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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of the secondary school teachers about the teachers' role in the development of the curriculum in Kenya. Specifically, the study aimed at investigating the following objectives:

1. To find out the views of the secondary school teachers on the way the curriculum is developed in Kenya.

2. To determine the extent to which secondary school teachers are involved in curriculum development in Kenya.

3. To identify the possibilities of increasing the degree of participation of the secondary school teachers in the development of the school curriculum.

4. To find out the problems secondary school teachers encounter when implementing the developed curriculum.

5. To find out the views of the secondary teachers on the roles they should play in the development of the secondary school curriculum.

The main findings of the study included the following:

♦ Teachers are dissatisfied with the present way of curriculum development which neglects them.

♦ The majority of the teachers in Kisii District have never participated in the development of the curriculum.
Most teachers are willing to participate in all stages of curriculum development.

Teachers stated that they encounter some problems when implementing the developed curriculum.

There are several roles that teachers should play in the development of the curriculum.

Finally, on the basis of the findings, several recommendations and suggestions for further research were made.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the problem

Education is important in peoples' lives because to a large extent, it brings positive changes. Thus, it has been given a global recognition especially after 1948 United Nations' Declaration that everyone has a right to education (United Nations, 1978). However, according to Burstein (1995), education is a complex, multilevel, highly contextualised system whose oversimplification is likely to misinform policy makers, practitioners and researchers alike. Accordingly, Hawes (1979) and Bishop (1985) have emphasized the need for societies to plan their education through the school curriculum.

Taba (1962) states that developing a school curriculum is a very complex undertaking which involves making many decisions such as:

(i) the identification of the general aims which schools are to pursue,

(ii) the determination of more specific objectives of instruction,

(iii) the selection of the major subject areas of the curriculum,
(iv) the identification of the specific content to be covered,
(v) the identification of the suitable learning experiences,
(vi) the selection of the evaluation criteria and the determination of the overall pattern of the curriculum.

The preparation and production of the curriculum should be seen as a team effort between many people where decisions are made competently and consistently with both the theoretical thinking of the curriculum developers and the practical experience of the teachers in the field contributing productively (Taba, 1962 and Oluoch, 1982).

Hoyle (1969), Skilbeck (1982) and Shaeffer (1992) have emphasized the need for including teachers in the curriculum development teams. This is due to the fact that the teachers have first hand knowledge of the environment, the pupils and how they operate. The trained teachers also form the largest group of professionals who use the developed curriculum (Oluoch, 1982). It is on similar grounds that Havelock (1971) advanced the view that the quality of an education system be dependent on its teachers who should initiate, develop and direct the pupils learning.
Lee and Zeldin (1982) and Hoyle (1969) have noted that generally, the teachers' responsibilities are being widened; in addition to classroom expertise, they are also being required to be well versed in policy-making, organization and management of the curriculum. Thus, it is crucial that relevant training programmes be instituted within the regular teacher preparation curricula and within the in-service teacher training programmes to enable the teachers to cope with the increased demands that are being put on them. Though, Ayot and Patel (1987) have observed that every teacher is believed to be a curriculum developer and is prepared accordingly, it has not been clearly established whether the preparation they get during their training can enable them to take up the above mentioned demands effectively.

Skilbeck (1982) has observed that the best place for designing the curriculum is where the learner and teacher meet. As such, the teachers should have the primary responsibility for determining curriculum content, learning resources needed, the teaching, learning and evaluation procedures. The teachers should not then be separated from developing the country's curriculum as observed by Hawes (1979:5) that;

"It may be convenient and certainly usual to keep separate the administration and professional duties of those who plan and execute educational policies but it is hardly profitable to the process of curriculum development."
Furthermore, since the teachers have the enormous responsibility of implementing the curriculum, they need to be used far more widely in the development of the curriculum than is the case at present (Hawes, 1976 and Duke, 1990).

Since independence, the Government of Kenya has been committed to reviewing its curriculum to improve its quality in meeting the aspirations and the changing needs of the country (Mugiri, 1979). This is also evident from the recommendations made by the various educational commissions that have been set in Kenya (Ominde, 1964; Bessey, 1972; Gachathi, 1976; Mackay, 1981 and Kamunge, 1988).

In spite of these efforts, the intended educational objectives seem not to have been achieved as recently observed by the Director of Education Mr. Kyungu that more changes on the curriculum are likely to be effected (Daily Nation. April, 1997).

Eshiwani (1993) has further noted that the objectives of any educational system can be achieved mainly through what is taught and how it is taught. These are very pertinent curriculum questions that require the teachers themselves to answer rather than the teachers having the questions answered for them by detailed syllabi, study guides, examination boards, inspectors and other ways employed by the central body that develop the curriculum (Makatiani, 1989; Bernard, 1990 and Shaeffer, 1992).
A curriculum that is developed is likely to be relevant to the society and learners' needs and by extension meet the educational objectives of a country if committed and trained teachers are given the opportunity to participate fully in its development (Taba, 1962; Hawes, 1976; Skilbeck, 1982; Makatiani, 1989 and Shaeffer, 1992). This is largely because being the people directly involved with the implementation of the curriculum, they can bring up issues encountered at implementation to be reflected in the developed curriculum. Therefore, the curriculum developer should respect what the teacher knows and feels about the actual school setting by giving him/her a chance to participate in the development of the curriculum (Pillet, 1971).

On teacher perception of curriculum changes and innovation, Herron (1970) points out that teacher perception of the new course materials, their structure, goals and basic philosophy is a problem that lies at the root of resistance to curriculum change. While Okech and Asiachi (1992) have noted that any curriculum designed becomes real when it is adapted to the classroom. Therefore, the teachers need to interpret the curriculum correctly to the learners for it to be successful.

Unfortunately, the actual curriculum in schools is sometimes distinct from the official curriculum which is developed centrally as asserted by Bishop (1985: 185) that;
there is often a mismatch between the official curriculum developed by a national curriculum development centre and the actual curriculum in the school situation. Discrepancies occur between the intent of the curriculum projects and what actually happens in the classroom, between theory and practice, desire and actual implementation and between plan and execution.

This situation arises to a large extent when the teachers who are the direct implementers of the curriculum may not have been adequately involved in its development as institutes of curriculum development often overlook the role of the teacher and develop the curriculum with little or no involvement of the teachers (Herron, 1970).

Whiteley (1971) describes as inadequate the model of curriculum development where curriculum specialists develop curriculum programs while teachers are largely seen as program implementers who are only represented in curriculum planning committees.

Herron (1970) further asserts that in centralised systems of curriculum development, the typical curriculum project cycle runs from development and testing by a few select teachers, to redevelopment and retesting on the basis of feedback obtained in the first phase, to widespread dissemination of the materials to teachers who have had little or nothing to do with their development. In some instances, other than providing feedback, the initial testing teachers themselves have little to do with the development of the actual materials. As a result, classroom
teachers find themselves outside the focal point of curriculum decision making.

The functional consultation method has its drawbacks and limitations.

In Kenya, curriculum development is done centrally by the K.I.E (Otunga, 1986). Though it is believed that when developing the curriculum the K.I.E consults with other groups such as teachers, educational administrators, inspectors of schools, representatives of the University, religious organisations and teacher trainers, a number of criticisms have been directed towards its operations. Shiundu and Omulando (1992) for instance have observed that:

(i) the school inspectors and the teachers find it very difficult to interpret a curriculum which they simply receive from K.I.E without having participated in its planning.

(ii) The materials developed are not representative nor do they reflect the needs of all the children and the schools in the country.

(iii) curriculum development panel membership at K.I.E is restricted to about fifteen persons and therefore difficult to represent all districts in Kenya.

(iv) Sometimes K.I.E has failed to select appropriate people to work in the subject and course panels as curriculum developers.
Okech and Asiachi (1992) have further observed that most of the curriculum designers at K.I.E have got limited knowledge of the true educational conditions in the different school situations and yet they decide and develop the curriculum used in schools. This approach may have its advantages and disadvantages as summarised by Lawton (1973) that curriculum development might appear easier when centrally developed but in practice the key factor should be the attitudes of the teachers who should make decisions about what to teach and how to teach it. This explains why teachers should not be ignored when the curriculum is being developed.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The main problem which the study investigated was the perceptions held by secondary school teachers of Kisii district about the role of the teachers in curriculum development in Kenya.

As observed by Makatiani (1989), the role of the teacher in curriculum development in Kenya has received varying degrees of attention, sometimes giving considerable attention to their positive involvement in the planning, investigation and implementation of new developments in education, sometimes treating them merely as informants and sometimes as recipients of new directives about what should be taught and how it should be taught.
Ideally, most teachers should be consulted and should participate fully in the development of the curriculum for them to implement it without much difficulty, but a problem arises when educational planners and curriculum development experts develop a curriculum with little or no teacher participation.

In Kenya, the K.I.E is the main body that develops the curriculum through the course and subject panels where teachers and other stake holders are represented. However, it is not clear whether the teachers in the field are aware of how those teachers who participate in the course and subject panels are selected and whether they adequately represent them in the curriculum development teams. Thus this study sought to find out the views of the teachers on their involvement in curriculum development and determine the roles they should play in developing the curriculum in Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the views of the secondary school teachers about their role in curriculum development in Kenya. It sought to find out the views of the teachers on the way the curriculum is developed for secondary schools and establish whether the teachers are adequately involved therein. The study further aimed at establishing the teachers’ potential role in curriculum development and determine
the various stages and roles they should play in the development of the curriculum they used secondary schools in Kenya.

1.4 Basic research questions

The basic research questions which the study attempted to answer were:

(i) What are the views of secondary school teachers on the way the secondary school curriculum is developed in Kenya?

(ii) To what extent are secondary school teachers involved in curriculum development in Kenya?

(iii) What are the problems that secondary school teachers encounter when implementing the developed curriculum?

(iv) How do the secondary school teachers perceive the possibility of increasing the degree of teacher participation in the development of the secondary school curriculum?

(v) What are the views of the secondary school teachers on the roles they should play in the development of the curriculum in Kenya?
1.5 Objectives of the study

The specific objectives of this study were:

(i) To find out views held by secondary school teachers on how the curriculum is developed for secondary schools.
(ii) To determine the extent to which secondary school teachers are involved in curriculum development in Kenya.
(iii) To find out whether secondary school teachers encounter any problems when implementing the developed curriculum.
(iv) To identify the possibilities of increasing the degree of participation of the secondary school teachers in the development of the secondary school curriculum.
(v) To find out the suggestions of the secondary school teachers on the roles they can play in the development of the secondary school curriculum.

1.6 Theoretical framework

This study was based on the main idea behind the curriculum development and diffusion models which emphasize that for any curriculum development model to become practical the teacher has to be at the centre of the model irrespective of his or her limitations (Lawton, 1973: 20)
Many educationists have advanced views in favour of the above theory. Havelock (1971) for instance, observes that teachers should not be made mere receivers of materials produced by curriculum experts but they should be actively involved alongside educational administrators and policy makers in the development of the curriculum.

Coombs (1968:16) seems to support this when he asserts that:

we firmly believe that the world crisis in education can be overcome if the people concerned candidly and systematically diagnose their educational problems and plan their educational future in the light of what they uncover in their self diagnosis

Bennars, et.al (1994) warns that no country can move forward without the full co-operation of the teachers since their skills and attitudes play a leading role in the implementation of the curriculum. Ondiek (1986) describes the teachers as the key factor in educational reform be it short-term changes or long-term re-orientation of the school curriculum.

It is on this basis that this study was guided by the above theory in maintaining that secondary school teachers being the direct implementers of the curriculum should be made part of the formulation team. Similarly, given that secondary school teachers are knowledgeable, having undergone curriculum development courses in their training and since they understand the learning, school and social situation better than curriculum developers who
are at the K.I.E, they should be genuinely involved in curriculum development teams.

1.7 Significance of the study
The findings of the study are likely to be significant in the following ways:

(i) provide the Ministry of Education with guidelines for involving teachers in formulating educational programmes. This is likely to lead to the formulation of more relevant, cost effective and self sustaining education programmes.

(ii) equip the K.I.E with researched data on teachers' potential role in curriculum development since at present they seem to overlook them. This may pave way to their genuine inclusion in the curriculum development teams.

(iii) sensitize the secondary school teachers that their role is not only to implement what has been developed as it may be the case at present, but that they should be actively involved in other stages of curriculum development. This is likely to make them dedicated to their teaching as they are likely to feel part and parcel of the system.
(iv) prompt the teacher trainers to understand that any curriculum is only as good as its teachers since they can enrich it by their creativity and imagination. This might make their training to emphasize on all aspects of teacher education to enable the teachers to graduate not only as classroom teachers but also as curriculum developers.

(v) ensure that the learners and the community being the consumers of the curriculum are given the relevant materials that will meet their needs and aspirations as the teachers who are the implementers and close to them would have been made part of the curriculum formulation team.

(vi) contribute to the existing literature on curriculum development especially with regard to the teachers participation therein.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

Among the limitations of the study was the fact that it was only confined to trained secondary school teachers. This left out the untrained teachers who also form part of the teaching force. This was mainly because the untrained teachers may lack professional knowledge and skill necessary for curriculum development.
Second, the study only focused on the teachers and left out other parties who should be involved in the development of the curriculum such as school inspectors, church representatives and other interested groups. This was mainly because the teachers are the direct implementers of the developed curriculum and are therefore in a better position to give feedback on the developed curriculum than any other group.

Finally, the study was only carried out among the Kisii District secondary school teachers. It left out teachers from other areas mainly because of time limitation and the financial constraints.

Nevertheless, the findings of this study are likely to reflect views of other teachers of similar conditions from other areas of Kenya since all of them are teachers by profession.

1.9 Definition of terms

These terms were given the following operational definitions by the researcher:

(i) Curriculum development: This is the preparation of the curriculum plan, programme or document to be implemented in schools. It involves selection and organization of content and learning experiences, development of curriculum packages, guides and basic
resources, identification of the evaluation criteria, trial out of the materials in sample schools and review of the tried out materials ready for implementation.

(ii) School curriculum: This refers to all that is planned to enable the learners acquire and develop the desired knowledge, skills and attitudes.

(iii) Secondary school teachers: These are the professionals who are charged with the responsibility of promoting the learning and welfare of secondary school students by interpreting the curriculum and national goals of education in a language to be understood by learners.

(iv) Secondary schools: These are post primary school institutions that offer education to primary school graduates with the intention of joining university, or middle level colleges or the labour market after its completion.

(v) Perceptions: These are views, opinions, attitudes, interests and feelings about a particular situation.

(vi) Role: Part to be played or task to be undertaken when doing something.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this Chapter, the available literature is reviewed under three sub headings, namely

1. The history of curriculum development in Kenya.
2. Role of Kenya Institute of Education in curriculum development.

2.1 The history of curriculum development in Kenya.

Before the coming of the Europeans and the introduction of formal education in Kenya, African children received some education that was organized and implemented by elders and parents (Sifuna, 1990). The curriculum of this traditional education was wide, varied and rooted in the social cultural and physical environment of the learners (Otiende et al., 1992). Therefore, those who played the role of teachers were also involved in deciding what constituted the curriculum to be taught.

Bogonko (1992) points out that during the colonial period (1884-1963), the development of the school curriculum for the whole country was entirely in the hands of the missionaries with little government help. The curriculum was dominated by
foreign content together with what the missionaries wanted the Africans to learn since the Africans had no say on what was to be taught.

Despite recommendations made by the Phelps-Stokes commission that the Africans be involved in making decisions affecting the education they were receiving and that the education offered be related to the needs of the people and the society, little was done to this effect as decisions affecting the curriculum continued to be centralised under the influence of the missionaries (Annual Report, 1924; Binns Report, 1952). Thus there was no specialised body to co-ordinate educational development in the country.

The first serious attempts to look into the curriculum offered in the country were made in 1957 when the Ministry of Education set up a special English centre to advice and develop materials on a new method for upgrading the standard of English particularly in the Asian primary schools (Mugiri, 1982). Other related centres in Science and Mathematics were established in 1961 and 1965 respectively to steer developments in those subjects. These centres were later merged to form the Curriculum Development and Research Centre in 1966 (Mugiri, 1982).

Similarly, attempts were made to coordinate primary teacher education in the country. The two bodies (ETTO and WTTO) which had been established in 1957 to look into the training needs
Since its formation in 1964, K.I.E. performs an important role as far as educational development in Kenya is concerned. Its functions have been expanded to the following as shown by the K.I.E development plan of 1980.
1. Conducting research and preparing syllabuses for institutions of learning below the university.
2. Preparing curricula support materials like textbooks and mass media programmes.
3. Conducting in-service courses and workshops for teachers mainly involved in the experimentation and trials of new syllabuses and teaching materials.
4. Conducting seminars on the new syllabuses and teaching materials for inspectors of schools and college tutors.
5. Conducting orientation programmes for administrative officers who should be made aware of developments that are taking place in the school and college curriculum.
6. Organising and conducting curriculum evaluation.

It is clear from the foregoing that the K.I.E is the main body that develops curriculum for institutions of learning below the university. In its operations, the K.I.E is expected to work together with various groups of people such as teachers, educational administrators, inspectors of schools, teacher trainers, the university representatives, professional associations, religious organisations, the private sector and voluntary organisations. (K.I.E staff paper, not dated).

Curriculum development should then be a participatory process which ensures that the developed curriculum meets the national objectives of education and the needs of the learners and the society (Gachathi report, 1976 and Kamunge report, 1988).
Despite this responsibility bestowed on K.I.E several writers show that it has not been able to live up to its expectations as far as curriculum development is concerned. The Bessey Education Commission (1972) that was established to look into the structure of the curriculum was not satisfied with the arrangement and the operations of K.I.E, it observed that:

The interests of curriculum development are served in the long term not by a creation of a profession of "curriculum developers" but by creating opportunities for all levels of practising teachers and research workers to initiate and develop ideas" (Bessey Report, 1972:111).

The Bessey report (1972) further reported the deteriorating staffing situation at the K.I.E and partly attributed this to the heavy reliance on the short term contract expatriates, a fact confirmed by Gachathi Report (1976) and Oluoch (1982).

When citing the problems encountered in curriculum development, Otunga (1986) observes that the number of people involved in the process of curriculum development is limited and there is a definite lack of trained curriculum development staff. It seems, this trend still continues as noted by Okech and Asiachi (1992:132) that:

formal arrangements for decision making on the curriculum have not materially changed and the people who did not understand the concept of curriculum change have continued to initiate and sanction curriculum ideas.
On the inclusion of teachers in curriculum development teams at K.I.E., evidence available shows that K.I.E relies on the course and subject panels as forums where teachers are represented when a curriculum is being developed for schools (Oluoch, 1982, Okech and Asiachi, 1992). This has received many criticisms from different educationists. Shiundu and Omulando (1992) for instance have noted that curriculum development panel membership is restricted to about 15 persons and therefore does not represent all the districts of the country, an issue also shared by Ontunga (1986).

Similarly Oluoch (1982) doubts the selection criteria of the few teachers who participate in the subject panels on the grounds that panel members can be drawn from certain areas to the exclusion of others, while it is possible that the panel members' decision can be ignored as observed by Oluoch (1982:76) that:

> it is very tempting for people in authority to by-pass the panels and make decisions without making reference to them.

This situation has happened in Kenya where some curriculum changes have taken place either through ministerial orders or a snap political decision (Eshiwani, 1993). This is likely to generate a lot of implications on the curriculum that is eventually developed for the gap between the intent of the curriculum projects and what actually happens in the classroom may be widened further.
This study therefore sought to find out the extent to which teachers who are the implementers of the curriculum are involved in the development of the curriculum in Kenya and clearly show the roles they can play therein.

2.3 The role of secondary school teachers in curriculum development.

Many curriculum writers have advanced views in favour of teacher involvement in curriculum development teams. However, the writers have not been categorical on the extent to which the teachers should be involved and the actual roles they should undertake. Tanner and Tanner (1975) for instance, have asserted that teacher professionalism is inextricably intertwined with curriculum development and attempts to shut the teacher from making curriculum development decisions are unrealistic and unproductive. This is however, a very general statement that apart from showing that professional teachers should make curriculum decisions, it has done little to determine what roles the teachers should undertake.

According to Sachsenmeier (1978) the heart of the problems of curriculum development lies within the school itself which should be seen as a fertile ground for curriculum development. Taba (1962) has similar views as Sachsenmeier though she goes a little further by suggesting that curriculum change begins with experimentation at the classroom level rather than with an imposed design. Though the two writers have identified the
ideal place where the curriculum development process should begin, they are very vague in identifying the role of the teacher in the real experimentation and by extension in curriculum development as a whole.

Verdun (1967) and Nicholls and Nicholls (1978) have noted that all teachers have something to offer to curriculum development and that they should accept the responsibility of participating in curriculum development. Apart from justifying the teachers’ participation in curriculum development and recognizing the capability of teachers to participate, the three writers have not shown how and what particular participation they are talking about. They have equally failed to show what the teacher thinks of the matter.

Some writers have suggested that when recommendations for change and prescribed curricula are handed down from outside experts (other than the teachers) such recommendations are not likely to be completely accepted nor will they be effectively utilised (Verdun, 1967; Herron, 1970; Hawes, 1976; Oluoch, 1982 and Bennars. et al, 1994). These writers were concerned more in establishing the root cause of resistance to educational changes and though they point out that teachers need not be handed recommendations for change which they were not part of formulating, they have not been categorical as pertains to the participation of the teachers.
On the study of the role of teachers advisory centres in the education of the teachers and parents, Maranga (1984) found out that most teachers were unwilling to participate in curriculum development activities of T.A.Cs mainly because their suggestions and recommendations were rarely accepted. Maranga's study was however, only confined to the teachers' participation at the teachers' advisory centres. His study did not seek to find out what the teachers' views were about their role in curriculum development as a whole.

Saylor and Alexander (1966), when discussing the important curriculum development determinants, identified the state, the school system, the teaching group and the individual teacher as very important considerations. Though the two writers identified positive factors that should be considered when developing the curriculum, they discussed them in a very general way and did not attempt to show the role of each in the development of the curriculum.

Studies carried out by Johansen (1965) and Duet (1972) came to conclusions that curriculum implementation is facilitated if teachers who use the curriculum participate in its planning. The two writers were however more concerned with how teacher involvement in curriculum planning can make implementation successful. They failed to explain how the teachers perceive their role in curriculum development as a whole.
In a study of teachers' attitudes towards curriculum use and planning, Langenbach (1969) and Osman (1970) found a significant difference between those who had participated in curriculum planning and those who had not. The two writers then concluded that teachers' attitudes if properly utilised in the initial phases of policy making will reduce future resistance to educational changes. These studies were only concerned with explaining how to avoid teacher resistance to curriculum change, they did not show how the teachers perceive the curriculum that is developed for them nor the roles the teachers should play in curriculum development.

In their studies, Heusner (1963) and Nault (1965) arrived at a conclusion similar to that of Langenbach (1969) and Osman (1970) but cautioned against assuming that teachers participation in curriculum planning alone would ensure effective implementation. They advocated that other conditions are necessary to support implementation but failed to identify the other conditions they were referring to.

On the role of the teachers in curriculum development, Tyler (1957) holds the view that a teacher has a leading and significant role to play in deciding what and how to teach while Marie (1974) and Ferede (1981) found out that the teachers' role is more than the simple presentation of lectures. Apart from showing that the teachers need to be involved in curriculum development, these studies failed to identify the actual roles the teachers should play. They did
not further explain how the teachers perceive their roles in curriculum development.

More studies on teachers reveal that they have a wide range of concerns throughout their career which have great implications on curriculum development (Unesco, 1986). However, these studies were far too general and did not indicate what particular concerns of teachers need to be acknowledged when developing the curriculum.

In a study of the classroom situation, Okech (1990) found out that teachers want to maintain individual control of the classroom and a greater role in curriculum decisions that cut across the classrooms. This study was however, only confined to the teacher-pupil relationship in the classroom and did not give any account of the teachers' wider role in curriculum development.

Hawes (1979); Okech (1981); Ngeno (1981); Mlanga (1987) and Eshiwani (1993) have revealed that a wide gap exists between centrally developed curriculum plans and local school situations. Though the studies emphasize the importance of bridging the gap, they are not very clear on how the teacher perceives the situation of being involved in the development of the curriculum and how this can help in bridging the said gap.
2.4 Summary of related Literature

Views expressed by various authors above point to the fact that classroom teachers should be a very important consideration towards the development of the curriculum. Since they are the educators in the field, their feedback on the curriculum should be respected by the curriculum developers at the Institutes of Curriculum development who should give them recognition and a chance to participate in curriculum development.

However, it is unfortunate when institutes of curriculum development develop a curriculum without adequate involvement of the practising teachers in the field. This form of rigidity seems to relegate the teachers' role only to the classroom situation to implement what has been developed as noted by Shiundu and Omulando (1992:222) that:

our experience with students both at undergraduate and graduate and with practising teachers shows that they believe and behave in ways that would lead others to believe that they cannot and do not make important decisions regarding what is taught in their classrooms. They are so bound to the content, methods, resources and time schedule suggested by K.I.E. and inspectorate that they do not make the responsible professional decisions that they as teachers should make.

The fact that centralization of the development of the curriculum in Kenya restricts the teachers' participation therein, cannot be disputed but the view that their role in curriculum development is only in the classroom may be
unrealistic. Thus, this study sought to find out from the teachers how they perceive the situation of teacher involvement in curriculum development in Kenya and then clearly show what the teachers’ role should be in curriculum development in Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The study adopted a survey design as the main purpose was to obtain an accurate assessment of the secondary school teachers’ views about their role in curriculum development in Kenya.

3.3 Location of the study

This study was conducted in Kisii District, Nyanza province in Kenya. It targeted all the trained secondary school teachers from the district.

The rationale for the choice of Kisii was premised on the following factors. First, the researcher is familiar with the district and this made the identification of the schools and travelling easier. Second, Kisii being the researcher’s home district and given that the researcher had limited financial resources, conducting the research in the district would
impose fewer financial constraints than would be the case if the researcher were to meet accommodation costs in a different setting.

3.4 Sampling procedure

There are about 150 public secondary schools in Kisii District. All these schools could not be adequately covered within the time given and the financial resources available. Thus a sample was necessary.

To avoid using schools with similar characteristics such as: Boys boarding, Girls boarding, Mixed boarding and day, Mixed day or only well established schools, the researcher used purposive sampling where a deliberate effort was made to select 30 different schools representing all the above categories of public secondary schools from different areas of the District. This formed approximately 20% of all the public secondary schools from the District (see Appendix C).

There were 682 trained teachers in the selected 30 schools that took part in the study. The researcher targeted 40% of the 682 teachers. The sample of 40% was more favoured than any other sample because the researcher was dealing with the opinions (views) of teachers. It was thought that 40% would give a manageable and relatively higher proportion of teachers since it was not possible to carry out the study among all the 682 teachers due to financial and time limitations. However,
the researcher managed to obtain only 213 teachers which formed 31.2% of the trained teachers. This was mainly because it was not easy to get all the trained teachers of a particular school at once. In addition, there was lack of commitment from some teachers in completing the questionnaires.

The teachers who took part in the study were selected through the use of the basket method of simple random sampling. This was in an effort to give each teacher an equal chance of participating in the study.

The researcher also used headteachers of the thirty secondary schools in an effort to get additional information to the study. The headteachers were thought to be a useful source of information since most of them are more experienced and have used the curriculum more than most teachers. Similarly, the headteachers are the link between the Ministry of Education, K.I.E, TSC or any other interested party in education and the teachers.

The breakdown of the schools and the teachers who took part in the study appears in Appendix C.

3.5 Description of data collection instruments
the researcher managed to obtain only 213 teachers which formed 31.2% of the trained teachers. This was mainly because it was not easy to get all the trained teachers of a particular school at once. In addition, there was lack of commitment from some teachers in completing the questionnaires.

The teachers who took part in the study were selected through the use of the basket method of simple random sampling. This was in an effort to give each teacher an equal chance of participating in the study.

The researcher also used headteachers of the thirty secondary schools in an effort to get additional information to the study. The headteachers were thought to be a useful source of information since most of them are more experienced and have used the curriculum more than most teachers. Similarly, the headteachers are the link between the Ministry of Education, K.I.E, TSC or any other interested party in education and the teachers.

The breakdown of the schools and the teachers who took part in the study appears in Appendix C.

3.5 Description of data collection instruments

Before selecting and developing instruments for data collection, reference was made to various authorities on the
use of different instruments such as Kerlinger (1964), Gay (1976) and Conner et al (1977). The researcher then established that the appropriate instruments for collecting the survey kind of data were questionnaires and interviews. These instruments were developed with the guidance of experts in curriculum development and pretested in two secondary schools. They were then revised and put into their final form before being administered on the respondents by the researcher.

Questionnaires

The researcher required varied opinions and views from many respondents concerning the teacher's role in curriculum development in Kenya. Such information would reliably be obtained through the use of the questionnaire since it has relatively more advantages than other instruments such as the following:

(i) The questionnaire can cover a large number of issues.
(ii) It can deal with a large number of respondents.
(iii) It is anonymous.
(iv) It encourages greater honesty on the part of the respondents on answering questions.

A covering letter which explained the purpose of the study and the necessity of co-operation of the teachers was also
designed to accompany the questionnaire. This aimed at encouraging honesty and high response rate from the respondents.

The revised questionnaire which contained various closed and open ended items was administered to the classroom teachers by the researcher. The items of the questionnaire were designed to obtain information on two broad areas namely:

(a) General information on the sample schools and the teachers.
(b) Teachers’ views on the role of teachers in curriculum development.

A sample of teachers’ questionnaire appears in Appendix A.

The other data collection instrument used was an interview schedule particularly in obtaining additional information on the teachers’ role in curriculum development from the headteachers. It was administered to the headteachers of the 30 schools by the researcher since they were few and they are always thought to be busy hence would not get adequate time to respond to the questionnaires.

The interview schedule was designed to elicit information on the following;
(i) Initiatives and opportunities provided for teachers' participation in curriculum development.

(ii) Issues arising from the teachers' use of the developed curriculum.

(iii) Level of teacher involvement in curriculum development.

(iv) The opinions of the headteachers regarding the way the curriculum is developed for secondary schools.

The interview schedule appears in Appendix (B).

3.6 Data collection procedures

A permit to carry out research was obtained from the Office of the President. Permission to visit the schools was obtained from the Kisii District Education Officer. Before meeting the teachers, the researcher consulted with the headteachers of the respective schools who allowed him to meet the teachers. The researcher then distributed the questionnaires to the teachers and made arrangements with them on the convenient time thereafter when the completed questionnaires were collected.

With the interview schedule, consultations were first made with the respective headteachers and appropriate dates set when the interviews were carried out by the researcher.
3.7 Data analysis

According to Gay (1978), the most commonly used method of reporting descriptive survey research is by developing frequency distributions, calculating percentages and tabulating them appropriately. Similarly, Kerlinger (1964) points out that analysing survey research includes coding, tabulating responses, translating the responses into specific categories recording them appropriately and computing them using appropriate statistical ways.

Since this study was based on the survey design, the researcher adopted the above approaches of data analysis. All the completed questionnaires were assembled and studied by the researcher. They were then organised for analysis and processing. The complete responses were separated into specific categories according to the study objectives, frequencies developed and percentages computed.

The information from the interview schedule was analyzed qualitatively. This involved sorting out the data into various themes according to the objectives raised by the study and discussing the information objectively. Some of the responses from the interviews were directly quoted in the discussion by the researcher.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, an analysis of the data collected is presented. The data was obtained by administering questionnaires to the selected trained secondary school teachers from selected schools in Kisii District. Supplementary information was obtained through interviewing the headteachers of the selected schools.

The analyzed data is presented in five main sections according to the research questions raised in Chapter One. The research questions aimed at seeking information on the following:

1. Views of the secondary school teachers on the way the curriculum is developed for secondary schools in Kenya.
2. The extent to which secondary school teachers are involved in the development of the curriculum in Kenya.
3. The problems that the secondary school teachers encounter when implementing the developed curriculum.
4. The possibilities of increasing the degree of the secondary school teachers' participation in the development of the secondary school curriculum.

5. The secondary school teachers' suggestions on the roles the teachers should play in the development of the curriculum.

The findings of the study are presented quantitatively using frequencies and percentages and qualitatively in narrative and discussion form.

4.2 Background information of the respondents.

In order to understand the type of respondents the researcher was dealing with in the study, their background information was necessary especially in relation to the nature of schools in which the respondents were teaching and their qualifications. The first item in the teachers' questionnaire was therefore designed to elicit information on the type of schools the respondents were teaching in. Table 1 shows the responses obtained:
Table 1: Distribution of teachers according to the type of schools they were teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Boarding</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Boarding</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Boarding</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed boarding and day</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>213</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows a varied distribution of respondents among the five main categories of public secondary schools, though the majority of the respondents (33.3%) came from Boys Boarding category. This was followed by the Mixed Day category with 23.0% of the respondents while a considerable proportion of the respondents (22.5%) came from Girls Boarding category. The lowest proportion of the respondents came from the Mixed Boarding and Mixed Day-Boarding categories which comprised of 12.2% and 9% respectively.

The respondents were also asked to indicate whether they were male or female. Table 2 presents the findings:
Table 2: Classification of the respondents according to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ gender</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the male category of the respondents formed the majority (71.8%) while the female category formed 28.2% of the total respondents.

The qualifications of the teachers was also considered very important in establishing the kind of respondents who participated in the study. This is because as Bishop (1985) observes, a curriculum is only as good as the quality of its teachers hence the researcher sought their qualifications to determine how qualified they are, in relation to the demanding tasks of developing the curriculum. Table 3 presents the findings:

Table 3: Distribution of teachers according to their qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed.</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma (Ed.)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.T.S</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be observed from Table 3 that the Bachelor of Education (B. Ed.) formed the majority of the respondents since it constituted 64.3% of the total respondents. This then points out that the teaching force in secondary schools is mostly composed of B.Ed. graduates. However, there was a significant proportion of those with Diploma in education as shown by the percentage 22.5% of the total respondents who took part in the study. The lowest category of the respondents was 1.9% and this represented especially those with additional qualifications apart from the first degree such as M.Ed., Msc. and M.A.

When the respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had served as secondary school teachers in an attempt to determine their experience with the secondary school curriculum, the following responses were recorded.

Table 4: Distribution of Teachers According to Their Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of service</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4, it can be observed that the majority of the respondents (46.5%) had a teaching experience of between 6-10 years, while a relatively small proportion had taught between 11-15 years and 16 and plus years. A significant proportion of
the respondents (33.8%) had a relatively low experience of between 1-5 years.

As shown by the background information, a great variety of teachers participated in the study and from all nature or categories of public schools. There were those teachers with very long experience and those with relatively little experience. Their qualifications were equally diverse, there were the B. Ed. graduates, Diploma and those with Approved Teacher status. Equally both male and female teachers took part in the study and finally teachers from both well established and upcoming secondary schools participated in this study.

4.3 The Secondary School Teachers Views on The Present Curriculum Developers and how the curriculum is developed for secondary schools in Kenya.

When the respondents were asked to indicate whether they knew who the present curriculum developers are, they gave the responses shown in Table 5.
When the respondents were asked to give their views on the extent to which they agreed with the way of developing the curriculum, where the K.I.E and Ministry of Education plays a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum developers</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education and K.I.E. Educationists (teachers, lecturers, teacher trainers and educational administrators)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed from Table 5 above that the majority of the teachers (81.2%) stated that curriculum development in Kenya is mainly done by the Ministry of Education officials and the Kenya Institute of Education personnel. Table 5 further show that only a small percentage (18.8%) of the respondents indicated that other educationists are involved in the development of the curriculum. Such educationists include university lecturers, teachers, teacher trainers and educational administrators. The implication that emerges from this distribution is that the curriculum is developed at the higher levels usually at the K.I.E with consultations with the Ministry of Education and then forwarded to schools where the teachers who are hardly consulted are to implement.
major role, they gave the following responses as shown by Table 6.

Table 6: Teachers' agreement/disagreement with the way the curriculum is developed for secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement/disagreement with the way the curriculum is developed</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed from Table 6 that the majority of the respondents (65.3%) did not agree with the present way of developing the secondary school curriculum. Only 15% of the respondents agreed. Other respondents (12.7%) disagreed while 0.9% strongly agreed.

The point that seems to emerge from Table 6 is that the way the present curriculum is developed is not acceptable to most practising teachers. Even among the 30 headteachers interviewed, none of them seemed to agree with the way the curriculum is developed. Most of them felt that many teachers are not consulted when a curriculum is being developed as shown by the following remark attributed to one headteacher interviewed about the way the curriculum is developed. He observed that:
it is unsatisfactory and inadequate because it involves a few teachers from selected schools especially urban and national schools assuming the rest of the schools and 'people' from the Ministry of Education and K.I.E are involved, some of whom have never taught in schools.

Since all the respondents were practising teachers who had undergone through teacher education at some level and had wide experience of using the developed curriculum, as Table 3 and 4 have already shown, they were asked to identify weaknesses of the present curriculum developed for secondary schools. Table 7 presents the findings.

Table 7: Teachers' views on the weaknesses of the present curriculum developed for secondary schools in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses of the present curriculum developed for secondary schools</th>
<th>Number of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politically influenced / Not independent</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed without systematically following the necessary stages.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrepresentative of most peoples' views</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly planned (lacks foresight)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total mentions</strong></td>
<td><strong>360</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7, it can be noted that most of the teachers held the view that the curriculum which is developed for secondary schools has got four main weaknesses. The majority of the respondents felt that it is unrepresentative of most people's views and mentioned that weakness 176 times out of a possible 213 mentions. Other weaknesses mentioned by the teachers
From Table 8, it can be observed that, to develop a good and acceptable curriculum several factors should be taken into consideration. Out of the four factors suggested by the
respondents, adequate consideration of all stakeholders' views when developing the curriculum featured prominently and was mentioned 176 times. This formed 82.6% of the possible number of mentions. Other factors mentioned include lack of political influence, logical and systematic development of the curriculum and adequate planning and coordination of the whole process of curriculum development.

It may not be proper therefore, for a system of curriculum development to be only composed of a few so-called curriculum development experts who formulate and develop the curriculum on their own at the curriculum development centre. Since in most cases such curriculum experts may be far from the actual school situations where the curriculum will be practically applied, there is need to find means of enabling them to be in constant contact with the school situations as observed by one of the Headteachers interviewed that:

Centralising all curriculum development issues at K.I.E in Nairobi makes it removed or withdrawn from the actual situations in many schools of the country. Some of their offices and centres should be spread throughout the country.

4.4 The extent to which secondary school teachers are involved in curriculum development in Kenya:

The teachers form an integral part of the education system of any country since they are the vehicles through which the curriculum and by extension the whole education policy is
translated and interpreted to the learners. Many writers have argued in favor of teacher participation in the development of the curriculum as shown by the background information and the literature reviewed.

All teachers should then understand the principles and the rationale behind the formulation, development and working of any curriculum used in schools. Only then can they be able to perform their role in teaching effectively and more so if they feel part and parcel of the formulation, planning and execution team of curriculum development.

In view of the above, the respondents were asked to indicate for the period they have been serving as teachers whether they have ever been involved in the development of the curriculum. Table 9 presents the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual teacher participation in curriculum development</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed from Table 9 that the majority of the respondents (92.5%) indicated that they have never been involved in the development of the curriculum. Only 7.5% of the total respondents indicated that they have been involved in the development of the curriculum. Three point eight
percent of the 7.5% who acknowledged being involved indicated that they have participated in material development especially books, 2.3% indicated that they have been involved in project building while 1.4% indicated that they have been involved in project set up.

The respondents were further asked to describe the general situation of teacher involvement in curriculum development whether they thought the number is adequate or not. Table 10 presents the findings.

Table 10: Distribution of teachers' views on the adequacy of teacher involvement in curriculum development teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are teachers adequately involved</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by Tables 9 and 10, the majority of the respondents (92.5%) and 99.1% respectively felt that practising teachers are not adequately involved in the development of the curriculum. What is emerging from Tables 9 and 10 is that a very small proportion of teachers are involved in curriculum development. This is further confirmed by views expressed by one teacher that;
only a few teachers are involved in curriculum development teams. The majority are not used because the method of selection is dubious only favouring some areas like Nairobi and well developed schools while avoiding less developed and rural schools.

Among the headteachers interviewed, only one acknowledged being involved in the writing of books, the others pointed out that they have never been invited to participate. Furthermore, the headteachers pointed out that even the majority of the teachers from their schools have never participated in curriculum development as one of the headteacher's observation explains that:

After all, educational policies are only spelt out to teachers and their headteachers from above. I don't know of any teacher in the field who has been involved in the curriculum development teams.

It is evident from the foregoing discussion that the number of teachers who participate in curriculum development is very small and therefore unrepresentative of the other practising teachers' views. Nevertheless, a few indicated that they are involved either as individuals or as members of the curriculum development panels. A significant proportion of these write books which have also been highly criticised by the teachers as shown by the following remark attributed to one of the headteachers interviewed that:

Some books provided by the K.I.E are brief, shallow and substandard. It seems the formulators of the curriculum are either not adequately motivated, do not have experience or they simply write poorly to create market for their books.
In fact, a former Deputy clerk of the National Assembly tends to agree to the teachers' views expressed above. He observed that Chapter 8 of Book three K.I.E History and Government contains some errors which represent substantial misconceptions pervading the civics syllabus in both primary and secondary schools (Daily Nation, June 29Th, 1996).

These and related remarks show that when the curriculum is prepared at the top with few individuals and then brought to the teachers to implement, it may have great implications on the education system of the country since the implementers may not know what to do. Even the Director of Education seems to agree to this fact as he recently stated that:

we do not have monopoly of wisdom as wisdom is shared. (Daily Nation, April 19th, 1997).

When the respondents were asked to give their views on whether K.I.E contacts teachers when developing the curriculum or when making any changes affecting the already developed curriculum, they gave the following responses as shown by Table 11.
Table 11: Teachers' views on the existence of communication between the K.I.E and the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K.I.E's contact with teachers</th>
<th>Number of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't seek teachers' opinion</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends ready made syllabuses &amp; other material</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through headteachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through M.O.E/ Inspectors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 11, the majority of the teachers (62.9%) mentioned the fact that they have never been contacted by the K.I.E to participate in curriculum development nor have they been invited or asked to give any feedback on the curriculum they are implementing. Even the headteachers who were interviewed indicated that the K.I.E does not consult teachers when developing the curriculum. One of them explained that;

K.I.E is too remote an institution to teachers, in fact they never make any communication to the teachers who are supposed to implement what they develop.

According to this view, K.I.E does not contact teachers at the field when developing the curriculum. Table 11 further reveals that the only contact that the teachers receive from K.I.E is about ready made materials like recommended text books, teaching and learning guide books and circulars on changes
already made on the existing curriculum. This shows that K.I.E does not contact most teachers before the changes are introduced but after it has made the changes as observed by one teacher that:

the teachers find themselves unable to make a decision on how the curriculum should be developed. In fact teachers only find themselves with the task of implementing what is set, some areas almost uninterpretable or out rightly wanting. Just read the Education sections in the local newspapers and see how teachers express themselves over the issue.

From Table 11, only a small proportion of the teachers (4.6%) mentioned that K.I.E contacts them when developing the curriculum either through their headteachers or the Ministry of Education offices (Inspectorate and D.E.os).

When the respondents were asked to suggest the factors that may have hindered teachers from effective participation in the development of the curriculum, the following responses were obtained.

Table 12: Factors inhibiting effective teacher participation in curriculum development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibiting factors</th>
<th>No. Mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous selection criteria</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopoly by K.I.E</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligence of teachers views</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication and poor co-ordination</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of encouragement and rewards</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching work-load</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 12, it can be noted that there are a number of factors which have worked against the teachers’ effective participation in curriculum development. The majority of the teachers mentioned the ambiguous selection criteria as the main factor which hinders them from effective participation in curriculum development. In fact most teachers do not understand how the few teachers who participate are selected with one teacher observing that:

they are hand-picked presumably on the basis of qualification and experience.

Another factor which was mentioned highly was that K.I.E monopolises and dominates all matters pertaining to curriculum development. One teacher who took part in the study further observed that:

The curriculum developers are officers employed by K.I.E who with time lose touch with what is happening in the field.

On the same subject, another teacher remarked that:

The developers at K.I.E have not shown interest in the others who have never taken part in the development of the curriculum.

Some teachers (43.2%) mentioned that the K.I.E personnel ignores the teachers’ views developing the curriculum while a similar percentage indicated that the K.I.E is inaccessible and does not communicate to the teachers.
Among the interviewed headteachers, one indicated that the K.I.E rarely visits most schools and one of them suggested that the inspectorate which supposedly links the schools with K.I.E is very ineffective in its contact with schools. It only visits schools when there is a problem and sometimes to harass teachers on schemes of work and other teaching apparatus.

Other teachers mentioned poor co-ordination, lack of encouragement and rewards, teaching workload and lack of commitment on the part of teachers as some of the factors that hinder effective teacher participation in curriculum development. Though the teachers who mentioned the last two factors were few, 4.2% and 1.9% respectively.

When the respondents were asked to give their views on the selection criteria used to select the few teachers who participate in curriculum development, the following responses were recorded:

Table 13: Teachers' views on the selection criteria used in selecting teachers who participate in curriculum development;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' views on selection criteria</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not aware</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's experience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well developed schools</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed by K.I.E/ M.o.E</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province representation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.C.S.E best performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Departments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from Table 13 that the majority of the respondents (68.1%) were not aware of the way the few teachers who participate in curriculum development are selected. Even the few respondents who indicated that they had some knowledge of how the teachers who participate are selected, were not unanimous in their responses; 9.4% indicated that it is the experience that is used to select the teachers, 8.5% indicated that those from well developed schools, presumably national schools are selected, 6.6% mentioned that they are picked by the K.I.E and the Ministry of Education while others 4.2%, 2.3% and 0.9% mentioned that they are selected on the basis of provincial representation, K.C.S.E best performance and Heads of Departments respectively.

The different views expressed above on the selection criteria point to the fact that the way teachers who participate in curriculum development are selected is not very well known to the teachers hence, it remains unclear. It is likely that teachers from some schools may be more advantaged in the selection than those in other schools as was noted earlier by the teachers’ views quoted in page forty eight. This is in agreement to the views expressed earlier in the literature review that panel members at the K.I.E can be drawn from certain areas to the exclusion of others.

Consequently, it is possible that teachers from many schools may never have participated in the curriculum development teams as can be noted in the views expressed by one of the
The sampling is not adequate and it should be random i.e. teachers should be picked from various categories of schools rather than from few specific schools especially the well developed schools.

The above view indicates that teachers from not so well to do schools never have never participated in curriculum development. Furthermore, none of the views expressed above as indicated that the teachers from rural and not well developed schools have ever been selected.

Even the 30 headteachers interviewed seemed not to understand how the few teachers who participate in curriculum development are selected. They indicated that the criteria used should be made known to most teachers to enable them have a chance of participating in curriculum development.

As Table 5 indicated, the majority of the teachers who took part in the study felt that the formulation and development of the curriculum is mainly done by the K.I.E personnel and the Ministry of Education representatives. Though other interest parties in education may be consulted, it is to a very little extent. When the respondents were asked about the people they thought should be involved in curriculum development and

reasons why, the following responses were obtained.
Table 14: Teachers' suggestions on curriculum developers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents views on curriculum developers</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and K.I.E</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.I.E/M.o.E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educationists (lecturers, teacher trainers, educational administrators).</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the teachers (49.3%) as shown in Table 14, mentioned that the K.I.E and the teachers should be involved in curriculum development. About 32% of the teachers stated that the teachers should be the curriculum developers while 32.3% pointed out that different educationists such as university lecturers, educational administrators and teacher trainers should be involved. Only 11.3% mentioned that the K.I.E and the Ministry of Education officials be the only curriculum developers.

A keen observation of Table 14, shows that most of the respondents' views point to the teachers as the people who should play a key role in curriculum development. Furthermore, one teacher in justifying why teachers should be curriculum developers pointed out that;

Teachers are the men and women at the field dealing with the students whom the curriculum is developed for, they are well versed with the syllabus and the educational problems like lack of adequate educational facilities. Therefore, they are in a position to work out solutions and come up with practicable and widely acceptable curriculum.
On the issue of who should be the curriculum developers discussed above, the respondents suggested several reasons why they thought different interested groups should be fully involved in curriculum development in Kenya. These reasons are that:

(i) Teachers as implementers of the curriculum encounter many problems hence they are in a better position to suggest possible solutions as a feedback to be used when developing the curriculum.

(ii) Teachers are in constant contact with the learners and hence they know them better; their interests, abilities, needs and aspirations.

(iii) Teachers being part and parcel of the society, they understand its needs as aspirations to be reflected in the curriculum.

(iv) Teachers are educational professionals who represent a wide geographical area. they therefore understand the different environments and the dynamic changes that can affect learning positively.

(v) K.I.E personnel is composed of experienced curriculum experts who can advise and co-ordinate curriculum development activities.
(vi) K.I.E has got the means to conduct extensive research and come up with what is adequate/relevant to be included in the curriculum.

(vii) K.I.E is in a better position to liaise with the Ministry of Education and to come up with the National needs and educational goals of the country.

(viii) The Ministry of Education can advice on the government policy on education.

(ix) Several educationists can give advice on the changes in society, the different areas of knowledge and other changes to be effected in education.

All these explanations point out that curriculum development be a participatory process between many groups of people mentioned above with the K.I.E and the teacher playing a major role.

4.5 Problems secondary school teachers encounter when implementing the developed curriculum:

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the majority of the practising secondary school teachers are not involved in the development of the curriculum they use in schools. However, it is clear from the discussion above that all the secondary school teachers are fully involved in the
implementation of the developed curriculum. Many writers have warned against the attitude of most curriculum developers subjecting the practising teachers to the position of mere receivers of already developed materials (Obanya, 1974; Bishop, 1985 and the Nigerian report of the National workshop on primary education, 1971). When teachers are relegated to the position of mere receivers and deliverers of the developed curriculum packages, they are likely to face many difficulties.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they have ever encountered any problems when implementing the developed curriculum. Tables 15 and 16 show the responses and the type of problems experienced.

Table 15: Teachers’ views on whether they encounter any problems when implementing the developed curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers views on whether they face problems</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 15, it can be noted that the secondary school teachers face problems when implementing the developed curriculum.
curriculum as shown by 93.9% of the total respondents' information. Only 5.2% indicated that they do not face any problems while 0.9% did not respond to the question. Table 16 shows the specific problems encountered by the teachers.

Table 16: Specific problems encountered by teachers when implementing the developed curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems encountered by teachers</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wide content</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate materials</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed up content/abrupt changes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability of learners to understand some content</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus interpretation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by Table 16, practising teachers encounter different problems when implementing the developed curriculum. Out of the six problems suggested by the teachers, inadequate materials emerged as the main problem and was mentioned 129 times out of a possible 213 mentions. About 44% of the teachers identified wide content not easily covered within the specified period, 20.2% cited mixed up content mainly caused by abrupt changes in the syllabus. Others, 20.2% and 9.4% cited inability of learners to understand some content and syllabus interpretation respectively.

Even the headteachers interviewed admitted that their teachers complain a great deal on different subject areas of the curriculum. The headteachers pointed out that much complaint
has been directed to the wide syllabuses not easily covered within the limited period of time. Lack of adequate and appropriate learning and teaching materials especially practical equipments, textbooks and teachers' guide books some of which have been criticised for being sub-standard un resourceful and sometimes contain some errors.

According to one headteacher interviewed, the above problems mainly occur because most curriculum developers are far from the actual school situations where the curriculum will be practically implemented. He further observed that:

The K.I.E has lost touch with most of the serving teachers in the secondary schools and the curriculum is mostly developed by people who have either left classroom teaching or retired hence leading to inadequacies in the curriculum.

On the same subject, another headteacher explained that since all the curriculum development issues are centralised and left in charge of the K.I.E whose headquarters are in Nairobi, there are bound to be problems in implementation as the curriculum that is developed is removed from many schools in the country.

The respondents gave several suggestions aimed at overcoming the above problems. These suggestions are presented in Table 17 below.
Table 17: Suggestions on how to overcome problems encountered by the teachers during the implementation of the developed curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions on how to overcome curriculum implementation problems</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate involvement of teachers in curriculum development teams</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating opportunities for frequent teacher meetings</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-servicing teachers</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.I.E to consult many people when developing the curriculum.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development to follow stipulated stages.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total mentions</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by Table 17, the majority of the teachers (40.0%) felt that if practising teachers were adequately involved in the curriculum development teams, they are likely to analyse situations at the field and ensure that such situations are properly addressed to when developing the curriculum. This is likely to prevent many problems from arising since the curriculum which will be eventually developed will consider different school situations.

About 22% of the teachers felt that when changes are introduced in the curriculum, the serving teachers need to be offered in-service courses to enable them to understand the new syllabuses and how to effect the changes that may be found necessary. 22.5% felt that the K.I.E should consult relevant people with an interest in education when a curriculum is being developed. This is likely to lead to the development of the curriculum which considers all people’s views and this
will make it acceptable and appropriate for most learners. Others (13.1%) mentioned that curriculum development follow all the necessary stipulated stages of curriculum development before implementation to ensure that all the necessary adjustments and improvements are made. This is likely to ensure that the content which is developed is not mixed up or distorted.

Table 17 further reveals that if all the above suggestions are adopted, the curriculum that will eventually be developed is likely to have adequate, relevant materials and satisfactory content that will be appropriate to both rural and urban schools, well established and less established schools.

4.6 The possibilities of increasing the degree of participation of the secondary school teachers in the development of the secondary school curriculum.

As it has been noted in the foregoing discussion, the inclusion of the teachers in the curriculum development teams is far from adequate as only very few may have participated in one stage or another in curriculum development. Similarly, the selection criteria of the few, who participate in curriculum development remains unknown to most of the teachers as discussed above and as noted by one teacher interviewed that;
we are not informed when and how they select the teachers who participate and sometimes we are left to wonder whether any teachers were involved at all, we only hear over the radio that a seminar organised by K.I.E is over and was closed by a personality from the Ministry of Education.

Consequently, the respondents were asked to give their views on the possibility of having more teacher involvement in the development of the secondary school curriculum. Table 18 presents the findings:

Table 18: Possibility of increasing the involvement of teachers in curriculum development teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibility of many teachers' participation</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 18, it can be noted that almost all the respondents (98.6%) acknowledged that it is possible to have more teacher involvement in the development of the curriculum. Only 1.4% of the respondents indicated that it is not possible to increase the degree of teacher participation in the development of the curriculum. Those who acknowledged to increase the degree of teacher participation, cited a number of enabling factors to this end. Table 19 presents the findings:
Table 19: Ways that can enable many teachers to participate in the development of the curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of increasing teacher participation</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicit teachers’ views through questionnaire.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher participation in the course and subject panels.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more curriculum development centres.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for more teacher meetings.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair representation of teachers per district.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage trained and experienced teachers to participate.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer refresher and in-service courses for teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 has outlined several strategies suggested by the teachers, which if properly utilised can ensure that as many teachers as possible contribute towards the curriculum that is developed for schools. A greater proportion of the teachers (73.7%) pointed out that if questionnaires containing different issues on curriculum development are frequently sent to teachers in schools, they can be able to give their views which should in turn be incorporated when the curriculum is developed.

Some teachers (46.0%) mentioned that many teachers from different school backgrounds, urban-rural, developed and less developed schools be invited to participate at the subject and course panels at K.I.E that develops the curriculum. About 19%
Relatively a small proportion of teachers (4.2%) indicated that those teachers with experience in teaching be given a chance to participate in the development of the curriculum especially those with an experience of five and more years of experience. Only 1.9% suggested for refresher and in-service courses for the practising teachers.

The small percentage of teachers (1.4%) as shown in Table 18 who indicated that it is not possible to have more teacher
involvement in the development of the curriculum, cited several factors such as; lack of enough funds to finance extra duties of many teachers, heavy teaching workload on most teachers, lack of adequate time as teachers are constantly involved with the teaching and evaluation of students both during school days and sometimes on holidays, organisational problems and the fact that K.I.E as a body is entrusted with a task of curriculum development.

Curriculum development is a very demanding and complex task that requires competent people with knowledge and skill (Taba, 1962). Therefore people without adequate knowledge and skills cannot be entrusted with the task of developing the curriculum. When the respondents were asked to indicate whether the teachers have the necessary knowledge and skill to enable them to participate in the development of the curriculum, the following responses were obtained as shown in Table 20.

### Table 20: Respondents' views on whether the teachers have the necessary knowledge and skill to enable them participate in the development of the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers have knowledge and skill of developing the curriculum</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown by Table 20, the majority of the respondents (98.1%) indicated that the teachers are capable of participating in curriculum development, while only 1.9% implied the contrary.

The respondents were further asked to indicate their willingness to participate if they were given a chance and opportunity. Table 21 shows the responses obtained.

Table 21: Respondents' views on teachers' willingness to participate in the development of the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are teachers willing to participate in the development of the curriculum</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by the majority of the respondents (96.7%) pointed out that they were willing to participate if given a chance while only 3.3% indicated otherwise. In fact the respondents' views on the affirmative side were remarkable as shown by the following assertions of some two teachers that:

I have the interest, knowledge to be tapped, experience to be incorporated and issues to be discussed only that I have not been given the chance.

Another teacher had this to say about the teachers' willingness to participate:
I have vast experience and knowledge in art and design and I feel that I can effectively participate in curriculum development.

When the respondents were asked to indicate whether there are any motivating factors that can encourage teachers to take part in the development of the curriculum, the following responses were obtained as shown by Table 22:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivating factors</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lack of motivating factors</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School support</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>No recognition/encouragement</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and knowledge in teaching</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Heavy work load</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though it has been noted above that the teachers have the capability and are willing to participate in curriculum development, Table 22 shows that there are no adequate motivating factors. Lack of rewards was considered as the highest demotivating factor and was mentioned 113 times. Other demotivating factors mentioned were lack of recognition and encouragement and heavy workload on the teachers.
A significant proportion of the respondents (36.2%) indicated that there is little encouragement for teachers to participate. Their role is not even recognised when a curriculum is being prepared. About 33% of the respondents pointed out that the teachers are motivated through the experience and the knowledge they have gained in teaching.

However, some teachers mentioned two factors which can motivate them to participate in curriculum development. These includes school support and teachers' own experience and knowledge in teaching.

In fact, all the headteachers interviewed pointed out that they were willing to give necessary support and encouragement to enable their teachers to participate in curriculum development.

Hence, a part from the self motivating factors of the teachers themselves as explained above and some school support especially from their headteachers, teachers are not given any encouragement at all. This situation is described better by one of the respondent's who observed that;

(1) There is no recognition given to teachers when developing the curriculum as they are always at the receiving end of implementing what has been developed.
(ii) The teachers are always scolded wherever they voice their views especially by politicians.

(iii) The teachers keep thinking about more lucrative jobs as teaching is financially frustrating.

4.7 Secondary school teachers' views on the role the teachers can play in the development of the school curriculum.

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that practising teachers need to be included in the curriculum development teams. However, it has not been clear at what stages of curriculum development should the teachers be involved and what specific roles they should undertake. The respondents were asked these questions and Tables 23 and 24 present the findings.

Table 23: Stages of curriculum development where teachers need to be involved when developing the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of curriculum development where teachers should be involved</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational analysis &amp; formulation of objectives</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials development</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum set up</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting the curriculum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stages of curriculum development</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be noted from Table 23 that, the majority of the teachers would like to be involved at all stages of curriculum development; from the situational analysis stage which deals with needs assessment to the implementation of the curriculum. This is evident from the high number of mentions which the teachers gave in favour of teacher involvement in all stages of curriculum development. Others felt that they should be involved at the material development stage. 39.4% of the teachers mentioned that they should be involved at the situational analysis stage and formulation of objectives.

About 27% mentioned that teachers be involved at the curriculum building/set up stage while 16.0% indicated that teachers be involved at the curriculum piloting stage.

When the respondents were asked the specific roles that the teachers should undertake in the above stages, several responses were recorded as shown in Table 24:

Table 24: Specific roles that the teachers should undertake in the development of the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' specific roles in curriculum development</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of teaching and learning materials</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggesting solutions to the implementation problems</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions on content and learning experience</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the syllabus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying the curriculum in pilot schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating educational objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 24, it can be noted that secondary school teachers have important roles that they as teachers should play in the development of the curriculum. As shown by the responses in Table 24, their role should not only be implementation of the curriculum in schools but rather should be widespread through all the stages of curriculum development.

The majority of the teachers as shown by Table 23 (67.1%) felt that they should play the role of preparing teaching and learning materials in the development of the curriculum. Another 67.1% pointed out that the teacher's role should be carrying out careful investigation on the operations of the curriculum to find out the problems it is facing and suggest ways of overcoming those problems.

About 30% mentioned that the teachers should be involved in making decisions on the content to be included in the curriculum and decide the kind of learning experiences to be offered to the students in the schools while 24.5% stated that teachers prepare syllabuses while 14.1% and 4.7% felt that teachers undertake the roles of piloting the curriculum project in trial schools and formulating educational objectives respectively.

When the respondents were asked to indicate how the teachers will be able to undertake the above roles effectively, the following strategies were put forward by the respondents as shown by Table 25:
It can be noted from Table 25 that there are many ways that can enable secondary school teachers to perform their roles effectively. The majority of the teachers (63.8%) indicated that many practising teachers be contacted especially through the use of questionnaires where they are asked about different curriculum issues. Through this way, teachers at the field can be able to give their views on the situations in the field.

A significant proportion of the teachers (32.4%) cited the creation of opportunities for teacher meetings especially workshops and seminars where teachers can meet regularly and review the curriculum they are using. Through this way, they can come up with important issues that can be incorporated in the curriculum. About 28% indicated that K.I.E should improve its communication and co-ordination with the teachers at the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling strategies for effective teacher participation</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact many practising teachers</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for teacher meetings</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.I.E to improve communication with teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection criteria for participating teachers be made known to them</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.I.E to appreciate and to respect the teachers' views</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more functional curriculum development centres</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage/Reward teachers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessen teachers workload</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
field while 25.8% cited clarification of the selection criteria to enable all teachers from all types of school background to participate.

Other teachers (23.5%) indicated that the K.I.E needs to appreciate, recognise and respect the teachers’ views by allowing them to feel part and parcel of the system of developing the curriculum. About 21% of the teachers pointed out that K.I.E needs to establish more functional curriculum development centres throughout the country from divisional to district level where teachers can be reached easily. About 17% mentioned the need for encouragement while 12.2% suggested that the teachers workload needs to be lessened to enable them to take more duties of curriculum development.

When the respondents were asked to indicate whether the teachers will get any benefits if they performed their role effectively in the development of the curriculum, the following responses were obtained.

Table 26: Benefits teachers can get if they participated effectively in the development of the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers benefits</th>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the curriculum easily</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow professionally</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher satisfaction/Motivation</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant and adequate materials will be developed</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 26, it can be noted that there are many benefits that teachers would get if they participated effectively in the development of the curriculum. The majority of the teachers (64.8%) mentioned that the teachers would be able to implement the developed curriculum without much difficulties since being part of the formulating team, they would be able to understand the rationale behind its formulation and its operational details. Thus, they will be able to interpret it correctly and teach it effectively. About 36% of the teachers felt that relevant and adequate materials will be developed since the teachers would be able to point out what they may need in the field and this will ensure that the curriculum that is developed does not become irrelevant or make unrealistic demands which may be unattainable.

Other teachers 34.7% noted that the teachers would derive some satisfaction from participating, since the curriculum is prepared for them to implement, their inclusion from the initial stages would motivate them and make them feel part and parcel of the system. This will bring positive results on the job. About 34% felt that teachers will grow professionally by participating, while 14.1% pointed out that by participating, most teachers would get promotions on the job. These benefits are a pointer towards the teachers effective teaching which will in turn lead towards the achievement of educational objectives and the success of the curriculum.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.1 Summary and conclusions

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the views of the secondary school teachers about the teachers' role in curriculum development in Kenya.

The study was conducted in 30 secondary schools. The sample of the respondents was 213 teachers including the 30 headteachers of the respective schools.

The instruments for data collection were the questionnaire for the teachers and the interview schedule for the headteachers.

The responses obtained from the respondents were analysed using frequency distributions and calculation of percentages.

The study found out the following about the teachers' views on the roles they should play in curriculum development in Kenya:

- The majority of the practising teachers in Kisii District are professionally qualified teachers with some experience in teaching. Most of them are B. Ed. graduates from different universities, some are diploma holders while others have trained as teachers in primary teacher training colleges and
have been promoted to serve as teachers in secondary schools. However, despite their experience in teaching and professional qualification, the study found out that most of them had not participated in the development of the curriculum, their role has been mainly been to receive an already developed curriculum and then implement it in their different schools.

The majority of the respondents indicated that the selection criteria of the few teachers who may be participating in curriculum development is not well known to most teachers. Most of them expressed concern whether any teachers are selected at all. They felt that the curriculum that is developed hardly represents their views since there is poor and inadequate representation of teachers and other stakeholders in curriculum development teams.

Most of the respondents felt that there is no proper channels of communication between the teachers in the field and the K.I.E when the curriculum is being developed. The majority of the respondents pointed out that K.I.E either neglects them, does not consult them or simply sends to them ready made changes on the curriculum. This leaves them with no option but to effect the already made changes.

The majority of the respondents indicated that most of the secondary school objectives have not been achieved mainly because the curriculum that is developed has got several weaknesses which in turn make its implementation difficulty.
The respondents cited factors such as political influence on the development of the curriculum, lack of proper consultations with other stakeholders in education and developing the curriculum without adequate consideration of all the necessary stages of curriculum development among others as the main weaknesses of the present curriculum developed for secondary schools.

The respondents further indicated various problems they encounter when implementing the developed curriculum and suggested that the problems mainly arise because the curriculum developers are not in touch with the actual school situations thus they impose a lot of demands on the teachers and students not easily achieved. Some of the respondents cited the issue of making some subjects like Biology, Physics, Chemistry compulsory and introducing other subjects such as Home Science without adequate provision of necessary resources for their implementation as a major problem.

The majority of the respondents stated that teachers are not given enough support and encouragement from their employer, the K.I.E and the Ministry of Education so as to enable them participate in the development of the curriculum. However, the majority of the teachers in the field expressed their willingness to participate in the development of the secondary school curriculum and appealed for support, recognition and encouragement from the above three bodies.
The majority of the respondents also felt that as many teachers as possible should be involved at all stages of curriculum development where they should undertake various roles in developing the curriculum. To the respondents therefore, the curriculum should not be developed in the absence of practising teachers and then impose it on them to implement. Instead, the teachers should be central in its development by being part and parcel of the curriculum development team. This will enable them to understand the principles of the development of the curriculum and its workings for easy and better implementation.

Finally, the respondents suggested various benefits teachers will get if they effectively participated in the development of the curriculum. Such benefits will enable the teachers become effective professionals both as teachers and as curriculum developers.

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings obtained from the study, the following recommendations are made.

The majority of the teachers stated that most of the present curriculum developers have lost touch with what is happening in the schools. Therefore, it is necessary that the curriculum developers be in constant touch with the schools especially through extensive research, adequate communications and making
physical visits to the schools. This might enable them develop a curriculum that is flexible to be used by all teachers depending on the learners needs and different school environments.

The majority of the respondents felt that, since the teachers are the implementers of the curriculum, the professionals who are entrusted with the responsibility of interpreting the curriculum to the learners and the people who are in constant use of the curriculum, they should be extensively involved in the development of the curriculum by performing various roles such as the following:

(i) diagnosing and defining curriculum problems
(ii) articulating priorities and setting goals of the curriculum
(iii) collecting and analysing information concerning the curriculum
(iv) assessing available resources to be used when implementing the curriculum
(v) deciding and planning learning programmes
(vi) designing implementation strategies
(vii) managing educational programmes
(viii) monitoring progress of educational programmes
(ix) evaluating results of the curriculum and redefining problems generated for further action
To enable the teachers perform the above roles effectively, it is recommended that enabling strategies be sought which should include the following:

(i) Well developed questionnaires containing curriculum development issues be sent to teachers to complete.

(ii) Teacher meetings be organised frequently where they meet to discuss curriculum development matters. This should take the form of seminars, workshops and conferences.

(iii) Teachers should be frequently in-serviced to make them familiar with the new developments in education.

(iv) K.I.E should improve its contacts with the teachers in the field on curriculum development matters. It should not only communicate to the teachers when changes or improvements have already been made but also when it intends to make them.

Since the curriculum is the most important aspect of any education program in a country, especially the guidelines and directions it contains on what is to be taught and for what purposes, there is need to make it more realistic and achievable. It should be developed gradually and systematically taking into consideration all the stipulated steps and with all concerned people performing their roles as expected. This is likely to make it relevant to the learners and the society's needs.
Since the Kenya Institute of Education performs a crucial service and important role in the development of the secondary school curriculum, there is need to make it more accessible to most of the practising teachers in the schools. It is also necessary to find ways of establishing more functional curriculum development centres throughout the country especially in districts which should liaise with the K.I.E in the development of the curriculum. Through this way, K.I.E will become a co-ordinating and facilitating body not the sole body to be relied on in all the curriculum development matters. The teacher centres which had been earlier established to coordinate curriculum development issues at the local level are not effective as they are neglected and poorly managed. Even the teachers have poor attitudes towards the Teacher Centres especially on the curriculum development issues as their views are not considered (Maranga, 1984).

The majority of the teachers felt that they are not given enough support and encouragement to enable them to participate in the development of the curriculum. Thus, it is necessary that the K.I.E, T.S.C, the Ministry of Education and the school administration recognise the teachers' role in curriculum development and give them the necessary financial and moral support to enable them perform their roles effectively in the development of the curriculum. They should convince the teachers that their contribution to curriculum development is worthwhile by enabling them to participate fully.
The teachers also felt that they are curriculum developers apart from doing the actual teaching in schools. These are very demanding tasks which need extensive preparation and guidance. It is then recommended that teacher trainers devise strategies of meeting the dual roles of teachers adequately in their training programmes. This does not imply that teachers are presently inadequately prepared, the issue is that the trainers emphasize more on the actual teaching aspect than the teachers' role of participating in the development of the curriculum.

The teachers also felt that a workable curriculum is that which is well thought out and properly planned especially by those directly involved in its usage. It is therefore necessary that there be as little external influence as possible especially from people not directly related with its operations. Even politicians need to channel their views through acceptable and recommended forums as opposed to introducing snap decisions and changes on the curriculum. Proper consultations need to take place by all the interested parties and not only from the influential quotas.

5.4 Suggestions for further research

This study was only carried out among school teachers of 30 secondary schools in one district. Related studies can be done in other geographical areas not covered in this study. A large sample of teachers can be used than the 213 teachers which the
The study only looked at the position of the teachers about their role in the development of the curriculum. It did not try to find out the K.I.E personnel and the Ministry of Education's positions on the teachers' involvement. It would be interesting to find out what the K.I.E and the Ministry of Education have to say about teacher involvement in curriculum development in Kenya.

There are many interested parties in education who are supposed to be included in the curriculum development teams other than the teachers. These parties include; University lecturers, church representatives, voluntary organizations e.t.c. There is need to carry out a study to establish the extent to which all these parties are involved in curriculum development.

The study only concentrated on the secondary school cycle of education. There is need to carry out an investigation on teachers of other levels of education and establish their position on the matter.

The study mainly concentrated on issues related to the perceptions of the secondary school teachers about their role in the development of the curriculum. Though the study covered other related issues as factors inhibiting their effective participation and on strategies of teacher involvement, this
was done very briefly. There is need to carry out extensive research to find out why teachers have never been adequately involved.

Finally, some respondents claimed that the few teachers who may have participated in the development of the curriculum in the past are likely to have come from the well-developed and established schools. It is necessary to carry out a study in the so-called well-established schools only, to find out the degree or number of teachers who might have participated in the development of the curriculum to verify or dismiss the above claims.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINED SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

The questionnaire is about the secondary school teachers' perceptions of their roles in curriculum development in Kenya. Please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Tick the appropriate answer or fill in the blank spaces. Be honest when answering the questions. The information you give will be treated as confidential and will be used for the purposes of the study only.

SECTION ONE

Background information

1. Name of your school
2. Is your school:
   - Boys boarding ( )
   - Girls boarding ( )
   - Mixed boarding ( )
   - Mixed day ( )
   - Any other (specify) ______

3. Your sex
4. For how long have you taught? ______
5. What are your qualifications?
   - a) Graduate (B.Ed.) [ ]
   - b) Diploma (Ed.) [ ]
   - c) Approved teacher status [ ]
   - d) M.Ed. [ ]
   - e) Other (specify) ______
SECTION TWO

Curriculum development

1. Who develops the curriculum used in Kenyan Secondary Schools?
   a) Ministry of Education officials and curriculum experts at K.I.E. [ ]
   b) Curriculum experts, secondary school teachers, representatives from various interest groups in Education and other Educationists. [ ]
   c) University lecturers [ ]
   d) Other (specify) [ ]

2. Have you ever been involved in the development of any curriculum materials used in Kenyan secondary schools?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   i) If yes, at what stages/levels?
      a) Situational analysis and formulation of Educational objectives [ ]
      b) Setting up the curriculum project and building the programme [ ]
      c) Piloting the new programme in selected schools [ ]
      d) Improving the new programme [ ]
      e) Any other (specify) [ ]

   ii) Which materials?
      a) Programmes and syllabuses [ ]
      b) Teachers and learner's guide books [ ]
      c) Text books and other learning resources [ ]
      d) Any other (specify) [ ]
1. To what extent do you agree with the way of developing the secondary school curriculum in Kenya?
   a) Strongly agree ---------------------------------- [ ]
   b) Agree ---------------------------------- [ ]
   c) Undecided ---------------------------------- [ ]
   d) Disagree ---------------------------------- [ ]
   e) Strongly disagree -------------------------- [ ]

4. (i) Which is the criteria used in selecting the teachers (if any) who participate in the development of the curriculum in Kenya? ________
   (ii) To what extent do you agree with the selection criteria in (i) above
   a) Strongly agree ---------------------------------- [ ]
   b) Agree ---------------------------------- [ ]
   c) Undecided ---------------------------------- [ ]
   d) Disagree ---------------------------------- [ ]
   e) Strongly disagree -------------------------- [ ]

5. Does K.I.E. contact you when developing the secondary school curriculum is concerned?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Explain your answer briefly. ____________________________

6. In your view, who should be involved in the development of the curriculum materials used in secondary schools in Kenya? ____________________________
7. In your view, is the number of secondary school teachers who are presently involved in the development of curriculum materials enough?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
Explain your answer briefly ________________

8. In your view, is it possible and necessary to increase the number and level of secondary school teachers in the development of curriculum materials in Kenya?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes in which ways? ________________
If No, what are the constraints? ________________

9. In your view, are there any problems encountered by secondary teachers when implementing the developed curriculum?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
10. In your opinion, do secondary school teachers have the necessary knowledge and skills to enable them participate in the development of the curriculum materials used in secondary schools?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

11. In your view, will you participate in the development of the secondary school curriculum if you are given the chance and opportunity?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

12. In your view, are secondary school teachers given enough support and encouragement to enable them participate in the development of the curriculum?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Explain your answer briefly

13. In your view, at what stages, should secondary school teachers be involved in curriculum development?

(a) Situational analysis and formulation of educational objectives [ ]
14. In your opinion, which ways will guarantee effective secondary school teacher participation in the development of the secondary school curriculum?

________________________________________________________________________________

15. In your view, what important roles should secondary school teachers play in the development of the secondary school curriculum?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

16. In your view, are there any problems that hinder secondary school teachers from effective participation in the development of the curriculum that they use in schools?

i) Yes [ ] No [ ]

ii) If yes, Which problems?

________________________________________________________________________________
Suggest ways in which the above problems can be overcome.

17. In your view, what benefits would teachers get if they participated in the development of the curriculum?

18. In the space below give an honest opinion of what you feel are the weaknesses of the current curriculum developed in Kenya.

Suggest how they can be overcome.
APPENDIX B INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

1. How many years have you served as a secondary school teacher?

2. Have you ever been involved in the development of any aspect of the secondary school curriculum. The researcher will probe the various aspects and reasons of not being involved.

3. What are your views about the way of developing the secondary school curriculum in Kenya? The researcher to find out both the negative and positive aspects of the system.

4. How many trained teachers do you have in your school? Of these how many participate in the development of the curriculum used in the secondary schools in Kenya? The researcher to probe reasons for the rate of involvement and criteria used in selecting those who participate.

5. Does any of your teachers complain about the curriculum they use? The researcher will probe the following:
   - subject areas where complaints have been raised and reasons for the complaints.
   - reasons whether teachers are satisfied with the system of developing the secondary school curriculum.

6. In your view are the teachers adequately involved in curriculum development teams? The researcher to probe reasons for answers given.
7. In your view, should the participation of secondary school teachers be increased in the development of the curriculum?
   - Probe (Interviewer's guide note).

8. Are there adequate channels of communication between K.I.E. and your school in issues related to curriculum development?
   - Probe their effectiveness (Interviewer's guide note).

9. Are there any constraints towards increasing teacher participation in the development of the secondary school curriculum?
   - Probe (Interviewer's guide note).

10. Would you encourage your teachers to participate in the development of the secondary school curriculum?
    - Probe (Interviewer's guide note).
## APPENDIX C

### SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND THE TEACHERS WHO TOOK PART IN THE STUDY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>NO. OF TRAINED TEACHERS</th>
<th>40% (TARGETED SAMPLE)</th>
<th>ACHIEVED SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sameta</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itierio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyancwa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riosiri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sengeri</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabururu</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kioge</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nduru</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cardinal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suneka</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisii</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magena</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyamagwa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kereri</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabigena</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otamba</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyamache</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendere</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesusu</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegati</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itibo</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riokindo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machongo</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirwa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakegogi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gakero</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyangweta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichuni</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyangusu</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabaka</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>682</strong></td>
<td><strong>273</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>