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ABSTRACT

It is the desire of all stakeholders in education that teachers and students achieve good results. However, in Ugenya Sub-County, the mean score for History and Government had declined in between the years 2013 and 2017. The Sub-County was chosen for study because in comparison to other sub-counties, it registered a huge drop in performance in KCSE examinations. This trend implied that there were challenges with curriculum implementation which needed to be established with an intention of reversing the downward trend of the mean score in the KCSE examinations. The purpose of this study was to assess challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub County. Objectives of the study were to assess teacher-based challenges, student-based, resource-based challenges and curriculum-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum. The study is significant because it establishes challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County. This will help teachers and education officers to take necessary measures to revitalize the subject. The theoretical framework was based on teacher-based challenges, student-based challenges, resource-based challenges and curriculum-based challenges which were the independent variables, funding and nature of curriculum were the intervening variables while implementing of History and Government curriculum was the dependent variable. The research was conducted through descriptive survey with results presented in terms of frequency counts and percentages. The study population was 25 teachers, 25 principals, 1200 Form Four History and Government students and one sub-county Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (QASO). From these, a study sample of 22 teachers, 22 principals, 291 students and one QASO was selected based on Krejcie and Morgan sample size estimation table of 1970. Simple random sampling was used to select students while teachers, principals and QASO were selected through saturated sampling. Data from teachers and students was collected through questionnaires while interview schedules were used to collect data from the principals and the QASO. To ensure validity research instruments were presented to two experts in the Department of Educational Communication, Technology and Curriculum Studies of Maseno University to study them and advice the researcher. Reliability of the instruments was ensured through a test-retest method whereby 3 teachers and 30 students were involved. Reliability coefficient of 0.82 was obtained from the students responses while that of the teacher questionnaire was 0.84. Quantitative data was analyzed through descriptive statistics using percentages, frequency counts and means. Qualitative data was transcribed, categorized and reported verbatim and in terms of emergent themes. Resources were the most serious challenge. These included inadequate teaching aids, few field trips, inadequate reference materials and textbooks. Under student-based challenges, serious issues included career aspirations, reading habits and historical material and History notes. Serious challenges under curriculum included content and inadequate assignments. The researcher recommends attendance of INSET training by teachers. Career guidance and good reading habits should also be encouraged among students. School administrators also need to increase financial allocation for the subject in order to acquire adequate teaching and learning resources. Additional time needs to be created and testing be made regular teachers.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study
Internationally, History and Government plays key role in the development of the society since it teaches knowledge of the past which helps to understand the present and foresee the future. The development of a standard-based curriculum in History can be related to the school reforms where performances are crucial. Performance emerges in connection with the students’ discourse on grades and History which has an emphasis on reading, writing and doing homework to get better grades (Samuelsson, 2018). This statement sums up the predominant trend in international thinking about pedagogy which posits that teachers and students must improve their performance to be competitive in an increasingly globalized world.

As the society grows it keeps on changing and this creates new needs that should be addressed. The school is a social institution that and must change to address the needs that arise in the society from time to time. This statement has an impact on the various needs of the subjects that are taught at school, which must also be taught in new and better ways in order to meet the needs of the learners (Fullan, 2014). Furthermore, arming students with enough historical background to be able to develop their historical understanding is crucial. This can only be achieved when History and Government is considered an essential subject in the school (Darling-Hammond, 2015). An increase in student’s historical skills and background knowledge can only happen when a system recognizes the potential of History to improve students’ learning in general. Providing teaching conditions and school environment that support and sustain student learning is a key aspect of education.
Considering the growing emphasis on accountability and standard, teachers seem to be pressed to develop standard-based instruction perhaps without much direction on how to design the curriculum that is historically relevant. This therefore suggests that teachers may need assistance in conceiving standards with broad, historically significant themes (De Oliveira, 2018). In lieu of that argument, it was necessary to carry out this study in order to assess challenges that both students and teachers face in order to determine the necessary assistance. Students’ difficulties with reading are sometimes the cause of their limited experience, background information and understanding of History (De Oliveira, 2018). This calls for more time to cover concepts needed to understand subsequent concepts and periods. Writing is an integral skill for History teaching and learning and students are often asked to demonstrate their Historical understanding through writing. Students’ abilities to express their knowledge in writing needed to be studied in this regard.

Laddunuri (2012), conducted a study on the “status of school education in Tanzania and emerging issues in in Arusha Municipal” which revealed that pass percent of students had been declining continuously from 82.3% to 50.74 % during the last five years majority of teachers were found to be unqualified. This affected students’ performance negatively. Many factors were responsible for students’ failures, e.g poor infrastructure, insufficient books and frequent changes to the curriculum. The study revealed that many teachers had not attended INSET training. Teachers can fail to attend In-service teacher training due to high cost of training or inadequate information.

African Population and Health Research Centre (2010) reported a study which had shown that some teachers are weaker than their pupils. The study involving primary school teachers and trainees showed that some teachers are within the range of the trainees or just a little better. The study showed that some teachers who are supposed to impart knowledge to the pupils could be the
sources of poor performance. In most cases, the study found out, teachers failed to explain to their pupils why they get some questions right or wrong, because they subject pupils to memorization and recitation. The study covered 72 primary schools, 2437 pupils and 211 primary school teachers across the country. This study, however, did not show the reason why some teachers were weak and lacked appropriate knowledge in their subjects. It was short of indicating that some of them were incompetent. This research was necessary to establish the competencies of History teachers in Ugenya Sub-County: their highest levels of education and professional training.

Owusu-Acheaw (2014) conducted a study in Ghana which revealed that many students mainly read because they wanted to pass their exams. His study found out that majority of the respondents acknowledged the importance of reading. 81.9% of the respondents neither read novel nor fiction within the last two terms while 62% only read for the purpose of passing exams. It is against this backdrop that it was necessary to conduct a similar study in Ugenya Sub-County to examine the reading habits as a student-based factor of implementing History and Government curriculum.

Students may not have adequate access to the textbooks in order to get in-depth explanation of historical facts. A Keele university survey (2010) showed that only one quarter of 13 and 14 year olds in England have access to History textbooks for homework, and 40% have shared in class. This study did not give the main reasons why schools lacked adequate History and Government textbooks. In this regard, the researcher sought to establish whether the school principals allocated adequate finances for acquisition of History and Government resources such as textbooks. It was also of researcher’ interest to establish whether students effectively used them to find information not well highlighted in their notes or whether they only had to depend on notes provided by teachers.
The Constituency Development Fund (C.D.F.) has led to the establishment of many new schools by various communities (Mwiria, 2010). This expansion has come with a quality cost. In addition to being understaffed, (most have one or two TSC teachers) the new schools lack basic infrastructure. They admit average or below average students who are taught mainly by unqualified teachers. This is why they account for the bulk of the candidates who score grade D and below (Mwiria, 2010). This expansion is based on the resolutions of the Jomtien conference of 1990 on Education for All (E.F.A). According to Mwiria, the former Assistant Minister for Higher Education, the few teaching and learning resources in such schools adversely affect performance. This is coupled with other factors such as inadequate assessment, poor motivation and attitude. Mwiria’s argument was a political statement whose reality could only be verified through research such as this. Furthermore, his observation narrowed challenges to matters of staffing, infrastructure and entry behaviour which may not be the only challenges. The researcher therefore wanted to assess the challenges in a more conclusive manner.

Kidombo (2010), reported that technology today is revolutionising the way both teaching and learning processes are conducted. However, failure by the teachers to embrace the new technology may dampen the whole process if a survey released by the Association of Professional Teachers is anything to go by. Findings of the report showed that nearly half of the teachers in public schools are computer illiterate. As a result, teachers are not using computers and the internet to enrich their teaching and get the most current information in their respective fields. In the report, Kidombo of the School of Continuing and Distance Education, University of Nairobi, the lead researcher, says, while younger teachers use ICT than their older peers, few are in decision-making positions to influence adoption in learning process. This is generally likely to affect teachers who may end up
teaching obsolete ideas due to lack of access to current information. This study concentrated on ICT which is just one of the teaching aids. The researcher wanted to find out whether schools had adequate aids and other resource materials.

In recent years, the role of textbooks in schools has come under increasing scrutiny. In Korea’s National Council for Curriculum Assessment (2008) first review of the curriculum, teachers reported that textbooks varied in the extent to which they were aligned with the content and methods of curriculum and they reported that many textbooks provided children with a poor stimulus for learning. In the same year, the Inspectorate’s evaluation of the curriculum in schools reported that textbooks exerted a dominant influence on teaching and learning in a significant number of classrooms. This means that there was little emphasis on the development of higher order thinking skills, on nurturing creativity, or on encouraging pupils to respond emotionally and imaginatively. Teaching methodologies were also restricted. The researcher hoped to establish from the respondents the adequacy of the contents of the textbooks that they used for teaching and learning.

Each teaching programme has its own challenges particularly those that make it more difficult for the teachers to accomplish the objectives of any given content area (William, 2010). In Ugenya Sub-County where this research was conducted, the performance of students in History and Government had declined between 2013 and 2017. The decline suggested that teaching and learning activities faced challenges. The challenges specific to implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County needed to be established through research as a starting point towards improving implementation. This research was aimed at assessing challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in Ugenya sub-County.
Ugenya Sub-County, where the research was conducted, is found in Siaya County. The performance of students in History and Government declined from 6.23 in 2013 to 4.51 in 2017. In comparison to other Sub-Counties, Ugenya registered a drop of -1.72 which was the highest margin within the five years. The decline could have also been caused by changes in examinations system. However it was not uniform across the Sub-Counties. Within the same time, Gem Sub-County registered a deviation of -1.09, Siaya Sub-County -0.6, Bondo -1.19 and Rarieda -0.73. There was sharp decline in the performance of students in History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County. This indicated that the process of implementing History and Government curriculum in the sub-county had faced more challenges than in other areas within the stated period. This research was necessary in order to assess challenges that resulted into the decline in Ugenya enable teachers reverse the downward trend.

Table 1.1: Sub-County KCSE History and Government mean scores for the period 2013-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ugenya</th>
<th>Gem</th>
<th>Siaya</th>
<th>Bondo</th>
<th>Rarieda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of decline</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Sub-County Education Office, Ugenya 2017)

Similarly, in comparison to other Humanities, History registered the highest drop in mean scores within the same period as indicated in table 1.2.

Furthermore, means scores were used for ranking both Sub-Counties and schools. Any marginal differences made a Sub-County rank higher than the others in terms of performance because it was
considered significant. By 2017 Siaya Sub-County was ranked the best (4.99) followed by Gem (4.97), Bondo (4.87), Rarieda (4.69) and lastly Ugenya (4.51).

Table 1.2: Ugenya Sub-county mean scores for Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>History and Government</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>CRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>+0.32</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ugenya Sub-county Education office 2018)

From Table1.2 History and Government had a negative deviation of -1.72 on the other hand Geography registered a positive mean deviation of +0.32. This shows that the performance of students in Geography improved within the five years. On the other hand Christian Religious Education (CRE) registered negative deviation of -0.97. In comparison to History and Government, CRE had a lower deviation over the last five years.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The mean score for students in History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County dropped between the years 2013 and 2017 from 6.23 to 4.51. The margin of decline between 2013 and 2017 was – 1.72. In comparison to other Sub-Counties, this was the highest. This indicated that implementation of History and Government curriculum faced challenges. This called for an assessment of challenges of implementation of History and Government curriculum through empirical research so that a solution could be found to help schools design a recovery plan for
revitalizing the subject. That could only be identified through research. The researcher took notice that there are unforeseen factors that could lead to poor results. These were dealt with in theoretical framework.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to assess challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in Ugenya Sub-County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study
This study sought to achieve the following objectives:

i. To assess teacher-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County.

ii. To assess student-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County.

iii. To assess resource-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County.

iv. To assess curriculum-based challenges of implementing History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County.

1.5 Research Questions
This study sought to answer the following questions:

i. What are the teacher-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in Ugenya Sub-County?

ii. What are the student-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in Ugenya Sub-County?

iii. What are the resource-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in Ugenya Sub-County?
iv. What are the curriculum-based challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in Ugenya Sub-County?

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study was conducted in Ugenya Sub-County. Its focus was restricted to assessment of challenges, of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in the Sub-county. It involved 1200 form four students of History and Government, 25 teachers, 25 principals and 1 QASO.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

This study covered Ugenya Sub-county and the information gathered may not generally apply to all Sub-Counties in Kenya. Nevertheless, it is hoped that it will benefit stakeholders in the Sub-County.

This study relied mainly on questionnaire for data collection. The questionnaire may limit the amount of information collected particularly in addressing matters of why and how. This limitation is addressed by the use of interview and observation schedule to supplement the questionnaire and for the purpose of triangulation of data captured.

1.8 Significance of the Study

This study is useful because it established challenges of implementation of History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County. This is important in guiding teachers to vary their teaching methodologies in order to meet the needs of the learners. It also encourages them to understand their students and to design the curriculum to meet their needs. It also reminds teachers to help learners change their attitude towards the subject. The study calls upon the government through school administrators to plan and provide adequate resources in all the subjects. It also reminds the government about inadequate staffing in many schools in the Sub-County.
1.9 Assumptions of the Study

This research was based on the following assumptions:

i. All students of History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County have expected entry behaviour which is similar across the schools.

ii. All the schools in Ugenya Sub-County have a culture of promoting good performance in History and Government.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

This study was based on the context, Input, Process, and Product Model (CIPP) proposed by Stufflebeam and Coryn (2014). This model helps to identify learning needs. It identifies unmet needs that bar achievement of human needs. In this study, these were challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum. These constitute independent variables. Teachers and students have objectives to meet which in this case is good performance that emanated from implementing History and Government curriculum. These are the dependent variables. The researcher took notice of the fact that unforeseen factors could come into play and influence performance of students in History and Government. These constituted intervening variables such as funding and nature of curriculum. These were controlled by picking public schools that got equal capitation from the government and were taught the 8-4-4 curriculum. The model can also help to prescribe a responsive model than can best address the identified needs. It measures, interprets and judges project outcomes, and interprets their merits with significance and probity. It has different components. The first one is context which identifies audience and resources. The second one is input which analyses available human and material resources. The third one, process, checks on implementation. The fourth component, product, is meant to measure and interpret outcomes of an assessment.

The researcher categorised the challenges as follows:
i. Teacher-based challenges: Teacher qualifications, INSET attendance and attitude.

ii. Student-based challenges: Entry behaviour, Career aspirations and attitude

iii. Resource-based challenges: Textbooks, time allocation and teaching aids.


De Oliveira (2008) suggests that in order to have a clear understanding of curriculum challenges, one should analyse them in the four stated categories.
1.11 Operational Terms

In the course of the research, the researcher used terms as follows:

**Challenges**- Used to refer to difficulties encountered in teaching and learning History and Government in Secondary schools.

**Curriculum-based challenges**- Used to refer to challenges associated with History and Government Curriculum including content, teaching methods and assessment

**Implementation**- Used to refer to teaching and learning of History and Government

**Resource-based challenges**: Used to refer to textbooks, time allocation, and teaching aids.

**Student-based challenges**: Used to refer to challenges including entry behaviour, career aspiration and attitude.

**Teacher-based challenges**: Used to refer to teacher qualifications, INSET attendance, and attitude.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter review of related literature is done under four themes connected to the study objectives:

i. Teacher-based challenges

ii. Student-based challenges

iii. Resource-based challenges

iv. Curriculum-based challenges.

2.2. Teacher-based Challenges

Teachers-based challenges included teacher qualifications, INSET attendance and attitude.

2.2.1. Teacher Qualifications

Teacher qualification can be looked at in terms of teacher academic and professional training. In the past few years, a lack of skilled and qualified teachers has been observed across the globe. Experts believe that this shortage of educators will result into fewer and less qualified teachers for students in the larger classes. In 2015, the volume of trainee educators recruited across an array of subjects was substantially below the target (Howson, 2015). Without drastic action, more head teachers will be forced to employ staff not qualified in their subjects or simply remove the subject from their curriculum. The rise in pupil numbers which is easy to predict from birthrates is putting huge pressure on schools. Many head teachers are losing sleep or having nightmares about how to find appropriately trained teachers to teach their students. Such shortages can severely affect students. This statement suggests inadequate teaching staff in schools. In Kenya, secondary school teachers are trained to teach two subjects. Any teacher teaching History and Government
definitely has to handle another subject. The researcher was interested in finding out the level of challenge of the number of History and Government teachers.

Whatever nature of frame factors and teaching process is, students are always directly affected. Therefore they must become the centre of teacher’s planning (Wong & Fitzsimmons, 2008). Appropriately trained and qualified teachers are expected to freely deliver lessons to their students. Lack of it can lead to challenges in teaching and negatively affect students’ understanding. Teaching can generally be hampered by incompetence and poor performance by the teachers. Teachers are the frontline source providers in education. Excellent teachers do more than just teaching the content; they inspire their students and serve as role models in terms of attitude and social relationships (Ruto, 2014). In Ruto’s view, delivery of quality education is critically dependent on having appropriately trained and motivated teachers who can go beyond imparting knowledge. This research intended to establish the competencies of History and Government teachers in Ugenya Sub-County.

Beginning teachers face a myriad of challenges as they enter schools, including a growing emphasis on standards and accountability, an increasingly diverse student population and lack of support and mentoring (Yeager & Van Hover, 2011). Research on beginning teachers demonstrate that novice teachers often struggle both psychologically and instructionally as they enter their first few years of teaching. In their research, Yeager and Van Hover (2011) discovered that beginning teachers struggle instructionally. Their views however did not explicitly address why these challenges influence their teaching of History. Therefore this study examined the level of experience of teachers in Ugenya Sub-County and how it influenced their instructional decisions.
The exact period needed for a beginning teacher to develop into a teacher expert is impossible. To some it can last up to five years whereas to others it can last three years (Bozack, 2008). Wider literature on graduate teachers with respect to early years of their career indicates that they faced challenges such as inadequate knowledge and skills, time management, students’ indiscipline, lack of students’ interests, decreased self-efficacy and increased stress and importance of workplace learning (Boakye and Ampiah, 2017). This means that teachers with little experience face challenges in teaching than their older colleagues who have mastered the art of classroom control and variation of teaching methodologies. This was an area of interest to the researcher and he wanted to assess its level of challenge in Ugenya Sub-County.

As the factors linked to improvements in students’ outcomes become more apparent, governments around the world are looking at the quality of their teaching workforce. One segment of teaching workforce that may need particular attention and support comprises teachers who are new to the profession (TALIS, 2008). The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) conducted a research in 23 countries in 2008. Comparisons were made between new and more experienced teachers. New teachers reported lower levels of self-efficacy and classroom teaching time. On average, 73% of new teachers’ classroom time was spent on actual teaching and learning compared to 79% of more experienced teachers’ classes. The main reason for this was the great percentage of class time that new teachers spent on keeping order in classroom. Time spent on keeping order may not be the only reason why teachers suffered less self-efficacy. It could be a matter of poor planning too. This study was also meant to find out how beginning teachers’ classroom practices influenced effective teaching and learning for History and Government students in Ugenya Sub-County.
2.2.2. INSET Attendance

In-service education and training (INSET) can be defined as a variety of activities and practices, in which teachers become involved in order to enrich their knowledge, improve their skills in teaching and also enable them to become more efficient on the job (UIS, 2006). Pre-service training provides the teacher with some knowledge, skills and other competencies needed to be able to perform. However, these must not be allowed to be static, as teachers must always keep pace with changing trends in teaching strategies and curriculum reforms (Koellinar, & Greenblatt, 2018). Professional development for teachers should be continuous. This can foster collegiality among them. Through collegiality, teachers can share their teaching experiences, ideas, and knowledge and can influence one another to employ good teaching practices. This research was meant to establish whether History and Government teachers in Ugenya Sub-County attended INSET training and how useful it was in improving the quality of teaching and learning.

Poor attendance of INSET training leaves teachers teaching using outdated methods (TALIS, 2008). New teachers have greater developmental needs compared to more experienced teachers, particularly to develop skills to create more teaching and learning ways. Failure to attend such kinds of training therefore leaves teachers without new ways of addressing the challenges in History and Government curriculum implementation. The researcher was interested in finding out whether inadequate INSET attendance influenced curriculum implementation.

2.2.3. Attitude

A teacher with positive attitude has pride, self-esteem, commitment, drive, adventure, creativity and vision. Teacher perception depends on self-evaluation, the influence and support of school leadership and school culture. Teaching is perceived negatively by young people because of salaries in comparison to other professions like Medicine and Law. In addition teachers are not
respected in the society as before (Mosha, 2016). Complaints from teachers about poor teaching and learning environment, shortage of resources and large class size do not attract young people to the profession. Secondly, the teaching profession is not a choice for young people but they join because they have no alternative. Third, youth perceive teaching profession as the profession joined by those who did not perform well in the national examinations. It can be concluded that teaching is perceived negatively compared to other professions. Many teachers have a negative attitude before joining the profession and this has an impact on service delivery.

The content area of Social Studies is not an emphasis in recent legislations. For example, Burroughs, Groce and Webeck (2011) investigated the impact of ‘No Child Left Behind’ (NCLB) legislation on teaching of Social Studies in three USA states. They found that the legislation emphasizes the development of standards and assessment systems in reading, Mathematics and Sciences but leaves out other core subjects such as History. The study concludes that many Social Studies educators are hesitant to request the addition of Social Studies in the N.C.L.B even though they are unhappy with its omission from the legislation. From the findings of that study, it is apparent that negative attitude may be as a result of other factors and not necessarily the teacher. In this case, government policy created feeling that History is a lowly subject and teachers of History were not a concern to the Government.

De Oliveira (2008) observes that many History teachers encounter a difficult reality at their schools: the diminished status of History in comparison to other schools subjects. Attention to Mathematics leads to a problematic reality for the school subject of History especially for the 11th grade History teachers. Because History is not a major focus in the middle school curriculum, teachers struggle to catch up on several aspects of the curriculum. In Kenya, History and
Government is an optional subject in the secondary school curriculum. The status of the subject in the school and the society from could influence the attitude of teachers of History and Government. This study was meant to assess the attitude of teachers Of History and Government towards the subject and to recommend ways of overcoming negative perceptions.

Ruto (2013), carried out a study in Wareng’ Sub-County on the impact of secondary school teachers’ attitude on teaching and learning History and Government. Her study revealed that the attitude of teachers towards the subject affects their interests, pride and preference in the subject, allocation of time for the subject, use of instructional materials in teaching, catering for individual learner differences and generally enhancing the achievement of subject objectives. These findings were as a result of a study in Wareng’. The researcher therefore wanted to establish how attitude influenced teachers’ performance in Ugenya Sub-County in a similar way.

2.3. Student-based Challenges

These included entry behaviour, career aspirations and attitude.

2.3.1 Entry Behaviour

Entry behaviour includes the prerequisite knowledge; skills or attitudes which the student already possesses that are relevant to the learning task or subject matter and that you may require students to demonstrate before beginning your module (Maheshwari, 2017). Sekyere, Sekyere and Akpalu (2013) in a study based in Ghana argued that a learner’s entry behaviour affected their overall academic performance. In the study they noted that learners with very high entry marks exhibited very high achievement in their final secondary school examinations. Students come to school with a variety of learning backgrounds. They have different strengths and weaknesses that can affect their rate of acquisition and retention. Teachers have to be aware of who they are teaching as well as what they are teaching. Failure to recognize this can lead to a feeling of alienation among low-level learners and can affect their attitude towards a subject. If schools fail to meet the challenges
of accommodating this population it could cause the demise of a system. This study was intended to establish whether students’ differing abilities were taken care of by teachers of History and Government in Ugenya. It also sought to establish how entry behaviour influenced students’ performance in History and Government in Ugenya.

2.3.2 Career Aspiration

Career Choice refers to the professions that are picked by the students. It can also be termed as the desire which one has for a relevant and suitable profession and individual opportunities for job experience and instructions leading to economic and social independence (Ogungbemi & Ajayi, 2009). It is the valid and useful exploration about the world of work, including its structure and organization. Subject choices have an impact on what people study at college. Deciding what you want to do can spur the process of subject elimination. Many students find this very difficult because they lack guidance, making their choices without the help of any person. One of the developmental tasks of any individual is the preparation for a career. Studies conducted by Ogungbemi and Ajayi (2009) showed that career aspirations determined choice of subjects. The study was aimed at investigating the relevance of subject selection of school going adolescents in relation to their career aspiration. History and Government is a career subject. Choice of subjects to study should reflect the interest and ability of the students and considerations of possible careers aspirations (McGuire, 2017). Students who choose careers which are not related to this subject may not consider it as a priority subject and may give little attention to it. Kenyan education system is not geared towards any specific career pathways. Therefore students can choose any subjects in the curriculum. The researcher sought to find out whether career choice influenced selection and performance of students in History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County.
2.3.3. Students’ Attitude

Joseph (2013) conducted a study which sought to examine students’ thinking about History to determine the extent to which their perceptions coincided with widely held views on the subject. The study employed a mixed-method research design aimed at triangulating quantitative and qualitative data obtained from questionnaires and focus group interviews. Four hundred and fifteen participants were randomly drawn from selected secondary schools in Tobago and the East/West corridor of Trinidad. Findings of the study revealed that while students largely rejected the notion that History content is difficult, boring and irrelevant to contemporary life, many of them were still reluctant to pursue the subject further at the tertiary level. Many students also ranked the subject among those that do not lead to suitable career of their choice. This study has implications for curriculum policy and practice regarding the creating relevance in the subject. The researcher was interested in finding out perception of form four students of History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County.

Kiio (2012) conducted study and reported that History and Government is no longer a popular subject among learners. The society tends to place priority on science and technology. Secondary school students are therefore looking for marketable subjects. This element of marketability of subjects in relation to the job market may relegate History and Government to the rank of lowly subjects. This can negatively affect their performance. Students’ attitude is closely related to reading habits in a given subject (Palanis, 2012). Palanis is also of the opinion that, effective reading is important avenue of effective learning and that reading is interrelated with the total educational process and hence, educational success requires successful reading habits. These days emphasis on reading has become a thing of the past. Here, he is suggesting that students have a poor reading culture and this can affect retention of what has been taught or learnt. Before this
research, it was not clear whether the students of History and Government in Ugenya took the subject because they liked it or due to lack of an alternative. This study was therefore necessary to unearth the students’ general attitude towards the subject.

2.4. Resource-Based Challenges

2.4.1. Textbooks

De Oliveira (2008) documented that in some respects, the main problem with secondary school History is that it is not much of a problem. Resources these days are being directed towards areas of challenge and this means that History rarely receives attention; only infrequently does it appear in school improvement plans. From this observation, it is worth noting that History is allocated very few resources which include textbooks for use by learners and teachers. This could pose a challenge on curriculum implementation.

Teaching and learning resources are not confined to textbooks and are available in many other forms such as reference books, pamphlets, newspapers, journals, periodicals and magazines. A statistical survey of school and teaching resources in Sub-Saharan Africa by UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS, 2010) highlights challenges which undermine children’s chances to succeed in their studies. Overcrowded classrooms, too few teachers, insufficient school books and few resources often without separation between boys and girls: these are some of the problems facing students in the region. The study findings generalized the challenge of History and Government textbooks across Sub-Saharan Africa. The researcher saw it necessary to find out whether there were adequate textbooks for History and Government lessons and the challenges of their use.

With so many schools teaching a narrow range of content, publishers merely respond to this marker, focusing on the same periods of narrow curriculum (Luciana de Oliveira, 2008). This
therefore means that apart from the few textbooks that schools have, the other challenge lies in the content of the same books. The content is mostly shallow and does not support the curriculum adequately. A teacher in the secondary school with a number of classes in various subjects on his or her hands finds it next to impossible to get materials other than the dry bones of the textbooks into the hands of his pupils. The Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development vets and approves textbooks for use in secondary schools in the country. Before the study it was yet to be confirmed whether schools in Ugenya Sub-County were satisfied with the content of their textbooks.

2.4.2. Time Allocation

As History is made every day, History teachers’ subject matter is growing with it even as the number of classroom hours remains the same. That ever expanding content is the crux of the Social Studies teacher’ dilemma: How to cover every topic within limited time (Holland, 2011). In this case, Holland implies that teachers have to use methods that allow them to cover the content in the shortest time possible. In this regard, the learners could be disadvantaged. They are forced to remain passive in the lesson. In lieu of Holland’s argument, it can be concluded that teachers have to rush to clear the syllabus within the time allocated. What was not clear was whether the methods employed were as a result of limited time or time wastage on the part of teachers. This study was meant to reveal it.

2.4.3. Teaching aids

Using educational teaching aids can boost a student’s success in classroom. Teaching aids reinforce what the teacher says and ensures that main points are understood (Cuban, 2012). They signal students to the important information and allow them to experience something that is abstract in life. Teaching aids can be categorized into audio, visual and audio-visual. Visual aids are those that use sense of vision for example slides, charts, posters, chalkboards, pictures, models and film strips. With pictures, the concepts or ideas are no longer simply words but words with images
(Patin, 2009). Charts and posters can help illustrate and clarify what is being taught in class. Visual aids play a role of enhancing a package, supporting learning and encouraging participation. Audio aids involve the sense of hearing for instance radios, cassette recordings and disk recordings. Audio-visuals are those that involve the sense of vision as well as hearing such as televisions, videos and films. It should be noted that teaching aid can have specific educational values and help in the realization of desired learning objectives only when put to good use. Regardless of their overall quality, audio-visual materials are of little value if operators do not know how to incorporate them effectively into a presentation. Too often however, teaching aids are used as a passive process without any analysis of what is being presented, why it is being presented and how it is being presented Rosenzweig (2010). The researcher sought to establish the types of teaching aids used during teaching in Ugenya Sub-County. It was also supposed to unearth the ability of teachers to use them in teaching-learning process.

Cuban (2012) has observed that recent surveys indicate that even teachers who have sufficient training and access to teaching/learning resources are not using them as much as had been expected. Once there it is chalk and talk. The researcher was not only interested in finding out the availability of teaching aids but also their use by teachers of History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County. Ogungbemi and Ajayi (2009) reported a study which indicated that teachers did not use teaching aids in most of their History lessons. About the level of seriousness of the same, 56.9% stated that it was very serious, 30.6% said that it was serious while 6.9% gave an average response. Teachers and principals agreed in the study that lack of essential teaching aids constituted the most serious problem of History teaching in senior secondary schools. Teaching without relevant aids makes facts remain abstract in the mind of learner. It generally affect their understanding of what is being taught. Before this research the challenge of using available
teaching aids had not been viewed in a more practical aspect in Ugenya Sub-County. This research was meant to illuminate that.

2.5 Curriculum-Based Challenges

These included content, teaching methods and assessment.

2.5.1 Content

According to Levin (2008), the term curriculum refers to the lessons and academic content taught in a school or a specific course or programme. It includes all the knowledge, skill, norms, values, cultural elements and beliefs to help develop a student fully with respect to the physical, spiritual, mental and emotional aspects. Overloaded curriculum has its challenges: lesson content is sometime repeated and unrelated, the syllabus contains too many items, teaching and learning is dependent on textbooks and this restricts the use of other teaching techniques (Levin, 2008). For this reason, there are side effects. First, it has an effect on time management where teachers are rushing for content coverage before examination period. Time consumed in a week is not enough and teachers need to make extra classes in the weekends or after school just to complete the syllabus. This affects curriculum implementation.

Lage, Platt and Treglia (2012) stated that students gain more knowledge, retain more information and perform far better when teaching styles match learning styles. However, because of time constraints, teachers are not able to apply interesting and effective teaching styles in the classroom. For this reason, teachers tend to teach more on theory and use traditional teaching styles where there is no or less contextual and practical learning involved among the students. Korea’s National Council for Curriculum Assessment (2008) gathered information on curriculum in schools in two phases. In both reviews, teachers and principals identified time as one of the greatest challenges in
implementing the curriculum. Both teachers and principals noted the challenge of insufficient time and the growing range of children’s learning needs. Wide content should be supported with adequate time. Limited time leads to lack of timely completion of syllabus and puts pressure on both teachers and students.

The focus for every school teacher must be how to meet the immediate needs of the learners taking into account the syllabus prescriptions. This may pose a challenge to many teachers in terms of preparation and generally affect curriculum implementation.

2.5.2. Teaching Methods

Teachers are themselves perceived as competent to the extent that their schools perform with excellence in an average narrowing area (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Whenever teachers believe that their role is to ensure high test scores rather than to help students learn, they pressure themselves and in the process use controlling autocratic teaching techniques. Here control means emphasizing extrinsic reward, allowing students little choice for how they go about learning and threatening to withdraw emotional support as a means of punishment. Such regimen forces teachers to deemphasize topics not covered on standard tests. The researcher sought to find out whether teachers used various teaching methods in implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County.

With standardization and greater accountability in school performance comes superficial coverage and the possibility that we may simply be teaching children a series of tricks that enable them to perform well on standardized tests yet leave them deficient in basic understanding (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Superficial teaching can only allow students to tackle simple recall questions. However, it may not be important in the essays that require wider explanation from what the
student understands about concepts. Methods used by teachers depend on the skills or information the teacher would like to convey to the students (Mgina, 2016). Prior knowledge of the student should inform the choice of teaching methods. Teachers must be aware of the content of the subject that they want to teach and the appropriate methodology that can help in good delivery.

Field trips refer to out of class learning in which learners come into contact with people, places, objects, animals and other things out of class environment (Noel, 2018). Field trips can connect school work with the world, making it tangible and memorable. Field trips permit students to encounter the past at historic sites and museums. Field trips can help students to construct knowledge actively through interacting with historic places, experts and artifacts (Mya, 2017). It is worth noting that much as field trips have the ability to create a lasting impact on students’ leaning processes, not all teachers organise them due to various factors. Teachers are rarely allowed to schedule field trips without justifying in writing how they will help in meeting the stated standards. The amount of subject matter they need to teach each year to meet the standards of the schools’ mandated curriculum is so great that there is no time to schedule such visits. The schools’ budgets are also so tight that it is nearly impossible to pay for buses to go for trips or get parents to pay for outreach programmes (Nespor, 2008). These findings show that teachers no longer organize field trips for their students because of different reasons. In this case it is not possible for teachers to ascertain the benefits of field trips. This can be a challenge to curriculum implementation especially if students cannot access learning items and relate them with what is taught in class.

Current issues such as standardized curriculum, lack of funds and overloaded schedules have forced many teachers to forego field trips (Nespor, 2008). Although they are usually praised for being authentic and interactive, field trips do not guarantee success. In this study the researcher
was interested in finding out whether field trips organised by teachers of History and Government were used to improve learning or merely as rewards.

Resource persons are people who lend real life experiences to help enhance an interactive lesson or class. Research indicates that supported teachers are in the best position to deliver effective education (United Kingdom, Department of Education and skills, 2017). There are agencies and resource persons in the community that have the expertise and knowledge to augment school education programmes. Interactions between students and adults from the community can have a positive effect on student learning and student attitudes. Use of such resource persons can lead to deeper understanding of the subject matter and provide a more meaningful engagement with materials (United Kingdom, Department of Education and Skills, 2017). Resource persons may be available in the community but what matters is their integration in the teaching-learning process. In this study the researcher first wanted to find out whether teachers of History and Government were aware of their presence in the school neighbourhood. He also intended to find out whether they were called on some occasions to schools to help reinforce what teachers taught in classrooms.

In considering use of an external person, the teachers should have a clear understanding of the curriculum need and how a resource person will satisfy the need. This means being clear about the desired learning outcomes before deciding who is best able to help achieve them. As well, resource persons need to be clear on their role in supporting your desired curriculum outcomes-this will require discussion and negotiation to ensure good curricular outfit. The researcher felt it necessary to establish availability and contributions of resource persons in enhancing the understanding of students in selected topics in History and Government.
Team teaching is another method of teaching. It means a group of two or more teachers working together to plan, conduct and evaluate the learning activities for the same group of learners (Goetz, 2012). Team teaching has two models. First is where one teacher, usually the lead educator, leads the instructional activity. The second model is where two teachers divide the content to be taught to the class between them. Each teacher delivers a portion of the lesson to a section of the class group and then students rotate between two teachers. The teacher in the support role observes, checks students’ understanding, supports the work of individual students or manages behaviour. The primary challenge to team teaching appears to be time: the time required prior to implementation of team teaching partnership for professional development, the many meetings needed during the running of the programme as well as numerous impromptu chats that are bound to arise from such an endeavor. Ironically, the time required to function effectively as a team may increase the probability of personality conflict. Much as teachers may be willing to conduct team teaching, time may not allow them. For this reason the researcher was interested in finding out whether teachers were able to plan for team teaching given the fact other teachers had other engagements.

Team teaching is not always successful. Some teachers are a rigid personality type or may be wedded to a single method. Some simply dislike other teachers on their team; some do not want to risk humiliation and discouragement at possible failure. Other teachers are unwilling to share pet ideas or to lose total control (Goetz, 2012). For this reason they may not wish to involve other colleagues in their classes. Failure to integrate team teaching means that they have to struggle to teach topics or sub-topics that do not interest them. Prior to this study, the benefits of team
teaching in History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County had not been explored. It was therefore intended to highlight benefits of team teaching.

Differentiation as a method of teaching is adapting instruction and assessment in response to differing student interests, learning preferences and readiness in order to promote growth in learning. They must use methods that tap into learning styles of their pupils and be flexible and creative (Tomlinson, 2018). Differentiation is not necessarily individualized instruction. Differentiation requires much more lesson planning time for teachers who may already be strapped for time. It may require more resources for a school to implement (Logsdon, 2018). Lessons are not about treating everyone alike, but working to ensure that each student has the support he or she needs to produce an end-product that shows mastery of the concepts presented (Tomlinson, 2018). Critics argue that there isn’t enough research to support the benefits of differentiated instruction outweighing the added prep time. What Tomlinson advocates for here is that teachers must take note of their students’ individual differences and move with each of them at their pace. In this case, the study was meant to find out whether teachers of History and Government really understood their individual students’ abilities and whether they planned their lessons taking care of such situations. Michael (2010) argues that many teachers fail to practice differentiation because they feel it disrupts class and is impossible to implement. This means that they rarely take care of individual differences among learners and this could pose a challenge to curriculum implementation.

Classes are made up of students with differing abilities, interest, skills and knowledge. For this reason, teachers face the challenge of meeting the variety of needs they are confronted with (Penny, 2009). Teachers always like to see pupils in terms of potentialities and challenge rather
than constraints. From Penny’s arguments it is worth noting that one is always working with and for the pupils and unless you clearly understand his or her limitations, you are bound to be disappointed. In light of Penny’s assertions, the researcher sought to establish whether teachers took care of individual needs of their students and the challenges they face in the process of doing so.

2.5.3. Assessment

The challenge of assessment relates to the planning and programming phase, but it takes a step further. When it comes to time for report writing, assessment helps teachers to give more accurate overview of student performance and helps to determine grades with greater level of objectiveness (Penny, 2009). The challenge is in selecting assessment tools which allow students to best present what they know and teachers to best present this data. While teachers are continuously assessing students-marking books, observing students at work, monitoring quizzes—there are key times when students’ progress needs to be reported on and teachers are met by the challenge of providing tasks that will accurately determine student learning (Palmitessa& Stephen,.2008).

Assessment remains the weak link in the chain. In a nutshell, we tend to assess far too much, yet not do it very well. We often end up measuring the things that are easy to measure, and sometimes do not actually measure directly enough the real achievement of intended learning outcomes. We need to reduce the burden of assessment while at the same time improving its quality (Race, 2009). Too many classrooms ignore questioning as a learning model. They spend most of the class time providing information and then ask questions later in the form of a quiz, test or discussion (Curwin, 2014). Too many students never learn this way. Lessons, units and topics are more motivating when they begin with a question whose answer students want to know. Not only do great questions generate interests, they also answer the question that so many students wonder about. Great
questions increase cognitive organization of the content by framing it into meaningful answer to opening question (Curwin, 2014). There is a catch, though in using questions to begin your lesson. The question must be connected with the content, so that the following learning activities actually answer the question. The question must fit your students’ ability and experience. In addition the question needs to provoke both thought and curiosity.

Nearly every student has suffered the experience of spending hours preparing for a major assessment, only to discover that the material that he or she has studied was different from what the teacher chose to emphasize on assessment (Guskey, 2009). This experience is common because many teachers still believe that they must keep their assessment secret. As a result, students come to regard assessments as guessing games. Classroom assessments that serve as meaningful sources of information don’t surprise students. They reflect the concepts and skills that the teacher emphasized in class, along with the teacher’s clear criteria for judging students’ performance. These concepts, skills and criteria align with the teacher’s instructional activities. Assessments must be followed by high-quality, corrective instruction designed to remedy learning errors the assessment identified.

Assessment can be vital in our efforts to improve education. But as long as we use them only as a means to rank schools and students, we will miss the most powerful benefits (Guskey, 2009). We must focus instead on helping teachers change the way they use assessment results, improve the quality of their classroom assessment and align their assessments with valued learning goals. When teachers’ classroom assessments become an integral part of the instructional process, and a central ingredient in their efforts to help students learn, the benefits of assessment for both students and teachers will be boundless (Guskey, 2009). The best classroom assessments also serve as meaningful sources of information for teachers, helping them identify what they taught well and
what they need to work on. It was hoped that this study would establish the assessment methods teachers of History and Government used with a view to shaping them to meet expectations of the students and to make them appreciate its importance.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the researcher explains the methodology employed in the study including research design, area of study, population, sample and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection, reliability, validity, data collection procedure, ethical considerations and methods of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This study was carried out through descriptive survey design. This research design involved the administration of questionnaire and interviews. This is because the sub-county is large with poor means of transport and communication. It was therefore easier to use questionnaire to reach out to respondents. This design was intended to enable the researcher describe the performance of learners in History and Government and to provide solutions to the same. Surveys are concerned with describing, recording, analyzing and interpreting conditions that exist or existed. Kasomo (2011) defines descriptive survey as a systematic method for data collection and analysis of data in order to answer questions or test hypotheses concerning the current status of a programme, project or activity. Descriptive statistics give a clear picture of opinions, attitudes and perceptions of groups of interest to the researcher.

3.2. Area of Study

This research was carried out in Ugenya Sub-County, Siaya County. Ugenya Sub-County borders Mumias Sub-County to the east, Butula Sub-County to the north, Ugunja Sub-County to the South-east and Siaya Sub-County to the south. The Sub-County lies between latitude 0° 10’ and 0° 18’ North and longitude 34° 10’ East and 34° 20’0’ East.
3.3 Study Population

The study population was 25 teachers of History and Government, 25 principals, 1200 form four students of History and Government and one Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer. The form four students were preferred because they had studied the subject for a longer duration and were deemed capable of identifying its attendant challenges. History and Government teachers were suitable because they teach the subject and could identify the challenges they encounter while teaching. The principals were necessary because they provide resources and give school policy guidelines. The Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (QASO) was chosen because he was in charge of curriculum implementation and supervision in the Sub-County.

3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques

The study sample was 22 teachers, 22 principals, one DQASO and 291 form four History and Government students. This was arrived at based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size estimation table. Simple random sampling was used to select the students. Simple random sampling is a procedure in which all the individuals in a defined population have an equal chance of being selected a member of this sample (Kasomo, 2011). This was meant to enable the researcher get a good representation of the whole study population.

Saturated sampling was used to select teachers, principals and the Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer. This is because the teachers and principals were few and the Sub-County had only one quality and standards officer.
Table 3.1: Population and Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQASO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each category of teachers, students and principal samples, at least 10% of the respondents were used during piloting and therefore not included in the final study.

3.5. Instrument for Data Collection

This study utilized questionnaire, interview and observation schedule in collecting data. The use of the questionnaire was preferred because it is a faster method of data collection. It gave the researcher time to explain to the respondents why the information was being collected. It also provided a chance to explain the meaning of the questions to the respondents (Lokesh, 2011). Interview schedule was used to supplement data from questionnaire. Kathuri and Pals (2010) says that interviews are the most powerful tools used in social science research. Interviews were expected to provide detailed information from the quality assurance and standards officer and the principals. Each of these instruments is described below.

3.5.1 Questionnaire for Students

These were administered to form four students of History and Government in Ugenya Sub-county secondary schools. It focused on student-based challenges like behaviour, career aspirations, attitude, resource-based and curriculum-based challenges. Questions were closed ended. A sample questionnaire is attached as Appendix B.
3.5.2 Questionnaire for History and Government Teachers
These were used to collect data on the teacher-based challenges such as teacher competence, experience, INSET attendance, teaching methods, differentiation and attitude, resource and curriculum-based challenges. The questions here were closed-ended. The teachers’ questionnaire is attached as Appendix C.

3.5.3 Interview Schedule for Principals
Principals play key roles in curriculum implementation majorly as supervisors of curriculum implementation and resource providers. Principals’ interview schedule comprised questions related to their role in these two areas. This is attached as appendix D.

3.5.4 Interview Schedule for DQASO
One interview schedule was prepared for use. This research instrument was used to collect data concerning the quality of teachers of History and Government, general status of staffing of the subject in the sub-county, organization of the syllabus and quality assurance and standards in the subject. This is indicated as Appendix E.

Observation schedule was mainly used to collect data on availability of teaching aids. This was mainly directed to the teachers.

3.6 Reliability and Validity of Instruments

3.6.1. Reliability of Instruments
Kasomo (2011) defines reliability as the stability and dependability of an instrument or a procedure in order to obtain information. According to Kasomo, reliability can be obtained by piloting a study using at least 10% of the sampled respondents. Before issuing out the questionnaires and engaging in data collection, the instruments were piloted. Test- retest of questionnaire was estimated by performing the same survey with three teachers and 30 student respondents at different times. This translated to 12% of teachers and 10.31% of students respectively giving a
reliability coefficient 0.82 for student questionnaire and 0.84 for teachers. Respondents used during piloting were not used in the final study.

3.6.2 Validity of Instruments

Validity is the degree to which a research instrument measures what it should measure (Kasomo, 2011). It applies to how representative of the total defined domain that instrument is i.e. the instrument should contain adequate traits expected to measure the domain. For the purposes of reaffirming the validity of the instruments, they were presented to experts in the Department of Educational Communication, Technology and Curriculum studies of Maseno University to study them and advice the researcher appropriately.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

Before commencing the research work, the researcher sought a letter of introduction from the Dean School of Graduate Studies (SGS) of Maseno University. A copy of the letter was handed over to Ugenya Sub-County Director of Education. The researcher then visited schools for familiarization, introduction and to administer questionnaire to the respondents. The researcher explained the purpose for the research to the respondents before issuing questionnaire to them in different groups. He then revisited the schools after one week to collect the questionnaires and to ensure that they were all returned. All the items in the questionnaires were checked to ensure that they were all answered. Interview was administered through face to face meeting with the principals and the Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer.

3.8 Ethical considerations

This research was conducted in Ugenya sub-county, Siaya County. The study was carried out without access to protected information about the respondents like termly report cards. The respondents were asked not to identify themselves in the questionnaire and interview schedules in
order to maintain confidentiality. Data collected from the respondents were analysed by the researcher in order to prevent them from leaking to other persons not involved in the study. Later it was safely kept for purposes of references by the researcher for the entire duration of the study.

3.9. Methods of Data Analysis

Data collected from teachers, principals, students and the Sub-County QASO were analysed by use of descriptive statistics to yield means and frequency counts. Quantitative data was analysed then presented using tables. A Likert scale was developed whereby responses were given scores. For instance 5 for strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 not sure, 2 disagree and 1 strongly disagree. The number of respondents ticking a particular score was then multiplied by the score for example if 33 chose 5 then the 33 was multiplied by that 5. This was repeated for all the responses. The results were then added and eventually divided by the sample size. The score was then rated on interpretation scale. This gauged the attitudes and opinions of respondents.

A scheme of interpretation was developed based on the level of seriousness of challenge and scores rated as indicated below:

4.1-5.0 Least challenge
3.1-4.0 Less challenge
2.1-3.0 Big challenge
1.1-2.0 Biggest challenge

Qualitative data were transcribed and also reported verbatim under each theme and category. The findings were later linked with existing research studies.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter results and discussion is done under four themes connected to the study objectives:

v. Teacher-based challenges
vi. Student-based challenges
vii. Resource-based challenges
viii. Curriculum-based challenges.

4.2. Teacher-Based Challenges

This section gives the findings of the study done by the researcher. Several questions were put to the respondents who were students, teachers, principals and the Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer.

4.2.1. Teacher qualifications

The researcher sought to find out the level professional qualifications of History and Government teachers in Ugenya Sub-County. The results are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Academic and Professional qualification of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of professional training, 9.09% had master’s degree, 36.36% stated that they had bachelor’s degree, 27.27% had Diploma certificates while 27.27% were not trained teachers. From the findings, 72.72% of teachers had received formal training. However, 27.27% were untrained. School principals were also asked whether they had adequate number of trained teachers for History and Government. In their responses, 22 out of the 22 sampled stated that they faced shortage of trained teachers of History and Government. Probed further about how they catered for the deficit, 15 out of 22 indicated that they employed trained teachers to assist them while 7 indicated that they employed people who had training in other professions. From the information obtained, most teachers had formal professional training and for this reason, they were qualified to implement the History and Government curriculum. However, they were inadequate. This was a challenge to curriculum implementation.

Ruto (2014) observe that teachers with more post-secondary education are effective and achieve more with their students than teachers with less post-secondary education. This is attributed to the fact that they are believed to have acquired more knowledge in the subject. In Ugenya Sub-County where the research was conducted, schools had a shortage of trained History and Government teachers as shown in Table 4.1. Further, all the sampled principals decried high turnover of History and Government teachers in their schools. The Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (QASO) also stated in the interview conducted on 3rd February 2018 that schools faced a big shortage of teachers of History and Government.

“Ugenya Sub-County faces a shortage of about 250 teachers. The most affected subjects are History and Government, Agriculture, Physics and Kiswahili. All the 25 schools in the sub-county have a shortage of qualified History and Government teachers. (SQASO, interviewed on 15th May 2018 at 1435hrs)

The researcher also asked teachers other questions about the academic and professional qualifications. The responses given by the teachers are shown in Table 4.2.
Teachers were asked whether their academic qualifications were adequate for teaching. From the findings, 9 teachers strongly agreed that their academic and professional qualifications were adequate for teaching, 7 agreed, 2 were not sure, 2 disagreed while another 2 strongly disagreed. This resulted into a mean response of 3.86 which in the interpretation key showed that it was less of a challenge. Whether their qualifications made them feel confident to teach, 11 teachers strongly agreed, 5 agreed, 1 was not sure, 1 disagreed while 4 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean of 3.82 meaning that it was less of a challenge based on the key provided. On the question about the need for further professional training, 16 teachers strongly agreed, 4 agreed while 2 were not sure. There were no teachers who either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The mean response here was 4.64. Teachers in this case expressed the need for further training in order to carry out their duties better. Further training here is not limited to acquisition of more degrees and diploma but professional engagements that can be achieved through seminars and workshops. The overall mean response generated was 4.11 from the questions about professional training. It is clear here that teachers felt

Table 4.2: Teacher responses to academic and professional qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My academic and professional qualifications are adequate for teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My qualifications make me feel confident to teach History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I need further professional training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

4.1-5.0-least challenge  
3.1-4.0- less challenge  
2.1-3.0- big challenge  
1.0- 2.0- biggest challenge  

Teachers were asked whether their academic qualifications were adequate for teaching. From the findings, 9 teachers strongly agreed that their academic and professional qualifications were adequate for teaching, 7 agreed, 2 were not sure, 2 disagreed while another 2 strongly disagreed. This resulted into a mean response of 3.86 which in the interpretation key showed that it was less of a challenge. Whether their qualifications made them feel confident to teach, 11 teachers strongly agreed, 5 agreed, 1 was not sure, 1 disagreed while 4 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean of 3.82 meaning that it was less of a challenge based on the key provided. On the question about the need for further professional training, 16 teachers strongly agreed, 4 agreed while 2 were not sure. There were no teachers who either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The mean response here was 4.64. Teachers in this case expressed the need for further training in order to carry out their duties better. Further training here is not limited to acquisition of more degrees and diploma but professional engagements that can be achieved through seminars and workshops. The overall mean response generated was 4.11 from the questions about professional training. It is clear here that teachers felt
that professional training was of the least challenge to implementation of History and Government curriculum. Ruto (2014) argues that excellent delivery of curriculum was dependent on having appropriately trained teachers. Many teachers of History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County had adequate professional training. However, they were not adequate.

The researcher studied the level of teacher experience and the results were reported in table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Teacher Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of experience, 54.59% had taught for less than five years, 27.27% between five to ten years while 18.8% had taught for more than ten years. The study findings show that a majority of teachers had taught for less than five years and therefore had limited experience. For this reason they may not have fully mastered the art of classroom control and varying of methodology for specific situations. The findings are related to those of Yeager and Van Hover (2011) who discovered that beginning teachers struggle both psychologically and instructionally. The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) conducted a research in 23 countries in 2008. Comparisons were made between new and more experienced teachers. New teachers reported lower levels of self-efficacy and classroom teaching time. On average, 73% of new teachers’ classroom time was spent on actual teaching and learning compared to 79% of more experienced teachers’ classes. The main reason for this was the great percentage of class time that new teachers spent on keeping order in classroom. Obviously this resulted in significant reduction in effective teaching and learning time. While reduction in actual teaching time can have a negative impact on
the students, the difference between new and experienced teachers can be interpreted in various ways. On the one hand minimal difference in self-efficacy between new and experienced teachers could show quality of graduates and their preparations to the rigours of classroom teaching. On the other hand major difference could highlight the effectiveness of experience and professional learning. The researcher further sought to find out from teachers information concerning other areas of teacher-based challenges. The responses are indicated in table 4.

### 4.2.2 INSET Attendance

The researcher sought to know from the respondents about In-Service Education and Training (INSET).

Table 4.4: Teacher responses to the questions on INSET attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSET training are usually organised for History teachers in Ugenya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend INSET training organised in Ugenya and beyond.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of INSET training enables me have new insights in the subject.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean response**

**2.97**

**Interpretation key**

4.1-5.0- least challenge
3.1-4.0- Less challenge
2.1-3.0- Big challenge
1.0-2.0- Biggest challenge

On the question of whether INSET training was usually organized for History and Government teachers in the sub-county, 2 strongly agreed, 2 teachers agreed, and 3 were not sure, 8 disagreed while 7 strongly disagreed. The mean response for this question was 2.27 meaning that INSET was
not regularly organised. The general agreement among teachers was that lack of INSET training was a big challenge to History and Government curriculum implementation in Ugenya Sub-County. The Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards officer (QASO) was also asked by the researcher whether he organized INSET training for History and Government teachers.

G.O, interviewed on 4\textsuperscript{th} March 2018 at 1016hrs stated:

\textit{I have never done so but schools are encouraged to send teachers to attend workshops organized by publishing firms.}

This therefore indicates that teachers are left to depend on the knowledge acquired during pre-service training which cannot be sufficient to tackle emerging issues. Teachers were also asked whether they attended INSET training organized in the Sub-County. In their answers, 4 of them strongly agreed, 4 agreed, 1 was not sure, 5 disagreed while 8 strongly disagreed. The overall mean response to the question on INSET was 2.97. From this mean response, teachers did not attend INSET. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation. Principals were also asked whether teachers of History and Government attended INSET training. In response, 8 agreed while 14 disagreed. These findings are in agreement with those of TALIS (2008) which found out that poor INSET attendance leaves teachers teaching using outdated methods. Asked whether attendance of INSET training could enable them to have new insights in the subject, 10 strongly agreed, 6 agreed, 4 were not sure, 1 disagreed while another 1 strongly disagreed. There was a mean response of 4.05. The teachers in this case had agreed that INSET training was beneficial to their teaching since it provided new insights into the subject. The Sub-County QASO was similarly asked the same question and agreed to it. The responses of teachers, principals and the Sub-County QASO concurred with those of Koellinar,& Greenblatt (2018) which reported that INSET attendance improves collegiality and through such collegiality, teachers can share their teaching experiences, ideas, and knowledge and can influence one another to employ good teaching practices.
4.2.3. Teacher Attitude

The researcher asked teachers questions on attitude. The responses are presented in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: Teacher responses to the questions on attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy teaching History and Government.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking History and Government is enjoyable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my students to like the subject.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History leads to respectable careers in life</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were asked to indicate whether they enjoyed teaching History and Government. In this case, 11 strongly agreed, 7 agreed, 2 disagreed while another 2 strongly disagreed. This resulted into a mean response of 4.05. From these findings, teachers agreed that they enjoyed teaching the subject. Asked if they enjoyed marking History and Government exams, 9 of them strongly agreed, 5 agreed, 2 were not sure, 4 disagreed and 2 strongly disagreed. The resultant mean response was 3.68 showing that the question was of less challenge based on the interpretation key. Here also teachers indicated that they enjoyed marking History and Government exams and the question was less of a challenge.

On whether they encouraged their students to like the subject, 15 strongly agreed, 2 agreed, 3 were not sure, 1 disagreed and another 1 strongly agreed that they did so. This generated a mean of 4.32. This mean shows that teachers in Ugenya encouraged their learners to like the subject. It also reinforces the positive attitude teachers of History and Government have about the subject. The overall mean response on the questions about negative attitude among the teachers was 4.20. Teachers’ attitude towards the subject can be said to be positive. This indicated that attitude was of
the least challenge among teachers. It therefore means that teachers did not have a challenge in this area. The attitude of teachers was of the least challenge to curriculum implementation.

4.3. Student-Based Challenges

Students-based challenges dealt with various issues such as entry behaviour, career aspirations and attitude.

4.3.1 Entry Behaviour.

In this section the researcher sought to find out whether entry behavior affected students’ performance in History and Government as indicated in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Student responses to the question on entry behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My KCPE marks are adequate for secondary education</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher asked the students whether they felt that their entry behaviour was adequate enough to enable them pursue secondary education. In response, 127 strongly agreed, 73 agreed, 8 were not sure, 34 disagreed while 19 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 3.98. From the mean response, the students agreed that their entry behaviour was adequate and was of less challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government. It was therefore expected that the students would easily tackle learning challenges that would be encountered. However, going by the results of the five years shown in Table 1, the performance of students in History and Government had declined over the years. This observation is related to Tomlinson (2018), who argued that students come to school with a variety of learning backgrounds. They have different strengths and weaknesses that can affect their rate of acquisition and retention.
4.3.2. Career Aspiration.

Several questions were put to the students regarding career aspirations. Students’ responses to these are indicated in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Student responses to the questions on career aspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and Government is important to my future career.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Government has a wide range of career opportunities.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to pursue art-based courses in future</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first question was whether they felt that History and Government was important to their future careers. In response, 161 of them strongly agreed, 42 agreed, 13 were not sure, 16 disagreed and 29 strongly disagreed leading to a mean response of 4.11. From these responses, the students agreed that History and Government was important to their future careers and lives. On whether History and Government had a wide range of career opportunities, 33, strongly agreed, 38 agreed, 99 were not sure, 53 disagreed while 38 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 2.90. The mean response here suggests that a majority of the students rejected the idea that the subject had a wide range of career opportunities. It also means that students lack career guidance and this is why they were not sure which careers can be pursued by those who take the subject at secondary school.

The researcher sought to know whether the respondents intended to pursue arts-based courses. In their responses, 34 strongly agreed, 18 agreed, 33 were unsure, 61 disagreed while 115 strongly disagreed. This generated a mean response of 2.30. This mean indicated that a majority of the
students disagreed that they were intending to pursue arts-based courses. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation because teachers were teaching learners who were not interested in the subject being taught. These findings contradict those of Ogungbemi and Ajayi (2009) which indicated that career aspirations determined choice of subjects. These were students who were taking a subject which they neither wanted to pursue nor take courses related to. The findings concur with those of Joseph (2013) in Trinidad & Tobago which found out that while the students largely rejected the notion that History is boring and irrelevant to contemporary life, many of them were reluctant to pursue the subject at tertiary level. Many students, as it was realized, ranked the subject among those that do not lead to suitable careers. The overall mean response of students to the question about career aspiration was 3.07. The students in general felt that lack of career aspiration was a lesser challenge. However, it has to be noted that this contradicts their perceptions about the subject and future career aspiration in which History and Government would not play a major role. These findings are related to the assertions of Joseph (2013) that students’ perception of History may be shaped by factors outside the classrooms. Such factors include the perception that History has little or no relevance to present day existence.

4.3.3. Student’s Attitude

The researcher wanted to find out the attitude of the students towards History and Government and the responses generated are as indicated in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Student-Based challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy learning History and Government.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy reading History and Government notes.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like reading historical materials</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History content is easy to understand</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean response**  
3.17

**Interpretation KEY:**

4.1-5.0 Least challenge  
3.1-4.0 Less challenge  
2.1-3.0 Big challenge  
1.1-2.0 Biggest challenge

Students were asked whether they enjoyed learning History and Government, 125 strongly agreed, 78 agreed, 14 were not sure, 28 disagreed while 16 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 4.02 indicating that it was of the least challenge. The responses show that the students enjoyed learning the subject. This concurs with the findings of the study conducted by Joseph (2013) in Trinidad and Tobago which revealed that many students enjoyed learning the subject even though they did not intend to pursue it in future. The challenge was therefore not that the subject was boring, but the students’ career aspirations. It also concurs with that of Rono (2016) who found out in his study that many students enjoyed learning History. However, it contradicts Rono’s findings which suggested that students felt that the subject was relevant in their future careers.

The researcher also asked students whether they enjoyed reading History and Government notes. In this case, 52 strongly agreed, 48 agreed, 10 were not sure, 59 disagreed and 92 strongly disagreed.
The mean response was 2.67. This means that the students did not enjoy reading their notes. For this reason it was a big challenge to curriculum implementation. Principals, in their responses about the major challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum, cited poor reading habits among students as one of them. These findings attest to Palani (2012) assertion that nowadays reading habit has lost its importance. As far as educational institutions are concerned, coaching students for examinations seems to be the all-and end all-of our education systems (Palani, 2012).

Besides notes, the researcher sought to find out whether students enjoyed reading historical materials. In response, 22 strongly agreed, 33 agreed, 8 were unsure, 94 disagreed while 104 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 2.13. The mean response shows that students did not enjoy reading historical materials. This has an impact on reading habits of the students and posed a big challenge to curriculum implementation. The findings show that the challenge in performance of students in this subject is their reading culture. Owusu-Acheaw (2014) study finding are in agreement with these. He discovered that many students engaged in reading mainly to pass exams. Again, such students are not able to broaden their minds, because reading books, fictions and journals broaden individual’s perception and knowledge. Lastly, the students were asked whether History and Government content was easy to understand. In response, 130 strongly agreed, 54 agreed, 24 were not sure, 23 strongly disagreed while 29 strongly disagreed. The resultant mean was 3.80. This mean response indicated that the students agreed to the notion that the subject content was easy to understand and for this reason it was of less challenge. The overall mean response to the questions on attitude was 3.17. This means that more students had a negative attitude towards the subject. This posed a challenge to curriculum implementation.
4.4. Resource-Based Challenges

The researcher asked students and teachers questions concerning resources. This section deals with responses given by both of them.

4.4.1 Textbooks

Table 4.9: Teachers’ responses to questions on textbooks and reference materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate number of textbooks for my class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Government textbooks address all the needs of the syllabus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate reference materials to supplement textbooks that I use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean response 3.26

The first question to teachers here was whether there were adequate History and Government textbooks for their classes. In response, 4 strongly agreed, 6 agreed, 2 were not sure while 10 disagreed. This led to a mean response of 2.45 indicating that teachers disagreed. They did not have adequate textbooks. Their mean response indicated that it was a big challenge. Teachers were asked whether History and Government textbooks addressed all the needs of the syllabus as shown in table 4.7. In their responses, 5 strongly agreed, and 12 agreed, 1 was not sure while 4 disagreed. Their mean response was 4.73. Here, teachers strongly agreed. Teachers were also asked whether there were other reference materials to supplement the textbooks that they had. In this case, 2 strongly agreed, 7 agreed, 1 was not sure while 12 disagreed. The mean response was 2.59. These finding mean that teachers used information in the core textbooks only. This posed a big challenge to curriculum implementation because they could not access additional information not contained in their textbooks.
Table 4.10: Students responses to the questions on textbooks and reference materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have adequate History and Government textbooks for your class?</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your History textbooks address all the needs of the syllabus.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there adequate reference materials that supplement History and Government textbooks in your class?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation Key:**

4.1-5.0-least challenge  
3.1-4.0- less challenge  
2.1-3.0- big challenge  
1.0- 2.0- biggest challenge

Students were also asked questions on textbooks. In response, 48 strongly agreed, 62 agreed, 63 were unsure, 41 disagreed and 47 strongly disagreed. This resulted into a mean response of 3.09 indicating that they were not sure. The responses suggested that not all the students had accessed the textbooks. The question of inadequate textbooks here was challenge to implementation of History and Government curriculum among students. When the researcher asked the principal the same question, 18 out of 22 indicated that they lacked adequate number of textbooks for the subject while 4 stated that they had enough. The main reason given for this by the principals was that teachers did not give assignments most of the time and students could share the few available copies.

Students were asked whether History and Government textbooks addressed all the needs of the syllabus. Here, 81 strongly agreed, 82 agreed, 35 were not sure, 37 disagreed while 26 strongly
disagreed. The resultant mean response was 3.59. Both teachers and students were satisfied with the contents of textbooks that they used in History and Government. This means that it was of the least challenge to History curriculum implementation. The findings did not concur with those of De Oliveira (2008) who stated that publishers merely respond to narrow curriculum. To him, apart from the few textbooks that schools have, the other challenge lies in the content of the same textbooks. The content is usually narrow and does not support curriculum adequately. In Ugenya, the respondents were satisfied with the contents of their textbooks.

Students were also asked whether there were adequate reference materials to supplement the textbooks. In this case, 28 students strongly agreed, 48 agreed, 71 were not sure, 71 disagreed and 43 strongly disagreed. The mean response here was 2.80. This confirms that they did not have adequate access to the reference materials. Principals were also asked about the kind of reference materials they provided to teachers other than the prescribed textbooks. In response, 22 out of 22 mentioned past papers and revision books.

It can be concluded that reference materials were inadequate in Ugenya Sub-County. These findings agree with those of De Oliveira (2008) which indicated that the question on inadequate textbooks is a challenge to curriculum implementation. The findings also concur with those of Keele University survey (2010) which showed that only a quarter of 13 and 14 year olds had access to History textbooks for homework, and 40% had shared in class. Keele University survey (2010) found out that overall spending on History textbooks and other resources had often fallen. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2010) found out that insufficient textbooks and few resources are some of the problems facing students in Sub-Saharan Africa.
4.4.2. Time Allocation

Teachers were asked question on time allocation. Their responses were presented on Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Teacher responses to the question on time allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and Government is allocated adequate time in the school timetable.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question to the teachers was whether History and Government was allocated adequate time in the school timetable. In response, 4 strongly agreed, 6 agreed, 2 were not sure while 10 disagreed. The mean response was 2.45. Teachers indicated that the allocated time was inadequate. In this case, teachers reported that the question of time was a big challenge based on the interpretation key.

Table 4.12: Students responses to the question on time allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and Government is allocated adequate time in the school timetable.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were also asked whether History and Government was allocated adequate time in the school timetable. Here, 58 strongly agreed, 61 agreed, 50 were not sure, 58 disagreed while 34 strongly disagreed. The mean response generated was 3.19. This shows that the students were not sure. The students indicated that time was of less challenge. According to the responses obtained, time was a big challenge to History and Government curriculum implementation. These findings are in agreement with those of Holland (2011). According to Holland (2011), the ever expanding
content is the crux of the Social Studies teacher’ dilemma: How to cover every topic within limited time (Holland, 2011). Teachers are forced to use methods that allow them to cover the content in the shortest time possible. In this case the learners are disadvantaged. With the ever expanding content, teachers are trying to balance teaching content with helping students learn other essential skills.

4.4.3. Teaching Aids

Table 4.13: Teachers’ responses to the question on teaching aids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate teaching aids for use in my class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to establish availability and use of various teaching and learning aids from the students and teachers. In response, 2 teachers strongly agreed that they had adequate teaching aids, 4 agreed to it, none of them was unsure, 14 disagreed while 2 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 2.54. Teachers agreed with their students that teaching aids were not adequate in their schools. The researcher went further and used an observation schedule to confirm availability of teaching aids. The findings were as presented in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14: Observation schedule for teaching aids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo</th>
<th>AID</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
<th>NOT AVAILABLE</th>
<th>USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Charts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Radios</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cassette recordings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Disk recordings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Televisions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Films</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher discovered that charts were available for 12 teachers but 10 did not have them. Again 12 teachers used them while 10 did not. Pictures were accessed by 5 teachers while 17 did not have any. Out of these, 3 used them while 2 did not. Posters were used by 2 teachers only while 20 others did not have them. Of the 2 available cases only 1 was used while the other one did not. Slides were not available in any school and for that reason they were no teacher used them.

Only 4 radios were available but none was used in teaching and learning. In 6 instances, cassette recordings were available while 16 teachers could not access them. Three teachers used them for teaching while the other 3 did not. Disk recordings were not available and not accessible to any
teacher. A total of 15 televisions were observed by the researcher. However, on 3 teachers used them for teaching. Nine teachers had access to videos while 13 did not. Out of these, only 4 were used during lessons. No school had film recordings and as such they were not used by any teacher while teaching.

Table 4.15: Students responses to the question on teaching aids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate learning aids for use in my class</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the same question 39 students strongly agreed that they were adequate, 22 agreed to the question, 26 were not sure, 71 disagreed while 103 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 2.32. From the students’ responses, it is clear that they were taught without any learning aids. Based on the interpretation key, inadequate teaching aids was a big challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government.

These findings concur with those of Kidombo (2010), who reported in a study she led that technology today is revolutionalising the way both teaching and learning processes are conducted. However, failure by the teachers to embrace the new technology may dampen the whole process. Findings of the report showed that nearly half of the teachers in public schools are computer illiterate. As a result, teachers are not using computers and the internet to enrich their teaching and get the most current information in their respective fields. Failure to use teaching aids means that content is presented like dry bones that have no connection with the empirical world (Patin, 2009).

In general, many teachers taught most of their lessons without any teaching aids. For a teacher to succeed he must have a complete arsenal at his disposal. It is the teacher who has to choose the
means that suit his subject and students. Teachers also failed to stimulate the interest of learners in certain topics that would require demonstration through the use of audio, visual and audio-visual aids. The study findings here agree with those of Ogungbemi and Ajayi (2009) who reported a study which indicated that teachers did not use teaching aids in most of their History lessons. Teachers and principals agreed in the study that lack of essential teaching aids constituted the most serious challenge of teaching History in senior secondary schools.

4.5. Curriculum-Based Challenges

The researcher sought to establish curriculum-based challenges from the teachers and students. Their responses are indicated in table 4.16.

4.5.1: Content

Table 4.16: Teacher Responses to the questions on content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and Government content is too large to be completed within the time allocated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Government requires more lessons.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means response 2.48

Teachers were also asked whether History and Government content was not too large to be covered within the period provided. In this case 1 strongly agreed, 3 agreed, 1 was not sure, 6 disagreed while 11 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 1.95. Teachers were also asked whether the subject required additional lesson. In response, 12 strongly agreed, 5 agreed, 1 was not sure, 2 disagreed while 2 strongly disagreed. The mean response here was 4.05. The teachers agreed in their response that they needed additional time to complete History and Government syllabus.
Table 4.17: Student responses to the questions on content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can History and Government content be completed within the time provided?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Government requires more lessons</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher also asked students whether History and Government content was very large. In this case, 26 strongly agreed, 9 agreed, 19 were not sure, 85 disagreed while 122 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 1.97. This means that they disagreed. Students felt that the content of the subject was too wide to be covered within the stipulated time. This indicated that it was of the biggest challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government. In connection with the question of large content, students were asked whether the subject needed additional lessons. In this case, 66 strongly agreed, 107 agreed, 26 were not sure, 26 disagreed while 36 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 2.72. The findings show that students did not want the subject allocated additional time. It contrasted with the responses of the teachers who wanted more time for the subject. The responses could be attributed to negative attitude towards the subject. These findings disagree with Korea’s National Council for Curriculum Assessment (NCCA, 2008) which found out that content of History is wide and requires many lessons to be completed.

4.5.2. Teaching methods

Teachers were asked questions about teaching methods. The results are presented on Table 4.18.
Table 4.18: Teachers’ responses to the questions on teaching methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prepare professional records in time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use my professional records to prepare my lessons</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My schemes of work enable me to deliver my lessons easily and take care of differing needs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Government enables me to teach through various methods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I organise field trips for History and Government students.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trips help my students to understand History and Government better</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I call resource persons to give talks to students on various topics in History and Government.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of resource persons enrich my students’ of various topics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I employ team teaching in History and Government.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being taught by other teachers of History and Government enhances my students’ understanding.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always take care of my students’ differing abilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean response 3.36

The researcher wanted to know whether teachers prepared professional documents before teaching. In this case, 9 strongly agreed, 8 agreed, 3 disagreed while 2 strongly disagreed. The mean response here was 3.86. From the findings, teachers agreed that they prepared professional documents. It must be noted at this juncture that preparation of these documents alone does not translate into their use (TALIS, 2008). It was therefore imperative that the researcher probes further.
The researcher further asked the teacher respondents whether they used their professional records in their lessons. To this end, 13 of them strongly agreed, 6 agreed, 2 disagreed and 1 strongly agreed. This generated a mean of 4.27 showing that they agreed and it was of the least challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government. They were also required to state whether their professional records enabled them to deliver lessons easily and take care of differing needs in which case 16 strongly agreed, 4 agreed while 2 were not sure. This resulted into a mean response of 4.64 indicating that teachers did have a challenge using their professional documents for lesson preparation and actual teaching. This mean response suggests that teachers delivered their lessons easily whenever they used their professional documents. In this case, teachers felt confident about their preparation and use of their professional documents. Teachers were required by the researcher to show whether History and Government allows them to teach using various methods. In response, 9 strongly agreed and 13 agreed. Their mean response was 4.41. In this case, there was strong agreement among teachers that they could use various teaching methods to teach History and Government. The overall mean response to the questions about teaching methods was 4.25. This means that teaching methods was of the least challenge.

African Population and Health Research Centre (2010) conducted a study which indicated that some teachers were the source of poor performance among learners because they emphasized memorization and recitation of knowledge instead of understanding. Because of their limited education, they failed to explain to the students why some points were correct while others were wrong. Teacher’ responses contradicted the findings of the A.P.H.R.C. However, it should be noted that teaching methods and ability differ. Teacher character, personality and competence determine the atmosphere of the lesson, their relationships with the students and style of communication in the classroom (A.P.H.R.C, 2010).
The researcher sought to know from teachers whether they guided students appropriately in order to understand all the topics. In this case, 8 strongly agreed, 12 agreed while 2 disagreed. The mean response here was 4.18 indicating that the question was of the least challenge. This means that teachers agreed that they guided students appropriately and therefore this did not pose a challenge to them. From this, teachers indicated that they took care of the learners’ individual differences. This therefore meant that differentiation was less of a challenge. Tomlinson (2018) says that lessons are not about treating everyone alike but working to ensure that a student has the support he or she needs. However, it should be noted here that differentiation is not always easy to achieve due to class dynamics like average class population. For this reason some teachers could face the challenge of meeting a variety of needs they are confronted with (Penny, 2009).

Teachers were required to state whether they organized field trips for History and Government students. In response, 2 of them strongly agreed, 1 agreed, 3 were not sure 6 disagreed while 10 strongly disagreed. The mean generated was 2.05 showing that they disagreed. Based on the interpretation scale developed by the researcher, teachers reported that this was a big challenge to implementation of History curriculum. In connection with field trips, teachers were also asked whether these trips helped their students to understand the subject better. In response, 2 teachers strongly agreed, 1 agreed, 3 were not sure, 6 disagreed while 10 strongly agreed. The mean response was 2.05. Here, teachers disagreed. The mean response in this situation was attributed to the fact that majority of teachers did not take their students out for field trips. As such, they could not state the benefits that accrued to their students for attending such trips. On the question of calling resource persons, 2 teachers strongly agreed, 4 agreed, 11 disagreed, while 5 strongly disagreed. Their mean response was 2.41. With this response, teachers stated that they did not call
resource persons. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation in History. Asked whether resource persons could enrich their students’ understanding of various topics in History and Government, 9 teachers strongly agreed, 5 agreed, 2 were not sure, 5 disagreed, and 1 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 3.71 indicating that they agreed. In this case, teachers appreciated the contributions of resource persons in teaching History and Government. These findings concur with those of United Kingdom, Department of Education and skills (2017). The findings showed that interactions between students and adults from the community can have a positive effect on student learning and student attitudes. Use of such resource persons can lead to deeper understanding of the subject matter and provide a more meaningful engagement with materials. The researcher wanted to know from the teachers whether they employed team teaching. In response, 4 strongly agreed, 7 agreed, 8 disagreed while 3 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 2.81. This response indicates that many teachers did not involve their colleagues in handling their classes. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation according to teachers. Probed to establish whether they felt team teaching enhances students’ understanding, 4 teachers strongly agreed, 3 agreed, 6 were not sure, 2 disagreed while 7 strongly disagreed. Their response generated a mean of 2.77 to show that they disagreed. From this response, many teachers did not practice team teaching and also failed to recognize the contribution that could be made by their colleagues. It also shows that there was little sense of collegiality among teachers and others were contented with the way they were teaching. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation.
Table 4.19: Students’ response to the questions on teaching methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your teacher organize field trips for History and Government students?</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do field trips help you understand History and Government better?</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are resource persons are called to give talks concerning History and Government in your class?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do resource persons enrich your understanding of History?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you at times taught History and Government by other teachers of the same subject?</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does being taught by other teachers of History and government ease your understanding of the subject?</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean response 3.11

The researcher also asked the students whether their teachers organized field trips for them. In this case, 51, strongly agreed, 71 agreed, 39 were not sure, 49 disagreed while 51 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 3.08. This means that they were not sure. This means that those students did not go for fieldtrips in most cases. However, based on the interpretation scale, the students indicated that this was of less challenge to curriculum implementation. Inadequate field trips posed a big challenge to curriculum implementation.

On whether these field trips enabled them understand History and Government better, 51 students strongly agreed, 71 agreed, 39 were not sure, 49 disagreed while 51 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 3.08. This mean response indicated that the students were not sure. The reason behind this was that many did not attend such trips and for this reason were not able to identify the benefits. The findings concur with those of Nespor (2008), who found out that the teachers rarely organized field trips these days because of various reasons. This situation was mainly caused by financial constraints and overloaded schedules. The amount of subject matter they need to teach
each year to meet the standards of the schools’ mandated curriculum is so great that there is no
time to schedule such visits (Nespor, 2008). The schools’ budgets are also so tight that it is nearly
impossible to pay for buses to go for trips or get parents to pay for outreach programmes (Nespor,
2008).

Students were asked whether resource persons were usually called to give talks to them concerning
History and Government. In response, 56 strongly agreed, 60 agreed, 50 were not sure, 43
disagreed while 52 strongly disagreed. The mean response here was 3.10. This response shows that
the students were not sure. It was of less challenge to them. It also reveals that resource persons
were rarely integrated in the teaching process by the teachers.

On whether use of resource persons enriched their understanding of History and Government, 56
students strongly agreed, 52 agreed, 43 were not sure, 50 disagreed while 60 strongly disagreed.
This led to mean response of 3.00. In this case, the students’ responses indicated that they were not
sure. This was as a result of failure by many teachers to integrate resource persons to augment what
students were taught in class by their subject teachers. For this reason, many students were not
aware of the usefulness of such persons in reinforcing whatever they were taught by their teachers.
This indicated that the question was less of a challenge to implementation of curriculum
implementation in History and Government. Research however, indicates that supported teachers
are in the best position to deliver effective education (United Kingdom, Department of Education
and Skills, 2017). There are agencies and resource persons in the community that have the
expertise and knowledge to augment school education programmes.
The researcher also asked the students whether they were at times taught by other teachers of History. Out of 261 respondents, 48 strongly agreed, 73 agreed, 63 were not sure, 39 disagreed while 38 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 3.21. This shows that students were not sure. It points to the fact that many students were not handled by other teachers of History and government. They contradicted their teachers because they reported that it was of less challenge. Based on the interpretation key, the question on team teaching was of less challenge to curriculum implementation History and Government.

As asked whether team teaching makes them understand the subject easily, 55 students strongly agreed, 72 agreed, 41 were not sure, 45 disagreed while 48 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 3.16. Based on the measurements of the Likert scale, this indicates that the students were not sure. This response is mainly founded on the fact that most students had no experience of being taught by others who were not their regular subject teachers. From the findings, team teaching was not practiced by many teachers. Goetz (2012) argues that team teaching may not be for everyone as some teachers prefer to be the only person in charge of their students’ learning. Goetz (2012) discovered in his study that some teachers are a rigid personality type or may be wedded to a single method. Some simply dislike other teachers on their team; some do not want to risk humiliation and discouragement at possible failure. Other teachers are unwilling to share pet ideas or to lose total control.

**4.5.3. Assessment Methods**

Teachers and Students were asked questions concerning assessment methods.
Table 4.20: Teacher Responses to the questions on assessment methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I ask students of History and Government questions in class</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly test my students to find out their progress in the subject.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests I administer help me identify my History and Government students’ weaknesses and address them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I revise History and Government tests I administer in my classes.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like marking History and Government assignments.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always mark History and Government assignments in time.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Government assignments and exams are important in preparation for KCSE exams.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were also asked whether they asked students questions during their lessons. In response, 16 strongly agreed while 6 agreed. The mean response was 4.73. This showed means that they asked students questions in class. Teachers were also asked whether they tested their students regularly. In this case, 8 strongly agreed, 12 agreed, 1 disagreed while 1 strongly disagreed. The mean generated was 4.14. Teachers indicated that that they regularly tested their students. It was of the least challenge to curriculum implementation.

The researcher also asked teachers whether they revised tests that they administered to their students. In their responses, 9 strongly agreed, 8 agreed, 3 disagreed while 2 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 3.86. With this response, teachers agreed that they revised tests that they administered to their students. Teachers who develop useful assignments, provide corrective
instruction, and give students second chance to demonstrate success can improve their instruction and help students learn (Guskey, 2009). Assessments must be followed by high quality, corrective instruction designed to remedy whatever learning errors the assessment identified. Teachers were also asked whether they liked marking History and Government assignments. 4 strongly agreed, 9 agreed, 1 was not sure, 4 disagreed while 4 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 3.23. With this mean response, teachers were not sure. While some teachers gave the assignments and marked, others did not do so. Teachers, as Guskey (2009) reported, need to change their view of assessment. They need to see assessments as an integral part of the instruction process and crucial for helping students learn. That was one of the ways of identifying areas of weakness and coming up with appropriate remedies. On the same note teachers were asked whether they marked History and Government assignments in time. In response, 8 strongly agreed, 7 agreed, 5 disagreed while 2 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean of 3.64. Teachers in this case agreed that they marked students’ assignments in time that was an issue of less challenge.

The researcher also sought to know from teachers whether they felt that assignments and exams were important in preparation for the K.C.S.E exam. In this case 16 strongly agreed while 6 agreed. The mean response was 3.72. Teachers also agreed that assignments and exams were important in preparation for KCSE examinations.
Table 4.21: Students’ Responses to the question on assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you participate in answering History and Government questions in class?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you regularly tested to find out my progress in History and Government?</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do tests administered help you identify your weaknesses in History and Government?</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your teacher help you revise History and Government tests?</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your teacher give History and Government assignments?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are History and Government assignments marked in time?</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Government assignments are important in preparation for KCSE exams</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean response</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation Key:**

4.1-5.0-least challenge
3.1-4.0-less challenge
2.1-3.0-big challenge
1.0-2.0-biggest challenge

The students were asked was whether they participated in answering questions in class. In response, 80 strongly agreed, 113 agreed, 10 were not sure, 45 disagreed and 13 strongly disagreed. Their mean response was 3.77. With this mean response, the students agreed that they answered questions in class. This question was of the least challenge to curriculum
implementation in History and Government. It should be noted that questions alone do not necessarily translate into good assessment. Curwin (2014), states that there is a catch in using questions. The question must be connected with the content, so that the following learning activities actually answer the question. The question must fit your students’ ability and experience. In addition the question needs to provoke both thought and curiosity.

Students were also asked whether they were regularly tested to find out their progress, in which case, 104 strongly agreed, 93 agreed, 8, were not sure, 27 disagreed while 29 strongly disagreed. This led to a mean response of 3.83. In this case the students agreed that they were regularly tested. Students felt that it was of less challenge. The question was of less challenge to curriculum implementation in History. Assessment helps teachers to give more accurate overview of student performance and helps to determine grades with greater level of objectiveness (Penny, 2009). Nevertheless, teachers’ responses here are reinforced by those of Guskey (2009) who argues that the best classroom assessments also serve as meaningful source of information for teachers, helping them identify what they taught well and what they need to work on.

Students were also asked to state whether test administered to them helped them identify their weaknesses. In their answers, 127 strongly agreed, 73 agreed, 8 were not sure, 34 disagreed while 19 strongly disagreed. The mean here was 3.98. Students agreed with their teachers about the quality of the test given to them. In this case, students agreed that the tests helped them to identify their weaknesses. Assessment of students needs to reflect concepts and skills that teachers emphasize in class along with the teacher’s criteria for judging students. Teachers facilitate learning by providing students with feedbacks on their learning progress and help them identify learning problems (Guskey, 2009). Critics contend that this approach means teaching to test.
However, if desired learning goals are the foundations of student’s learning experiences, then assessment of student learning are simply extension of those goals.

The researcher also asked the students respondents whether their teachers revised tests administered to them. 64 strongly agreed, 97 agreed, 7 were not sure, 29 disagreed while 64 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 3.26 meaning that they were not sure. This indicates that the students felt that it was of less challenge. The responses of students show that while some teachers revised the tests they administered, others did not do so. However, it was of less challenge to curriculum Implementation.

Students were also asked whether they liked doing History and Government assignments. In response, 18 strongly agreed 21 agreed, 4 were not sure, 53 disagreed while 165 strongly disagreed. The mean response was 1.75. In this case students strongly disagreed. This response emanated most likely from the fact that many teachers did not give assignments in the subject but waited until formal tests are lined up in the school termly programmes. It was a big challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government. This can generally make students not to study their work on their own. Students were also asked whether History and Government assignments were marked in time. In their responses, 60 strongly agreed, 47 agreed, 21 were not sure, 67 disagreed while 66 strongly disagreed. The mean response here was 2.88 meaning that they disagreed. Students differed with their teachers. They saw it as a big challenge. Nothing we do to or for our students is more important than our assessment of their work and the feedback we give them on it (Brown, 2011). The results of our assessment influence our students for the rest of their lives and careers. Students benefit from timely feedback. The longer the students have to wait to get work back, the less likely that they will make constructive use of the teacher’s comments (Brown, 2011). This implies that work should be returned quickly while students still care and while there is still time for them to act upon advice.
Students were also asked a similar question. In as much as they appreciated the importance of assignments, they were not keen on giving them to students. In response, 140 strongly agreed, 52 agreed, 34 were not sure, 30 disagreed while 35 strongly disagreed. The mean response for the students was 3.89 meaning that they were not sure. Students could not identify the benefits of assignments in History and Government because they were not given. The teachers’ and students’ responses were similar in this situation. Both teachers and students indicated that this question was of the least challenge to History and Government curriculum. Assignments as Brown (2011) observed can direct students’ learning behaviour by designing and implementing better assessment.

The researcher asked the principals what they did to ensure that curriculum implementation in History and Government was appropriately conducted. In their response, 18 out of 22 reported that they had appointed heads of departments to be in charge. They also indicated that they depended on the reports from their deputies. On the other hand, 4 out of 22 directly checked teachers’ schemes of works and records of work covered. From this report, it was evident that many principals did not follow keenly on their teachers’ work and students’ progress. The Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards officer also stated that he carried out quality assessment in a few schools once a year. The major factor leading to this situation was inadequate number of officers at his disposal and lack of adequate funds. In order to carry out his duties, he had on many occasions invited officers from other sub-counties to assist him. Furthermore, he had to seek for financial support from the Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association, Ugenya chapter.
4.6. Overall Ranking of Challenges

The purpose of this research was to inform action. The findings have implications for policy and future curriculum implementation. In addition, resources are usually scarce and therefore the findings were to guide main priority areas. It is on this background that the researcher ranked the challenges in order of severity as shown in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22: Teachers’ mean responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Overall mean response</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-based challenges</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource-based challenges</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum-based challenges</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Lowest number denotes biggest challenge while highest number denotes least challenge.

From Table 4.22, teachers indicated that resources were of the greatest challenge. This was followed by curriculum and lastly teacher-based challenges. Teacher-based challenges generated a mean response of 3.59. The most serious challenge here was inadequate INSET attendance (2.27). This was a big challenge to History and Government curriculum implementation. This finding reinforces Koellinar& Greenblatt (2018) argument that teaching skills must not be static. Resource-based challenges led to a mean of 2.75. On the questions on resource-based challenges teachers identified textbooks (2.45), time (2.45) and reference materials (2.49) and teaching aids (2.54) as the main challenges. On curriculum the areas of greatest challenge were field trips (2.05), resource persons (2.41) and team teaching (2.77).
Table 4.23 Students’ Overall Mean responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Overall mean response</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student -based challenges</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource-based challenges</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum-based challenges</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Lowest number denotes biggest challenge while highest number denotes least challenge.

Students on the other hand showed that resources were of the greatest challenge (2.89). On resource-based challenges the areas of seriousness included learning aids (2.32) reference materials (2.80), textbooks (3.09) and textbooks (3.17). On students-based challenges, the most serious areas included reading habits (2.13), desire to pursue art based courses (2.21), whether History should be made compulsory (2.66) and whether History has a wide range of career opportunities (2.90). On the questions about curriculum, areas of greatest challenge were assignments (1.75) and content (1.97).

Student-based challenges led to a mean response of 3.40 while curriculum-based challenges registered overall mean responses of 2.89.
5.0. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

5.1.1 Teacher-Based Challenges

Majority of teachers of History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County were trained. To a large extent, many teachers were capable of teaching at secondary school level. They also reported that they had the confidence to teach but were open to further training. This meant that the question was of the least challenge to History and Government curriculum implementation. Teachers who had taught for less than five years were 54.59% of the totals. This indicates that many of them had limited experience in teaching. The research also discovered that teachers did not attend INSET training. For that reason they solely depended on their pre-service training knowledge to teach leaners. This caused a big challenge to curriculum Implementation. Teachers employed various teaching methods. To this end, teaching methods was of the least challenge to curriculum implementation. Teachers reported that they varied learning experiences to take care of the needs of their students. Their responses implied that differentiation was a lesser challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government. The research established that the attitude of the teachers towards the subject was positive. For that reason it was of the least challenge to implementation of History and Government curriculum.

5.1.2 Student-Based Challenges

This study also established that the entry behaviour of students to secondary schools was adequate. This means that they were capable of understanding History curriculum. For that reason it was of the least challenge. The question of career aspiration was a big challenge with students indicating that they were not intending to pursue courses related to History and Government. The researcher
also established that many students enjoyed learning the subject. However, they did not like reading it. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation.

5.1.3. Resource-Based Challenges

Many teachers and students faced serious shortage of textbooks and other reference materials. This implies that the issue of textbooks was a big challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government. The combined mean response for both the students and the teachers about time allocation indicated that it was a big challenge. Both of them rejected the idea that the subject was allocated adequate time. The study also discovered that teachers of History and Government did not organise field trips for their students. This was a big challenge to implementation of History and Government curriculum implementation. Teachers of History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County also failed to utilize the services of resource persons. Team teaching was also not practiced by many teachers. At the same time they felt that failure to apply team teaching was a big challenge. Both teachers and students reported inadequate teaching and learning aids in their schools. This caused a big challenge to curriculum implementation.

5.1.4. Curriculum-Based Challenges

Both the students disagreed to the question that History and Government content can be covered within the time provided. They viewed it as a big problem to curriculum implementation. They therefore required additional time for the subject. In both cases, teachers, students and principals identified time as one of the big challenges in implementing the curriculum. The question about assessment was of less challenge to curriculum implementation in the subject. Teachers and students were satisfied with the assessment methods. According to the responses given by the teachers and the students, their textbooks addressed all the needs of the syllabus. This meant that the issue was of the least challenge to curriculum implementation.
5.2 Conclusions

5.2.1 Teacher-Based Challenges

From the research findings, it was discovered that the Sub-County lacked adequate number of trained teachers of History and Government. This generally lead to poor performance among students. Teachers further confirmed that they did not attend INSET training. This left them teaching most using methods that were not in tandem with modern trends. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation. Other related attitude did not feature as big challenges in this category.

5.2.2 Student-Based Challenges

One of the main challenges noted in this category was career aspirations among students of History and Government. Many students did not enjoy reading History notes and historical materials. Poor reading habit among the students was a big challenge. Entry behaviour was of less challenge to curriculum implementation.

5.2.3 Resource-Based Challenges

Several schools faced a big shortage of History and Government textbooks. In essence, students had to depend on notes given by teachers but could not carry out personal research in cases of inadequacies in the notes. Other reference materials were also inadequate. This was a big challenge to curriculum implementation in History and Government.

5.2.4 Curriculum-Based Challenges

Both students and teachers agreed that the content of History and Government curriculum was large. This was a big challenge. Both of them agreed that the subject requires additional time in the timetable. Teachers also failed in most cases to organize field trips for their History and Government students. This means that there was no connection between school work with the world. On the issue of resource persons, teachers did not involve them in their lessons and
therefore could not understand their usefulness. In the same way, team teaching was not practiced and teachers had to deal with all the areas of the syllabus on their own without variation of teaching methodologies from their colleagues. This was also seen as a big challenge to curriculum implementation. The research also revealed that the question of teaching aids was another big challenge. Teachers did not give assignment to their students as confirmed in their responses. This was a big challenge considering the poor reading habits among the students. The textbooks that were used in Ugenya schools addressed the needs of the syllabus.

5.3 **Recommendations**

The researcher recommends various measures to be taken in order to reverse the downward trend in the performance of students in History and Government in Ugenya Sub-County.

5.3.1 **Teacher-based Challenges**

i. Teachers need to be encouraged to attend INSET training in order to learn emerging issues in the subject. This training should also be attended by untrained teachers.

5.3.2 **Student-Based Challenges**

i. Teachers of History and Government should explain to their students the importance of learning the subject.

ii. Career guidance days also need to be organized to enable students know how to choose subjects that are related to their envisaged courses.

iii. Students also need to be taught good reading habits that will encourage them to constantly revise their notes.

5.3.3 **Resource-Based Challenges**

i. School administration need to increase financial allocation in order to acquire adequate History and Government textbooks, other reference materials and teaching aids.
ii. Teachers should occasionally organize for field trips, resource persons and team teaching in order to spice up learning.

iii. Teachers should also use available teaching aids and improvise where possible.

5.3.4. Curriculum-Based Challenges

i. Content of History and Government needs to be revised with a view to reducing it or allocating more time for the subject.

ii. Students need to be constantly tested to monitor their progress in the subject. This should include assignments after every topic. Regular assignments should form part of the regular tests.

5.3.5 Suggestions for further Research

i. Relationship between career choice and subject selection among secondary school students in Ugenya Sub-County.

ii. Strategies of implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA IN KENYA
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

DEAR STUDENT,

You are one of the respondents selected to help carry out a research on the challenges of implementing the History and Government curriculum. Please assist by answering the following questions:

Please tick appropriately after the choices given after each question.

**KEY:**

Strongly agree (SA)

Agree (A)

Not sure (NS)

Disagree (D)

Strongly disagree (SD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo.</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Are your entry marks are adequate for secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is History and Government important to your future career?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does History and Government have a wide range of career opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Would you like to pursue arts-based courses in future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is History and Government is important to your daily life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>History and Government should be made compulsory in all schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do you enjoy learning History and Government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do you enjoy reading History and Government notes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>History and Government content is easy to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Do you have adequate History and Government textbooks for your class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Are there adequate reference materials that supplement History and Government in your class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>History and Government has more resource materials than other subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>History and Government is allocated adequate time in the school timetable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other subjects are allocated more time in the school timetable than History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does your teacher organize field trips for History and Government students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Do field trips help you understand History and Government better?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Are resource persons are called to give talks concerning History and Government in your class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Do resource persons enrich your understanding of History?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Are you at times taught History and Government by other teachers of the same subject?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Does being taught by other teachers of History and Government ease your understanding of the subject?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Can History and Government content be completed within the time provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Do you participate in answering History and Government questions in class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Are you regularly tested to find out my progress in History and Government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Do tests administered help you identify your weaknesses in History and Government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Does your teacher help you revise History and Government tests?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNo.</td>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Does your teacher give History and Government assignments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Are History and Government assignments marked in time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>History and Government assignments are important in preparation for KCSE exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Do History and Government textbooks address all the needs of the syllabus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>History and Government content is too wide to be completed within the time allocated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>History and Government requires more lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Good Morning/ Afternoon? You are one of the respondents selected to participate in this study.

The main purpose of the study is to establish the challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in secondary schools in Ugenya Sub-County. I request for your cooperation and any responses provided will be treated with a lot of confidentiality.

1. What is your highest level of education? Tick whichever is appropriate.
   
   K.C.S.E. [ ] A-LEVEL [ ] COLLEGE [ ] UNIVERSITY [ ]

2. What is your highest level of professional training? Tick appropriately.

   Untrained [ ] Diploma [ ] Bachelor’s degree [ ] Masters’ degree [ ] others [ ]

3. For how long have you been teaching the History and Government?

   Less than five years [ ] 5-10 years [ ] More than 10 years [ ]

Please tick the following answers appropriately

KEY

Strongly agree (SA)

Agree (A)

Not sure (NS)

Disagree (D)

Strongly disagree (SD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo.</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My academic and professional training is adequate for teaching History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My qualifications make me feel confident to teach History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I need further professional training in teaching History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>INSET training are usually organised for History and Government teachers in Ugenya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I attend INSET training organised for History and Government teachers in Ugenya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attendance of INSET training enables me to have new insights in the subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I prepare professional records before teaching History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I use my schemes of work to prepare my History and Government lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My schemes of work enable me to deliver my History and Government lessons with ease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>History and Government allows me to teach through various methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I organise for remedial lessons to address my students’ weaknesses in History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I vary my teaching to take care of individual student’s needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I always guide my students appropriately to understand all the topics in History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I enjoy teaching History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marking History and Government exams is enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My students report to me that History and Government is interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I encourage my students to like History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>History and Government leads to respectable careers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>There are adequate History and Government textbooks for my class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>There are adequate reference materials that supplement textbooks that I use to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>History and Government has more resource materials than other subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>History and Government is allocated adequate time in the school timetable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Other arts subjects are allocated more time in the school timetable than History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I organise field trips for History and Government students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 25   | Field trips help my students to understand History and__)}}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo.</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I call resource persons to give talks to students on various topics in History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Use of resource persons enrich my students’ of various topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I employ team teaching in History and Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Being taught by other teachers of History and Government enhances my students’ understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I ask students of History and Government questions in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I regularly test my students to find out their progress in the subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tests I administer help me identify my History and Government students’ weaknesses and address them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I revise History and Government tests I administer in my classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I like marking History and Government assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I always mark History and Government assignments in time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>History and Government assignments and exams are important in preparation for KCSE exams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>History and Government textbooks address all the needs of the syllabus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>History and Government content is narrow and can be completed within the time allocated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>History and Government requires more lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D: OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>AID</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
<th>NOT AVAILABLE</th>
<th>USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Charts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Posters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Slides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Radios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cassette recordings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Disk recordings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Televisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Videos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

You have been selected as one of the respondents to help gather information on the challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in Ugenya Sub-County. Your responses will be appreciated and treated with a lot of confidentiality.

1. Do you have adequate number of trained teachers of History and Government?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

2. In case of shortage of qualified staff, how do you cover the deficit?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Have your teachers attended any INSET training?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

4. How do rate the results of such training?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Does your school have adequate textbooks for History and Government?
   Yes ( )   No ( )

6. Can you explain the reason for your answer in question 4.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. Other than textbooks, what other teaching resources do you provide for your teachers?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. How do you rate the performance of History and Government in your school?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Please explain your answer in question 8.

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

10. What major challenge does your school face in implementing History and Government curriculum?

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

11. As a principal, can you briefly what you are doing to solve some of these challenges.

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

........................................................................................................
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE QASO

Dear Sir/ madam,

I am carrying out a research on the challenges of implementing History and Government curriculum in this district. I request for your cooperation and accuracy in answering the following questions. Your responses will be highly appreciated.

1. For how long have worked in the ministry?
   ........................................................................................................................................

2. Are you a trained teacher? Yes [ ]   No [ ]

3. If yes what were your teaching subjects?
   ........................................................................................................................................

4. Do the schools in your district have enough teachers of History and Government?
   Yes {   }   No {   }

5. How often do you carry out quality assurance programmes in each secondary school in the district?
   Once per term {   }
   Once per year {   }
   More than once per term {   }
   Not at all {   }
   Give reasons for your answer.
   ........................................................................................................................................

6. Have you ever organized an INSET training or workshop for History and Government teachers in the district?
   Yes [   ]
No [   ]

Briefly cite some of the impact of that training.

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

7. Can you please comment on adequacy of History and Government teachers in your schools.

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

8. What challenges does your office face in ensuring regular quality assurance and standards in History and Government in the district?

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

9. How do you overcome some of those challenges?

...........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
## APPENDIX G: KREJCIE AND MORGAN SAMPLING TABLE

*Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.—* *N* is population size.  
*S* is sample size.
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