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ABSTRACT

There is a general view by educators that assessment is a process of gathering and providing information on the learner about his or her performance on a learning task. This definition makes assessment a very important component in the learning process. For instance, formative assessment is used to monitor learning progress during instruction and to provide continuous feedback to both students and the teacher concerning learning successes and failures. Basically therefore, assessment is an integral part of the educational process, concentrating on determining the learner's achievement through application or employment of diverse assessment techniques.

The study was specifically concerned with the use of school based techniques in assessing secondary school students' achievement in history - a case study of Kakamega District, Kenya. The researcher sought to find out the basic reasons for the school based assessment, the
The study sample consisted of history teachers in Kakamega district and their respective secondary schools. The schools selected through random sampling were grouped into girls, boys and mixed. A total of 40 secondary schools were selected to represent the general population of 80 schools in the district. One teacher was involved from each school in the District.

In the subsequent stage, data was collected using questionnaire and checklist. The collected data was then analysed and the results reduced to frequencies, totals and percentages.

The findings of the study indicated that majority of the teachers N 37 (97.4%) never attended inservice training in history. Only one teacher N 1 (2.6%) had attended inservice training. Majority of the teachers N 19 (50%) indicated that class size mostly affect them in choosing assessment technique. It was also disclosed that majority of the teachers N 38 (100%) use oral questioning in assessing performance. N 20 (52.6%) use observation and N 14 (36.8%) use questionnaire.
1.1 Background Information

Different scholars have defined assessment in different versions. Phillips (1968) considers assessment as the process used in determining effectiveness of teaching and/or value of learning experience in assisting students to achieve the goals of education. On the other hand Sutton (1991) defines assessment as a human process, conducted by and with human beings, and subject inevitably to the frailties of human judgement.

Assessment generally is necessary in education in the sense that it helps in collecting descriptive information about an educational programme. This information is then used to modify and improve the programmes, compare the programme to the other programmes and make judgement as to the worth of the programmes.

Examinations and assessments may be thought of as having predominantly educational purposes. Kemp (1986) specifically provides purposes of assessment in education as follows:
(i) To assess students' attainment at the end of the course or study program.

(ii) To evaluate diagnostically students' academic progress and/or learning difficulties.

(iii) To estimate students' aptitude, possibly for the purpose of assigning them to different courses or teaching functions.

(iv) To evaluate the effectiveness of educational program or curriculum.

Assessment therefore, forms an integral part of the educational process. It has been in existence for many centuries as Njoroge (1982:1) observes.

For more than 400 years examinations have been one of mankind's institution. It is interesting to note that in the year 2356 B.C. a system of written examinations formed the basis admission in the civil service in China. Through all these past centuries, assessment has been indispensable to both teacher and pupil as road is to a tourist.

Reknown Kenyan historians like Ogot, Kimambo, Kiwanuka and Were basically wrote academic history, but made no mention of assessment in their presentations. It is against this background that some specific research should be conducted to examine assessment in history to establish its purposefulness and frequency in schools.
History is one of the subjects that are taught in our secondary schools in Kenya under the 8.4.4 system of education. The Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) regulations and syllabuses (1989-90) list six general objectives of History and Government as follows:

(i) Demonstrate understanding of how people and events of the past have influenced the way in which people live and behave.

(ii) Derive through the study of history an interest in further learning.

(iii) Develop the capacity for critical analysis of historical data.

(iv) Appreciate the need for and importance of mutual social responsibility.

(v) Understand the social, economic and political development of certain parts of the world and relate these to the history of Kenya.

(vi) Develop a sense of patriotism and national pride through participation in various development activities in the country.

In order to achieve all these objectives, it is of paramount importance for teachers of history to assess their students frequently. This will assist in establishing the progress of the learners in the learning process. Assessment in social studies, a domain that comprises history subject,
generally must seek to determine the amount of understanding, skills and attitudes the learners have achieved over a specified period of time. Ayot et. al. (1989:230) commenting on this subject observes:

In determining the amount of understanding acquired, the evaluation tool must provide for the assessment of knowledge, the ability of the learners to use the knowledge in new situations, their ability to analyze information, ability to synthesise it and to evaluate any data and make informed judgement. Thus the tool ought to generate data or information on all the six classes of knowledge in Bloom’s taxonomy.

In education, there are basically two types of assessment. These are formative and summative. Formative assessment is used to monitor learning progress during instruction and to provide continuous feedback to both pupils and teacher concerning learning success and failures. It focuses on measurement of students’ achievement. The second type of assessment is summative. This kind of assessment typically comes at the end of the course or unit of instruction. Gronlund (1985) remarks that it is designed to determine the extent to which the instructional objectives have been achieved and is used primarily for assigning course grades or certifying pupil mastery of the intended learning outcomes.

There is a general agreement amongst educators like Macintosh (1976), Kemp (1986), Shoemamer (1975), Harlen (1978), Nichol (1984), Njoroge

We believe that the time has come to experiment with procedures which involve a more continuous assessment throughout the course. This might involve the organization of academic work in blocks, each assessed and each contributing towards the final assessment. A steady improvement in performance during the course would be seen as a ground for favourable consideration at the end of it.

The commission, therefore, emphasized formative assessment for it plays a central role in the summative assessment.

The second commission was headed by Gachathi in 1976 on educational objectives and policies. The commission basically reported that one of the ways of ensuring that examinations become an integral part of the learning process is by increasing the use of continuous and progressive assessment. Continuous and progressive assessment enables the
students to learn progressively in steps rather than wait for examinations at the end of the course. The committee recommended the following:

(i) To integrate progressive assessment into the overall evaluation system of academic achievement.

(ii) To integrate continuous assessment and aptitude testing with learning process.

(iii) To keep and use records and results of continuous assessment together with those of public examinations in secondary education selection procedures for university.

(iv) To inculcate a sense of common purpose of removing the vicious competitiveness of formal examinations and integrating them into the process of learning which are assessed continuously and progressively throughout the learning period (Gachathi, 1976: 138).

Furthermore, the Ministry of Education, Sessional paper No. 6 of (1988:42) on education, manpower and training for the next decade and beyond reported that while encouraging good performance in examinations, the government will ensure the provision of balanced education and training programmes that develop the whole person. It will ensure the implementation of continuous assessment of students' work as
part and parcel of national examinations and an important feature of the 8.4.4 system of education.

Assessment in history in Kenyan schools takes the form of Continuous Assessment Tests (CATs) which is usually given to students during the course of learning or at the end of the topic or sub-topic. Students are also assessed at the end of the term whereby all the work covered during the term is tested. There is also an assessment at the end of the year. Basically therefore both formative and summative are stressed.

There are many techniques of assessment as there are styles of teaching and learning. Assessment is said to be a creative process that can be as varied and interesting as teaching and learning. Considering the fact that assessment is a necessary element in educational process, a number of techniques have been developed with their own unique contribution to the measurement process. Oketch and Asiachi (1986) identify these techniques systematically as teacher made tests, oral tests, written, observation and oral reports. On the same subject Gronlund (1985:3) writes:

Evaluation includes a number of techniques that are indispensable to the teacher ... But evaluation is not merely a collection of techniques, it is a continuous process that underlies all good teaching and learning.
Assessment therefore has become a very important component in the education process.

History performance in secondary schools in Kenya over the years has not been stable since the inception of 8.4.4 system of education. Daily Nation (28.2.1998:17) quoted the Minister for Education Mr. Kalonzo Musyoka as admitting that there were disparities in performance according to subjects. In fact 10 out of 18 subjects offered at KCSE were poorly done, including Mathematics, Physical Sciences, Biology, History and Government and Islamic Religious Education.
### Table 1.1 National Performance in History From 1989 to 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidates no.</th>
<th>Mean Score (out of 200)</th>
<th>Percentage Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>130 788</td>
<td>81.05</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>132 651</td>
<td>70.98</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>136 642</td>
<td>94.22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>137 733</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>79 447</td>
<td>90.42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>78 729</td>
<td>94.07</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>77 166</td>
<td>88.43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>88 138</td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>83 019</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Kenya National Examinations Council (HQ)

From table 1.1 it is evident that the number of candidates registered for history over the years has been dropping. For instance, the number has dropped drastically from the initial 130 788 in 1989 to 83 019 in 1997. Likewise, performance has not been good either. For example, in 1989, the percentage mean was 41% which was relatively low. In 1990 the mean dropped to 36% although the number of candidates increased compared to the previous year. The performance of candidates in 1991 improved by
11%. In 1992 the performance dropped to 38% despite the fact that this was the year with the highest number of candidates registering for history.

From 1993 - 1994 the candidates registering for history drastically dropped although performance improved compared to the previous years. Poor performance was registered in 1995 - 1997 whereby the percentage mean stabilized at 44% and then dropped tremendously in 1997 to 41%. This trend causes concern especially as regards the future of history in our secondary schools in Kenya. There could be other reasons for this drop in performance, but one such reason may have to do with assessment techniques which in the end affect teaching methodology. Effective assessment and especially formative evaluation that emphasises continuous assessment tests is likely to aid learners to understand the concepts assessed.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

Assessment is basically an important area in learning process and an integral part of the educational process. Teachers in our schools cannot ignore it because, as a process it determines the extent to which the educational objectives are achieved. Summer (1991) contends that the purpose of testing is to enable teachers to get a more structured type of feedback from the analysis of test results, while Nichol (1984) observes
that assessment of pupil's progress is an essential element in the work of
the teacher. Not only does it help develop pupils' historical understanding,
but it's also an invaluable check on the success of the teaching.

Assessment is done through employment of various techniques by the
teacher. These techniques are essential to the teacher in achieving
his/her instructional objectives, besides contributing to the measurement
process.

The frequency of assessment in most schools do vary. In some,
assessment may be done monthly or termly while in others it may be at
the end of the year. This variation affects performance of students at the
national level. In situations where the frequency of assessment is high the
performance of students at the Kenya Certificate of Secondary
Examinations (KCSE) may be excellent. On the other hand, when the
students are not oftenly assessed by their teachers', records may indicate
poor performance. We may note from the foregoing that performance of
students at the KCSE level can probably be determined by the frequency
of assessment before the final examination (K.C.S.E.).
The conceptual framework as shown above (figure 1:1) was developed to guide the teachers of history on the best techniques in assessing performance. The teacher of history should first of all have his or her instructional objectives clearly stated. This will consequently aid the
teacher to choose desirable method of teaching. Teaching and learning can be effective if the teacher use teaching resources like maps and charts among others.

Assessment in schools occur only after the teaching and learning process. The students are assessed by the teacher using variety of assessment techniques, like oral questioning, observation, questionnaire, written and interview among others. These techniques are very important to the teachers of history because they assist in attainment of instructional objectives. Assessment in our schools prepare the students for the summative assessment at the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examinations (KCSE).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Basically assessment of students in schools is a continuous process and an integral part of curriculum development. This process cannot be ignored in the classroom even by the teachers who profess not to believe in assessment. This is primarily because as a process it determines the extent to which educational objectives have been achieved. The current educational system of 8.4.4 emphasises continuous assessment of students' work as part and parcel of formative assessment procedure. In
this way, assessment in history has become an important feature in the
8.4.4 system of education.

Consequently, assessment of students takes a great proportion of
teaching time, and whose educational aim is to improve standards of
teaching and learning in schools. It is likely that school-based
assessments have a bearing on methodology and achievement as
reflected in summative evaluation. The research basically concentrated
on the following important areas.

(a) School-based assessment techniques in history
(b) Importance of school-based assessment in history
(c) Types of school-based assessment in history
(d) Frequency of school-based assessment in history.

School assessment in history is indeed an important area, yet observation
and literature search show that no comprehensive study has been carried
out in Kenya to explore the above mentioned aspects adequately. Hence,
it's of great necessity to investigate the exact assessment techniques and
the purpose of assessment in secondary schools as practised by teachers
of history.
1.4 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the purpose of school-based assessment in history?
2. How frequent do teachers assess their students in history?
3. What are the school-based assessment techniques used by history teachers?
4. What types of questions are prepared by history teachers?
5. Do teachers of history prepare tables of specification when preparing their tests?

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To establish the commonly used school-based assessment techniques.
2. To find out the usefulness of school-based assessment in learning process.
3. To find out whether the types of questions prepared by history teachers follow the format stipulated by the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC).
4. To find out whether the teachers do prepare the table of specification before writing a test in history.
1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are of significance because they will help the education planners and policy makers to arrive at correct decisions of what assessment techniques may be stressed for use in schools especially in history.

The findings will guide the teacher trainers on the direction to take when training in assessment techniques. It may also indicate whether or not there is need for in-service training of the teachers on some assessment techniques.

The findings may stimulate other researchers to carry out more researches in other disciplines.

1.7 The Scope of the Study

It should be noted that external examinations like MOCK and national examinations were not discussed. The focus was on techniques of assessment as used in secondary schools in Kakamega District.

1.8 Limitation of the Study
The study was confined to Kakamega district and was carried out in samples of schools (40) out of 80 in the area. The number of schools too small to justify the generalization of the findings to the rest of the Kenyan secondary schools.

A lot of time had to be spent by the researcher in covering all the teachers in the study. This consequently affected the number of teachers in the sample.

1.9 Basic Assumptions of the Study

The researcher made the following assumptions:

1. All secondary schools in Kakamega district offer History and Government as a teaching subject.

2. All teachers of history do assess their students using a variety of assessment techniques.

3. Most teachers of history are professionally trained.

1.10 Operational Definitions

Evaluation: Systematic process of collecting, analyzing and interpreting information to determine the extent to which pupils are achieving instructional objectives.
Assessment: A process of gathering and providing information on the learner about his/her performance on a learning task.

Techniques: Methods of doing something, or style or procedure used by a teacher in assessing the learner.

School-based Assessment: In this context, it is used to mean the assessment technique as applied by teachers in schools. It does not entail external assessment.

Teacher Made Test: Tasks aimed at measuring the performance of the learner which are made and used by the learner's teacher.

Test: An instrument or systematic procedure for measuring a sample of behaviour.

KNEC: Kenya National Examinations Council - a body empowered in Kenya to set, mark examinations and give certificates.

Performance: Ability of students to do what they have been taught by their teachers.

Examination: Testing the acquired knowledge after learning and teaching process.
Kenyan system of education whereby learners take 8 years in primary, 4 years in secondary and another 4 years in university.

The Kenyan old system of education where learners spent 7 years in primary, 4 years in 'O' level, 2 years in 'A' level and 3 years in university.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter briefly highlights a range of sub-topics related to assessment in educational institutions. In this chapter, some pertinent concepts will be outlined under the following topics:

(i) Historical perspective of assessment
(ii) General principles of assessment
(iii) Purpose of assessment
(iv) Assessment techniques
(v) Types of assessment
(vi) Types of tests.

2.2 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF ASSESSMENT

The history of formal assessment is much longer than is generally perceived. Njoroge (1982) clearly states that, for more than 400 years examinations have been of mankind’s institution. It is interesting to note that in the year 2356 BC a system of written examinations formed the basis of admission in the civil service in China. Throughout, all these past
centuries evaluation has been as indispensable to both teachers and pupil as a road is to a tourist. In the same vein, Lindvall (1961) observes that education assessment is as old as the first attempt of one person to teach something to another.
Assessment generally has been used to determine the academic achievement of students in our institutions since time immemorial. Reflecting on this subject, Njoroge (1982) agrees that, it is true that testing and examinations are artificial in nature, but they have been the yardstick by which the achievements of architects, engineers, teachers, doctors, lawyers etc have measured to ascertain whether they qualified for vocation of responsibility.

Examination has become a very common phenomenon of the whole system of education in Kenya. The Kenya education system is examination-oriented to the extent that anything that is not considered for examination at the end of any particular academic session is not worth learning. Learners have therefore been made to believe that examinations are exclusively for selection into the succeeding levels of education, employment and training. The importance attached to examination and certification in Kenya demands that teachers be aware of the various techniques of assessment basically to carry out both formative and summative assessment effectively.

There has been considerable achievement in the development of assessment techniques throughout the history of education. The view that assessment is part and parcel of education process and means of finding
out whether knowledge and skills that should have been acquired is further emphasized by Sax (1980:6) who points out clearly that assessment: “requires innumerable judgement to be made by the teachers, the school administration, parents and the pupils themselves”.

It is important to note that not only is evaluation of performance based on formal external tests, but can also be done by the teacher using a variety of other techniques. Eaglestone (1969:10) makes this clear when he writes:

In some countries ... - it is accepted that the teacher is likely to know more about his pupils than an external examiner and that he can provide more information about them than a necessarily short examination can hope to do. He can also put his pupils in order of merit more accurately than any examination.

Henry (1940) observes further that examination idea as developed in Europe and America had its origin in the universities of the middle ages, where it was applied in testing candidates for admission in the various degrees. Examination appears to have been carried over into school practice for the purpose of indicating to the outside authorities the quality of schoolwork. Early school examinations were oral and were conducted by clergymen and other learned men.
Internal assessment in schools plays a significant role in determining the learners' performance in the final examination. According to Clark (1968) internal examinations are valuable tools for the teacher. They involve primarily the gathering of evidence to estimate the degree to which pupils and teachers are achieving educational objectives. Internal examinations may therefore be used by teachers to meet some of the major educational objectives such as developing desirable interests, attitudes and appreciation, besides helping in acquiring facts, concepts and generalization. Additionally, internal assessments complements external examinations as they both serve a vital role for handling external examination.

2.3 GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT

Assessment as a process determines the extent to which instructional objectives are achieved by students. This process like the process of teaching, counselling, administration is most effective when it is based on sound operational principles. Basically these principles provide the direction to the process and serve as criteria for appraising the effectiveness of specific procedures and practices. Below are some of the principles of assessment which provide a general framework within which the process of assessment may be viewed. According to Gronlund (1971) they include:
1) Determining and clarifying what is to be assessed. That no assessment device should be selected or developed until the purposes of assessment have been carefully defined. In terms of assessing pupil's progress the identification and definition of educational objective is always the first order of business.

2) Assessment techniques should be selected in terms of the purposes to be served. When the aspect of pupil behaviour to be assessed has been precisely defined, the appropriate assessment technique should be selected for use.

3) Comprehensive assessment requires a variety of assessment techniques. No single assessment technique is adequate for appraising pupil progress towards all of the important outcomes of instruction. In fact, most assessment techniques are rather limited in scope. An objective test of factual knowledge provides important evidence concerning pupil's achievement, but the results tell us little or nothing about how well he understands the material, the extent to which he is developing thinking skills, how his attitudes are changing, how he would perform in an actual situation requiring application of the knowledge, or what influence the knowledge might have on his personal adjustment. Such outcomes require evidence beyond that which can be obtained by an objective test.
Essay testing, self-report techniques and various observational methods would all be needed to assess such a diverse array of instructional objectives.

4) Proper use of assessment techniques requires an awareness of their limitations as well as their strengths. Assessment techniques vary from fairly well developed measuring instruments (e.g. scholastic aptitude tests) to rather crude observational methods.

Bloom (1956) identified six classes of cognitive domain in assessment. These classes are hierarchical (use classes or levels) from the lowest level of understanding (knowledge) to the more complex level of synthesis and evaluation as shown below:

(i) **Knowledge**: Defined as the recall of specifics and universals, the recall of methods and processes or the recall of a pattern, structure or setting. It includes those behaviours and test situations which emphasize the remembering either by recognition or recall, of ideas, materials or phenomena. In the learning situation the student is expected to store in his mind certain information and the behaviour is expected later is the remembering of this information.
(ii) **Application:** This represents the lowest level of understanding. It refers to a type of understanding such that the individual knows what is being communicated and can make use of the material or idea being communicated without necessarily relating it to other material or seeing its fullest implications.

(iii) **Comprehension:** This refers to the use of abstractions in particular and concrete situations. The abstractions may be in the form of general ideas, rules of procedures or generalized methods. For a student to apply something more effectively he requires comprehension of the method, theory, principle or abstraction applied.

(iv) **Analysis:** This is a more advanced level than the skills of comprehension and application. It entails the breakdown of communication into its constituent elements or parts such that the relative hierarchy of ideas is made clear and/or the relations between the ideas expressed are made explicit.

(v) **Synthesis:** Entails putting together elements and parts so as to form a whole. This involves the process of working with pieces, elements etc and arranging and combining them in such away so as to constitute a pattern or structure not clearly there before.
The students must draw upon elements from many sources and put these together into a structure or pattern not clearly there before. His efforts should yield a product.

(vi) **Evaluation:** This is defined as making judgement about value, for some purpose, of ideas, solutions, methods, materials etc. It involves the use of criteria as well as standards for appraising the extent to which particulars are accurate, effective, economical or satisfying. The judgements may be either quantitative or qualitative, and the criteria may be either those determined by the student or those which are given to him.

Evaluation is placed at this point in the taxonomy because its regarded as being a relatively late stage in a complex process which involves some combination of all the other behaviours of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis and synthesis.

### 2.4 THE PURPOSE OF ASSESSMENT

An effective classroom teacher should be able to employ assessment at different situations for different purposes. In this context, he should have purposes both for formative and summative assessment. Examinations
and assessments may be thought of as having predominantly educational purposes. According to Kemp (1986:1) we may use them in order:

(i) to assess students' attainments at the end of a course of study programme.
(ii) to evaluate diagnostically students' academic progress and/or learning difficulties.
(iii) to estimate students' aptitudes, possibly for the purpose of assigning them to different courses or teaching functions.
(iv) to evaluate the effectiveness of an educational programme or curriculum.

The KNEC conducts evaluation for six major purposes summarized by Kyalo (1992) in a seminar paper on 'The role of KNEC' as follows:

To determine the effectiveness of teaching strategies and the success of instructional materials; for diagnosis, for guidance, for predictions, selections and grading.

Summer (1991) contends that the purpose of testing is to enable teachers to get a more structural type of feedback from the analysis of test results while Nichol (1984) observes that assessment of pupil's progress is an essential element in the work of a teacher. Not only does it help develop
pupil's understanding of History but it is also an invaluable check on the success of the teaching.

2.5 ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES

According to the international encyclopedia of education (Vol. 3, 1985) assessment covers activities included in grading, examining and certifying. This in essence means that student achievement on a particular course is usually assessed for the purpose of data collection. Valid data for determining the degree to which desirable changes in the behaviour patterns of the learner are occurring can be provided by assessment procedures such as observations, interviews, questionnaires and student products. This view is supported by educators such as Wanga (1987), Yates (1972), Mukhalu (1992), Oggunniye (1984) and Orodho (1996).

Generally, there are quite a number of assessment techniques that a teacher of history can effectively use to assess his learners, either during instructional process or at the end of it. The styles of assessment are not merely limited to the giving of paper and pencil tests: any device or method which provides valid evidence regarding the progress of students towards educational objectives is appropriate.
Oketch and Asiachi (1986) have identified a vast array of techniques that can be adequately used by teachers of history. The techniques include teacher made tests, oral tests, written tests, observation and oral reports. When used properly, may help the teachers to tell whether the course objectives have been achieved or not.

Gronlund (1971) has also listed the techniques for assessment as tests, self report and observation.

The Kenya National Examinations council (KNEC), KCSE regulations and syllabi 1989 – 1990 provided a format for setting national history examination. It stated that paper I shall contain section A, B and C. Section A consists compulsory twenty objective items and one short structured question. In section B, candidates were expected to answer two essay questions. In section C candidates were expected to answer three essay questions. Paper 2 contained two sections A and B. Candidates were expected to answer twenty objective questions and one short structured question. Section B contained three essay questions of which candidates answered two.

The 1996 - 1997 KNEC syllabus however was changed. The objective questions were removed outrightly. Candidates were expected to answer
short structured questions. The syllabus was changed in 1995 objectively to allow candidates to give short structured answers. This situation still persist to date. The students are only expected to recall specifics as opposed to guess work as it was the case before.

In the 8.4.4 system of education, assessment generally plays a key role in the learning/teaching process. Learners are assessed at every stage of learning process. Urevbu (1985) contends that continuous assessment test is more comprehensive, cumulative and guidance oriented. It is said to be systematic in the sense that it requires an operational plan, the taking and filling of records and the determination of the evaluation instruments to be used.

Gronlund (1985) asserts that if properly used evaluation techniques can contribute to improved learning outcomes by:

- Clarifying the intended learning outcome
- Providing short-term goals to work towards
- Offering feedback concerning learning progress
- Providing information for overcoming learning difficulties and selecting future learning experiences.
It can be noted from the above that although the purposes are probably best served by periodic evaluation during instruction the final evaluation of intended outcome should also contribute to these ends.

The application of a technique should be utilized where appropriate. It should not be used where that usage cannot contribute to the attainment of the instructional objective. This point is systematically presented by Lindvall (1961:138) in the following words:

If a teacher has a goal that requires pupils to present a logical explanation of the causes and results of certain historical events, he will probably evaluate the achievement of this goal through the use of a paper or an essay examination. If pupils are expected to learn to locate and use appropriate sources to find information on various social problems, this learning can only be appraised by observing students and examining their reports as they work on such problems.

Teachers are also cautioned against using some techniques that may deliberately create problems to them as Oketch and Asiachi (1986:135) observes:

The art of question may at times create a problem to a teacher. Care should be taken when and how to use the techniques of questioning. It may plunge the teacher in a confusion and lead him to a situation where a lot of time gets wasted on trivial matters. In this case, planning in advance is necessary if objectives have to be attained.
It should be emphasized that no single technique is adequate in the assessment of students' learning outcome. This means that teachers should adopt a variety of these techniques in order to achieve the desired objectives. One vital feature of a good evaluation system is that the course objectives must be clearly stated. It should as much as possible be stated in behavioural terms. Commenting on this subject, Ayot et. al (1989) states that no single evaluation technique in itself can yield all the data needed to assess in totality the learners' achievement after a given teaching/learning experience. Thus a number of evaluation procedures may be utilized if sufficient information must be obtained and reliably used to make informed judgements about the learners' achievements.

Information from carefully developed assessment techniques can also be used to assess and improve instructions. Such information according to Gronlund (1985) can aid in judging the appropriateness and attainability of instructional objectives, the usefulness of the instructional materials and the effectiveness of the instructional methods. Basically therefore, assessment techniques can contribute to both improvements in the teaching and learning process itself and pupil learning.
While appreciating the principles of evaluation, teachers should be aware of their limitations at the same time. Shiundu and Omulando (1992) note that the principles of evaluation should help in selecting and using a variety of evaluation techniques, being aware of the limitations of these techniques and regarding evaluation should help in selecting and using a variety of evaluation as a process of obtaining information on which to base educational decisions because the main emphasis in classroom evaluation is the pupil and his learning progress.

Teachers in assessing their students in history should adequately use the techniques that will aid in the attainment of the objective. Likewise these techniques should be related to the objectives. A good observation was made by Frith and Macintosh (1984:18) when they stated:

"The techniques selected must relate to the aims and objectives and must be those likely to produce reliable indications of the abilities or qualities looked for in the pupils. Assessment technique should relate also to the significant objectives."

2.6 TYPES OF ASSESSMENT

There are basically two types of assessment. These are formative and summative. Gronlund (1985) defines formative assessment as a type used to monitor learning progress during instruction and to provide continuous feedback to both pupils and teacher concerning learning
successes and failures. Summative assessment on the other hand is viewed typically as a process that comes at the end of a course or unit of instruction. It is designed to determine the extent to which the instructional objectives have been achieved and is used primarily for assigning course grades of certifying pupil mastery of the intended learning outcomes.

In the current 8.4.4. system of education, both formative and summative assessments are stressed therein. Formative assessment at the instructional level is the work of the teacher and is an integral part of the teaching and learning process. Cougelosi (1990) suggests that teachers should make use of formative than summative assessment. However because of students and parents who are so grade conscious, one is likely to find them keenly interested in summative assessment, but barely aware of the ongoing formative assessment.

Formative assessment is viewed as one of the reliable means of determining the progress of the learners at the instructional level. Writing in support of this type of assessment in schools, Shoemaker (1975:21) observes:

Formative test is diagnostic and gives students a sense of adequacy of their progress in the unit. This
formative test provides feedback to the learner to give future studies.

The importance of formative assessment is further emphasized by Sutton (1991) who views it as an ongoing process, conducted both formally and informally by which information and evidence about a child's learning is absorbed and used to plan the next step, or guide through a given task.

2.7 TYPES OF TESTS

According to Zigmond et al (1983) tests are predetermined collection of questions or tasks to which predetermined types of responses are sought; while assessment is a process of collecting information about students and interpreting the likely meaning of that information for educational decision making.

There are many types of tests under use in schools today world over. Callahan and Clark (1990:343) have identified the following types of tests:

(i) Achievement test - designed to measure the student level of accomplishment, how much a student has learned about a subject area or assignment of that subject.

(ii) Teacher-made-test- are commonly achievement tests prepared by the teacher to measure student learning in a
specific area. A pretest is given prior to planned instructional activities.

(iii) Standardized test – is one prepared with careful research by testing experts so that the instrument represents desirable test characteristics. A test manual that is usually available approves information about administering the test, scoring it and interpreting results. These tests are useful for assessing such qualities as students' intellectual abilities, academic achievement, attitudes, interests and aptitudes.

(iv) Objective tests - Is one that can be scored consistently. The answers are either right or wrong. This type of test is probably most frequently used in schools. True-false, multi-choice and matching are examples of type of questions used in objective tests.

(v) Essay tests - require original student responses to questions and are considered subjective measures. Different people may react differently when scoring responses in a test of this sort. Often the answers cannot be considered right or wrong.

(vi) Diagnostic Test - specifically designed to determine the students' deficiencies. A readiness test is constructed to find out whether the student has the understanding skills and sometimes motivation to go to the next level.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides specific strategies to data collection and analysis to answer the research questions. Basically the strategies in this context entailed the following components:

- Research design
- Sampling technique
- Description of research instruments
- Piloting
- Data collection technique
- Data analysis.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The design for this study was descriptive (Descriptive research design). According to Kerlinger (1981) research design is the plan, structure and strategy of investigation used to obtain answers to research questions. Below is the illustration of the design that the researcher used.
FIGURE 3.1: Descriptive Research Design
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The design as shown above was undertaken in selected Kakamega secondary schools. In order to have a sample that was appropriate for the study, stratified random sampling technique was adopted. Data collection was done in those sampled secondary schools and thereafter analysed. Summary and conclusions were made. Appropriate recommendations and suggestions for further research were ultimately presented.

3.3 SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

The research took place in Kakamega District secondary schools. Kakamega district is situated in Western province, Kenya. Other districts found in Western Province include Bungoma, Busia, Vihiga, Teso, Mt. Elgon and Lugari. Kakamega district has 80 public secondary schools (Ministry of Education, Kakamega District). Public schools were chosen for the study because it was easy to categorize them into convenient strata of boys, girls and mixed schools. This district was the centre of focus in this study primarily because of its large size and high population density, thus giving a wide sampling strata. The total number of schools in the district (80) were identified and stratified according to the school type. The stratification of the schools was done as shown below:

i. Mixed schools
ii. Boys’ schools
iii. Girls’ schools
In each category, the schools were sampled using random sampling technique. The names of each category of schools were written on a paper, dropped in a box and then shaken. Each piece of paper was picked one after the other until the required number was got. It should be noted that all possible samples of fixed size had the sample probability of being selected.

The sum total of the sample schools were then identified as shown below.

Table 3.1 Sampling Grid for Schools in Kakamega District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys’ schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls’ schools</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed schools</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The representative sample of secondary schools in Kakamega District were therefore 40. By using the sampled schools, the form three history teachers were used in the study. The distribution of the questionnaires was done by the researcher himself to a total of 40 secondary schools. The questionnaires were collected from teachers within a specified period of one week.
One (1) teacher of history in each school was used. In total, 40 teachers were distributed with questionnaires, out of which 38 returned. The Form three was basically chosen because form fours were busy preparing for the National Examinations (KSCE), hence no need to disrupt them. Secondly, specialization in history, starts in form three and therefore the rest of the forms one and two were left out.

3.4 INSTRUMENTATIONS

The instruments adopted for the study were a questionnaire (Appendix I) and checklist. (Appendix II). The questionnaire was used because of its ability to solicit information, besides having a potential of being answered by the respondents in the absence of the researcher. The questionnaires were distributed to the history teachers in each sampled school in the District. The answered questionnaires were collected after a duration of one week. The instruments were piloted in three schools to test their validity and reliability. The results indicated that the instruments were valid and reliable.

A checklist (appendix II) was also used in the study mainly to analyse teacher test items. The researcher analysed the type of questions set by history teachers and established the characteristics of questions used by the teachers. A checklist was administered on 40 teachers in sampled
schools in the district, to crosscheck against what was available in the questionnaire. This meant that 40 history assessment papers were analysed. Forty teachers were used in the study to represent forty secondary schools in the District. One teacher was used per school because there is only one teacher of history in form three in most schools.

3.5 PILOTING

Piloting was carried out in three schools in each category. These three schools were not among the ones selected for the final study. The questionnaires were administered to the form three history teachers in the three schools. One teacher from each school, and a total of three teachers were used in the pilot study. The purposive sampling method was used in choosing schools for piloting and also in selecting teachers. Gender aspect was considered in selecting those teachers.

The teachers filled the questionnaires while two samples of test (end term) papers used by these teachers to assess their students in history were collected. Basically 6 (six) end term question papers were collected. The purpose of piloting was primarily aimed at pretesting the questionnaire. It also facilitated for changes and modification of the questions, for improvement of the instruments and the procedures for the actual data collection for the study.
3.6 DATA COLLECTION

The researcher applied for a research permit from the Office of the President. The permit 'allowed' the researcher to start the collection of the data in secondary schools in Kakamega District.

The questionnaires were then distributed to the form three (3) history teachers in each sampled school. The distributed questionnaires were 40, but the researcher received 38. They were collected after a duration of one week. The researcher also collected teacher tests together with the questionnaires from the respondents.

3.7 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis was based on the research questions that guided the study. The data analysis for the study was of descriptive nature. Basically, the data collected was analysed to establish the techniques used by history teachers to assess performance of the students. The research data has been reported using appropriate tables where applicable.

The researcher also applied simple statistics like frequencies, totals and percentages in analysing the responses. For instance
1. To find out whether the teachers prepared a table of specification before writing a test in history, the responses from the questionnaire were reduced to frequencies and percentages.

2. To determine the types of questions prepared by history teachers, a checklist was used and the results reduced to percentages and frequencies.

In general therefore, descriptive analysis was applied in the study because it simplified data by reducing them into component parts. Summary and conclusions were then made from the findings.
4.1 INTRODUCTION

Data was collected from the sampled secondary schools in Kakamega district. The instruments that were employed to retrieve information from the respondents were basically teachers’ questionnaire (appendix I) and checklist (Appendix II). In total the respondents were thirty eight (38) teachers. In this chapter, data is analysed, presented in tabular form containing frequencies and percentages.

4.2 GENERAL INFORMATION ON TEACHERS

The items in this section sought to find out information about teachers’ gender (sex), academic and professional qualification and experience.

Table 4.1 Teachers’ Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N (f)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings (Table 4.1) indicate that majority of the respondents N 27 (71%) were male and N 11 (29%) female. This disparity was purely coincidental because the researcher randomly chose schools without considering the gender aspect of the teachers.

Table 4.2 Types of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.2, it is noticed that the number of schools for the study were N 9 (23.7%) boys', N 10 (26.3%) Girls' and N 19 (50%) mixed. In total there were 38 secondary schools.

Table 4.3: Teachers' Academic and Professional Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualifications</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Edu.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 shows the professional qualifications of the teachers of history. The results show that majority of them N31 (81.6%) were B.Ed. graduates. Those with post-graduate Diploma in Education were N3 (7.9%) while those with Diploma in Education and S.I. were N3 (7.9%) and N1 (2.6%) respectively. None of the respondents had Bachelor of Arts degree or Masters in Education.

Table 4.4 Experience of History Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Untrained</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that one teacher N1 (2.6%) was untrained and had taught for a period of between 1-3 years (Table 4.4). The rest of the teachers were trained. For instance N2 (5.3%) had taught for less than
one year, N11 (28.9%) for 1-3 years, N11 (28.9%) for between 4-5 years and N13 (34.2%) indicated that they had taught for more than 5 years.

The results on the years the teachers of history have taught the subject indicated that N2 (5.3%) had taught for less than a year, N11 (28.9%) for between 1-3 years, N13 (34.2%) for between 4-5 years and N12 (31.6%) for more than 5 years.

The findings generally confirm that most teachers in the sample have high academic and professional qualifications. Consequently, these teachers should be able to use the possible recommended techniques in assessing their students. It was also established that the majority of teachers had taught for more than 5 years, a factor that should enable them to be conversant with the type of questions and format used by the Kenya National Examination Council in assessing learners summatively.

4.3 FORMS TAUGHT AND OTHER SUBJECTS TAUGHT APART FROM HISTORY

The items in this section sought to find out the precise forms the respondents teach, other subjects besides history these teachers teach, and lastly the University/college they were trained from.
Table 4.5  Subjects Taught Besides History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Taught</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 38 = 100\% \)

The findings (table 4.5) indicate that \( N = 38 \) (100\%) of the respondents taught form three history. This is because the researcher was interested in form three teachers teaching history. The results also indicate that teachers \( N = 17 \) (44.7\%) taught C.R.E., \( N = 17 \) (44.7\%) S.E.E. (2.6\%) Economics, \( N = 4 \) (10.5\%) Business, \( N = 10 \) (26.3\%) Geography, \( N = 4 \) (10.5\%) Kiswahili, \( N = 1 \) (2.6\%) Physical Education, \( N = 1 \) (2.6\%), English and \( N = 2 \) (5.3\%) Islamic Religious Education, apart from History. The relevance of
other subjects taught apart from history was generally to ascertain that teachers of history in the sample schools do not only teach history inform three, but are also involved in other related subjects. This probably affect them in using or choosing appropriate assessment techniques.

Table 4.6: Training of Teachers: Universities and Colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenyatta</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maseno</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laikipia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagumo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jomo Kenyatta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The (table 4.6) indicates that the training of the teachers took place at different colleges and universities, for instance it shows that N 11 (28.9%) and N14 (36.8%) teachers were trained from Moi and Kenyatta universities respectively. The rest were trained as follows N6 (15.7%) Nairobi, N2 (5.3%) Maseno, N1 (2.6%) Laikipia, and N3 (7.9%) Kagumo.
A general observation from the finding shows that more than half of the teachers were trained from Kenyatta and Moi universities. The rationale of asking the teachers to indicate where they were trained from was basically to assist in identifying the distribution of teachers of history according to the university or college. The aim was not compare them in terms of quality.

4.4 INSERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS

This section contains items that aimed at establishing whether the teachers of history do attend inservice training and the frequency of such inservice training.

Inservice training is generally viewed to be very necessary for the teachers in the learning and teaching process. These courses basically help teachers of history particularly to be conversant with the newest or latest techniques of assessment which in one way or another aid learners to excel in their examinations. The researcher was therefore interested in findings out whether such courses are offered and if so, whether the teachers in question have ever attended the sessions. Lastly, the frequency of these courses was also sought. The findings were as indicated in table 4.7 below.
It was found that N1 (2.6) of the total number of teachers attended inservice training while N37 (97.4%) never attended any (Table 4.7). This denotes seemingly that majority of the teachers had never attended any inservice training, a trend that should not be encouraged considering the fact that such courses guide teachers on how to assess their students in the best way possible. The courses also expose teachers to assessment techniques that are oftenly adopted by the Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC). It is also noted that these training or courses enable the teachers to share variety of ideas on the possible best methods of assessment. The new ideas that are usually imparted into the teachers.
are ultimately transferred to the learners. The learners, therefore, are likely to benefit a lot from those teachers who attend inservice training or courses.

The findings in table 4.7 further indicate that N1 (2.6) of the teachers said that inservice training is frequent, N8 (27.0%) indicated that it is not frequent and the majority gave no response. A general observation from these findings shows that inservice training of history teachers is not taken seriously by those in charge. This has made many of the teachers not to be inserviced at all, a factor that might affect the efficiency of the teachers handling history. From the results obtained, it is evident also that majority of the teachers appear not to have any idea about inservice training because they have not been given an opportunity at all. This may be attributed to the already established culture of putting the courses on the periphery without considering their importance in the learning and teaching process. The implications of not inservicing teachers is generally felt by the students in the sense that there is little input from the teachers’ side, a factor that might affect performance of the students.

4.5 ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES USED BY HISTORY TEACHERS

In the learning and teaching process, there are various techniques of assessing learners, aimed at determining whether the teachers have
achieved his/her objectives (instructional objectives) or not. Usually the teachers may employ such techniques as written tests, observations and interviews among others. The items in this section expected teachers of history to identify factors that may affect choosing assessment techniques rate, assessment techniques, provide purposes of assessments and lastly indicate probable assessment technique whether it is essential, important or unnecessary.

**Table 4.8: Factors Affecting Choosing Assessment Techniques**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in marking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results (table 4.8) above show that N8 (27%) of the respondents stated that teaching load affected the choice of assessment technique while N 19 (50%) of the respondents indicated class size, N 5 (13.2%) difficulty in marking N 5 (13.2%) less time and N1 (2.6%) wide content as the main contributing factors. From this information, it is evident that the major contributing factors that inhibit teachers of history from choosing assessment technique are teaching load which is related to class size.
Teaching usually becomes interesting to the teacher when he/she is not overloaded. It is therefore important to inject a new formulae that will enable teachers to have less load in schools. This will aid teachers to effectively employ diverse techniques of assessment for the betterment of the students.

On the other hand, class size was identified as a major contributing factor in choosing assessment technique. This in essence means that teachers of history are hard hit when the size of the class is large. It basically means also that the teachers of history are comfortable in choosing assessment techniques when the students they are handling are few. It is indeed true that when the number of students is small, the teacher usually has double time to give them assignments in form of assessments more frequently. He is also able to give back feedback on time and subsequently do the corrections.

It is also noted from table 4.8 that relatively small number of teachers identified difficulty in marking and limited time as factors affecting choosing assessment techniques. Only 1 N (2.6%) of the respondents indicated wide content as a contributory factor affecting choosing assessment techniques. From the findings, it can be stated that teachers of history in Kakamega District rated class size and teaching load as major
factors affecting them in choosing assessment techniques. On the other hand, the same few teachers found difficulty in marking; limited time and wide content as contributing factors affecting choosing assessment techniques.

Table 4.9: Rating of Assessment Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Very Regularly</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Less Regularly</th>
<th>Not Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>34 89.5</td>
<td>4 10.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>4 10.5</td>
<td>16 42.1</td>
<td>10 26.3</td>
<td>8 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>1 2.6</td>
<td>6 15.8</td>
<td>14 36.8</td>
<td>17 44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>3 7.9</td>
<td>11 28.9</td>
<td>5 13.2</td>
<td>19 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: N38 = 100%

The above results (table 4.9) indicate that the majority of the respondents N38 (100%) used oral questioning regularly in assessing the performance of learners in history, while N20 (52.6%) used observation regularly. Interviews and questionnaires were frequently utilized by respondents N7 (18.4%) and N14 (36.8%) respectively. Only N34 (89.5%) of the respondents did not regularly use observation, interviews and questionnaires in assessing their students. N 29 (76.3%) used interviews observations and questionnaires less regularly.
According to Asiachi and Oketch (1986) the teacher made tests, oral tests, written tests, observation, oral reports, and self reports are very useful for the teacher in assessing students. These techniques are so diverse, yet are supposed to be utilized by history teachers to the maximum without any discrimination or bias.

The findings however do not tally with the recommendations in the sense that there is a lot of preference for oral assessment against all other recommended techniques. Observation interviews and questionnaires techniques are not adequately used by the teachers. Possibly, teachers prefer oral assessment to other assessment techniques because it appears easy and faster for them and the feedback is immediate. Alternatively the technique is so selected or preferred mainly because it relates to the aims and objectives and hence likely to produce reliable indication of the abilities or qualities looked for in the students.

When a checklist was employed in each sampled school to establish the methods used in assessing learners, the following results were obtained by the researcher.
Table 4.10: Method of Assessment in Secondary School History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From (Table 4:10) it is clear that the majority of the teachers assess their students through written tests – N38 (100%) oral technique of assessment which the respondents had earlier on indicated to be popular was found to be unpopular by 0%. The researcher also noticed that observation and project were not used at all by the teachers. Oral assessment seemingly might have been unpopular as compared to the written tests because the researcher analysed the test papers and did not observe teachers of history teaching in class to determine whether they use oral technique of assessment or not.

The results further show that observation technique of assessment is not adequately used by teachers. This result tally with the earlier results obtained by the respondents. This is possibly because both observation and project methods demand perseverance and commitment on the side of the teacher, which may be lacking in most teachers. They are also time
consuming and involving, although if well utilized can produce the best outcomes and qualities expected from the students.

On a general note, written tests came out clearly to be one of the reliable and commendable techniques of assessment in sampled schools in Kakamega District. These results do not tally with those obtained by the researcher earlier on through the respondents who had indicated sparingly that oral assessment was more popular. Maybe written test technique appeared popular than any other technique because the researcher went through the question papers while establishing the type of questions that are set by history teachers. To most teachers, this technique is popular because, as a technique it provides and also measures the acquired knowledge appropriately after the teaching process.
Table 4.11: Purpose of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons of Assessment</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine the learners readiness for instruction.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To check the progress of the learners on education programme.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reassure the achievement of the learners at the end of the programme.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=38=100%

From table 4.11, it was noted that the majority of the respondents N 38 (100%) assessed their learners to check their progress. N 37 (97.3%) and N 35 (92.1%) assessed their learners to determine their readiness for instruction and to reassure their achievement at the end of the programme respectively. Only N 2 (5.3%) of the respondents indicated that assessing the learners to determine their readiness for instruction is not important while N 3 (7.9%) saw assessment to reassure the achievement of the learner at the end of the programme not to be important.
The reasons or purposes of assessment are wide. The purposes may vary from one teacher to another. However, these assessments generally have predominately educational purposes. Assessment of pupil progress is an essential element in the work of a teacher. Not only does it help develop pupils' historical understanding, but it is also an invaluable check on the success of the teaching.

The results obtained from the respondents indicated that they are generally conversant with the reasons for assessment.

Table 4.12: Assessment Techniques Used in History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Technique</th>
<th>Essential f</th>
<th>Essential %</th>
<th>Important f</th>
<th>Important %</th>
<th>Unnecessary f</th>
<th>Unnecessary %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular examination at least once per term</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination at the end of every year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering questions verbally or orally</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous assessment. Test based on objective test.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results (table 4.12) indicate that majority of the respondents rated regular examination at least once a term and examination at the end of the year as important by 100%. The results further show that N 35 (92.1%) of the respondents rated answering questions verbally or orally as important while N 3 (7.9%) rated it as unnecessary. N 35 (92.1%) of the respondents indicated continuous assessment test based on objective test as important and N 3 (7.9) rated it as being unnecessary.

From the findings it is clear that the teachers identified all the techniques provided as being necessary in assessing their students. Only a few saw answering questions verbally or orally and test based on objective test as being unnecessary.

4.6 TYPES OF QUESTIONS

The items in this section of the questionnaire were designed to find out the type of questions that are commonly used by teachers of history. The following results were obtained.
The information obtained (table 4.13) indicated that structured or short answer items and essays were popular by N 36 (94.7%) and N 35 (92.1%) respectively. Only N 3 (7.9%) of the respondents indicated that essays are not frequently used and N 2 (5.3%) said short answer items are not frequent. Filling in blanks and multiple choice items are not commonly used by teachers. For instance N 11 (28.9%) of the respondents indicated that filling in blanks items are frequently used in assessing performance. However N 15 (39.5%) of the respondents found filling in blanks items...
uncommon. N 5 (13.2%) of the respondents indicated that multiple choice items are frequent and N 27 (71%) noted that they are not used at all.

From the findings it can be concluded that essays and structured questions are predominantly used by teachers of history when assessing students. On the other hand, filling in blanks and multiple choice type of questions are not very commonly used by teachers. Probably this is because these type of questions are no longer set by the Kenya National Examination council (KNEC). This confirms that the teachers are aware of what is expected of them by the KNEC in terms of examination format and syllabus coverage. The results therefore tally with what is recommended generally by education stakeholders. However analysis of questions papers in sampled schools produced the following results.

Table 4.14: Types of Questions Analysed from Question Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Questions</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filling in blanks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured or short Answers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 38 = 100
The results from (table 4.14) were obtained through analysis of the test items prepared by teachers of history. From these results, it is explicitly clear that essays and structured type of questions are popular in schools although the respondents had earlier indicated that filling in blanks and multiple choice questions were minimal.

These findings on a general observation tally with those the respondents provided in the questionnaire.

4:7 TYPES AND ORIGIN OF ASSESSMENT

There are basically two types of assessment, internal and external. The internal assessment is planned or set by individual teacher or a group of teachers. While external assessment is set by an independent body or organisation other than the regular teachers and may be done once a term or at the end of the year.

The items in this part were designed to find out from teachers of history which of the two internal and external assessment they preferred most. The results are obtained in the table below.
From table 4.15 it is noted that N 18 (47.4%) of the respondents preferred external assessment while N 20 (52.6%) preferred internal assessment. There were several reasons that were given by either group. The majority of the respondents preferred internal assessment because of the following reasons:

i. To determine the entry behaviour of the learner according to what one has taught

ii. Gives an opportunity to know which area to test.

iii. Gives a proper picture of whether students have mastered what they were taught.

iv. To assess every level or topic covered so as to determine the level of difficulty.

v. External examinations are too expensive and time wasting.

vi. Some external bodies set questions outside the syllabi.
On the other hand, N 18 (47.4%) of the respondents preferred external examinations and gave the following underlying reasons:

i. Teachers are able to compare themselves with other schools in terms of syllabus coverage.

ii. They are standardised and cover the whole syllabus content.

iii. Helps teachers to strive to cover the syllabus in time.

iv. To avoid favouritism based on race, tribe, sex etc.

v. Learners take them more serious than internal examinations

Teachers see external tests as more reliable with higher level of validity.

The researcher also sought to find out the sources of questions prepared by history teachers. The following results were obtained from the respondents.

Table 4:16: Sources of Questions Used in Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text &amp; course book</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past papers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the respondents frequently gave assessments planned and set by themselves (Table 4.10). This accounted for N 24 (63.2%). The rest gave assessment from text and course books, group of teachers and past papers which accounted for N 4 (10.4%), N 5 (13.2%) and N 5 (13.2%) respectively.

In conclusion the findings show that the sources of assessment are basically textbooks, teachers themselves, groups of teachers and lastly past papers. These are valuable sources because learners are exposed a variety of questions and content expected in the final assessment stage. Although it was found that teachers use the above mentioned sources for assessing students, teachers’ own questions dominated as a source of assessment.

4.8 THE MODE OF GIVING TESTS AND EXAMINATIONS

A test is an instrument or systematic procedure for measuring a sample of behavior while examination entails testing the acquired knowledge after learning and teaching process. The items in this section aimed at finding out the frequency of these tests and examinations in sampled schools in Kakamega district. The data are as shown below.
Table 4.17: The Frequency of giving Tests in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Assessment</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half yearly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in two weeks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a term</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a term</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents N 14 (36.9%) gave assessment once in two weeks while N 10 (26.3%) gave monthly (Table 4.17). The rest gave tests once a term (15.8%) and twice a term (21%). Nobody indicated giving of tests weekly and half yearly. Assessment according to some educators like Macintosh (1984) can be introduced at different stages of a course of study for example:

(i) Continuous assessment - A continuous updating of judgements about a student’s performance.

(ii) Periodic Assessment - Measures levels of attainment reached at a predetermined interval throughout the course.

(iii) Terminal assessment - Measures the attainment of students at the end of the course.
The results therefore seem to be in support of the recommended mode of testing whereby the students are assessed at different stages. For instance the results indicated that the learners are assessed once in two weeks, once a term, monthly and twice a term. The frequency of tests in schools is usually determined by teachers willingness to assess and the school policy. Many a times the frequency of tests in schools determines the performance of students. A school that seldomly assess learners usually perform poorly because the learners are not tested adequately in preparation for the summative assessment in KCSE.

The researcher also sought responses from teachers on how often they give examinations to their students. The following findings were obtained.

**Table 4.18: Frequency of Giving Examinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termly</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from table 4.18 show that majority of the respondents gave examination termly by N 33 (86.5%) relatively small number of
respondents N 5 (13.5%) gave examinations monthly while nobody examined the learners yearly. These results also concur with the recommended examinations mode.

The results indicate basically that tests and examinations are frequently given to the learners, a trend that should be encouraged by the teachers of history.

The observations however made by the researcher through the use of checklists obtained the following results.

Table 4:19: Frequency of Tests and Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Tests and Examination</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly tests</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid year examinations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End year examinations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information obtained (table 4:19) revealed that tests are organised monthly by N 9 (23.7%). Apparently weekly tests are not offered at all. On the other hand examinations are offered every mid-term by N 22 (57.9%) End year examinations according to the results obtained were given by teachers of history by N 7 (18.4%)
From the findings it is apparently clear that students are given tests monthly to measure their academic progress and at the end of each term they are given mid term examinations. These findings also tally with those obtained from the respondents that: teachers prefer to assess when they have covered substantial amount of content – thus at mid-term.

4.9 THE LEVELS OF QUESTIONS AND PREPARATION OF TABLE OF SPECIFICATION

The items in this section sought to find out the level of questions teachers of history ask their students. It also aimed at finding out whether they prepared table of specification before or during setting their tests and examinations.

There are generally six levels of questions (cognitive domains) namely: knowledge, application, comprehension, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. When the learning outcomes have been defined and the course content outlined, a table of specification should be prepared. The purpose of table of specification is to provide assurance that the test will measure a representative sample of the learning outcomes and the subject matter content to be measured. It therefore serves the test maker like a blue print.
The results that were obtained from the respondents on the level of questions are as shown below in the table.

**Table 4:20: The Level of Questions: Responses from Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Questions</th>
<th>Very Frequent</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 38 = 100%

The results from table 4:20 revealed that the majority of the questions N 37 (97.4%) tested knowledge. Only one respondent N1 (2.6%) indicated that questions that tested knowledge were rare. N 33 (86.8%) of the respondents said that they tested comprehension while N 25 (65.7%) tested application. The rest of the results showed that N 22 (57.9%) of the respondents tested evaluation, N 21 (55.3%) analysis and N 17 (44.7%) synthesis.

From the findings, it is evident that most questions tested knowledge, comprehension and application, in that order while analysis, synthesis and
evaluation appeared not popular to teachers of history. For instance, N 25 (65.7%) of respondents indicated that analysis, synthesis and evaluation levels of questions never appeared in their tests and examinations. These results tally with the recommendations except that there is attendance of teachers over-relying on knowledge, comprehension and application related question at the expense of analysis, synthesis and evaluation questions. There is need for a balance between all these six domains.

The analysis that was performed by the researcher on the level of questions set by history teachers obtained the following results:

Table 4:21: Levels of Questions as Analysed from Teacher’s Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Questions</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 38 = 100\%\]

Table 4:21 shows as indicated earlier on, that knowledge, comprehension and application related questions dominated most question papers observed. For instance, N 38 (100%) of the questions observed indicated
dominance of knowledge oriented questions, followed by N 37 (97.4%) for comprehension and N 19 (50%) for application. Analysis and evaluation questions were N 9 (23.7%) and N 1 (2.6%) respectively. There were no questions that needed students to synthesize responses. Generally, the findings obtained through analysis of test papers indicated that knowledge, comprehension and application related questions dominated the question papers observed. Analysis, synthesis and evaluation level of questions appeared less popular. These results tally with the earlier findings provided by the respondents in the questionnaire.

The researcher in the final analysis sought to find out whether the teachers of history prepared table of specification or not when setting their tests and examinations. The findings were as shown below.

Table 4.22: Preparation of Table of Specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation of Table</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before setting test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During setting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents N 24 (63.2%) indicated that they prepared the table of specification before setting a test, N 5 (13.2%) during setting a test or examination while N 9 (23.6%) never prepared at all (Table 4.22).
The table of specification is usually prepared when the learning outcomes have been defined and the course content outlined. Basically, it is prepared before the teacher sets the paper to act as a guide to him. From the findings, it can be stated that majority prepared their table of specification before the test or examination is set. It therefore tallies with the recommendations stated above.
5:1 INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapters, the following aspects of the study were covered; the introduction and the background of the problem, the review of the related literature, methodology and the presentation and analysis of the data. This chapter gives a summary, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

4.1 Summary of Findings

5.2.1 Academic and Professional Background of Teachers

Teachers of history in Kakamega district were found to be of high academic and professional standard with B.Ed. (Bachelor of Education) degrees, postgraduate diploma in education, diploma in education and approved teacher scale (ATS)

The findings showed that these teachers were highly trained and basically fit to teach history at secondary level.
5.2.2 Teachers' Experience

Most of the teachers were experienced in the teaching of history. It was noted that most of the teachers had taught for more than four years. The teaching experience of majority of teachers was therefore an indicator that they were versed with the modern techniques of assessment.

5.2.3 Other Subjects Taught Apart From History

It was found that the teachers of history teach other related subjects like Christian Religious Education (CRE), Geography, Economics, Kiswahili, Business Education, English, Social Education and Ethics (SEE) and Islamic Religious Education (IRE).

It came out clearly that majority of those teachers teaching history also teach Christian Religious Education and Social Education and Ethics. Relatively few teachers teach history with English and Economics. It was generally observed that History as a discipline is taught by teachers trained and qualified to teach also C.R.E. (Christian Religious Education).

5.2.4 Training of Teachers

Most of the teachers in Kakamega District were trained from the universities and colleges in Kenya. The majority of the teachers were
trained from Kenyatta University. Other teachers were trained from Moi, Egerton, Nairobi, Maseno, Laikipia and Kagumo.

It was also found that majority of the teachers were trained for a period of 3 years. This in essence means that most of the teachers underwent the old system of 7.4.2.3. Those trained for four years were few. (8:4:4 graduates). Others were trained for a period ranging from 1-2 years.

5:2:5 Inservice Training
The majority of teachers in Kakamega district have never attended inservice training since they became teachers. This is so possibly because those in charge have relaxed in organising for these courses for the teachers of history. Inservice training is very relevant in the learning and teaching process in the sense that it guides teachers on how to assess the students in the best ways possible. They also enable the teachers to share a variety of ideas on the best methods of assessment. If the teachers of history are effectively inserviced, there's a likelihood that they will be able to adopt a variety of assessment techniques which are paramount in the learning and teaching process.
5:2:6: Factors Affecting Choosing Assessment Techniques

Generally, there are diverse factors which can curtail the teacher from using or choosing assessment techniques. Many educationalists mention class size, teaching load, difficulty in marking and wide content. The findings show that although these factors are contributory in choosing assessment techniques, the size or number of students a teacher is handling predominantly affects them most. This is possibly because the teacher is not able to deal with the students at individual level and hence adopts other alternative techniques which may not be effective in measuring the level at which the objectives have been achieved.

5.2.7: Purpose of Assessment

Most of the teachers of history assessed the learners to check their progress, to determine their readiness for instruction and lastly to reassure their achievement at the end of the programme. These findings basically indicate that the teachers of history know why they assess their students. This knowledge positively contributes to the teachers achieving their objectives in assessment. Generally, teachers are expected to assess their learners for a purpose in order to aid them attain their instructional objectives. The findings therefore tally with the
recommendations made by Kemp (1986) on the purpose of assessment in schools.

5:2:8: Assessment Techniques

The majority of teachers in Kakamega district use oral questioning regularly in assessing performance of the students. Observation, interviews and questionnaires are not popularly used. Possibly most teachers preferred oral questioning to other techniques because it’s easier and faster. The teacher is able to get the feedback from the learner immediately he poses a question to him/her. This is usually done during the lesson. The teacher can therefore determine whether the learners are following what is being communicated or not, depending on their oral response. Interview and questionnaires probably appear less popular to the teachers because they are time consuming and also involving both to the teacher and the learner. The teacher has to organise for the questions to be put in the questionnaire besides ensuring that the questionnaires are well constructed.

Another technique that was also found popular was written technique. It was noted that tests and examination were basically written. In other words, students are expected to give their responses to the teacher through written work. They are usually formal and timed or programmed.
The results tally with the recommendations made by educationalists such as Oketch, and Asiachi (1986), Gronlund (1971) who identified written tests, oral reports, observation oral tests, self report and interview as the main techniques of assessment.

5:2:9 Types of Questions

Most of the teachers mentioned that structured or short answer items and essays were popular in secondary schools in Kakamega district. Filling in blanks and multiple choice were not commonly used by teachers of history.

The findings basically tallied with the KNEC guidance and KCSE regulation and syllabi (1996-1997) which provided that candidates were expected to answer short structured questions and essay questions. Multiple choice and filling in blank items were consequently removed. The teachers therefore appeared conversant with what is expected of them by KNEC.
5:2:10: Sources of Assessment

Majority of teachers give assessment that is usually planned and set by themselves; Relatively few teachers give assessment from text and course books, past papers and group of teachers.

From the findings, it can be stated that teachers prepare their own questions based on what they have covered with the students. Although they use text and course books as a source of test questions, this usage is curtailed or limited extensively.

Generally, questions given to the learners can come from the teacher himself, textbook, past papers or from colleagues. A sample of questions from these sources can as well aid the teacher to assess the learners more effectively. Consequently, the findings support what is expected of teachers as pertains to the sources of assessment; although there is the need for these teachers to balance these sources to get varied ideas and concepts.

5:2:11: Frequency of Assessment

Majority of the teachers assessed their learners at least once in two weeks, monthly, once a term and twice a term. According to Macintosh
(1984), assessment can be introduced at different stages of a course of study, for example continuous assessment, periodic assessment, and terminal assessment. From the foregoing, the results obtained tally with what is recommended.

5:2:12: The Levels of Questions and Table of Specification
Most of the questions tested knowledge, comprehension and application. Relatively few questions were based on evaluation, analysis and synthesis.

According to Bloom (1956) there are six cognitive domains of learning namely knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. These six domains are the expected behaviour or responses from the learners when answering questions.

The results show that knowledge, comprehension and application related questions are popular to teachers. Although analysis, synthesis and evaluation based questions are used, they are indeed minimal. Possibly a good explanation for this phenomenon could be that the teachers are using the questions that are set by Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) as a guideline which usually examines knowledge, comprehension and application related questions and seldomly analysis, synthesis and evaluation questions.
The findings tally with the recommendations. Only that there is concentration in three domains (knowledge, comprehension and application) while the three other domains are not effectively utilized.

Majority of the teachers prepared table of specification before setting a test. According to Gronlund (1968), table of specification is usually prepared when the learning outcomes have been defined and the course content outlined. The findings therefore concur with these sentiments.

5.3 Conclusions From the Study

Arising from the research questions, objectives and findings of the study, it may be concluded that in Kakamega District history teachers have the following characteristics with respect to assessment.

They are academically and professionally qualified. The majority of teachers were found to be holders of B.Ed. (Bachelor of Education) and Diploma in Education. Others are approved graduates and SI. These credentials show that the teachers of history in Kakamega District are highly qualified to teach and assess effectively at secondary school level.
The teachers were also found experienced to teach history. This is mainly because most of them had taught history for more than four years.

It was also noted that teachers of history use variety of assessment techniques when assessing students. The two commonly used techniques were found to be written and oral. The teachers did not make use of techniques such as observation, interview and questionnaires etc in assessing their students. This is possibly because they are time consuming and at the same time involving. For instance, questionnaires and interview need somebody who has skills and knowledge on how to construct questions and the general technique or talent in interviewing students. This may be a setback to most teachers.

It was found that the teachers of history appreciate the usefulness of assessment in schools. They basically know the purpose of assessing their students particularly to determine the learner's readiness for instruction and to check the progress of the learners. This is necessary for the teachers in the sense that it serves as an essential element in their work.

The teachers prepare table of specification before setting a test. This is done when the learning outcomes have been defined and the course
content outlined. It also serves as a guide to the teacher in areas where to set from.

The teachers' tests and examinations are set according to the format or model of Kenya National Examinations council. The questions set are basically essay and short or structured. Multiple and filling in blanks type of questions are not prepared or set at all.

There is need for the teachers of history to be inserviced. It was found that most teachers of history have never attended any inservice training. This is possibly due to the laxity on the side of organizers for such courses. These courses are very relevant in the learning and teaching process in the sense that they expose the teachers to assessment techniques that are commonly adopted by the Kenya National Examinations council (KNEC).

The teachers of history found class size as a factor that affects them in choosing assessment techniques. Other factors that were identified but on a relatively low scale were teaching load, difficulty in marking, limited time and wide content. It was noted that class size affected them most because they are not adequately able to attend to students at individual level.
They test students mainly in the area of knowledge, application and comprehension. The findings showed that the teachers assessed the students in the three domains of knowledge, comprehension and application. Possibly this is due to the fact that the National Examinations Council (KNEC) has tended to overset questions on these three domains and rarely on analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

The teachers of history teach other related subjects like Christian Religious Education, Social Education and Ethics, Geography, Economics, Business Education, English etc. Furthermore, it was noted that majority of the teachers who teach history also teach C.R.E. and S.E.E.. This is possibly because history at college and university level is usually grouped with C.R.E. and many students opted for this combination, especially in the old system. In the same vein, S.E.E. which is a new subject in 8:4:4 system of education is basically taught by humanities teachers.

It was established that teachers prefer internal assessment to external examination because internal assessment gives an opportunity to know which area to test, gives a proper picture of whether students have mastered what they were taught, assess every level or topic covered so
5.4 Recommendations

The researcher came up with the following recommendations from the data analysis, interpretation and subsequent findings and conclusions. These recommendations will be basically useful in improving assessment of students' performance in secondary schools in Kakamega and Kenya in general.

a) This study found that teachers of history are not exposed to inservice courses which are key in reviewing assessment techniques. This lack of exposure is a setback to the teachers in the sense that they are not adequately informed on the latest techniques of assessment. The researcher recommends that inservice courses should frequently be organised by the inspectorate for the teachers of history to enable them to share variety of ideas on the best methods of assessment.

b) It was found from the study that the teachers of history underutilize observation, interview, questionnaire, and project techniques of assessment which are very pertinent in measuring the learning outcomes expected in the students. The researcher recommends that the teacher of history should strive to vary the techniques of
assessment depending on his instructional objectives. He should not over-rely on oral and written techniques of assessment in the sense that the remaining techniques that are not used can even measure more efficiently the expected outcomes in the students.

c) The study found that the teachers of history prefer internal assessment to external assessment because the former assess every level or topic covered so as to determine the level of difficulty while the latter is too expensive and time wasting. The researcher recommends that both internal and external assessments should effectively be used in secondary schools because they prepare the students for summative assessment in the National Examination (KCSE).

d) It was found from the study that assessments given to the students by teachers of history are usually prepared by teachers themselves. In other words, teachers rarely consult other sources when they are preparing their tests. The researcher therefore recommends that teachers of history should assess the students with questions from various sources particularly past papers, text or course books and group of teachers. These diverse sets of sources will provide an opportunity for the teacher to have questions that vary.

e) Teachers of history are adversely affected by class size in choosing assessment techniques. This is because they are not able to effectively deal with the students at individual level. The researcher
recommends that teachers should systematically put the students in small and manageable groups and subsequently give each group a project on the work covered. Each group leader will be expected to present the findings to the class orally. Alternatively, the teacher may go around the class assisting those students with difficulties at individual level.

f) Teachers of history tended to assess the students in knowledge, comprehension and application domains. The other three levels of cognitive domains of analysis, synthesis and evaluation were not adequately utilised by the teachers. The researcher recommends that all the six domains of learning should be utilized by the teachers of history while assessing the students. The Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) should be discouraged from setting questions predominantly from knowledge, comprehension and application domains, because the students only recall the specifics, methods and processes. This is basically the lowest level of understanding. The learners should be made to put elements and parts together to make a whole, besides making qualitative and quantitative judgements from what they have been taught. This can only be achieved if the students are tested in analysis, synthesis and evaluation domains.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

a) The study was basically limited in scope in the sense that it was confined to a sample of secondary schools in Kakamega District. Further and related studies are recommended in other districts and provinces with a view of giving results that can be compared and possibly generalised to all the secondary schools in Kenya.

b) An attempt should be made in carrying out a study in other districts and provinces to compare the frequency of inservicing teachers of history. The outcome will consequently give a generalised view about inservice of teachers of history in Kenya.

c) An investigation should be instituted in other provinces to find out the probable reasons as to why teachers in secondary schools tend to prefer internal assessment to external assessment. The results will henceforth aid in giving a comprehensive comparison and generalisation about the two types of assessment.
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APPENDIX I

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

The title of this study is the use of school based techniques in assessing secondary school students' achievement in History, a case study of Kakamega District, Kenya.

You can greatly contribute towards the attainment of this goal by being honest and giving individual answers.

The information so obtained shall be exclusively confidential. You do not have to write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

Please answer all the questions to the best of your knowledge and ability by ticking (✓) the appropriate answer and explaining where necessary.

Thank you in advance.

JOHN OSUNDWA
APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL HISTORY TEACHERS

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of school: --------------------- Type of school: ---------------------

   (i) Boys [ ]    (ii) Girls [ ] (iii) Mixed [ ]

   (Tick one)

2. Sex
   (i) Male [ ]    (ii) Female [ ]

3. What is your highest academic attainment?
   a) KACE/KCSE KCE/KJSE [ ]
   b) Graduate with:
      I. B.Ed. [ ]
      II. BA [ ]
      III. BA & PGDE [ ]
      IV. M.Ed. [ ]
      V. M.A. [ ]
      VI. PGDE [ ]
      VII. Dip, Ed. [ ]
4. What is your highest professional qualifications?

i. SI [ ]
ii. Approved Graduate [ ]
iii. Diploma Trained [ ]
iv. Graduate Trained [ ]
v. Others (specify) [ ]

5. If untrained, how long have you taught as untrained teacher? -----

6. If trained how long have you taught as trained teacher? -----------

7. For how long have you been teaching History? ----------------------

8. What forms do you teach History?

(i) Form I [ ]
(ii) Form II [ ]
(iii) Form III [ ]
(iv) Form IV [ ]

9. Which subjects apart from history do you teach?

(i) ____________________________

(ii) ____________________________

(iii) ____________________________

SECTION B: TRAINING

10. Which college or university did you attend for your training? ------
11 For how long did you train as a history teacher? -----------------------------

12 Have you ever attended any inservice course in history since you
       became a teacher? (Tick one)

   (i) Yes [ ]
   (ii) No [ ]

13 If Yes, when did you attend last? ------------------------------------------

14 How frequently are these inservice courses offered? ----------------------

SECTION C: CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES

The purpose of this section is to receive your views on some of the
procedures or techniques you use in assessing students in History.
Please read each statement carefully and complete every part of the
questionnaire as instructed.

15. Which of the following factors greatly affect the choice of assessment
techniques that you use in history?

   (a) Teaching load [ ]
   (b) Class size [ ]
   (c) Difficult in marking [ ]
   (d) Less time [ ]
   (e) Other (specify) ------------------------------

16. Rate the following assessment techniques as you usually use them in
    assessment of students in history.
17. Do you usually use assessment for the following purposes (Tick very frequent, frequent, never where appropriate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Assessment</th>
<th>Very Frequent</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Less Regular</th>
<th>Not Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) To determine the learners readiness for instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) To check the progress of the learner on an educational programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) To reassure the achievement of the learner at the end of a programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 The following are assessment techniques (Tick essential, important and unnecessary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques of Assessment</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Unnecessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Regular examination at least once per term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Examination at the end of every year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Answering questions verbally or orally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Continuous assessment test based on objective tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 How frequently do you use the following types of questions in your written tests. (Tick frequently, Not frequent, Not used at all).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Not Frequently</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Filling in blanks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Essays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Any other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 I personally prefer:
   a) External examination

   b) Internal examination or school based tests

Give reasons

21 I usually give test set:
   a) In test and course books

   b) By myself

   c) By a group of teachers

   d) From past papers

22 I give test to my students
   a) Weekly

   b) Half yearly

   c) Once in two weeks

   d) Once a term

   e) Other (specify)

23 I give examinations
24 I usually test my history students in the area of (Tick very frequently, frequently, rarely, never).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Knowledge</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Rarely Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 I prepare table of specification:

- a) Before setting a test
- b) During setting a test
- c) Not at all.
APPENDIX II

CHECKLIST FOR ANALYSING HISTORY TESTS

This instrument consists of fundamental aspects that are helpful in the analysis of history test in general. This list is used to cross check against what is available in each test paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Analysis</th>
<th>Tally Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Types of Tests</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Weekly tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Monthly tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Mid year exams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) End of year exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Method of Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Prefect work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Level of Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Types of Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Filling in blanks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Multiple choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Essays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Any other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

SAMPLE SCHOOLS

SAMPLE OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KAKAMEGA DISTRICT
USED IN THE STUDY

BOYS' SCHOOLS (10)

1. Kakamega High
2. Malava High
3. Samitsi Secondary
4. Musingu High
5. Ingotse High
6. Mukumu Boys
7. Lubinu Secondary
8. Butere High
9. Mwihila Secondary
10. Mumias St. Peters
GIRLS' SCHOOLS (10)

1. Mukumu Girls
2. Lirhanda Girls
3. Shikoti Secondary
4. Lirhembe Girls
5. Musoli Girls
6. Eregi Girls
7. Namirama Girls
8. Malava Girls
9. Bishop Sulumeti Girls
10. Mumias Girls

MIXED SECONDARY SCHOOLS (20)

1. Bushiangala Secondary
2. Makhokho Secondary
3. Shieywe Secondary
4. Matonde Secondary
5. Eshisiru Mixed
6. Ebuchinga Mixed
7. Bukhaywa Secondary
8. Tande Secondary
9. Ikonyero Secondary
10. Matioli Secondary
11. Shikoti Mixed
12. Shivagala Secondary
13. Mumias Muslim Secondary
14. Eluche Mixed
15. Musanda Secondary
16. Buchifi Mixed
17. Sikalame Mixed
18. Butere Mixed
19. Matawa Mixed
20. Kholera Secondary