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ABSTRACT

This study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter provides an introduction to the study in terms of background to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, purpose of the study, theoretical framework and definition of terms. Chapter two presents literature review related to the present study. In chapter three, the methodology of the study is discussed. Chapter four presents the data findings and analysis of these findings. The final chapter summarizes these findings and proposes various recommendations.

The study addresses itself to the impact of streaming on the formation of self-images of academic performance of students in different streams in streamed schools. This being a case-study, only one school, Chebuyusi High School in Kakamega district of Kenya, was studied to obtain qualitative data. The perceptions of students and teachers were sought to obtain information on the tangible ongoing experiences of students in a streamed school. The results of this study were to serve as a basis for effective policy-making on academic grouping in Kenyan schools.

Interviews, observation schedules and document analysis were used to gather teachers' and students' perceptions on the impact of streaming on the formation of self-images of academic performance of students belonging to different streams. In addition, various factors in operation in streamed schools were deciphered from the data collected. The out data gathered was analysed using basic descriptive statistics.
Data analysis indicated that social factors were inherent in the school streaming practice that influenced the formation of self-images of academic performance of students in different streams. Factors that were related to differential treatments that the students were exposed to included, teacher expectations, time allocations for important subjects like mathematics on the time table, space allocations and subjects offered to students in different streams.

In addition, students felt that apart from academic advancement which seemed to be the main factor teachers emphasized when streaming students, they also recommended that social and personal factors should be considered when grouping them.

The study therefore suggests that in the light of the fact that there is no clear Ministerial policy on the grouping procedures schools should employ, a revision of the Ministry of Education grouping policy should be made to enable head teachers to choose appropriate grouping methods for their schools. On the basis of data collected, it was generally recommended that the Education Act be revised to give parents a chance to participate in school management affairs. Parents should be able to choose grouping procedures to be employed by the schools their children attend.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background to the study

Schools in Kenya are not guided by a clear and uniform Education Ministerial policy with regard to how they should organize learning groups.¹ As a result, some schools group their students according to their academic abilities in what is known as streaming. This was revealed in a study done on Nairobi secondary schools.² Yet the rather naive assumptions which underlie the practice of streaming, that children whose abilities are unchanging can be placed in relatively homogeneous groups, have, however, been recently abandoned following studies done in the United States and Britain. The studies have shown beyond any doubt that children's scores vary from year to year some steadily increasing, yet others oscillating up and down although usually showing a long-term trend.³

There is also a great deal of evidence to show that streaming has an element of self-fulfilling prophecy; that is, that the original decision to put children into streams is proved right by their subsequent performance. Douglas, for example, showed that children in the "upper" streams improved their attainment test-scores between 8-11 with the less able children improving the most. Between the same ages, children's scores in the "lower" streams deteriorated with the most able among them deteriorating most. Marginal children had moved towards the stream's norm.⁴

Delamont attributes the self-fulfilling prophecy to the process of labelling students in terms of the streams they belong. She says that,
Pupils react to the allocation by living up to the label attached to them. Top streams adhere to the values of the school which has labelled them clever and achieve academically. In contrast, the lower streams reject the norms of the school which has rejected them and fail academically.

In view of the effects of streaming outlined above, coupled with the lack of a clear Educational Ministerial policy on the academic grouping process in Kenya, it is possible that the practice may have yet unknown and far-reaching impacts and implications with respect to children's continuing academic performance. In this respect, various important questions arise that are the main focus of this study. Questions like, what effects either negative or positive would the practice have on the students? Is academic ability the best criterion for determining which stream students should be placed? Are there alternative factors that should be considered when streaming is necessary? It is imperative that these questions be looked into and answered if streaming is to avoid risking what Delamont sees it doing, the imposition of long-lasting labels on students.

Therefore, the perceptions or views of various school constituents in a streamed school would be one of the best methods of deciphering the answers to the above questions on streaming. It was the aim of this study to look at a streamed school in Kenya, with the goal of finding the perceptions of teachers and students in this school as regards the impact of streaming on the academic performance of students. The results of this study would serve as a basis for effective policy-making on academic grouping in Kenyan schools.

Statement of the problem

The problem of this study was to examine the perceptions of teachers and students in one Government maintained streamed school, Chebuyusi High School in Kakamega District, with regard to what impacts streaming would be imposing on the self-concept of academic performance of the students. The
study also attempted to find out personal and social factors that may be in operation in a streamed school, as well as those that could be incorporated in a more pluralistic policy regarding school streaming.

Research Questions

Specifically, this study was to answer the following research questions:-

* Were students and teachers aware of the streaming procedures the school employed?

* Did streaming impose labels that had a deterministic possibility of a self-fulfilling kind in terms of the academic performance of the students?

* In terms of academic issues, what did students like or dislike about the streams they belonged to?

* Did transfer of students between streams occur when teachers noted improvement or drops in the performance of students in the different streams?

* Beside academic ability, were there other factors that should have been considered in grouping students?

* What were the teachers' and students' perceptions on streaming in terms of its advantages and disadvantages?

Purpose of the Study

The Ministry of Education has no clearly laid down policy on grouping practices to be employed by schools in Kenya. As a result, schools proliferate the streaming practice based on short-term perceived academic abilities of pupils. Schools frequently do not reflect on any external information, new findings or knowledge regarding what might be the best policy both in the
interests of the pupils, schools, parents and the Ministry of Education. Therefore, it was hoped that this study would attempt to generate better streaming policies and practices based on how school constituents view or perceive the streaming practice.

Although there are already two survey studies completed on the question and problem of school streaming in Kenya, they are mainly introductory works that lay a foundation for further research in the area. Therefore, more intensive studies using different approaches such as case studies, are required which would provide in-depth data, more sensitive to, and arising from tangible ongoing cases of streaming. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to endeavour to generate, using a case study approach, basic knowledge which would sensitize and enlighten different concerned parties about the influence or non-influence of school streaming on the academic performance of secondary school students.

The Significance of the Study

The results of this study had the following contributions:

* The issue of school streaming has had minimal research work done on it in Kenya, the study may assist in the development of background information in this area.

* The results could assist in creating awareness on the effects of streaming on the academic performance of students so that teachers and head teachers would be sensitized to determining what might be the best method to use when grouping their students, if and when the need arises in future.

* The results may serve as a reservoir of practical information for all parties interested in Education be they teachers, teacher trainers and trainees and parents regarding the consequences of streaming.
The results may serve as a basis for effective policy making for educational administrators of various kinds as regards educational grouping in Kenya solely based on academic abilities.

Limitations of the Study

* The Study was limited to one Boy’s school in Kakamega District. This means that the results cannot be generalized to other schools in the country.

* The study employed the case-study methodology and therefore did not involve other procedures or techniques like the questionnaire employed by other research methods.

Assumption of the Study

The study was based on various assumptions, namely:

* That teachers have certain yet unrevealed assumptions, expectations, perceptions, views, regarding schooling including streaming practices which can be the sources of important knowledge

* That normal characteristics of pupils who belong to the same stream are those imputed by their stream as a whole in terms of academic performance. Therefore, beneficial information would be provided by this imputation regarding what students view themselves as.

* That teachers may not always have similar expectations on students in different streams. This in turn could influence the way they teach the various streams.

Theoretical Framework

Introduction

The orientation of this study is sociological. It uses the socialization perspective to examine the school streaming practices and their subsequent impacts on students’ school performance. For sociologists, socialization often refers to the process through which individuals learn to acquire values, attitudes
and skills of the society they belong to. Socialized individuals are able to acquire a “self” that enables them to function appropriately in society.\(^6\)

In order to effectively carry out socialization, various groups and institutions are involved. These are known as agents of socialization and include the family, religious organizations, the mass media and the school.\(^7\)

Since education in general and the school in particular are important agents of socialization with regard to children, it is possible to apply the socialization theory as a basis for understanding or explaining school and classroom practices. For example, if it is assumed that the school streaming practice can set in motion certain perceptions of a self-fulfilling kind, which in turn may influence the self-perceptions of pupils’ behaviour, abilities and lives later, then, socialization becomes a central concern in the school streaming practice.\(^8\) This study therefore adopted its theoretical framework from George Herbert Mead’s and Charles Horton Cooley’s theories of socialization otherwise known as symbolic interactionism.

**Application of Symbolic Interactionist Theory in a School Setting**

**Symbolic Interactionist Perspective**

Symbolic interactionism is a school of thought in social psychology that was developed mainly by two American sociologists Mead and Cooley. It emphasized the development of the individual in a social context. This development was seen to take place through the interaction process between human beings conducted at the symbolic level. This interaction between the individual and his society is sociolization.\(^9\)

Mead’s socialization theory of the “mind”, “self” and “society” infers that identity is formed in and by society. He stressed that the “self” and social consciousness are an emergent phenomenon that develops through interaction in
social contexts. He, therefore, saw socialization as a process of social communication taking place symbolically through gestures and language.\textsuperscript{10}

The significant or shared symbols enable individuals to take on the "role of the other". The process of taking these roles continues as the child takes in the attitudes and views of the "significant others" such as the parents in the family and the teachers in the school situation.\textsuperscript{11}

Cooley's theory of socialization is based on the concept of "the looking glass self". This theory advocates that the individuals develop their identity or self-concept according to how they think others especially the significant others, around perceive them. They come to adopt or accept as their own those evaluations and judgements of themselves seen to be reflected in the faces of others in their environment. So according to Cooley, we think we are talented because the teachers and other students praise us and probably perform poor academically because others give us an impression indicating so.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{The Application of Symbolic Interactionism to a School Setting}

Symbolic interactionism explains how individuals develop a "self" or unique identity through the interaction between them and others.\textsuperscript{13} In a school situation, students develop a "self" through their interaction with others like their teachers and fellow students. Mead singles out the "significant others" as the most important people that shape the "self".\textsuperscript{14} In a school situation, these significant others are teachers and fellow class-mates. This view is also expressed by Cooley in the concept of "the looking glass self". He advocates that people see themselves through the eyes of others,\textsuperscript{15} so that in a school situation, students see themselves in terms of what they believe others see them as.
The self-images formed from the socialization process help to shape the personality of the students in terms of the social, personal and academic development. Therefore, the self-images of what the students can achieve academically are more likely shaped within the contextual inclinations as described by Mead and Cooley. The academic self-images are not only influenced by what teachers and other students say, do, think or the way they interact with them, but also by various aspects of the school environment and practices such as streaming.16

In a streamed school for example, students belonging to the "lower" streams probably internalize negative images about their academic capabilities into their self-definition of self-concepts. This may be as a result of the encouragement/discouragement and verbal praises/reprimands they receive from the teachers. Furthermore, the students self-images about their academic capabilities may be shaped by the demands they receive from their teachers concerning academic work. The demands of the teachers on the "upper" stream students may be directed towards academic work since such students are often perceived to be capable of performing well academically.17 This may be done at the expense of other aspects of development like personal and social aspects, probably more so than their counterparts in the "lower" streams.

In summary, how the teachers plus other students interact with the individual students in a school or classroom may shape the students self-perception of his academic capabilities. This may have a bearing on how the student’s long-term or short-term future may be affected by the streaming process that tends to label students in terms of their ability. The results are probably that expected performances of the different ability groups are in a manner likely to induce self-fulfilling prophecies.
In this respect, the present study explored the expectations of students in a streamed school situation concerning the self-images they have of their academic capabilities and if these are in any way influenced by the streaming practice. Similarly, teachers' perceptions about what the impact of streaming is on the academic performance of their students would on the other hand generate information regarding the impact of the labelling process on the academic performance of students.

Definition of Terms

(i) Streaming

A stream refers to learning units that have a set of learners who lie within the same academic ability range. On the other hand, streaming refers to the allocation of each yearly intake of classes based on academic ability so that the most able students are placed in the "upper" streams and the less able students in the "lower" streams. Various schools have different ways of naming these streams although grouping is still on the basis of academic ability.

(ii) Academic Performance

This refers to the average academic standing or grade of a student in the various subjects given at the end of the term.
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CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction:

The most important focus of the literature review will be on the effects of streaming on academic performance of individual streams. An objective look at the mixed ability grouping that is the solution advocated in place of streaming will also be assessed. Specifically, the literature review will follow the following order. First, a review of studies done outside Kenya will be done followed by those done in Kenya and finally, the focus of the present study will be made.

Effects of Streaming on the Academic Performance of Individual Streams.

Many people believe that some form of self-fulfilling prophecy could be in operation in a streamed school and that the children take on the characteristics of the streams in which they are placed. Teachers are too concerned with what to expect so much so that they seldom think of the effects these expectations might cause to their pupils.

There is adequate evidence to show that streaming is a self-fulfilling prophecy. The original decision to group children into streams according to academic ability is proved right by their subsequent performance. Various studies have been done on this concern.
A study done by Douglas in Britain revealed some very important facts about the effects of streaming on the academic performance of individual streams. A separation of students who were streamed by ability before their eighth birthday and who stayed in the same schools from then until they sat the eleventh selection examinations was done. The study found out that during the succeeding three years the children in the "upper" streams improved their scores by an average of 0.17 points and those in the "lower" streams deteriorated by 0.49 points.

In Douglas's study mentioned earlier, it was found out that children in upper streams made better progress than those in lower streams. Over the whole three-year period, the children in upper streams made greater gains than those in lower streams.

The study further revealed that at each level of ability, the children in the "upper" streams improved their scores while the others deteriorated. In the upper streams it was particularly the children of relatively low ability who benefited the most, for example, those with low scores improved by an average of 45 points, whereas those with high scores showed an average improvement of only 1.3 points.

In lower streams the "brighter" children showed a greater average deterioration in the test score than the "duller" children. The net effect was that the two streams had bigger differences between them at the end than at the beginning. Marginal children in the stream had improved towards the stream norm. However, marginal children did not succeed in the continuous performance of their tasks due to lack of transfer between the streams that account for the performance of their tasks due to lack of transfer between the streams. This lack of transfer between streams is mainly due to the lack of transfer between the streams.
The low transfer rates between streams clearly illustrates the inflexibility of
the streaming system. Yet transfer between streams should occur to correct
initial errors in selection. Various studies have confirmed the low rate of transfer
between streams. A study done by Daniels in Britain on the effects of streaming
in the primary school revealed that it was rare for children to change streams. In
the schools studied, he found only about 5% transfer between streams.³

In Douglas’s study mentioned earlier, it was found out that children
changed streams rarely. Over the whole three years period, the annual rate of
transfer was 2.3 percent and approximately the same number moved up as
down.⁴

In another study by Barker Lunn the same point on the transfer between
streams was noted. He found out that children who were in the “wrong” stream
(according to their measured ability) remained in that stream.⁵ Thus it became
apparently clear that, once streamed, pupils were on a predetermined course
with little likelihood of being deflected from it. They were victims of an inbuilt
finality of judgement, so hard to overcome.

The various studies reviewed attributed the continuous performance of
the various streams to lack of transfer between the streams that occurs in the
streamed school. Yet, apart from the lack of transfer between streams, many
other factors may be in operation: factors like the nature of teachers teaching the
different streams and the type of work given to the different streams.
Jackson studied ten streamed and ten unstreamed schools. In the streamed schools, he found an answer to the question of the performance portrayed by the different streams. He found out that the "top" stream teachers were older and more experienced and sometimes they were better qualified than their colleagues in the "bottom" streams. The "A" teachers by the virtue of their long services, slightly better qualifications and major share of "graded" posts drew larger salaries than their "B" and "C" counterparts. One would think the reverse would be in operation in such cases. That is, those who had the greatest learning problems and presented teachers with some frustrations than their more able colleagues should surely merit more skilled teaching from experienced qualified teachers. In addition, Jackson found that "A" students ran everything, got the best equipment and new books, while the rest got rejects.

Apart from differences in the allocation of resources to the various streams being one of the explanations that can be given for the differences in the academic performance of the different streams, differential instruction would be another. Labelling of students by teachers in terms of the streams they belong to makes the same teachers treat the streams accordingly. They develop the curriculum and levels of work that they think are appropriate to these streams; never expecting more from them and therefore, never obtaining anything more.

A study done by Keddie in 1971 of British secondary schools displays characterization of pupils. This in turn influences what curriculum is presented to pupils in different streams. She quotes from a team of teachers who were planning the next part of a social studies course, and then summarizes:-
What seems to emerge overall from the way teachers discuss teaching material in relation to pupils' abilities is an assumption that "C" pupils cannot master subjects. Both Economics abstractions of Sociology and the Economics implications are inaccessible to them.

Thus the curriculum offered to the "C" stream is different from that offered to "A" stream pupils even when they are following the same syllabus. Differential instruction can also be looked at in terms of the amount of instruction time given by the teachers to the various streams. Results of a study done by Rowan shows that teachers spend more instruction time and interact more with students in the higher level groups. The assumption in all the above studies is that differential treatment of students by teachers promotes achievement differentials. The present study intends to focus on some of the differential treatments that the students in the different streams are exposed to.

After looking at the effects of streaming on the academic achievement of students, it would be unwise not to review literature on the alternative methods of grouping that are adopted. In this respect, a look at mixed ability grouping will offer solutions to the problems cited in the streamed school situation.

Mixed Ability Grouping

Kelly refers to mixed ability grouping as,

Grouping of pupils without reference to ability.

He goes on to explain that methods used by schools to create mixed ability groups vary enormously. These include the following:

* A deliberate mix of ability based on IQ scores or attainments
Mixed ability grouping like any new system presents some problems especially with the teaching process. For instance, teachers need to adopt new teaching methods to suit the new groups created. However, this cannot be done effectively unless the attitudes of the head teachers and other teachers change in favour to the new grouping system. This change of attitudes will ensure the commitment of the teachers to the values and needs of the new grouping system.  

Kelly advocates special training for the teachers that adapt the mixed ability grouping. With the training they receive the teachers will be able to employ the flexibility attribute of mixed ability groups. Flexibility of mixed ability grouping is seen in terms of having more than one teaching unit in one class, so that the teacher can give remedial lessons to the slow learners and extension work for the gifted. So the argument here is that, although it is best to drop the streaming system of grouping and adopt mixed ability grouping, the schools should note that they need to prepare the teachers to handle the new groups that will be created.

After looking at studies done in Britain and America, a review fo studies done in Kenya will bring the present study into a better perspective.
The Beecher report of 1949 mentions the introduction of streams in Kenya. This is a report whereby a committee was appointed to inquire into the scope, content and methods of African Education, its administration and finance and make recommendations. This committee noted that there were increased enrollments in the primary schools so much so that classes were becoming too large to be taught at one sitting. It therefore made proposals for the division of the existing classes into streams. In other words, the primary schools were to become double streamed throughout with 80-100 students in standard one, 50-60 in standard two, 30-40 in standard three and so on. These classes were to be run in double sessions. Thus, the Beecher report brought forth the formation of streams that referred to the division of large classes into small ones for instructional purposes.

Since 1949 when the Beecher report appeared, the Kenyan Ministry of Education does not seem to operate on a systematized grouping policy as regards streaming. In an official document that is the only one available on this subject, streaming is defined without clearly specifying the modalities to be followed by schools in effecting streaming or grouping in general.

As a result of this uncertain position of the Ministry of Education in terms of grouping practices to be followed by schools, two studies have been undertaken in this area. A study done by Kimokoti was a survey of Nairobi Government maintained schools to find out the extent to which streaming is practiced in Kenya. The study also offered a definition of the term streaming. The study defines streaming as:
The allocation of each yearly intake to classes on the basis of academic ability attainment.\textsuperscript{14}

The survey further revealed that there were different streaming patterns portrayed in the various schools in terms of the criteria used to group students according to ability. Some schools streamed according to Certificate of Primary Education results, entrance interviews and performance in English and Mathematics in first term for Form one students. Form two students were grouped by some schools according to how well they performed in some subjects.

Another study was done by Lukhoba of three schools in busia District. He showed that there were two criteria used to place students into the different classes; overall student ability on the primary leaving examination and curriculum ability in certain school subjects. He further related grouping to academic performance, interest in class-work and educational aspirations. The results showed no relationship between grouping and variables such as academic performance.\textsuperscript{15}

Summary of Literature Review and Prospects of the present Study

The literature review for the studies done outside Kenya focused on streaming in general. Some of them compared streamed and non-streamed schools. Considering the nature of the surveys on streaming in general, the
results obtained did not adequately explain the notion of the self-fulfilling prophecy that goes in a streamed school situation. Therefore, the present study intends to take an intensive approach using the case study method to focus on one streamed school. The perceptions of students and teachers on the impact of the labelling process on the academic performance of students and observation of factors that may be in operation in a streamed school to bring about the self-fulfilling prophecies will generate a comprehensive picture of the impact of streaming on the academic performance of students.

Similarly, the two studies done in Kenya provide definition of terms in the area, look at grouping practices in streamed and non-streamed schools and at an exploratory level, try to relate grouping to important variables like academic performance, and educational aspirations. In other words, these are general surveys done to obtain fundamental information in the area of streaming upon which other studies can begin. This means a deeper focus on streaming need to be undertaken in terms of relating it to important factors like academic performance, social and personal development.

Thus, the present study intended to intensively focus on a streamed school with the aim of finding out the perceptions of teachers and students in relation to the impact of streaming on the academic performance for students. It is hoped that the results of this study would assist the Ministry of Education in taking a firm stand as concerns formulating a policy that will guide schools in Kenya as concerns the grouping practices they can utilize.
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CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This Chapter describes the research design used in the study that was aimed at finding the perception of students and teachers regarding the impact of streaming on the formation of self-concepts of academic performance of students. This study was developed using a qualitative paradigm and employed the case-study method. The appropriateness of using the case study methodology is given below. In addition, the tools used in data collection and the techniques employed in data analysis are described.

Case Study Methodology

Van Dulen defines a case study as,

Basically an intensive investigation of one person, group, project, institution or agency.¹

The case study was appropriate for this study because it enabled the researcher to collect in-depth information concerning the perceptions of students and teachers on the impact that streaming may be imposing on the academic self-image of students in a single institution. In addition, the in-depth analysis of one case enabled the researcher to adequately collect hitherto, unknown and
undiscovered information on the sensitive and personalized experiences of students in a streamed school. As a result, a comprehensive and integrated picture of a streamed school in terms of academic self-images of students in the different streams was obtained. The case study method has, therefore, the advantage of involving all elements in the investigation.

The qualitative nature of case studies in terms of being exhaustive is recommended by Young who says that,

The most meaningful numerical studies in science are those which are lined with exhaustive case studies describing accurately the interrelationships of factors and processes.  

Case studies may reveal factors in a given situation that the survey method using a quantitative approach may not always capture. The case study makes useful contributions to research by directing itself to settings and individuals within a single unit holistically. That it, the case study method, does not reduce the subject of the study, be it an individual or organization, to isolated variables or statistical aggregates. It instead considers individuals and organizations as capable of developing own definitions, perceptions, likes and dislikes of the situations they find themselves in. For the present study, the case study methodology enabled the researcher to explore deeply set-in self-images of students’ abilities whose essence could have been lost in quantitative research.

The case study, like any other method, has limitations that the investigator should be aware of when using it in research. These include the following:
* Generalizations cannot be drawn from one single case or a few casually selected ones and be applied to all cases in a given population.
* Elements of subjectivity may enter into the report particularly when making judgements on the responses.
* Questions arise regarding the scientific validity of qualitative research especially when it comes to data analysis and collection.

Nevertheless, the case study method still remains the best method to be used for this study, because it involved an indepth way of searching for facts related to the problem in question. To guard against the limitations mentioned about the case-study methodology, the researcher utilized simple statistics like the frequencies and percentages to ensure scientific validity and avoid subjectivity during analysis.

Selection of School

Since the study applied the case study method, only one school was chosen. The school, Chebuyusi High school is in Kakamega District, Lurambi Division, Bunyala location. Chebuyusi High School, is the oldest secondary school in the Division having been started in the 1950's by Friends African Missionaries. The school, situated 1.5 km from Bungoma, Kakamega, Malava junction, is a boys' boarding school. In 1993 at the time of the study the school had a population of 600 students, 30 teachers and 50 members of the non-teaching staff. The school has twelve classrooms, one equipped school laboratory, an administration block, five dormitories, one central store, one dining hall and a playground. The school was selected because of the following reasons:-
1. The students are grouped into several classes based on their academic performance. It has four forms, Form One to Four. Each form is divided into three streams named W, X and Y. In Form One, the students are grouped according to their K.C.P.E. results. The best students selected at the provincial level are placed in stream W, often called “Government” stream. The next group of students is chosen during the second selection at the district level. These are put into the X stream often called the “harambee” stream. The last group of students are those that did not perform well in the examinations but obtained places in the school through requests made by their parents to the head teacher. This stream (Y) is known as the “community” stream because most students in this stream happen to come from the area in which the school is located.

2. The school is Government maintained. This means that policies made by the Government affect this school directly. This is of great importance to this particular study because it is concerned with grouping procedures used by the school. The main question is whether the procedures are based on Government Ministerial polices on grouping in Kenya.

3. The school has the advantage of being accessible to the researcher since the researcher comes from the area where the school is situated. The
researcher was, therefore, able to obtain maximum cooperation from the school administration, teachers and students in the school.

4. The researcher has taught in this school for some time in the past and is thus well acquainted with the structures and processes of the school. This fact enabled the researcher to apply the case study methodology satisfactorily.

Selection of the teacher sample

All the thirty teachers in the school were involved in this case-study. Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 describe the sample of teachers used in the research in terms of their personal parameters such as age, sex, academic qualifications and teaching experience.

### Table 1: Teachers' Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Intervals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Teachers' Academic Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Trained Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trained Teacher</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Teachers' Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Teachers’ sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Teachers’ academic qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained Graduate Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Technical Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Teachers’ teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, the Chebuyusi High School teacher sample could be described as a young male dominated, moderately experienced and mostly professionally trained staff.

Selection of the student sample.

Since this research involved a case-study, all the forms and classess or streams in Chebuyusi High School were used. A sample of about 10% or five students from each stream was randomly selected. A total of 60 students from the twelve streams of the school were selected for the interviews. However, the observations and document analysis did not involve all the forms. This was done to obtain worthwhile quality data in the limited time available. Consequently, only Form Two classes were selected for observations and document analysis. This form had the advantage of being more streamed than the other forms. The Form Two classes, unlike the others, had been grouped according to the students' performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Examinations. In addition, this was not an examination class and therefore students were not pressurized by examinations. Unlike Form Ones, the Form Two students had settled into the school system. Therefore, all the 147 Form Two students were involved in the observations and document analysis.

Research Instruments

The following research instruments were used for data collection:-

A. Observation
B. Interviews
C. Document analysis
A. Observation

Observation was the first instrument employed in data collection. The following aspects of the school were observed.

(a) General school environment

To obtain in-depth information on the general school environment, one whole day was set aside to observe this aspect. The researcher walked around the compound observing the buildings and activities going on in the school. Special attention was paid to the classrooms where displays and illustrations on the walls and space allocations in the different streams were noted. In addition, the physical conditions of the classrooms like floor, windows and lighting were noted.

(b) Student participation in class activities

Intensive data was obtained from observing student participation in class in the different streams. In order to obtain worthwhile information, only Form Two streams were observed. Teachers were observed teaching some among the three compulsory subjects - Biology, English and Mathematics. An observation schedule was used to help focus on specific areas of student participation.
B. Interviews

Interviews were used in this study to collect data verbally from various school constituents - head teacher, students and teachers.

(a) Structured interviews for head teacher

The head teacher of Chebuyusi High School was interviewed to obtain information on the following areas:

* The policy used to group students in the school.
* The criteria he uses to allocate teachers for different subjects to the different streams.
* Differences in syllabi, if any, between the different streams
* His views on the advantages and disadvantages of streaming in schools.

(b) Structured group interviews for sampled students

A sample of about 10% or five students from each stream in every form was randomly selected. A total of 60 students from the twelve streams of the school were interviewed. The students were interviewed in groups of seven. This was done at break, lunch and games times when students were not involved in the learning process.
established a rapport with some of the other students before the interview session. In addition, teachers were not allowed into the classroom where the interviews were being conducted. All these were to ensure that the boys aired their views freely.

Group interviews were used to obtain information on the following:-

* Whether students were aware of what streaming means and the labelling process that goes with it
* What they liked or disliked about their streams regarding academically related issues
* Allocation of resources to the different streams
* Advantages and disadvantages of streaming students
* Other factors that can be used in grouping students
* Their general view towards the streaming of students
* Whether their parents were aware of the grouping procedures used by the school.

Group interviews had various advantages that were beneficial to the study. These included the following:-

* The students interviewed belonged to the same class and therefore their experiences were somehow similar
* A variety of responses as a result of a wide range of experiences on the part of the group was expected
* The higher chances of some students feeling more encouraged to speak in small groups
(c) Structured interviews for subject teachers

All the thirty teachers in the school were interviewed. The interviews which lasted for three weeks took place in the staff-room when teachers did not have lessons. Information on the following areas was obtained:-

* Teachers' teaching experience, qualifications and positions of responsibility held in the school
* Differences they noted when teaching different streams
* Their perceptions on the impact of streaming on the academic performance of the different streams
* Their general views towards the streaming of students

C. Document analysis

An analysis of school time-tables and academic reports was made to obtain information on factors that may have been in operation in the streamed school.

(a) School time-tables

One day was spent looking at the school time-tables with special attention being paid to times allocated for important subjects like mathematics. Later in the week, only Form Two time-tables were analyzed due to the fact that the researcher wanted to intensively focus on one form. The Form Two class had been chosen because unlike the Form One students who were still new in the school, the Form Two students had settled into the school system. Similarly, unlike the Form Three and Four students, the Form Two students were not pressurized by examinations. The Form Two students also had the advantage of
being more streamed than the others because they had been rouped on the basis of Kenya Certificate of Primary Education results.

(b) **Academic reports**

Two days were spent examining documents such as Form Two end of term reports. The aim was to obtain a general pattern of the Form Two streams in academic subjects.

Later during the study, the school received the 1992 Form Four Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education results. The researcher was prompted to analyze these results in terms of the performance of students belonging to the different streams. The aim of the analysis was to find out if the actual performance of the students in the different streams conformed to what the teachers and students perceived performance.

**Piloting of interview schedules**

In order to ensure the validity of the instruments chosen for the study, a pilot study was done in Lusumu Secondary school in Kakamega District. This took a period of one month before the actual study was undertaken. It is on the basis of the information received from the pilot study that the subsequent interview questions were formulated.

**Data Analysis**

The data presentation and analysis was in form of absolute and percentage frequency measures. These were used to qualitatively describe the
responses from interview. In addition, inferences from interviews, observations and document analysis were qualitatively analyzed to formulate possible factors that could be operating in the streamed school.

Summary

The chapter outlined the research methodology employed by the study. The advantages and limitations of the case study method employed by the study were discussed. In addition the research instruments and the data analysis tools were discussed. The next chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained from the study.
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CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study. The study aimed at finding out the perceptions of students and teachers about the impact of streaming on the formation of self-images of academic performance of students in a streamed school situation. The study employed the case study methodology and focused on one streamed school in Kakamega district - Chebuyusisi High School. The study aimed at answering the following research questions.

* Were students and teachers aware of the streaming procedures the school employed?
* Did streaming impose labels that had a deterministic performance of a self-fulfilling kind in terms of academic performance and the self-images of academic performance the students formed?
* In general, what were the teachers’ and students’ perceptions on the effects of streaming on students in terms of its advantages and disadvantages?
* In terms of academic issues, what did students like or dislike about the streams they belonged to?
* Did transfer of students between streams occur when teachers noted improvement or drops in the performance of students in the different streams?
* Besides academic ability, were there other factors that were considered in grouping students?
The chapter is divided into three parts. Their contents are as follows:

**Part I** - Presents, analyses and interprets data on the perceptions of the teachers and students on the grouping criteria and processes the school employed.

**Part II** - Presents, analyses and interprets the results of observations on the general school environment with special focus on the classrooms and class participation of students.

**Part III** - Presents, analyses and interprets the results of the documentary analysis of academic reports and school time-tables.

### Part I - Perceptions of teachers and students on the grouping criteria and processes employed by the school

The head-teacher, senior master, subject teachers and students were each interviewed separately during their convenient times.

#### Head Teacher's responses

The head teacher was interviewed on the criteria the school used to group students into streams. In response, he said the boys were selected at the Provincial and District levels on the basis of academic merit. On arrival at the school, they were allocated to streams on the "first come, first serve" basis. Those who arrived early filled the first stream. Students maintained the same streams in Form Two. He said students in Form Three were grouped according to the science subject choices they made. Those who choose physical and biological sciences were grouped separately.
When asked if there was any official policy from the Ministry of Education guiding the grouping procedures the school employed, the head-teacher said there was none. He said the decision on the grouping procedures the school employed was made by the school administration.

The head-teacher was asked about the criterion he employed in allocating teachers to different streams. He said that new teachers were allocated to streams that need teachers at that time.

To obtain more information on the differential treatments that students in the different streams were exposed to, the head-teacher was asked about the criteria employed in issuing learning resources like exercise books and text books. He said text books in the school were very few. These were distributed equally among the different streams by the subject teachers. On the issue of academic trips, the head-teachers said the students did not go out for academic trips due to lack of a school van and funds to finance these trips.

Information on learning experiences students in different streams were exposed to was obtained by asking the head-teacher about the syllabi. The head-teacher said the curriculum offered to the different streams was different. He said these differences were only evident in Forms Three and Four whereby the Form Three and Four W and X were offered pure sciences while forms Y were offered biological and physical sciences (which are not pure sciences).

The head-teacher was also asked if transfer of students between streams occurred. He said this did not occur because it would bring about
inconveniences on the part of the teachers in terms of variations in the pace of learning between the different streams.

Lastly, the head-teacher was asked whether he was in favour of streaming as a grouping procedure. He said that he was not in favour of streaming pupils because the teachers handling the low ability streams got discouraged by the classes they taught in terms of their levels of understanding detailed work. He suggested further that students should be randomly allocated to streams so as to avoid the disadvantages caused by streaming.

After informally talking to teachers in the school about the grouping procedures their school employed, their responses indicated that the school was in fact streamed contrary to what the head-teacher had indicated when interviewed. The researcher therefore decided to interview the senior master who had been in the school five years longer than the head-teacher and the deputy head-teacher. The interview was carried out to verify the information given in the head-teacher's interview.

Senior-teacher's responses

With regard to the criterion used to group students into streams, the senior-master said that the school had for the past three years grouped students according to their performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education. He said this was the criterion used to group the students who were in Form Four during the period of the study. Streaming had not been employed in grouping Form One students because they took a long time to report. Thus, the school administration was forced to employ the "first come, first served" method of grouping for the new students.
Previously, the W stream that consisted of students selected at the provincial level was known as the “Government” stream - these students were selected during the first selection. The X stream consisted of students whose parents had requested for places in the school because of poor results that would not enable them to get places in other schools. (This stream was known as the “community” stream because most students in this stream were from the area within which the school is located). The Y stream that was known as the “harambee” stream consisted of students who were selected at the district level during the second selection. The second selection allocated schools to students who had not obtained “good” results in their KCPE and had therefore been left out during the first selection. Students belonging to this stream paid slightly more fees compared to the students in the W stream and thus the name “harambee”. This was because the Government subsidized the fees of those students who belonged to the “Government” stream.

The senior-master was asked whether the students and parents were aware of the grouping procedures the school employed. He said that previously, the grouping procedures the school employed were evident in the fees structures. The “Government” stream (W) students paid less fees when compared to the other streams because it was Government assisted. Thus, the parents were able to tell why students belonged to different streams. At the time of the study, the parents were unable to tell grouping procedures employed from the uniform fee structures of students in different streams. Students on the other hand were able to tell grouping procedures used by the school from the special subject (technical drawing) offered to the W stream that was believed to have students that could “handle” the subject better than the other streams.
He said that differences in subjects offered to different streams was also noted in Forms Three and Four. Forms Three and Four W were offered technical drawing and pure sciences (Biology, Physics and Chemistry). Their counterparts in forms three/four X were offered two pure sciences and either biological or physical sciences. The forms three/four Y students were offered only biological and physical sciences.

The senior master confirmed the head-teacher's claim that transfer between streams did not occur and that students did not go out for academic trips. However, contrary to the information the head-teacher had given, the senior-master said the school streamed its students. He said this was evident in the distinct differences that existed between the students in the three streams in terms of their academic performance. He said, the W stream students performed better than the other two streams followed by X and Y. He said this was evident in the Form Four national examination results that had just been received by the school during the period of data collection. For that year, the students had been grouped in such a way that the best students had been placed in the W stream. He further went on to give an analysis of these results. He said that out of the 38 students who obtained C and above, 18 were from the W stream which was the best stream, 11 from Y and nine from X. Looking at those who obtained D+ and below, 20 were from Y, 11 from W and 24 from X.

An analysis of the senior-master's and subject teachers' interviews confirmed the fact that Chebuyusi High school was streamed. One can conclude that the form two students were grouped according to their performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education while the forms three and four students were grouped according to how well they could “handle” pure science subjects.
In addition, streaming is still evident in form one although it is moderated by the late reporting phenomenon as a result of school fees problems.

The head-teacher’s choice of not revealing the streaming procedures the school employed may be explained in terms of the unclear grouping policy from the Kenyan Ministry of Education to be employed by schools. The attempt to keep secret the streaming practices used to group students was also observed in other schools during the pilot study done in Kakamega District. Out of the ten schools visited, seven head-teachers said they did not stream their students. Yet teachers in these schools confirmed the fact that their schools were streamed. When the researcher made an inquiry on why the head-teachers were disputing this fact, the teachers said it may be due to the fact that the Kenyan Ministry of Education did not approve of the streaming method of grouping students. They said it was because of the psychological effects it had on students. Most head-teachers, in fact, went ahead to enumerate the following disadvantages of streaming students:

* It resulted into divisions between the low ability and high ability students
* It had a negative psychological effect on the low ability students
* It was difficult to allocate teachers to teach the low ability streams

From the analysis of the head-teacher’s and senior-master’s interviews, one can assume that the ambiguity in the Ministerial policy resulted into head-teachers being limited in terms of what grouping procedures they were to employ when grouping their students. Consequently, they were hesitant in revealing the streaming procedures they employed in their schools. These head-teachers may
be of the opinion that the Ministry of Education disapproves of streaming of students on academic grounds.

An analysis of the senior-master’s interview results also revealed an important indicator of differential treatment that students in different streams were exposed to. He pointed out differences in subjects offered to students in different streams. It is quite possible that the differential treatments the students were exposed to influenced the self-images and academic performance of students in different streams. The self images formed by students depended on the subjects the students were offered. This is important owing to the fact that the allocation of subjects was based on ability differences that existed between the students.

Similarly, one can infer that since transfer of students between streams did not occur, students who were in the “wrong” stream (according to the academic performance measures used) remained in that stream. It becomes apparent that once streamed, pupils were on a pre-determined course with little likelihood of being deflected from it. They were victims of an inbuilt finality of judgement, so hard to overcome.

Subject teachers’ responses

The following are the responses obtained from the interviews conducted with subject-teachers on the grouping practices and processes the school employed.
An inquiry was made on the allocation of resources by teachers to students in different streams with the aim of identifying some indicators of differential treatment the students in different streams were exposed to. This in turn was to point out factors other than academic ability that were in operation in a streamed school. The subject teachers were asked how they allocated textbooks to students in the different streams. In response, all the thirty teachers interviewed said that there were very few textbooks in the school. The teacher of English for example, said that there were thirty text-books for form twos. Given the average number of students in each stream as 46, this meant that each stream was provided with ten text books and each book was shared among ten students. In some subjects like Biology, there were as few as three textbooks per stream. This meant that one biology text-book was shared among approximately fifteen students.

Teachers of science subjects said that the laboratory was not adequately equipped and the school had to borrow some of the equipment from a neighbouring school during national examination periods. Laboratory equipment like burrets, pippettes, stands and beakers were very few in number. They said the laboratory was utilized in accordance with the time-table allocations of the science subjects. The teachers of English said the library was not adequately equipped. They said there were about ten Kenya Institute of Education textbooks for each subject available in the library. These books were free for the students to use during break, lunch and preparation periods.

From the interview results of subject teachers concerning the differential resource allocations between streams, it can be concluded that no differences existed between the different streams in terms of resources allocations of text-
books, laboratory and library facilities considering the fact that these resources were limited.

To find out the perceptions of teachers regarding the general performance of students in the different streams, the teachers were asked to indicate what they felt was the comparative general performance of students in different streams. The results of their responses are summarized in table 5.

Table 5: The subject Teachers' perceptions of the comparative general performance of students in the different streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>General performance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70 marks and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>49 marks and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked to give reasons why they felt students performed as they had indicated, the teachers said it was due to the academic ability grouping procedures the school used and that students in streams X and y were less motivated to learn. The breakdown of the responses given in terms of the frequencies and percentage are given in table 6.
A group of teachers on teaching practice in the school pointed out that the grouping procedures (streaming) used by the school could have had a bearing on the differentiated performance but were not sure. Seemingly, even new teachers in the school were not aware of the grouping procedures the school employed. The results in table 6 clearly indicate that most teachers in the school felt that students' performance was influenced by the academic ability grouping procedure the school utilized.

Teachers of different streams were asked to indicate what they felt regarding the pace at which the streams moved forward in school work. Sixteen teachers felt the pace of W stream was rapid, that of X moderate and Y slow. Six teachers felt the W stream was rapid while the X and Y streams were moderate. Two teachers said they noted no difference in pace when they compared the three streams.

The teachers who indicated that W stream students moved faster said it was because this stream grasped the learning material faster than the others. In addition, they said students in the stream read ahead even when not requested to as part of an assignment and therefore answered questions correctly. They said students in this stream were able to express themselves better than those in...
the other streams in terms of answering questions in class and from class tests given by the teachers.

The teachers said streams X and Y students were slow in learning because they did not do their homework on time and thus much time was wasted in following them around. In addition, the teachers said these students from the teachers point of view asked irrelevant questions and took a long time to grasp the material that was taught. For example the Chemistry teacher said one student once asked if the irons in Chemistry was the same thing as the iron metal he knew.

From the interview results analysed above, what clearly emerged was the fact that teachers had formed some clear-cut expectations of students in different streams with respect to academic related issues. Most teachers felt that students in the W stream excelled in all the academic related issues investigated. They performed better, moved faster in terms of learning and understood detailed material better than the other streams. In addition, the teachers felt that they prepared better for streams X and W in comparison to the Y stream.

The overall perceptions held by the teachers concerning the academic work of students in the different streams may have been one of the factors that was potentially capable of influencing changes in students self-images of academic performance and levels of motivation for school work.
The teachers were asked whether they felt in favour of or against the use of streaming as a grouping procedure, and gave reasons for their feelings. These reasons are shown in table twenty-eight in each case responded.

Table 7: Reasons why teachers were not in favour of streaming students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number out of 28</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of competition from weak students and feelings of inferiority in academic related issues</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of interest from teachers teaching the ability students</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Difficulties in preparing lesson plans due to differences in ability and learning pace between the streams</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Streaming ignores other aspects of human development other than academic development of students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 7 above, it can be discerned that a majority of teachers were not in favour of the use of streaming as a grouping method because streaming resulted into lack of competition and feelings of inferiority in academic related issues among the low ability students. In addition, they felt that streaming caused a lack of interest among teachers teaching low ability students.
All the 28 teachers interviewed suggested that students of different ability levels should be mixed up when forming the different streams. In addition to the reasons the teachers gave for not favouring the streaming of students, other feelings did come into play to influence the unfavourable views the teachers gave. For example, teachers did not favour streaming since those in authority - headteacher and their deputies always denied that streaming existed. In addition, the unclear ministerial policy on the grouping procedures schools in Kenya should employ probably influenced the negative stand the head teachers took concerning the use of streaming as a grouping procedure. After having seen the teachers responses, our attention is now turned towards the students’ views.

**Students Responses**

The following are responses obtained from the interview conducted with a sample of 60 students on the grouping practices and processes the school employed. The students were asked what they felt were the criteria that had been used to group them into the streams they now belonged. Table 8 shows the breakdown of the responses given by students in different forms and streams.
Table 8: Students perceptions on the criteria used to group them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping criteria</th>
<th>Students responses in forms and streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W X Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic performance</td>
<td>3 2 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' own choice</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that most (59%) students felt that the school used academic performance to group them. This was especially so with forms two, three and four. In contrast form I students contributed a majority of the feelings that the school used random selection. These students had previously been grouped into streams on “first come first served” policy. The five form one students who felt that they were grouped according to their academic performance may have inferred this from the rest of the students in the school who were grouped using this criterion.

In order to obtain information about differential treatments that may have been in operation in a streamed school, students were asked to give the criterion they felt was used to allocate to them the subjects they were presently taking. The breakdown of the responses are given in Table 9.
Table 9: Perceptions of students on the criteria used to allocate to them subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria used</th>
<th>Form I</th>
<th>Form II</th>
<th>Form III</th>
<th>Form IV</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic performance in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's choice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 9 show that 60% of the students interviewed felt that they were allocated subjects depending on how well they performed in these subjects, especially for the form two, three and four students. Conversely, the form one students felt that the subjects were randomly allocated to them. It may have been due to the fact that all the form one students took similar subjects (confirmed from the interview with the senior-master).

Students were asked to indicate all the subjects they were studying at the time. Table 10 gives a breakdown of the responses they gave.
Table 10: A breakdown of the subjects that were done by students in different streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Same subjects were offered to all streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Same subjects were offered to all streams except technical drawing that was offered to only 2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 &amp; F4</td>
<td>W - Three pure sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics), Geography, Technical drawing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X - Two pure sciences (Biology, Chemistry) Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y - Physical and Biological sciences, Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From tables 9 and 10, it is evident that subjects played a major role in creating awareness of the streaming processes the school employed. The variation in subjects offered to students in different streams was a clear indicator to the students about the ability differentials that existed among them, a factor that may have played a major role in influencing the self-perceptions of academic performance formed by students belonging to the different streams.

An investigation into the allocation of exercise and text-books was conducted so as to provide information on the resource factors that may be in operation in a streamed school situation. Students were asked to explain how the exercise and text-books were allocated to their streams. They said that exercise books were issued by the class prefects who obtained from the school's central store. They said the text books were few and were equally distributed among students in the different streams. They further pointed out that the classes with slightly more students were disadvantaged because more students...
shared one book. For example, Form 2Y had 49 students while 2W and 2X had 44 and 46 students respectively.

Like the results of the interview with subject teachers on the issue of distribution of exercise and text books, the interview with students confirmed the fact that no differences existed between the different streams in terms of allocation of exercise and text-books.

The students were also asked to rate the general academic performance of students in their streams in comparison with the other streams using the rating scale of good, average and poor which the teachers had given. The results are given in Table 11. Streamed forms (two, three and four) were grouped together.

**Table 11: Students' perceived average performance of students in their stream**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average performance</th>
<th>Students response in forms and streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forms One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W X Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results shown in Table 11, one can conclude that most of the students rated the performance of their streams as either average or good. It can be discerned that the students did not want to admit that their streams performed
poorly even in cases where they were aware this was so. The researcher later discovered that these students were withholding some information. An analysis of the results obtained from the streamed classes however gave distinct differences in the views given by students in different streams. The W sample of students in forms two and three showed that thirteen out of sixteen students rated the performance of their stream as good. This was an indicator of the positive self-images of academic performance these students possessed. Conversely, the majority of the X and Y sample of students (thirteen out of sixteen and ten out of fourteen respectively), rated the performance of students in their stream as average in comparison to the other streams. In comparison with the W stream students, it may be inferred that the X and Y students possessed comparatively less positive self-images of their academic performance. This can be discerned from the fact that most X and Y students rated the academic performance of their streams as average, unlike the W students that rated their as good.

During the interview, the researcher noted that the X and y students were not willing to give their views freely on the subject of academic performance of their streams. When asked why this was so, one student said,

"The truth is bitter because we cannot admit the fact that we are academically poor"

He went on further to explain that although other students and teachers rated their streams' academic performance as poor, they were better than the streams in arts subjects, a fact that made their academic performance be rated as good or average.
What emerged from the results given above was the fact that lower ability stream students "pretended" that differences in academic performance between streams did not exist at all. Their feelings of academic inadequacy were therefore mollified.

The students were asked to give examples of academic related issues they liked or disliked about their streams. Forms two, three and four W stream students cited subjects offered to their streams as a reason for liking their streams. They said technical drawing and pure sciences were only offered to the W streams in the school. Two form three W students went on further to explain that their stream was considered to be the school's "weapon" because they were offered pure sciences that determined the schools' academic success. The W stream students however, said that they did not like their streams because some students missed lessons. They went on to further explain that the students missed lessons because they "felt they knew everything" and would do without attending some lessons.

The Form Four X sample students also cited missing lessons as an aspect they did not like about their stream. They said students who missed lessons thought it was a waste of time attending some lessons in subjects like mathematics since they knew they would never pass it.

Students from Form Four Y cited over-crowding as an aspect they did not like about their stream. When asked to elaborate further, they said their class had 49 students unlike the other two that had 44 and 46 students respectively, a fact that made the distribution of text-books and laboratory facilities difficult.
One student from Form Three Y said he did not like his stream because teachers referred to the students in this stream as "kumbets" which meant "the dumb ones". In addition some students from streams X and Y said the subjects offered to their streams would not enable them to obtain jobs after school because job opportunities available in these areas were already flooded. Nevertheless, some students in streams X and Y said subjects offered to their streams suited their future careers. They gave an example of agriculture which they said would make them self-employed after school. They said history was political and would enhance their future political careers.

An analysis of the responses given by students interviewed showed some consistencies in the aspects cited by students belonging to the high and low ability streams existing in the school. It was noted that the W stream students who were perceived by the school to be of high academic ability cited factors that probably indicated that they possessed positive self-images of academic performance. For example, they said teachers had informed them that the pure science subjects offered to their stream would uplift the general performance of the school in the national examinations. Unfortunately, it seemed that the positive self-images of academic performance formed by the W stream students made them decide to miss lessons because they assumed "they knew everything".

Conversely, factors cited by X and Y stream students who were perceived by the school to be of low academic ability, probably indicated that they possessed negative self-images of academic performance. They said the same arts subjects offered to their streams were those that would not enable them to obtain jobs after school. In addition, they said teachers had attached some negative labels to their streams when it came to their academic abilities. It was
also noted that these students missed lessons because they felt it was of no use attending lessons in subjects like mathematics since they believed they would fail in these subjects.

Some students said they would not have attended some of the lessons even if it were obligatory since they believed it was of no use to them. Some students said they would not have attended some of the lessons even if it were obligatory since they believed it was of no use to them. Some students said they would not have attended some of the lessons even if it were obligatory since they believed it was of no use to them.

Once again, there emerged the fact that lower ability stream students used "defense mechanisms" to camouflage the perceived ability differences that existed in the school by assuming that subjects like agriculture and history offered to their stream were equally competitive in the market economy when compared to the pure sciences the W stream students were offered. Yet some of those students had said they were aware that the market economy was flooded with arts oriented graduates.

In addition, the students were asked if they were used to the subjects offered to their stream. The sampled students were asked if they would like to change streams. The responses are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Views of students on whether they would like to change streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would like to change streams</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 95% of the students did not want to change streams. When asked why they did not want to change streams, most students said they were used to the subjects offered to their streams and would not like to change
subjects in case they were taken to different streams. In addition, they said they were used to their teachers and students belonging to their streams and were not ready to change. Some students said they would only cope with the ability levels of the streams they belonged to. It is also logical to infer that it was too late for the students to cope with new subjects late in their year in school.

From the responses, it can be deduced that once streamed, students become loyal and content with their learning sets. It may be that students accepted the social and academic status attacked to their streams and were therefore not willing to change to other streams.

In addition, the students were asked if they were in favour of being grouped according to their abilities. Their responses are shown in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions on streaming</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in favour</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that 75% of the sampled students were in favour of the use of streaming as a grouping procedure. It can be assumed that the students had become accustomed to the streaming processes the school employed. It was noted that 70% of the students who were not in favour of streaming...
belonged to the lower ability streams, X and Y. It therefore seemed that students in the lower streams were probably dissatisfied with the streaming processes employed by the school but some would welcome change. Further probing had indicated that some students in the Y stream felt that they were wrongly grouped and should be moved to the W stream where they felt their abilities fitted.

The researcher probed students to obtain reasons why they were either for or against the use of streaming as a grouping procedure. The responses obtained are shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14: Views of students on why they were in favour of streaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number of mention out of 45</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Streaming raises the school's average</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Streaming enables teachers to allocate remedial</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time for the slow learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Streaming ensures that students are allocated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjects they can handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Streaming enables students to know where they</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie academically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Streaming is the easiest method of grouping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, it can be observed that most students (93.33% and 88.89%) were in favour of streaming because they felt streaming raises the schools' average performance and enables teachers to allocate time for the learners. On the other hand 55.6% of the students felt streaming allows students to follow the subjects of their choice.
Table 15: Views of students on why they were not in favour of streaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number of mentions out of 15</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students in the lower ability streams were psychologically oppressed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The lower ability stream students were neglected and labelled by teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competition was only evident in the upper streams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, it is observed that most students (100% and 53.3%) were not in favour of streaming because they felt that streaming had negative psychological effects on the low ability stream students. They felt that streaming encouraged teachers to attach negative labels to the low ability stream students. The reasons students expressed gave a clear reflection of the experiences of the low ability stream students considering the fact that 70% of the students who were against streaming belonged to these streams.

The students were asked to suggest grouping methods other than streaming that can be used to group students. The suggestions they gave are shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Suggestions by students on the grouping procedures other than streaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th>Number of mentions out of 60</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students own choice</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The social conduct of students</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Careers students wished to pursue in future</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students’ friendship pattern</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of the suggestions given revealed that, apart from academic advancement, students were probably interested in gaining socially and personally from the grouping method their school employed. The researcher is of the view that students would probably gain socially when their friendship patterns and moral patterns were put into consideration. Consequently, personal development would probably be gained when their interest in specific subjects and the careers they wished to pursue in future were considered as well.

Lastly, students were asked if their parents were aware of the grouping procedures the school employed. The 60 students interviewed said their parents did not know the grouping procedures the school used. This confirms the senior-master's response on the issue. He had said that he felt the parents were not aware of the grouping processes the school used because students were given uniform fee structures unlike previously when the high ability stream known as the 'Government stream' paid less than compared to the other streams. Students suggested that parents should be involved more in the running of the school because this would enable them to know the academic progress of their children and thus understand why they were being put in the streams they belonged to. After looking at the perceptions of students and teachers, the next section gives an analysis of classroom observations made in the study.

Part II: Observation of the Classrooms and Students

Participation in class Activities

This section presents the data obtained from observations made in the school during the study. Observations made, combined with inferences from the
interviews conducted assisted the researcher to formulate factors that may have been in operation in the streamed school situation. The results obtained from observations of students' participation in class activities and physical aspects and space allocations are described below.

Observations of the physical aspects and space allocations of the classrooms were to generate information on the differences between the streams that may have influenced the self-images of academic performance the students formed.

The researcher focused on the physical state of windows, roofs and the floor. In addition, space allocations and the presence of maps and charts on the walls were observed.

The observations showed that the physical state of the classrooms were similar. Most classrooms had broken windows, cracked floors and old roofs. Space allocations were also similar except in form four where the Y stream had slightly more desks (49) compared to the W and X which had 46 and 47 desks respectively. The researcher confirmed the interview information given by students from Four Four Y that their class was over-crowded and this, therefore, affected the utilization of important resources like books and laboratory facilities.

Generally, there were few charts on the classroom walls in the school. There were two newspaper cuttings in Form Two W and three biological charts in Form Four W. The researcher probed to find out who was responsible for other charts. The students said the newspaper cuttings were put by the students themselves while the chart had been put up by a teacher.
Observations were carried out to verify the data obtained from the teachers' interview that the low ability stream students were "dull" in class. In order to obtain quality information in the limited time available, only form two streams were observed. Students in these streams were observed on their class participation in compulsory subjects like Mathematics, English and Biology.

The researcher observed that the Form Two W students participated more in the class activities compared to the other streams. During the biology lesson for example, the teacher found it difficult to choose one student to answer the questions he had asked on respiration because all the students had their hands raised. In addition, these students gave examples when required to especially in English after learning new topics. The researcher noted that nearly all the students in the class were able to construct sentences using the new items they had learned.

Students in Form Two W were observed not to hesitate to clarify issues that were not clear. They were asking the teachers to explain some ideas that did not seem to be clear yet were related to the topic in question. The researcher noted one such incident during a biology lesson on respiration. One student wanted to find out if hiccuping had a biological explanation that was more realistic compared to the traditional one that said that one was being talked about at the precise moment when one hiccuped. In response, the teachers said hiccuping was caused by lack of enough oxygen.

When compared to the other streams, students in Form Two W made less noise during the class hours, while students from Form Two Y made the most
The noise was manifested in terms of murmurs when lessons were in progress. In addition, the Form Two Y students were noted to speak in vernacular in between lessons and gave chorus answers when teachers asked questions. Form Two X students were on the other hand observed to be somewhat “dull”. They were not willing to answer questions or participate in class activities unless threatened with phrases like “I will follow the line,” which meant that the teacher would follow the seating arrangement when choosing students to answer questions to ensure that all students participated in the class activities.

Some Form Two Y students were noted to have a problem in communicating. These students appeared to have problems with communicating in English, a fact that may have discouraged many of them from actively participating in class. In addition, the Form Two Y stream students often tended to speak “Kinyala” (the Luhya dialect spoken by people in the area where the school is located), when the teachers were out of class. The researcher was thus able to confirm the information given by the senior-master that most students in stream Y come from the community around the school. One can conclude that, having come from the same area, the students found it expedient to communicate in the local dialect. The researcher was interested in what the teachers were doing to improve these students’ English. Only the English teacher cautioned them to stop speaking vernacular during class hours. The researcher is of the view that more strict measures like the use of a “disc” to punish those whose students spoke vernacular would have been a better way of improving the spoken English by weak students of the school.

The researcher noted that the classroom participation observations coincided with the labels the teachers attached to students in the different
streams. Although these differences would be attributed to the ability grouping procedures the school used, some other contributory factors were evident. For example, the observations revealed that although Form Two Y students were generally active, they were disadvantaged because they would not adequately express themselves in English. Such social factors may have further reinforced the negative labels the teachers had attached to the low ability stream students. After looking at the observations made in the study, we now turn to the report on document analysis.

Table 1.1(a): Grades of high school form two Y students in the first year of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III: - Document Analysis of Academic reports

and school time-tables

An Analysis of academic reports was made in order to obtain information on the actual performance of students in different streams. This information was in turn analysed and interpreted in the light of the information obtained from interviews. In addition, the school time-tables were observed to verify the interview information obtained.

The Form Two students were randomly selected since all the students could not be used in the limited time available. Otherwise students in this class had the advantages of being streamed. In addition, the researcher was able to assess the academic performance of the Form Two streams for the period when the students were in Form One. The aim of the documentary analysis was to find out from past documents or records if the actual performance of students in different streams tallied with the perceived labels the teachers had attached to them. This in turn was to show whether some kind of self-fulfilling prophecy was
in operation in terms of students in different streams conforming to the labels the school attached to them.

The results obtained were presented in form of grades students obtained and their absolute frequencies in terms one to three of the school year. The results for each stream are shown in Tables 17(a), 17(b) and 17(c).

**Table 17(a) Chebuyusi high school form two W end of term grades for the first year of study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Range of marks</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0-34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17(b): Chebuyusi High School form two X
end of term grades for the first year of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Range of marks</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17(c): Chebuyusi High School form two Y end of term grades for the first year of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Range of marks</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0-34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grades were converted into points using the National Examination grading scale given in appendix 5. After converting the grades into points, the mean points were calculated using the formula:

\[
\text{Mean} = \frac{\text{Total number of points}}{N}
\]

Table 18 shows the mean points that were obtained.
The stream means showed that 2W performed better than the other streams. The performance of forms 2X and 2Y on the other hand is trivial statistically. Relating this to the perceived abilities of these classes, it can be noted that form 2W conformed to the perception of academic performance attached to it, that if performed better than the other two streams. Forms 2X and 2Y on the other hand, did not conform to the perception of academic performance attached to them. Instead of form 2X performing better than 2Y as it was expected, 2Y's performance was the same as 2X. This outcome appeared to spoil the students (other than 2Y) and teacher's perception that 2Y students were relatively poor performers compared to the other streams. The 2Y class was composed of students from the surrounding community who had failed to secure places outside the location. The results appear to suggest that academic performance may not be entirely the reason for the students' failure to secure places in the surrounding high schools. The researcher is of the view that reasons like lack of school fees, transport and the quality of the schools may have played major roles in limiting the students.

Since the perceived academic abilities of students in the different streams did not appear to be based on stream means as the analysis of documents had shown (especially for Forms 2X and 2Y), one is likely to say that there is a
possibility that incorrect labels had been attached to the poor streams. These labels may have influenced the self-concepts of academic performance formed by students in the different streams and these may in turn have an impact on the actual performance of the students. To verify this further, an analysis of the national examination results was done.

Results of 4 Streams

During the time of data collection, the 1992 KCSE results were received by the school. The researcher thus had an opportunity to look at these results with an aim of analyzing the performance of students in the different streams. Subjects that were offered to students in the different streams are shown in Table 19.

Table 19: Subject allocation of form four students of 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Subjects offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Y</td>
<td>Physical and Biological sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4X</td>
<td>Pure sciences/Physical and Biological sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4W</td>
<td>Pure sciences, technical drawing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores of each stream were calculated from the points obtained by students in each stream. The results are shown in Table 20.
Table 20: 1992 form 4 stream mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Mean (in points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Y</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4X</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4W</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Mean</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See appendix 5 for the National Examination grading scale.

The table shows that Form 4W (which contained the best academic performing students that year), obtained the best results when the means were calculated. It obtained a mean of 51 which was far above the school mean for that year. Comparing these results with the perceptions of teachers concerning the academic capability of different streams, one can conclude that the teachers’ view that the form 4W was the best stream academically was justified. The other two streams that consisted of students of low ability came much behind the upper stream when the means were calculated. Apart from National Examination results, the researcher also looked at school time-tables.

Allocation of Subjects on Time-tables

Inferences from the interviews necessitated the observation of form two class time-tables. The form 2X students who were interviewed had cited the allocation of important subjects at wrong times of the day as one of the reasons for disliking their stream. They said mathematics which is an important subject was taught in the afternoons. All form two time-tables were studied, the results are given in Appendix 6.
Table 21: A breakdown of streams allocation of Mathematics and Science subjects in the last three periods of the day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Number of times in a week</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 21 confirm the interview information given by Form 2X students that their stream is disadvantaged in terms of time allocations for important subjects like Mathematics. Yet they felt that subjects like Mathematics were better understood in the morning when students were fresh. They also felt that afternoons were inappropriate for teaching such lessons considering the hot weather conditions prevailing in this area. From the above data, the researcher is of the view that teachers should allocate important and “difficult” subjects like mathematics in the mornings because students felt they learn better at this time of the day. The time-tables revealed that some important subjects like mathematics and science were allocated to be taught in the afternoons more for some streams than others. Table 21 shows the number of times these subjects were taught during the last three periods of the day in a week in each stream.

Summary

Chapter four has presented and analysed the data obtained from interviews, observations and document analysis of the study. The results of the
study showed that the school streaming process exhibited some factors that had either a positive or negative impact on students belonging to different streams. Such factors include, different subjects offered to different streams, the names given to different streams, the way the teachers treat students belonging to different streams and the actual performance of students in the different streams.

In addition the study found out that the head teacher was reluctant in revealing the fact that Chebuyusi High School was streamed. This may be due to the unclear Ministerial Policy on streaming that existed. Other than the two principal findings that were evident in the study, a detailed summary of the other research findings and recommendations are given in chapter five.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This section presents a summary of the principal research findings. The broad aim of this study was to find out the impact streaming may be having on the self-image of academic performance formed by the students belonging to different streams. This being a case-study, it focused on one streamed school in Kakamega district to obtain quality information. The study employed observations, interviews and document analysis as the research tools.

In view of the effects of streaming existent in streamed schools and the fact that there is no clear Ministerial Policy on the classroom streaming in Kenya, it is possible that the practice of streaming may have yet unknown and far reaching impacts and implications with respect to pupil’s performance. Therefore, the findings of this study are likely to go a long way in assisting the Ministry of Education to generate better streaming policies and practices. In addition, it will enlighten different concerned parties like parents, students, teachers and policy makers about the influence or non-influence of school streaming on the academic performance of students.
Whether Students and Teachers were aware that Streaming was Practised in the School

On the question of whether the students and teachers were aware of the grouping procedures the school employed, the study revealed that Chebuyusi High School administration probably did not favour disclosing to students the grouping procedures the school employed. However, the researcher found out that the students were aware that streaming was practised in their school. The unclear grouping policy from the Kenyan Ministry of Education coupled with the disadvantages noted when students had been streamed made many head-teachers reluctant to reveal the fact that they streamed their students. Nevertheless, the streaming process evident in Chebuyusi High School harboured distinct indicators that clearly showed the grouping procedures the school employed. The indicators included the following:

* Differentiated subjects offered to different ability groups
* National examination results
* Teacher expectations of students abilities
* Differential treatments given to students in various groups
* Location of subjects on the time-table
* The names given to different streams (i.e. Government, harambee, community)

On the question of subjects, what emerged from the study is that students of different ability groups were offered different subjects depending on how well the teachers thought these students would handle these subjects. Pure sciences and technical drawing which were believed to be “difficult” were offered
to the "best" academic performing students. The "poor" performing students were offered biological and physical sciences.

Teacher expectations was another indicator of the existence of streaming in the school. The teachers of Chebuyusi High School had formed some clear-cut expectations about the academic performance of students in different streams. Teachers felt that the "upper ability" students that belonged to the "W" streams were the "best" when it came to academic performance followed by "X" and "Y" streams. Similarly, in terms of other academic related issues like level of understanding detailed work, pace in classwork and participation in class activities, the teachers still rated the "W" stream better than the other streams.

The national examination of 1992 results also indicated that some form of streaming or grouping by ability had been employed. The performance of students belonging to different streams in the national examination also showed some indication that students must have been grouped according to their abilities. The stream average points showed that Form 4W (which was believed to consist of students of high ability) outshone the other two streams with an average of 51 points compared to 42 and 47 points respectively for 4X and 4Y streams.

The researcher also noted that there existed some distinct differences in the way students were treated in terms of time allocation of subjects on the time table and space allocations. The less able group of students belonging to the "low ability" streams were not favoured in terms of allocation of subjects on the time-table. For example, Form Two X had time allocations for important subjects like Mathematics, Chemistry, Biology and Physics in the afternoons which they
said was an inappropriate time to teach subjects like these that needed a lot of concentration on the part of the students.

In terms of space allocations, one of the low ability streams, Y, had more students when compared to the other streams. The students in this stream said this jeopardized the efficient utilization of the limited resources available in the school. For example, Form 2Y had 49 students unlike 2W and 2X that had 46 and 47 students respectively. This meant that the 2Y stream had more students sharing one text book when compared to the other two classes.

Thus although the students and teachers of Chebuyusi High School were not informed about the grouping policies the school employed, they nevertheless were well aware of the streaming procedures employed through the various indicators evident in the school. For example, the different names given to different streams (i.e. "Government", "Community" and "Harambee") show some form of ability grouping.

The information on parents awareness of the grouping procedures employed by the school was obtained from interviewing students. Students said their parents were neither informed nor aware of the grouping procedures the school employed. One wonders why parents who financed the school learning resources were not involved when it came to important aspects of the school like the organization. The researcher is of the view that if the parents were involved more, they would know about the lack of text-books and would be willing to provide more books. Similarly, parents would also begin to take interest in their
children's school work and therefore assist the school administration on which grouping methods to employ.

Did streaming impose labels that had a deterministic possibility of a self-fulfilling kind in terms of performance and the self-concept of academic performance the students formed?

According to Merton, the self-fulfilling prophecy is in the beginning a "false" definition of a situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the originally false conception come true.¹ In the case of streaming that involves ability grouping, some kind of self-fulfilling prophecy has been shown to take place. The students form self-images of academic performance in accordance with teacher expectations of the academic performance of their streams. They begin to work at the level of the group they find themselves in to satisfy but not exceed the expectations of the teachers.² The study revealed the following on the self-image and the actual performance of the students in relation to the self-fulfilling prophecy. The lower and upper stream pupils portrayed different self images of academic performance.

The lower stream students portrayed a negative self-image of academic performance that was derived from their perceptions on academic issues. These students rated the academic performance of their stream as average when compared to the other streams. Furthermore, they said subjects offered to their streams were arts oriented. They said the art related jobs were already flooded in the market economy. In addition, these students said most of their classmates had given up in subjects like mathematics and therefore missed lessons in
these subjects. However, students in the low ability stream were noted on occasion to defend their subjects and to use phrases like,

"Agriculture and History are practical oriented subjects that will enhance our future careers".

Nevertheless, the true picture was revealed when one of the students in the lower streams said after the interview that the students in his stream were not free in airing their views because,

"The truth is bitter".

This meant that many of these students knew that the ability differences existed between them and the upper ability streams, but they would not bring themselves to admit this fact.

The upper stream students portrayed a positive self-image of academic performance when their perceptions on academic issues were sought. When asked to rate their streams in terms of how they thought they performed academically compared to other streams, they said they were "good". In addition, they said they felt that in their view, they were the best students academically because they were offered "difficult" subjects like technical drawing and pure sciences that were considered to be the schools' "weapon" since the academic excellence of schools were derived from how well the schools performed in pure sciences.

Looking at the actual performance of students in relation to the self-images they formed, the study found that at the initial stages when students were grouped according to their abilities. There were no great differences in the average performance fo students in different streams. For example, the
document analysis of Form Two end of term academic reports obtained the following mean average points for the three streams, form 2W - 21.1, form 2X - 18.5, form 2Y - 19.3. These results, in fact, revealed that form 2W performed better than form 2X. Form 2Y was believed to be poorer academically. However, it seemed that with time, the students in the different streams began to take on the perceived ability performance of the streams they had been allocated. The form four KCSE results showed that the "best" stream (4W) actually performed better than the other streams, followed by 4X and 4Y came last. These results conformed to the perceived ability levels the teachers expected the streams to achieve.

Since the perceived academic ability of students in different streams did not appear to be based on stream means as the analysis of documents portrayed for form two students, one is likely to say that there is a possibility that incorrect labels had been attached to the poorer streams. Yet these labels influenced the self-concepts of academic performance of students in different streams formed. Consequently, these may have in turn had an impact on the actual performance of students (the case of form four). It can therefore be concluded that some kind of self-fulfilling prophecy was in operation in the streamed Chebuyusi High School. The original decision to group students according to ability was somewhat nurturing the self-images of academic performance that the students formed which subsequently had impact on performance in the final examinations.

In terms of academic issues, what did students like or dislike about the streams they belonged to?

Students cited the curriculum offered to their stream as an aspect they either liked or disliked depending on the streams they belonged to. As cited
earlier, the upper ability stream students liked their streams because they were offered pure science subjects which they said were marketable in the present economic situation. Conversely, students in the lower streams did not like their streams because they were offered arts oriented subjects. They said the art related subjects were already flooded in the market economy.

Similarly, students in lower ability streams cited negative teacher attitudes towards their stream as an aspect they did not like about their stream. One student went further to explain that teachers referred to students in the lower ability streams as "kumbets", which he said meant "the dumb ones". In addition, form two X students cited "wrong" time allocations of important subjects like mathematics on the time-table as an aspect they did not like about their streams. On the other hand, Form Four Y students cited overcrowding in the classroom as an aspect they did not like about their stream.

It was evident that students were treated differently depending on the streams they belonged to. Whether this was done conciously or unconciously, the fact remains that it may have affected the self-images of academic performance the students formed depending on the streams they belonged to. This was manifested in the overt behaviour of missing lessons by some of the students. For example, some of the upper ability students said, some students in their streams missed lessons because they thought "they knew everything". Conversely, some lower ability students said some students in their streams missed lessons because they "had lost the hope" of passing some "difficult" subjects like mathematics. They did not see the need of attending lessons in these subjects.
Did transfer between streams occur?

The senior-master and the head-teacher revealed that transfer between streams did not occur in Chebuyusi High School. This portrayed the inflexibility of the streaming system. It meant that students who were "wrongly" placed in streams did not get a chance of being transferred to the correct stream, a fact that revealed the inefficiency of the streaming system.

Besides academic ability, were there other factors that should have been considered in streaming pupils?

When students and teachers were asked to give other factors apart from academic ability that they thought can be used to group students into streams, the teachers suggested the random mixing of students. The students said they would like to be consulted in future when decisions were made on important matters like the grouping patterns the school wanted to employ. They said they would have liked to see the following aspects in the grouping method the school had chosen:-(Details of the statistical evidence are given in table 16).

* Students’ conduct and friendship patterns
* Careers students intend to pursue in future
* Students interest and performance in specific subjects

A careful examination of the suggestions given, revealed that apart from academic advancement, students wanted to obtain personal and social benefits from the grouping procedures their school used. Social benefits would have
been obtained from grouping students according to their friendship patterns and social conduct. Personal advancement would be reached by grouping students following their subject and career choices. Thus, the students raised two important elements that should be put in mind by teachers when making decisions on the grouping patterns they would like to use for their schools.

Some may argue that there is no need of considering the social and personal aspects when grouping pupils because these were taken care of in the social ethics lessons. It is doubtful, however, whether such a position is tenable. The time of looking at moral and social issues in a responsible way, under the guidance of someone skilled to supervise it, is no doubt of great value. However, a major part of social learning and growth of a person is the development of social attitudes that come about through real relationships, such as teacher-pupil relationships.

What did the teachers and students feel were the advantages and disadvantages of streaming students?

The study revealed that all the thirty teachers interviewed felt that streaming had disadvantages in terms of having negative psychological effects on the low ability stream students so that they felt that they were inferior when it came to academic performance. In addition, they said variations in ability between streams made teachers have difficulties in making different lesson plans for each stream.

Unlike the teachers some students also went ahead to give the advantages of streaming. Most students interviewed said streaming raised the school’s mean performance and ensured that students were offered subjects they were able to handle.
An analysis of the data obtained in this section came up with the conclusion that, like any other process, streaming had both advantages and disadvantages, depending on how one looked at it. The upper stream students were for the use of streaming as a grouping method because it seemed to favour them. The lower ability stream students were on the other hand against the use because it did not seem to favour them. Likewise, the teachers were against the use of streaming because of the problems they experienced in teaching. Therefore, the school constituents should carefully analyse the advantages and disadvantages of using streaming as a grouping procedure before they decide on whether to use it or not.

A question therefore arises whether it is beneficial to develop or adopt a pluralistic approach to serve as a basis for national school streaming policy. The study revealed that the unclear Kenyan Ministerial Policy on the grouping procedures to be employed by schools made most head-teachers interviewed unsure of the methods they should use. Further, the ones who used streaming were aware of its advantages as a grouping method and were sensitive when asked whether they used it.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy Recommendations

Parents were not informed about the grouping procedures the school employed. In view of the above practice, a revision of the 1968 Educational Act should be done because parents were not fully empowered to have a say in the educational processes. There needs to be a collaborative effort between teachers, students and parents in the decision making process on matters that concern the school and in particular those that touch on students directly. As much as parents are involved in financing the school learning resources, they should also be involved in running the schools. In cases where conflicting interests arise, the Ministerial Policy should assist in making the final decision.

The unclear Ministerial Policy on the grouping procedures the schools should employ creates uncertainty on the part of the head-teacher as to whether they should stream their students or not. Consequently, a formulation of a clear Ministerial Policy on grouping is needed so that the head-teachers know exactly what is expected of them in terms of the grouping procedures they employ in their schools.

In the light of the impact streaming has on the formation of self-images of academic performance of students in different streams, as revealed by the study, serious discussions should be held by parents, students and teachers of schools that want to use streaming as a grouping procedure before they decide to use it. It is in such a forum that the advantages and disadvantages of streaming will be
discussed and a final decision reached. In the case where a tie occurs as to whether to stream or not, the Ministerial Policy recommended earlier would resolve the impasse.

**Recommendations for further Research**

The purpose of this case study was to find out the perceptions of students and teachers on the impact of streaming on the formation of self-images of academic performance. In the light of the findings obtained from this one case, the study suggests that more research through a survey of streamed schools in the country should be carried out to make the results be generalized to similar schools in the country. These findings will further assist the Ministry for Education in whatever policy it is going to adopt on the process of streaming. In addition, a study on streaming in primary schools should be undertaken because in class streaming seems to be known fact in these early childhood institutions. This is important because it is at this early age that children form self-concepts that will later shape their personalities and aspirations in life.

2. Ibid: p.243
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Interview guide for Head-teachers

1. What criteria if any does your school use in grouping students?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. Is there any official policy guiding the grouping method you use?

YES ___________  NO ________________

3. Do you agree with the policy? YES ___________  NO ___________

4. What aspects would you like to see in the policy or practice?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Are the students and parents aware of the criterion used to group students in the different streams?

Parents

YES ______

NO ______

Students

YES ______

NO ______
6. What criteria do you use to allocate teachers to the different streams they teach?

7. Do students go out for academic trips?
   YES _____
   NO _____

8. If so, is it all students in that particular form?
   YES _____
   NO _____

9. In your view, how do the students in the various streams perform as they progress from,
   Form 1 - F2 - X
   Y
   W
   Form 3 - F4 - X
   Y
   W

Indicate whether, Good, Average or poor.
10. Do they maintain the initial abilities, raise or lower them as they continue

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

11. What do you think is the reason for this?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

12. Does transfer between streams occur?

YES ___

NO ___

13. Who allocates exercise and text books to the students?

(a) ____________________  (b) ____________________

(c) ____________________

14. What differences do you note when teaching the different streams in terms of

(a) Pace ____________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(b) Amount of preparation you make ____________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
15. What is your general attitude towards the streaming of students?


16. Do you think other factors should be considered in grouping students?

   YES ___
   NO ___

17. Which factors?

   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 
   (iv)
APPENDIX 2

Interview guide for subject teachers

Male
Female

1. Teaching experience. Number of years

Teachers qualification
Bachelor of Education
Untrained Graduate Teacher
Diploma in Education
Trained Technical Teacher
Untrained Teacher

3. Positions of responsibility held in the school

No of years

(a)
(b)
(c)
(d)

4. How do you allocate exercise and text books to students?
5. For Teachers teaching English the use of the Library

6. For Teachers teaching Science the use of the Laboratory

7. In your view, how do the students in the different streams perform in the subjects you teach as they progress from Form One to Two

   Form One to Two

   Form Two to Three

8. What is the cause of this performance?

9. If you teach the same subject in the different streams, how do you compare the streams in terms of
   (a) Pace
   (b) Amount of preparation you make
   (c) The level of understanding detailed material
10. What is your view as regards the streaming of students? _____________________________

11. Is academic criterion the only one that can be used to group students?
   YES ___
   NO ___

   If no, what are the other factors that should be considered?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

12. Have you ever talked to the parents about streaming?
    YES ___
    NO ___

13. What do they feel? __________________________________________
    __________________________________________
    __________________________________________
APPENDIX 3

Interview guide for students

1. Do you know the criteria that was used to group you into the stream you find yourself in now?

   YES ____________________  NO ____________________

2. What subjects do you take?

   __________  __________  __________
   __________  __________  __________
   __________  __________  __________

3. What in your view, is the general pattern of performance of the stream you belong to? Rate in terms of Good, Average or Poor.

4. How are text and exercise books allocated to your stream?

   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

5. What do you like about the stream you belong to in terms of academic work, e.g., your teachers, the pace at which you move etc?

   ___________________________________________________________________
6. What don't you like about your stream in terms of academic issues?


7. Given a choice would you stay in the stream you are in?

YES ____ NO ____

Why?


8. Are you in favour of streaming?

YES ____ NO ____

Why? ____________________________


9. Do you think other things should be considered in grouping?

YES ____ NO ____

Give examples ______________________


APPENDIX 4

Observation schedule 1:

Observation of classroom learning resources

All the classrooms and laboratory were observed. The following information were noted and recorded for each stream.

(i) Spacing of the classroom in terms of amount of space between the desks in the classroom.

Form ______

Sufficient ____ Crowded _____

(ii) The use of displays and illustrations on the classroom walls.

Utilized ______ Not utilized ______

(iii) The physical condition of the classroom.

Broken windows _____ Leaking roof _____

Floor _____ Lighting _____

(iv) Organization of the laboratory before the start of the lesson

Well organized _____ Not well organized _____

(v) Number and condition of text books for each stream.

Form ______

Number of text books _____ Subject _____

Good condition _____ Poor condition _____
Observation schedule 2:

Documentary observation

The form two end of term report forms were observed and recorded in terms of grades awarded for each student. The records were in the form given below.

Form 2 Performance Frequencies 1992.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall letter grade</th>
<th>1st term</th>
<th>No. Of students</th>
<th>2nd term</th>
<th>3rd term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation schedule 3:

Students participation in the classroom

Observation on how the form two students participate in the class-room will be done. Different subjects and teachers will be involved. The records will be made as follows,

Form 2 _______ Subject __________ Date __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Activities</th>
<th>Frequency of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ask questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Give examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarify issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Answer questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Add any other activities noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

The national examination grading scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 6

Chebuyusi High School Form Two time-tables

### Form 2W class time-table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>Hist</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Phy</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>CRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Phy</td>
<td>Phy</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>S.eth</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Hist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Form 2X class time-Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Hist</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Chem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Geo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>His</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table represents the time-table for Form 2W and Form 2X classes of Chebuyusi High School. The columns represent different subjects and the rows represent different days of the week. The subjects are arranged in a specific sequence, with some subjects repeated throughout the week.
Form 2Y class time-table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>B.ed.</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Phy</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Agr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Hist</td>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>S.eth</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Eng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key for time tables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kis</td>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ed</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.eth</td>
<td>Social Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Christian Religious Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>