendations

The teachers were asked to state their roles with regard to the implementation of the integrated English language curriculum in the questionnaire and the interviews. Subsequently, the principals, the heads of language departments and subject teachers were questioned on the following: supervision, provision of teaching materials, motivation of English language teachers, monitoring, encouraging teachers of English, and attending seminars and workshops. The subject

teachers were further asked about their improvisatory role, requisition of teaching materials, use of integrated materials, evaluative role and concerns at the teaching of integrated English language curriculum. The majority of principals agreed that supervision was their role. The majority of the principals also envisioned monitoring the implementation of IELC as their role. On their role in encouraging teachers, the majority agreed. The majority of the principals also agreed that provision of teaching materials and motivating teachers were among their roles. Therefore a significant majority of the principals agreed that most of the cited roles were within their roles for they provided leadership in curriculum implementation. Similarly, the heads of language departments were also subjected to the same instruments and items. A whooping majority acknowledged their supervisory, monitoring, encouraging teachers, motivational, and provision of teaching resources as their roles. This implied that the HODs were aware of their roles as far as the implementation of curriculum was concerned and could impact positively on the learning outcomes.

Likewise, the majority of teachers were also very clear on their roles of self motivation, concern at the implementation of integrated English curriculum, improvising and using integrated teaching and learning materials, praising other teachers implementing IELC, self evaluation of teaching, self motivation and attending IELC seminars and workshops. It emerged from this study that a significant majority of teachers implementing IELC conceded the cited roles in implement the official curriculum. Such acknowledgment should positively impact on their performance and learning outcomes. In a nutshell, the majority of teachers have conceded their various roles but there is a minority that remains neutral or disagrees with some of the roles. This implies that such teachers have not embraced their roles for whatever reasons and may negatively impact the learning outcomes.

Three major recommendations emerge from this study

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations were made: There is need by the ministry of education to improve the capacity of teachers to enhance their roles in 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 on their unique roles, 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 courses that targets areas of weaknesses such as induction, orientation and refresher programs. 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 by English language teachers. Otherwise, teachers' role in using and improvisation of teaching materials will be rendered redundant. Since there are high levels of concern at integration, and use of integration materials, 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

- 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.
- Blumberg, P. and Everett, J. 2005. Achieving a campus consensus on learning centred teaching: process and outcomes to improve academy, 23, 191-210
- Brandon, K.F., Jana, J.D, William, W. S., and John, N.O. 2006. It's Time for a Paradigm Shift in the Quantitative Evaluation of Left Ventricular Dysynchrony. HHS, Public Access.
- Carless, D. R. 2003. *Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools*. Retrieved November 19, 2009, from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.
- Clemente, M. A. 2001. Teachers' attitudes within a self-directed language learning scheme system, 29: 45-67.
- Coffman, S.J. 2002. Ten Strategies for getting students to take responsibility for their learning, college Teaching, 51, 2-4.
- Creswell, J. W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* London: Sage Publications.
- Cuttance, P. 2001. *School Innovation: Pathway to the Knowledge society*. <http://www.detya.gov.au/schools/publications/index.html>.
- Daily Nation, Friday, 15th May 2015
- Daily Nation, Thursday April 30th, 2015.
- Fink, L.D. 2003. *Creating significant learning experiences*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- 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.
- Hong W. and Liying C. 2009. Factors Affecting Teachers' Curriculum Implementation, *Linguistics Journal*; Dec2009, Vol. 4 Issue 2, p.135
- Joffrion, C. 2010. *Mixed Method Research Defined*. Retrieved May19, 2014 from www.prolog.org/108142-mixed-method-research-defined.html
- Kenya Institute of Education 1999. *Executive Summary on the Needs Assessment for the Secondary School Curriculum*. KIE Report Series No. 64, Nairobi: KIE.
- Kenya Institute of Education 2002. *Secondary Education Teacher Preparation Guide for English*. Nairobi: KIE
- 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.
- 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.
- KNEC, 2007. *Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education regulation and syllabuses*: Nairobi

- KNEC, 2011. *Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education regulation and syllabuses*: Nairobi
- KNEC, 2012. *Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education regulation and syllabuses*: Nairobi
- KNEC, 2014. *The Year 2013 KCSE Examination Report, Volume I: Languages*. Nairobi: KNEC
- 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 & B. McCombs (Eds), *How students learn*. Pp. 1-15. Washington D.C. American Psychological Association.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000. *Techniques and principles in second language teaching*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Longo, R., J. 2006. *Inclusive Education: Policies, Teachers' Attitudes and Perspectives*. Retrieved on 7/2/2012 from <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/inclusive+education%+policies%30+policies%2c+teachers'+attitudes+and+pespectives-ao17998526>.
- 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.
- Magoma, C. M. 1999. *Teacher Related Factors which Influence the Implementation of Integrated English Course in Secondary Schools: A Case of Ibacho Division, Kisii Central District*. Unpublished M.Ed Thesis. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Matshidiso W. 2007. *The Role of the School Principal in the Implementation of the Revised National Curriculum Statement in South Africa, Tshwane North District*. M.Ed. (Unpublished) Thesis, University of South Africa.
- Mbogori, K. 2006. *Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Implementation of Secondary School English in Miriga-Mieru Division, of Meru Central District, Kenya*. (P.G.D.E Thesis) Catholic University of E/A
- McIntyre, D.J. and Byrd, D.M.(Eds.) 2000. *Research on effective models for teacher education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Megha S. J. and Pratibha, S. P. 2013. *The Role of Teachers' in Curriculum Development for Teacher Education in India*, A paper presented for National conference on Challenges in Teacher Education, Physical Education and Sports <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/258023165>
- Oxford, R. 1998. Language teachers: new roles, new attitudes: Introduction to the special issue. *System*, 26: 1-2.
- Porter, G. 2001. *Ability and Inclusive Education*. www.disabilityworld.org/05-06-01/children/inclusiveed.s.html. Retrieved on 9/11/2011
- Republic of Kenya, 1964. *Kenya Education Commission Report*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- 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.
- 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 Sunday Nation, June, 28th 2015.
- Subban, P. and Sharma, U. 2005. Understanding Educator Attitudes Toward the Implementation of Inclusive Education. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 25. No. 2. Retrieved on 15/6/2011. From dsq-sds.otg/article/view/545/22
- Thomas, J. A., Cooper, S. B. and Ponticell, J. A. 2000. Doing math the science way: Staff development for integrated teaching and learning. In McIntyre, D. J. and Byrd, D.M. (Eds.), *Research on effective models for teacher education* (pp 10-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Verma, S.K. and Krishnaswamy. N. 2014. *Modern linguistics: An Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press:
- Vieluf, S. 2012. *Teaching practices and pedagogical innovation: evidence from TALIS*, OECD Publishing.
