Implementation of Kiswahili Curriculum in Universities and Its Impact on the Performance of Teachers in Secondary Schools

Author: *Mwanzi Jackline*

*Email:*jacklinemwanzi@yahoo.com *Kibabii University-Kenya.*
Department of Kiswahili and other African Language.

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to examine how the implementation of Kiswahili curriculum in universities impacts on the performance of teachers in secondary schools. Teachers who teach in secondary schools receive their professional training from various universities. During their preparation in universities, these teachers are trained using different curricula prepared by those universities. After graduation, they are expected to implement a single curriculum prepared by the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) to be taught in all secondary schools. Research was conducted to determine whether the professional training offered in universities to prepare Kiswahili teachers equips them with the knowledge and skills they need to teach in secondary schools after graduation. This article is based on research conducted *to evaluate the relationship between Kiswahili curricula used in public universities in Kenya and the curriculum prepared by KICD to be implemented in secondary schools.* The research was carried out in five public universities in Kenya. The research design was descriptive survey. Data was collected through interviews, document analysis, and questionnaires. Data analysis was both statistical and descriptive. The research found that there was no direct relationship between the formal Kiswahili curricula of public universities and the curriculum used in secondary schools. This situation affected the performance of teachers when implementing the secondary school curriculum. The minimal relationship between the formal curricula of universities and the formal KICD curriculum was evident by examining the main components of the curriculum, which are: objectives, topics, implementation, and evaluation. The research recommends regular revision of the KICD curriculum by involving teachers, lecturers and other stake holders in matters education. Furthermore, the preparation of the curricula should be aligned to the objectives, content, implementation methods, and evaluation used in the preparation of secondary school teachers.

Key Terms: Curriculum; Implementation; Performance; Teachers

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The process of preparing secondary school teachers faces many challenges worldwide. Goodland (1995, 1984) states that much literature on teacher education has sparked debates about the challenges evident in preparing secondary school teachers. Some of these challenges affect teachers when implementing secondary school curricula.

Research conducted by Miller and Silvernail (2000) shows that the way secondary school teachers teach after graduation does not align with the teacher training they received in universities during their training. Miller and Silvernail state that what teachers do in the field while implementing the content of secondary school curricula are things they know are expected of them as teachers which are not related to the teacher training they received.

Lynch (2003) states that a study conducted at a certain university comparing the teaching methods used to prepare teachers while in college and those used in the field during teaching practice discovered that there was a problem in the preparation of teachers. The problem was the content which teachers were taught in college that did not suit them while teaching in secondary schools. Thus, teachers struggled while delivering their lessons in the field during teaching practice.

In Kenya, the process of preparing teachers has been criticized for many years. For instance, a study conducted by the Committee of Deans at the University of Nairobi regarding the faculty of education showed that the preparation of teachers in colleges was questionable (University of Nairobi, 1978). Following this discovery, the committee made two recommendations. First, the Bachelor of Education program was to be revised to meet the needs of the secondary school curriculum; secondly, teacher training was to be designed to equip teachers with the mastery of content in the secondary school curriculum.

Sitima (1995) states that even after recommendations were made by the University of Nairobi Committee of Deans, there were still problems in the preparation of teachers in universities. Sitima (1995) elaborates on the existing weaknesses in universities related to teacher preparation, saying:

"The major weakness evident in the training offered in universities preparing teachers is the development of a system where the main content that teachers are being prepared to teach in secondary schools is taught in fragmented sections therfore lacking comprehensive teaching. This system also does not align with the content in the secondary school curriculum. Because of this, when these teachers graduate, they struggle to teach some content areas they did not learn in college" (p. 111).

The situation that Sitima (1995) describes is caused by policies formulated by various university departments. Some of these policies compel students to learn compulsory courses while leaving out others which are elective. This situation has raised concerns about the preparation of teachers in colleges and their teaching in secondary schools, especially when a student decides not to study a certain course, for example, "Riwaya," which is mandatory in the secondary school curriculum.

According to Sitima (1995), the challenges evident in the preparation of teachers in colleges are related to the objectives of teaching, the content taught, and the system used in presenting this content. Therefore, there is need to examine the objectives of the training programs designed in colleges to guide the preparation of teachers to assess how they meet the needs of students. This stems from the challenges faced by teachers in implementing the secondary school curriculum. Furthermore, it is also important to analyze the content designed in colleges to prepare teachers in carrying out their duties in schools to identify how they relate to the content designed by the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD)..

According to Tyler (1949), when designing teaching objectives, it is essential to consider students' needs in ensuring that the training provided is beneficial to them. Similarly, Tyler states that the content designed should be presented in a specific order to match the students' level. When Tyler's observation about objectives and content is not considered, it is possible that the curriculum in question may face challenges.

Oluoch (2006) discovered that the preparation of secondary school teachers in Kenya faced many challenges. One of these challenges is the teaching system as mentioned by Sitima (1995). Another challenge identified was related to the curricula used in colleges. Oluoch (2006) explained that the curricula were extensive, with so much content, making it impossible for lecturers to teach it all within the specified terms and academic years in colleges. This situation led to part of the content not being taught, resulting in teachers not receiving comprehensive preparation. Regarding the amount of content, Tyler (1949) explains that the content in a curriculum should be manageable for a teacher to teach comprehensively within the training period. Oluoch's (2006) discovery necessitates examining the content taught in colleges to assess its weight, scope, and complexity as it was presented.

Furthermore, according to Oluoch (2006), another challenge faced during the preparation of teachers was related to the evaluation method used in universities. According to Tyler (1949), evaluation is meant to measure the achievement of educational objectives through the teaching of curriculum content. Evaluation results are expected to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the education system. Based on this point, university evaluations are expected to uncover challenges in curriculum implementation. However, Oluoch (2006) states that this has not been identified due to the evaluation system used in universities. Oluoch further says that university evaluations are controlled by lecturers who are the curriculum implementers. Since they control the evaluation system, it is possible for them to design evaluations that serve their interests rather than the students' interests. Tyler (1949) emphasizes that a good evaluation system insists on regular assessment. Following Oluoch's (2006) discovery, there is need to examine the evaluation system used in universities to determine how it measures the achievement of teaching objectives, the suitability of content taught in colleges and how its presented.

Another situation that affects the preparation of teachers in universities is the uniqueness of each institution in formulating various policies that control the training provided for teachers. Though the curriculum used to prepare teachers in various universities has fundamental and basic components that are similar, the implementation of these curricula varies from one university to another. The differences emerge through policies related to matters such as the number of courses that students are required to learn in college, elective and compulsory courses and the specific periods (semesters and years) when these courses are scheduled to be taught. Students who join various universities are expected to adhere to the policies that guide the training they receive. Since each university has its own policies, it is clear that the content in the university curricula is implemented differently. This raises concerns since these teachers are expected to implement a single secondary school curriculum as much as they have been prepared differently.

The situation referenced by Sitima (1995) and Oluoch (2006) was caused by the difficulty that Kenyan universities face in implementing changes in their arrangements and teaching strategies. This issue has been discussed by Kafu (2013) and emphasized by Nasimiyu (2017). These scholars state that although changes occur in society, many universities in Kenya do not make adjustments aimed at improving their performance. Based on various opinions (UoN Report, 1978; Sitima, 1995; Oluoch, 2006; Kafu, 2013; & Nasimiyu, 2017), the preparation of secondary school teachers in Kenya faces four major challenges: the breadth and selection of content; the objectives of Kiswahili training based on each university; the teaching system of Kiswahili courses in colleges; and the evaluation system used by university lecturers.

On the other hand, Kiswahili teachers in secondary schools are expected to teach specific content selected and structured by KICD. These teachers also teach guided by specific objectives. Moreover, Kiswahili teachers in secondary schools follow the methods, techniques, and strategies recommended by KICD. Similarly, the evaluation of Kiswahili in all secondary schools is conducted in a standard manner.

Due to these conditions in the university curricula and the KICD curriculum in secondary schools, this study was conducted to assess the implementation of the official Kiswahili curricula in universities. The research also aimed at examining how the implementation of curricula in universities affected the performance of secondary school teachers when teaching the content in the KICD curriculum.

1.2 Statement of the research problem

Various opinions have been expressed about the challenges facing teacher preparation in universities and the execution of their duties in schools (See UoN, 1978; Sitima, 1995; Oluoch, 2006; Kafu, 2013 & Nasimiyu, 2017). Among the issues that have emerged in the research done by these scholars are challenges concerning the objectives, content, implementation and evaluation of curricula. Few studies have been conducted on the preparation of teachers of Kiswahili (Mbuthia, 1996 & Wagari, 2003). However, it has not been elucidated

how this preparation affects their classroom performance. Additionally, in-depth research has not been conducted to examine how curriculum components (objectives, content, implementation and evaluation) relate to and affect the overall preparation of Kiswahili teachers and their performance after graduation. Doubts seem to arise when universities prepare teachers using different curricula while the very teachers are expected to implement a single curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya upon graduation. It is from this observation that this research was conducted to assess how the implementation of Kiswahili curricula in universities affected the performance of teachers while implementing the Kiswahili curriculum prepared by the KICD for secondary schools in Kenya.

1.3 Research Objectives

The main aim of this research was to evaluate the relationship between Kiswahili curricula in public universities and the Kiswahili curriculum in secondary schools in Kenya. The study aimed to reveal the actual situation between the preparation of Kiswahili teachers in public universities and how they implement the curriculum designed by KICD for teaching in secondary schools. The research sought to achieve the following specific objectives;

i)   To identify the components that make up the Kiswahili curricula used in public universities and the components in the Kiswahili curriculum of secondary schools in Kenya.

ii)   To discuss how the curriculum components affect its implementation in universities and the performance of secondary school teachers as they implement the Kiswahili curriculum designed by KICD.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 The Concept of Curriculum

The concept of curriculum is complex as it has been interpreted in various ways by different scholars (See Bobbit, 1918; Tyler, 1949; Taba, 1962; Oliver, 1982; Shiundu & Omulando, 1992 & Oluoch, 2006). The explanations provided by these scholars indicate that a curriculum involves what is expected to happen and how it should occur in the education system. The interpretations of these scholars show that the curriculum is a system, process, special arrangement of activities in the education system and also specific documents written to show the components that guide the education system.

Although there are three types of curricula, this research focused on examining the official curriculum. The official curriculum has been defined by Urvebu (1985) as the sum of the things that students are taught in school and are listed in the syllabus. Shiundu & Omulando (1992) and Oluoch (2006) state that the official curriculum involves the sum of the things listed in the syllabus, which show objectives, content, teaching methods, assessment systems, and teaching resources.

The explanations provided by different scholars about the official curriculum show that it includes four main components: objectives, content, implementation, and evaluation. UNESCO (2011) explains that the teachers play a crucial role in the implementation of the official curriculum because they present the planned content by organizing classroom teaching activities, designing methods, strategies and teaching resources as well as choosing assessment methods that help students achieve their learning objectives. This research aimed at examining the components that make up the Kiswahili curricula of universities and the secondary school curriculum designed by KICD and how these components affect its implementation in universities and the performance of teachers in secondary schools. In his research on the components of the official curriculum, Brown (1995) explains that before starting their training, it is important for teachers who are the implementers of the curriculum to identify, interpret and explain in detail the components that make it up. Later, they should assess these components before starting the training activity, during the training and after

the training is completed. This is done to evaluate the role of each component in the implementation of the curriculum.

2.2 Implementation of Official Curriculum Objectives

According to Tyler (1949), curriculum objectives are statements that define the expected behavioral changes among students after receiving instruction. Objectives are crucial for teachers when implementing the curriculum as they help identify the specific skills and knowledge that students are expected to acquire from their lessons (Brown, 1995). These objectives guide the teaching and learning process since they are achieved through teaching activities.

The research aimed to identify how the teaching objectives in universities were achieved. Their achievement was confirmed through the performance of secondary school teachers when they implemented the KICD curriculum in secondary schools. Tyler (1949) found that curriculum objectives were designed based on the needs of students, society and experts. The research sought to determine how this situation was reflected in the objectives of university and school curricula.

A study conducted by Musau (2002) showed that Kiswahili curricula in universities are criticized for not meeting students' needs because they have a theoretical bias that does not allow for high levels of language learning as in international languages. He continues to say that the curricula used in universities depend on the experience and perceptions of lecturers regarding the language, hence not meeting the required standards and not considering students' needs.

Simala (2002), in his research on curricula used in universities, found that university curricula are traditional and lecturers are not allowed to teach courses they specialize in with the creativity and expertise required. He recommended regular changes to these curricula to meet the needs of society and students. In his research, King'ei (2001) identified general objectives designed to implement the teaching of Kiswahili in all universities. Adegoke (2010) identified specific objectives suitable for implementing the preparation of teachers in universities. This research aimed to examine the objectives designed in various public universities to prepare Kiswahili teachers and to determine whether they met their needs as students prepared to implement the curriculum designed by KICD for secondary schools.

2.3 Content in the Official Curricula

Content is the sum of skills taught in educational institutions (Bilbao et al., 2008). This content is presented as specific courses expected to cause behavioral changes among students and society as a whole. According to Adegoke (2010) and Hedge (2002), the design of teaching objectives determines the selection of content taught. Flowerdew & Peacock (2001) state that good content teaching occurs if teachers have in-depth knowledge of what they are expected to teach, knowledge of teaching methods, and the expected behavioral changes among students. The research aimed at examining how the selection of content taught in universities prepared teachers to deliver the content in the KICD curriculum designed for implementation in secondary schools.

2.4 Implementation of the Official Curricula

MacArthur & Baron (1983) state that a well-prepared teacher can be relied upon to implement the curriculum. According to Oyedeji (1998), the primary goal of curriculum implementation is to ensure that learning occurs among students. This can be achieved if good teaching methods are designed at all levels of education (Makoti, 2010).

Simala (2019) explains the importance of providing teachers with quality training if they are to be relied upon to implement curricula properly. He states that the procedures followed by teachers in curriculum

implementation require high-level training. Thus, well-prepared teachers have the skills to implement the existing curriculum to provide students with skills to handle various life situations.

Curriculum implementation depends on approaches, methods and various teaching strategies. A study conducted by Mutiga (2008) on the teaching of Kiswahili in secondary schools found that its teaching faced challenges due to the approaches used, which led to students memorizing the lessons they were taught without gaining the intended proficiency and understanding of the language. The training provided enabled students to pass exams without gaining language proficiency. He recommended the use of several approaches that would help students gain proficiency in topics and language skills through training that would enable them to manage communication in the Kiswahili language. The research conducted by Asiime (2019) on approaches to teaching Kiswahili grammar in universities found that lecturers used outdated approaches. She recommended the use of modern approaches considered to be better, especially the communicative approach in teaching Kiswahili grammar.

Makoti (2017), when conducting an investigation on the teaching of Kiswahili in universities, found that it faced challenges because it was not implemented as it should have been. This situation was due to the use of inappropriate approaches in presenting content in curricula. He recommended the use of suitable approaches.

Research conducted by Eshiwani (1993); Musungu and Nasongo (2008); Mutiga (2008), Otunga (2010), and Makoti (2017) on teaching in secondary schools showed that the approaches used did not enable the student to gain proficiency in what they had learned when the curriculum was implemented.

Teaching methods play a significant role in the implementation of curricula in schools and universities. Eisner (2002) says that the effective delivery of curricula largely depends on the methods used by the teacher. Research conducted by Korteng (2009) found that secondary school teachers used methods that gave the teacher and student ample opportunities. Adegoke (2010) also found that when teachers implemented the curriculum using methods that involved student performance, the student was able to grasp the lessons quickly and retain them in memory for a long time compared to methods that were teacher centred.

Tyler (1949) emphasizes the use of methods that are student centred so that they can discover things on their own and be self-reliant without heavily relying on the teacher. This research aimed to investigate how the teaching methods used in universities to prepare teachers affected their performance when implementing the Kiswahili curriculum in secondary schools.

2.5 Curriculum evaluation

Tyler (1949) describes evaluation as a process aimed at measuring how the official curriculum goals are achieved in the education system through the training provided. Evaluation measures the level of expected behavioral changes that are anticipated to occur among students after they receive training.

Simala (2019) states that curriculum evaluation is important because it motivates teachers and students to put in more effort in their teaching and learning. He further says that good evaluation measures what the teacher taught, not what the student learned.

The results of evaluation are used to improve curriculum implementation in educational institutions as it is one way to measure the effective implementation of curricula. Moreover, the evaluation measures the achievement of curriculum goals, where the results also determine the quality of the selected content. This study aimed to investigate how university evaluation systems affected curriculum implementation in secondary schools.

3.0 Research Methods

The research design was descriptive survey, where data was collected from the field from the teachers of Kiswahili from secondary schools, Kiswahili lecturers from public universities and heads of Kiswahili departments in public universities.

A total of 42 secondary schools from Bungoma County were used in this study. They were selected using the random sampling method from a total of 140 schools in the county. These 42 schools were 30% of all 140 schools. 42 Kiswahili teachers from secondary schools were selected using the simple random sampling method. 17 Kiswahili lecturers from public universities in Kenya were selected using the simple random sampling method. These 17 were 30% of the total number of Kiswahili lecturers from each of the five selected public universities. Heads of Kiswahili departments from the relevant public universities were selected using the purposive sampling method as they were directly targeted.

Data was collected using three main methods: questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. Questionnaires were prepared for Kiswahili teachers in secondary schools and Kiswahili lecturers in public universities. Through the questionnaires, teachers and lecturers provided information about the KICD official curriculum, the curricula used to teach in universities, the components of those curricula and the challenges faced in implementing Kiswahili curricula in secondary schools and public universities. The secondary school teachers' questionnaire also aimed at evaluating how the implementation of official university curricula affected their performance in schools. Interviews targeted heads of Kiswahili departments in universities and were expected to provide information about the Kiswahili curricula used in universities, its components, how it was implemented and the challenges faced in its implementation.

The documents analyzed had specific information about the official curricula used both in schools and universities. Some of the analyzed documents included; the Kiswahili syllabus for secondary schools; guidelines for Kiswahili courses taught in the selected 5 public universities and documents that provide explanations about these courses. They were analyzed to obtain data about curriculum components (objectives, content, implementation methods and evaluation systems).

Feedback from the respondents enabled the study to determine how the official Kiswahili curriculum was implemented in public universities and secondary schools, considering various curriculum components. Moreover, the feedback also enabled the study to determine how the implementation of Kiswahili curricula in universities affected the performance of teachers teaching in secondary schools.

4.0 Analysis and Results

The data collected in this study was analyzed using two main methods: descriptive and statistical methods. Data collected from interviews, questionnaires and document analysis was analyzed descriptively. Data collected from closed-ended questionnaires was analyzed statistically. The descriptive and statistical analysis enabled the study to handle the collected data in a special way to obtain results related to the research issue. The analyzed data concerned the main components of curricula, which are objectives, content, implementation and evaluation.

4.1 Curriculum Objectives

The research found that the Bachelor of Education program in each university identified one general objective. It was expected that other specific objectives aimed at preparing teachers would be developed from this main objective. This did not happen. However, in some universities like Masinde Muliro, Moi, and Nairobi, the objectives of the Bachelor of Education program clarified that these universities prepared secondary school teachers, whereas Kenyatta and Egerton universities aimed to prepare secondary school teachers, education institution administrators, policy makers in the education sector and education officers in

the ministry of education. The situation where some universities formulated similar objectives for preparing secondary school teachers and administrators in other sectors related to education, such as the ministry of education, may have contributed to lack of specific objectives for preparing teachers. This situation likely affected how these teachers were prepared and ultimately how they implemented the KICD curriculum in secondary schools.

In some universities like Moi, Kenyatta, and Nairobi, where there was a Bachelor of Arts in Kiswahili, the lecturers who prepared Kiswahili teachers (Bachelor of Education) were the same ones who prepared Kiswahili professionals through the Bachelor of Arts in Kiswahili program. This situation led these lecturers into formulating general objectives that guided the teaching of these two programs. These general objectives were used to prepare both teachers and Kiswahili professionals. The existence of general objectives for preparing secondary school teachers affects their preparation and performance in secondary schools. Therefore, there is need to separate these two programs and the lecturers who teach them so that the lecturers who prepare teachers can be identified and guided to develop specific objectives for preparing teachers.

The research found that the lecturers who prepared teachers in universities were guided by the objectives of teaching various Kiswahili general courses, which helped students present the content in the courses when they graduated as teachers. These general course objectives were not aimed at preparing them to be teachers. However, the very course objectives were specific, measurable and divided into three levels: cogmitive, psychomoter and affective.

Although the objectives of university curricula were closely related to those of secondary schools in terms of qualifications, especially considering Tyler's model, the teaching objectives in universities were formulated in the respective departments to meet the needs of students in specific universities. Each university formulated its own objectives. On the other hand, the teaching objectives in secondary schools were formulated by KICD to be used in all schools nationwide. Therefore, the official curriculum objectives for secondary schools were standardized nationwide but those of universities varied. The variation in the official curriculum objectives formulated in different universities that prepared teachers affected how these teachers were taught as they were prepared differently as well.

University curricula are complex because each university has its own programs that differentiate it from other universities, remembering that public universities were established on different foundations. However, since universities prepare secondary school teachers to implement a single curriculum prepared by KICD, there is need to also standardize the official curriculum objectives used to prepare them in universities. The university education commission can provide guidance on this to formulate strong policies in universities that guide the preparation of secondary school teachers in all universities. This situation will standardize how they implement the official curriculum prepared by KICD in secondary schools. For this to happen, this study recommended that the government should identify specific universities to train teachers only. This would help in checking situations where administators and teachers are prepared in the same class which forces the lecturers to come up with general teaching objectives.

4.2 Content in Curricula

Content in university curricula is listed in various courses. The content listed in the courses form the syllabi used in universities. Courses were formulated in departments and approved by faculty committees and later by the senate. However, the content in the courses that form the syllabi is formulated by lecturers and approved in the departments.

There are compulsory and elective courses in all universities, although a course may be elective in one university and compulsory in another. Generally, compulsory courses were more than elective ones across all

the universities. The content in these courses was divided into three strands: literature, language and linguistics. Among these three strands, the courses with literature content were the most numerous followed by language and then linguistics respectively. This kind of scenario definitely affected how these teachers implemented the secondary school curriculum which included all the three strands.

Each university had a specific number of courses with content from all three strands. The research found that linguistics courses are very few in all the universities. This situation affected how these teachers implemented the KICD curriculum because when interviewed, they said they preferred teaching literature content and found it difficult to present language content, including grammar and linguistics. This was caused by universities teaching few linguistics and language courses. This study advices universities to increase the number of linguistics and language courses to enhance language teaching in secondary schools, remembering that one of the objectives of teaching Kiswahili in secondary schools is to enable students to communicate well in this language. Language and linguistics teach about language rules, which, when mastered well by students, would enable them have good communication skills. For this reason, there is need to strengthen the teaching of language and linguistics in universities. Alternatively universities can balance courses in these three strands bearing in mind those which are outlined the KICD curriculum to be implemented in secondary schools.

There are differences in teaching content in the official secondary school curriculum and university curricula. In the KICD curriculum, students were expected to learn all the content listed in the syllabus, while in universities, students were free to choose the content they wished to learn optionally, although some content was compulsory. The selection of optional and compulsory content varied from one university to another. This situation posed to be a complex issue because teachers from different universities learned compulsory and optional courses and were expected to teach all the content in the KICD curriculum even those they had not learned in the university. This study established that courses taught in the universities were either optional/ compulsory in one university and not the other.This situation affected their performance while teaching in secondary schools. Teachers interviewed said it was easier for them to deliver content they had learned in university than it was for them to present content they had not learned because they were made optional in the universities they attended. For instance, in one university the course in Poetry is optional and yet its in the KICD curriculum. A teacher who did not study it at the university will have difficulty in handling it at secondary school level. Nevertheless, it was discovered that in some universities, courses in Novel, Oral Literature, Play and Short stories were optional yet in secondary schools they formed an integral part of literature in the KICD curriculum. With this kind of scenario, definitely it affected how this teachers presented the content in secondary schools.

The differences between the content in both curricula and how they are handled raises questions. For example, how will secondary school teachers teach content in the KICD syllabus if they did not learn the courses that carried that content in university, especially if they were optional courses? This is a challenge that needs to be addressed as it affects these teachers' performance when implementing the KICD curriculum, as previously mentioned. This study recommended that it would be better if the courses that covered content taught in secondary schools were made compulsory in all universities. If this was to happen, teachers will implement the secondary school curriculum in a way that they understand and that will enhance Kiswahili teaching in the country.

4.3 Curriculum Implementation

The implementation of official curricula in universities and secondary schools depended on teachers and lecturers. They controlled the implementation of official curricula as they decided on the approaches, teaching methods, strategies, techniques, and materials to be used.

Lecturers who implemented curricula in universities received professional training at the universities where they obtained their bachelor's degrees. Most of them had a degree in education, although there were a few who did not receive teacher training because their first degree was Bachelor of Arts in the Kiswahili subject. It is possible that lecturers with a Bachelor of Arts degree, when implementing university curricula to prepare teachers, were guided by the general objectives of teaching Kiswahili according to how they were prepared. They were not guided by the objectives of preparing secondary school teachers as did the lecturers whose first degree was in education. Therefore, the preparation of teachers in universities depended on the lecturers who presented the content in the curricula used to prepare them.

When preparing teachers in universities, lecturers were guided by various teaching approaches and methods. The research found that the most commonly used approach was assessment. Although this is the approach that appears in Tyler's model, it has been criticized for focusing more on passing exams than on acquiring the knowledge that students were expected to gain from the training they received at the universities. Is it possible that the approaches guiding teacher preparation in universities affected their performance in schools? They were significantly affected as they also, in their performance, assessed their students' understanding through exams. The marks students obtained in their exams and tests were used as criteria to determine the quality of teachers and students. However, the approaches recommended by language experts are those that encourage performance among students and not those that prioritize assessment.

The methods and approaches used in universities to prepare teachers greatly affected their performance as a student is significantly influenced by his/her teacher. That is why the teaching methods used to implement curricula in universities were teacher centred just as those used in schools were also teacher centred. Both types of methods balanced each other out. The research found that lecturers and teachers chose teaching methods guided by the content they presented, the level of students and the objectives they aimed to achieve.

The research found that the implementation of the official Kiswahili curriculum in universities affected that in schools as teachers and lecturers used approaches, methods, techniques, and materials in the same way. However, in implementing curricula in universities, lecturers were not controlled as much as secondary school teachers were controlled by various stakeholders. This lack of control led to a certain level of laxity among lecturers, which affected the preparation of teachers. This study felt that if there was a way to assess the performance of teachers who graduated from different universities, the existing laxity in the implementation of official curricula in universities could be identified and addressed properly. This would define the quality of teachers from various universities as it happens with students from various secondary schools following assessment through national examinations.

4.4 Curriculum Evaluation

The official curricula of universities and secondary schools were evaluated at different levels and times. Evaluation was done to; measure how the teaching objectives were achieved, assess the level of training provided to students, measure the efficiency of teachers and students and also measure the strengths and weaknesses of the curricula.

The evaluation of the official curricula in universities and secondary schools followed specific steps. Additionally, this evaluation was expected to be conducted before the training began, during the training, and after the training was completed. Special policies were formulated to control the evaluation systems in universities and secondary schools. The main methods of evaluation were tests and exams.

However, according to the teachers and lecturers who participated in the research, the evaluation of the official curricula in secondary schools was frequent. In universities, the evaluation was conducted at specific periods and times. Teachers explained how evaluation played an important role in the official curricula and was able to control the teaching and learning activities. The teaching offered by teachers and lecturers and

also learning by students was directly related to evaluation since the efficiency of teachers and students was determined through exam results.

The research found that lecturers who prepared and implemented the curriculum in the classroom were also incharge of evaluation in universities. By doing so, lecturers evaluated the content they had taught basing on how they presented it. This evaluation is done in three ways in a given semester. Every lecturer has the freedom of choosing how to conduct this evaluation. The evaluation policy in the universities requires students to be given a written test done as a sit-in in class or a take away test; apart from the test, students are also given project work which is done in groups after which they are expected to present it in class. Lecturers also have the choice to give students research work to be presented as a term paper. Moreso, lecturers can give an online test. All these types of evaluation account for 30% of the total mark a student is expected to score in a semester. At the end of the semester, one comprehensive exam is prepared and this accounts for 70% of the total marks. Lecturers are incharge of all these types of evaluation and therefore chances of them being biased in their evaluation are quite high. They can choose the type(s) of tests to give and whether to return the marked scripts or not. When it comes to preparing exams at the end of the semester, still lecturers have the freedom to choose what to examine from the content presented in class. Since they have control over the content taught and the whole evaluation process, they are likely to conduct the process in a way that caters more for their interests more than the students' interests. Evaluation carried out in universities is conducted internally by lecturers. The situation is different in secondary schools where teachers have some control over the internal tests and exams given. When it comes to the one last summative exam given at the end of four years, teachers have no control since the exam is prepared externally by one national exam body (Kenya National Examination Council). This exam is marked by teachers who are trained and selected randomly for that exercise. The results are used to determine the ability of learners and efficiency of teachers. In secondary schools, the research found that teachers prepared tests and exams which were used to prepare students for the national exam held after four years of training. Here, tests and exams were prioritized whereby students who scored high marks were rewarded while those who did not meet the required standards were demeaned and publicly shamed. Teachers who enabled students to score high marks were praised and rated as the best teachers. On the other hand, teachers whose students performed poorly were shamed and seen to be non perfomers. This situation put teachers in some sort of competition, striving to give students the best training to the extent of using extra time. Such did not happen in universities therefore giving lecturers the freedom to implement the curriculum as they liked.

The scenario where lecturers control the entire evaluation process in universities has its challenges as well; some lecturers use tests and exams for personal reasons; some use them to oppress or favor students. This, sometimes does not potray a true picture of the students' abilities. Additionally, there are some lecturers who are not guided by professional ethics in teaching, whereby they only teach content they intend to examine. Such lecturers end up teaching for exams therefore not enabling students to gain knowledge that would help them manage their careers later. Due to situations like these occurring among students who receive this kind of teaching in some courses, it is possible that some of them fail to manage teaching those very courses just incase they are awarded marks in a biased way which they do not genuinely deserve. This therefore leads to the performance of secondary school teachers being directly affected by the evaluation system used to prepare them in universities.

The evaluation of official curricula in universities and secondary schools was conducted with similar objectives, although in secondary schools it controlled the teacher while in universities, lecturers controlled the process. The way evaluation was conducted in universities affected teachers' performance as they implemented the curriculum in secondary schools. This occurred when some lecturers prepared exams based only on the content they had taught. If there was content outlined in their curriculum yet they had neither

taught nor examined it, students did not study it neither. When this happens and some content is ignored by these teachers during their training, it affects them later as they implement the secondary school curriculum. Their implementation would be challenging for them especially when they were expected to teach the content which they ignored while receiving training. This study observed that this could be corrected if lecturers from different universities collaborated to prepare joint exams to be conducted across all universities. Alternatively, lecturers would arrange to collaborate with their counterparts in the same university, same department to prepare exams in various courses where subject lecturers would be requested to prepare exams in courses they did not teach so longer as they are provided with the course outlines indicating the curriculum content.

5.0 Conclusions of this study

The research found the following:

There was no direct relationship between university and secondary school curricula and this impacted significantly on teacher performance. This misalignment was noted in the following specific areas;

The objectives of curriculum implementation in universities are general and did not directly target teacher preparation. Moreover, they varied from one university to another. This affected the performance of teachers in secondary schools in the sense that they were expected to implement the same curriculum objectives formulated by KICD yet during their training, the universities where they were prepared had different training objectives.

Additionally, this research found that teachers did not learn all the content listed in the official university curricula, whereas when they taught in secondary schools, they were expected to teach all the content outlined in the curriculum (syllabus) prepared by the KICD. This too affected their performance since they were expected to teach some items of content they (some of them) had not learnt in university because some items of content in the university curricula were offered as optional courses .

The research also discovered that the implementation of curricula in universities was similar to that in schools because lecturers and teachers were guided by similar approaches, strategies, techniques, and methods. However, the implementation of curricula in universities was controlled by the lecturers themselves, whereas that in schools was controlled by many stakeholders (school administrators, managers, ministry officials and parents). Therefore, the implementation of curricula in universities affected the performance of teachers in schools as some of them taught the way they were taught in university using theories, methods, and techniques without considering the level of secondary school students.

Finally, the research observed that evaluation in universities was managed by lecturers whereas in schools, teachers did not have much say especially in the summative evaluation used to determine students' fate. This situation affected the performance of teachers to some extent, as they also prepared students by focusing heavily on curriculum content they expected to be examined.

6.0 Recommendations

This research recommended that frequent curriculum reviews and monitoring be made especially in secondary schools by involving teachers, lecturers and all other interested stakeholders. This is to allow them assess the objectives, content, implementation methods and evaluation in relation to the preparation given to teachers. By allowing this, teachers will identify and fill the knowledge gaps in the curriculum thereafter contribute their input in relation to the challenges posed by the curriculum they are implementing and the changes they expect to take place. Involving lecturers will enable them to provide training considering the outcomes of those reviews. This takes into consideration the fact that curriculum is dynamic and changes with the changing students' needs. Moreso, the review must focus on the relevance, practicality,

sustainability, effectiveness and consistency to enable learners achieve the desired outcomes. In doing so, they will prepare teachers to tackle the curriculum effectively in order to improve their overall performance because curriculum reviews are intended to give informed insights into what is working and what's not hence the need to make adjustments. Curriculum reviews help in setting future roadmaps to improve the existing curriculum. For instance, in reviewing the 8-4-4 curriculum, the curriculum planners made adjustments which necessitated the transition to the Competence Based Curriculum system in Kenya.

References

Adegoke, K. A. (2010). *Why Teacher Education Model Holds the Most Promise for the Nigerian Educational System?* Convocation Lectures for St. Augustines College of Education Akoka, Lagos, Nigeria, pp. 1-23.

Asiimwe, C. (2019). *Mikabala ya Kufundisha.* Katika: Simala, K. I (Mh.). Mitaala ya Kiswahili katika Vyuo Vikuu vya Afrika Mashariki. Zanzibar: Kakama

Bilbao, P. P., Lucido, P. I., Iringan, T. C., and R. B. Javier (2008). *Curriculum Development*. Quezon city: Lorimar Publishing, IncBobbit F. (1918). The Curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Brown, J. D. (1995). *The Elements of Language Curriculum. A Systematic Approach to Program Development*. Boston, MA: Heinle publishers.

Eisner, E (2002). *The Educational Imagination*: *On The Design and Evaluation* of *School Programs*. Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Eshiwani, G.(1993) *Education in Kenya Since Independence*. East African Educational Publishers, Nairobi.

Flowerdiew, J and Peacock, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1995). *Ralph Tyler: The Educators' Educator*. Educational Policy, 29(1), 75-81

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hedge, T. (2002). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom* (3rd Ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kafu, P. A. (2013). *Teacher Education: the Incubator of Science and Technology for Development in Africa.* African Journal of Education Science of Technology (AJEST), 1(1), 1-14.

King'ei, K. (2001). *From the Real to the Ideal: Survey of Kiswahili Curricular in East Africa's Universities.* Kiswahili in the 21st Century,179 2000 Publisher for Advanced Studies of African Society.

Lynch, D. E. (2003). *So You Want to Make a Real Difference: An Introduction to Learning Management for the Teacher in Training*. Monograph: Central Queensland

Mbuthia, F. K. (1996). *Comparative Study of the Effects of Two Instructional Approaches on Students' Performance in Kiswahili Poetry in Selected Secondary Schools in Eldoret Municipality*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Moi University.

McArthur, L. Z. and Baron, R. M. (1983). *Toward an Ecological Theory of Social Perception*. Psychological Review, 90(3), 215–238.

Miller, L and Silvernail, D. (2000). *Learning to Become a Teacher: the Wheelock way*. In L. Darling Hammond (Ed), Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education. Preparation in the Undergraduate Years. Washing D.C: American Association of college for teacher education.

Musau P. (2002). *Polemics Versus Reality: Bridging the Gap in Kiswahili Research.* In: K.Inyani Simala(Mh.) Utafiti wa Kiswahili.CHAKITA. Eldoret, Moi University Press.

Musungu, L. L. and Nasongo, J. W. (2008). *The Head-teacher's Instructional Role in Academic Performance in Secondary Schools in Vihiga District, Kenya*. Educational Research and Review, 3(10), 316-323.

Mutiga, J. (2008). *Nature and Nurture: Tenets in the Acquisition of Kiswahili as a Second Language in the Kenyan Bilingual System of Education*. In: Ogechi,N. et.al (eds).Nadharia katika Taaluma ya Kiswahili na Lugha za Kiafrika (pp.397-405) ISBN 9966-854-47-9, Moi University.

Nasimiyu, G, (2017). *Preparation of Teacher Trainees in Pedagogy in Kenyan Universities*. Journal of Education and Practice,V8 n 13 pg 28-34.

Oliver, A. I. (1982). *Curriculum improvement. A guide to problems, principles and processes.* (2nd ed.) New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Oluoch G. P. (2006). *Essentials of Curriculum Development*. Nairobi Longhorn Publishers.

Otunga, R. N. (2010). *The Dilemma of Curriculum Relevance in Kenya.*
Eldoret: Moi University Press.

Oyedeji, N. B. (1998). *Management in Education, Principles and Practice*. Lagos: Aras Publishers.

 Shiundu, J. S. and Omulando, S. J. (1992). *Curriculum: Theory and Practice* in *Kenya*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Simala K. I. (2019). *Uhuishaji wa Mitaala ya Kiswahili katika Vyuo Vikuu vya Afrika Mashariki.* Katika: Simala, K. I. (Mh.). Mitaala ya Kiswahili katika vyuo vikuu vya Afrika Mashariki. Zanzibar: Kakama.

Simala, K. I. (2013). *Critical Pedagogy and Kiswahili Education. Challanges and way Forward*. In: Egara K. na wengine. New Horizons in Pedagogy. Kakamega. MMUST University, Kenya.

Simala, K. I. (2002). *Miradi ya Utafiti katika Vyuo Vikuu Mnamo Karne ya Ishirini na Moja*. Katika: Simala K. I. (Mh) Utafiti wa Kiswahili. Eldoret: Moi University Press

Sitima, T. M. (1995). *Maintainance of Standards in Teacher Education*. In: Ministry of Education. Report of Proceedings of the 3rd Teacher Education Conference. Nairobi, Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.

Taba, H, (1962). *Curriculum Development.* New York: Hacourt, Brace and World.

Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum Development Theory & Practice*. New York. Harcourt: Brace & World.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

University of Nairobi. (1978). *A Review of Graduate Teacher Evaluation in Kenya*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.

UNESCO (2011). *The Hidden Crisis: Armed Conflict and Education*. Background paper prepared for Education for All Global Monitoring Report.Paris, UNESCO.

Urverbu, A. O. (1994). *Curriculum Studies* (2nd ed.). Singapore: Longman.

Urvebu, A. O. (1985). *Curriculum Studies*. Ikeja: Longman.

Wagari, S. (2003). *Problems Facing Teacher Education in Kenya*: *A Case Study of Teaching Practice in the University of Nairobi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Nairobi.