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ABSTRACT

Competence in writing skills in Kiswahili among the secondary school students in Kenya is significant in determining students’ performance in the overall Kiswahili examination and consequently their overall performance of Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination. Performance in the Kiswahili examination in the past has, however, been generally poor especially in the Kiswahili composition (Insha) paper. Students’ acquisition of Insha writing skills can only be facilitated by their teachers since writing is only acquired by being taught. The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of Kiswahili teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in Insha writing skills. The pedagogical competencies, which the study focused on, were: - teacher planning to teach, teaching methods, learning resources, classroom management, and design and use of assessment techniques. The theoretical framework of this study was based on Gerlarch and Ely (1980) Model which illustrates fundamental principles of teaching and learning of any subject. The study was intended to contribute to knowledge by trying to address teacher pedagogical competencies that motivate students to perform well in writing. The study adopted a quasi-experimental research design of the pre-test- post-test type. Stratified and purposive random sampling was used to select seven regions of Kenya, from which 16 public single, mixed, day secondary schools, which had the lowest overall mean score in the Kiswahili KCSE examination for two years in their respective sub-counties, were selected. The respondents of the study were 16 Kiswahili teachers and 637 form four students from the selected schools. Data were collected using questionnaires for teachers and students, observation schedule of live lessons, documentary analysis schedules and students’ pre-test and post-test scores in Insha writing. After pretest the students were grouped into experimental and control groups and then they were taught Insha writing before doing the post-test. The students in the experimental group were taught using an intervention module which was based on a process-oriented approach of teaching writing, while those in the control group were taught by teachers using the conventional method which was product oriented. Data were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to compute t-test for establishing any statistically significant differences between the overall pre-test mean scores of the experimental and control groups, pretest and post-test mean scores and between experimental and control groups in their post-test mean scores. The study findings indicated that, the students’ pre-test mean scores for both groups were low and there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups. The low pretest performance was because the students had not acquired sufficient writing skills due the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies as indicated in inadequate planning, insufficient learning resources, use of mass-oriented approach, inappropriate class arrangements and inadequate assessment techniques. The students’ post-test mean scores for both groups improved, with the experimental group performing better than the control group. There was, therefore, a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test overall mean scores and between the experimental and control group due to both groups having been taught and because of the experimental group using process-oriented approach which focused on group work or collaborative learning. The study concluded that; students’ performance in Insha writing was influenced by teacher pedagogical competencies. Students’ performance could be improved by teachers who did not only have the knowledge of pedagogical competencies but also the skills, commitment and motivation to use the pedagogical competencies holistically in a process oriented approach of teaching writing. The study recommendations were that: The Ministry of Education needs to consider to in-service the Kiswahili teachers in process oriented approach for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) and also to consider increasing the Kiswahili lessons in form three and four to eight. The school administrators need to support the teachers with facilities and time and also ensure that they applied all the pedagogical competencies in all their teaching. For further research, this study recommended that; research could be carried out on the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in other language skills or in other subjects at any level of education.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Kiswahili is a Bantu language which, like other Bantu languages in Kenya has its native speakers who are the Swahili, found along the coastal part of Kenya. However for most people in Kenya, Kiswahili is a second language or even a third language, according to Whiteley (1974), because most educated Kenyans are multilingual, since they speak their ethnic (first) languages, English and Kiswahili. Mitchell and Myles (2004) refer to first language as mother tongue or native language. Whiteley (1974) refers to first languages in Kenya as ethnic languages or African languages which are regarded as belonging to four major groups; Bantu, Nilotic, Para-Nilotic and Cushitic. Second language, on the other hand, is defined by Rod (1997) as any language that is learned after the mother tongue or the learning of a third or fourth language, and it is learned through contact or in a classroom through instruction. Mitchell and Myles (2004) concur with Rod, and further state that, such second languages can be of wide communication within the local region, like Kiswahili in Kenya or they can be foreign languages like English, French, Germany and other foreign languages in Kenya.

Languages can be acquired as a first language, or as a second language. The acquisition of first language is considered by linguists such as Brumfit (1989) and Mitchell and Myles (2004) to be easier, faster and the level of competence is high. This is because children acquire it through the natural process of socialization within the family and as they interact with adults in their natural environment. These linguists however view
second language learning as an extraordinary complex phenomenon which, they assert that, a large number of people never acquire it, to a high level of competence. Due to the differences in acquiring first and second language, Brumfit (1989) states that there is much greater need to learn a second language in an institution of learning than when acquiring first language. In this case, according to Omondi (1999), second language learning is particularly related to the conscious language teaching and learning, which takes place in the classroom.

Competence in second language is therefore only developed by being taught in the classroom, whereby, Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) suggest that, in teaching and learning a second language, instructors may need to focus more on oral skills of listening and speaking, in the early stages. This is because, according to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) competence in these skills is important for communication and they lay the foundation for the acquisition of the reading and writing skills later. They further emphasize that, all these four skills in second language have to be taught by competent teachers especially writing skill, because writing skills are the most difficult to master in second language acquisition. In supporting the importance of a competent teacher in second language teaching, Brumfit (1989) states that one major relevant factor in second language teaching is the teacher’s variable which includes aspects such as aptitude, attitude, motivation, age, previous experience and training. Gorman (1991) also recognizes the role of the teacher in students’ second language learning as that of a key position. He emphasizes that, the Teacher pedagogical competencies in second language teaching is significant for their students’ competence in second language.
Kiswahili which is a second language to most people in Kenya is also, according to Mulokozi (2002), a second language in most East and Central African Countries. In those countries it serves an important function of unifying different countries of this region of Africa and the world at large. Mulokozi, further, states that; Kiswahili is one of the 42 officially recognized languages used at the United Nations Headquarters to disseminate information to its member countries and it has been recognized as one of the official languages of the African Union. Kiswahili is also used in many parts of the world and it is taught in many universities in the Middle East, Japan, China, Europe and U.S.A. Major world broadcasting corporations such as British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Deutschvelle, Channel Africa, Voice of America, Radio Japan and Radio China broadcast in Kiswahili.

Kiswahili in Kenya is not only an important second language second language to most Kenyans, but according to the Kenya Constitution (2010), it is both a national as well as an official language. In the Kenyan school curriculum, Kiswahili is also a compulsory subject which is examined at the end of primary school level in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) and at the end of secondary school level in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination. As a compulsory subject in both primary and secondary schools in Kenya, good performance in Kiswahili in these two examinations is very significant for the students’ overall performance in both KCPE and KCSE examinations.

Performance in the KCSE examination in public secondary schools is a major concern for the government of Kenya. This is because all public secondary schools, which include, sub-county, county, and the national secondary schools are all funded by the
government and the community and they are provided with teachers posted by Teacher Service Commission (TSC). These schools are also managed by the Board of Management (BoM) and Parents Teacher s Association (PTA). Despite all these efforts, the Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) reports of the KCSE examination results show poor performance in this examination. The KNEC report of 2012 for the year 2011 KCSE examination results indicated that, the number of candidates who had a minimum university entry qualification of C+ and above were 119,658 (29.12%). The public district and low cost private schools which admitted over 70% of the students that joined secondary schools, had poor performance ranging from D+, D, D- and E which was 43% of the grades attained by students. It was also noted that the performance levels in Kiswahili were dwindling among other subjects which were poorly performed in that year and has continued dwindling over the years as it is indicated in Table 1.

Good performance in Kiswahili at the secondary school level is significant for the students because, being a compulsory subject; it contributes to their overall performance in the KCSE examination. It also provides an impetus for further learning of the language at higher levels of education and a criterion for selection into other courses which offer job placement. Furthermore, most professional courses after secondary education consider, for their selection, a pass in Kiswahili or English. At the post-secondary institutions like Primary Teacher Training Colleges, Kiswahili is one of the core subjects and at the university level, it is also one of the subjects being offered, especially in those universities which train Kiswahili teachers for secondary schools in Kenya.
Given the significant role of Kiswahili in Kenya, it is important that the teachers of Kiswahili should aim at developing adequate competence in their students so that they can perform well in the subject. On the contrary, Kiswahili has been one of the subjects which have had poor performance. This is illustrated in the performance of Kiswahili in the KCSE examination as analyzed by the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) (2009-2015) in Table 1.
### Table 1: Candidates' Performance in Kiswahili in K.C.S.E Examination from 2009 – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mwaka (Year)</th>
<th>Karatasi (Paper)</th>
<th>Watahiniwa (Candidature)</th>
<th>Alama ya Juu (Maximum Score)</th>
<th>Alama ya Wastani (Mean Score)</th>
<th>Asilimia (Percentage)</th>
<th>Alama Tenganisho (Standard Deviation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>335377</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>13.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>77.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>35.80</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>354,738</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>42.21</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39.22</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>14.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>87.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>410,807</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43.45</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37.76</td>
<td>47.20</td>
<td>14.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>97.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.81</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>433,886</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>71.62</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.71</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>445,555</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>83.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.77</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>482,122</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>40.34</td>
<td>12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42.93</td>
<td>53.66</td>
<td>15.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>95.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.88</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>521159</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>45.15</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>95.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the candidates' performance in Kiswahili in K.C.S.E Examination from 2009–2015. The table shows the total number of candidates in every year, the maximum scores and the mean scores for each of the three Kiswahili examination papers, the overall mean scores for every year, the percentages and standard deviation of each of the three Kiswahili examination papers and the overall mean score. From Table 1 the overall mean scores for the three papers have been below 50% in every year, from 2009-2015, with the highest overall mean score indicated as being 97.63 (48.82%) in the year 2011, while the lowest overall mean score is 71.62 (35.81%) in the year 2012. Paper 1, which is the focus of this study, was scored out of 40 marks and it had the lowest mean score of 10.43 (26.08%) in the year 2012 but there has been a steady improvement until in 2015 the overall mean score for paper 1 was 20.8 (52%). However, despite the improvement in Paper 1, it had the lowest standard deviation in all the years, which was an indication that this paper did not sufficiently discriminate between the good and poor performers.

In order to improve the students’ performance in the overall Kiswahili, Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) has been recommending in the reports released with the K.C.S.E examination results every year, that, the teachers should prepare their students well in all areas of Kiswahili according to the Kiswahili syllabuses of Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) and KNEC.
Furthermore, the teachers were advised by KNEC to give their students more practice in writing because competence in writing skills enables the students to improve in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. Furthermore, competence in writing also contributes to the overall performance in Kiswahili, since writing skills are used for answering questions in the other Kiswahili papers.

Writing, according to Gower, Philips and Walters (1995) and Conley (2011) is a way of communicating ideas and writing skills enable one to communicate effectively and clearly so as to be understood by others. Gower, Philips and Walters (1995) further state that, writing skills involve many different aspects such as: handwriting, spelling, punctuation, sentence construction, organizing a text and paragraphing, text cohesion, register or style and use of appropriate vocabulary in relation to the text. Conley (2011) states that, effective teaching of writing is whereby teachers help students to develop greater knowledge about writing, increase students’ ability to manage writing and promote positive attitudes about writing. All these aspects result into students’ competence in writing and they require to be taught by teachers who are competent. The role of the teacher in teaching writing skills is, therefore, significant because teachers determine students’ achievement in writing and consequently their overall achievement in second language.

A competent teacher, according to Shulman (2012), is one who has both content knowledge and pedagogical competencies. Content knowledge is what is to be taught while pedagogical competencies provide knowledge as well as skills of how to present the content. Stern (1983) further states that teacher pedagogical competencies in second language teaching consist of presage, context, process and product. He explains that the
Presage variables are the characteristics which teachers bring to their teaching context and consist of the conditions within which the teacher operates, such as: the community, the school environment and the pupils themselves. These determine the way the teacher will manage the teaching/learning environment. The processes are the learning activities which are determined by the teaching methods used by the teacher. The product variable refers to the outcome of the teaching/learning process, which is the actual language proficiency attained by learners as indicated by learners’ performance. Another definition of teacher pedagogical competence is by Suciu and Mata (2011) who consider the resources used by the teacher and the ability to manage the learning environment as pedagogical competencies. They also state that teacher pedagogical competencies consist of three major aspects of planning, teaching and assessing. In concurrence with Suciu and Mata (2011), Rahman (2014) defines teacher pedagogical competence as the ability to manage learning which includes, planning, implementation and evaluation of learning outcomes of learners.

From the definitions of pedagogical competencies by Stern (1983), Suciu and Mata (2011) and by Rahman (2014), this study considered focusing on the following typical Teacher pedagogical competencies: planning for teaching, methods of teaching, resources for teaching and learning, classroom management and design of assessment techniques as variables that influence students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.
Planning for teaching is one of the most important pedagogical competencies. According to Stern (1983), planning to teach a second language includes an analysis of the content areas to be taught, setting educational objectives, designing instructional procedures identifying and developing learning resources and learning activities. Planning is essential because, according to Ayot and Patel (1992) it enables the teacher to make sure that all syllabus topics are covered and teaching is done systematically. Research by Clark and Yinger (1979) established that planning enables teachers to be effective in teaching. Byra and Coulon (1994) found out that planning had a positive effect on Teacher instructional performance and thereby resulting to students’ positive learning experience. According Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) planning is, therefore, one of the basic pedagogical competencies and an essential requirement of a second language teacher, especially forward planning.

As for the pedagogical competency in methods of teaching writing, Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) state that current approaches to the study of writing and its teaching in English have been documented under traditional and modern approaches. The traditional approach is also referred to as the product- oriented approach whereby the teacher gives little information and asks the students to write a composition, which the teacher marks and returns to the students. The modern approach is referred to as the process-oriented approach to writing which according to Brown (2007) is a composing process that requires the teacher to lead the students through appropriate stages in the process of composing. The process-oriented approach requires the teacher, as recommended by Graham and Perin (2007a) to teach students to plan, draft, revise and editing strategies they can use independently and thus making this approach to be
learner-centered teaching style. Research findings on teaching writing have indicated that students’ achievement is higher when the process approach is used rather than product approach (Hillock 1984; Parson 1985). Since writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) have to be taught, it is only teachers with appropriate pedagogical competencies in teaching methods who can help the students to perform well.

Suciu and Mata (2011) define pedagogical competence as the teacher’s ability to use tangible resources or instructional materials such as: books, articles and technology such as software and hardware and also intangible resources such as knowledge, skills and experience. According to Gower and Philips (1995) and Farrant (2004), some of the resources a language teacher can use are like: the chalkboard, overhead projector, wall charts, pictures, maps, models, real objects, immediate environment, and artifacts. They also name other important resources like published materials such as course books, reference books, and other print materials like newspapers, journals and magazines. They assert that, use of teaching/learning resources make a lesson more interesting and effective because when resources are used in teaching writing, students are motivated to write and they create interest in them to learn to write. They emphasize that these materials help in achieving efficiency and effectiveness in pedagogy.

Classroom management as one of the pedagogical competencies is defined by Everton and Weinstein (2006) as the actions which the teachers take to create an environment that supports and facilitates academic and social-emotional learning. They also consider the aspect of physical space in the classroom in relation to capacity of students as important in classroom management. According to Marzano, Marzano, and Pickering (2003) classroom management is providing organized learning for students in ways that
allow all students to participate and succeed. Suciu and Mata (2011) state that, classroom management is the teacher’s ability to manage the teaching/learning process by considering optimum use of space and time factors, use of instructional resources as well as managing the learners so that effective learning can take place. All these aspects of classroom management require a teacher with pedagogical competencies in classroom management which can influence students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

Assessment is an integral component of the teacher pedagogical competencies as mentioned by Stern (1983), Suciu and Mata (2011) and by Rahman (2014) in their definition of Teacher pedagogical competencies. According to Stern (1983) assessment refers to the outcome of the teaching/learning process - the actual language proficiency attained by learners as indicated by learners’ performance. In teaching the writing skills, Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) assert that, the assessment tests designed for writing have to assess students’ ability to write. According to Coombe (2010) any type of writing assessment should measure students’ abilities to come up with the content, organize the ideas, use appropriate vocabulary, correct grammar, spelling use correct sentences, spelling, punctuation and accuracy. Another important aspect which the teacher needs to consider in assessing writing is to select the appropriate scoring scale depending on whether the instructional approach was product-oriented or process-oriented approach. The assessment of writing, according to Graham and Perin (2007b) is, therefore, an integral part of writing instruction because it enables teachers to establish whether their writing programme is successful, needs some adjustment and
whether some students need some extra help. All these aspects in assessment require teacher pedagogical competencies in designing assessment techniques.

An analysis of the teacher role in teaching writing skills shows that, Teacher pedagogical competencies are important in teaching writing because of the influence they have on students learning writing skills and the ultimate impact on students’ achievements. Studies which have been done in Kenya on factors that affect students’ performance in Kiswahili have however focused on other factors and variables other than the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition writing skills.

A study by Maloba (2010) in Rachuonyo district indicated that the students’ negative attitude to Kiswahili especially among the boys influenced their performance. Maina (2003) established that, the factors that caused poor performance in Kiswahili among the students in Kipiri division of Nyandarua district were: lack of learning resources, insufficient time, teachers feeling that they were overloaded and students’ negative attitudes to Kiswahili. Ogero (2012) who studied the effect of institutional factors influencing students’ performance in Kiswahili in Kisii, found out that the factors that caused students’ poor performance in Kiswahili were: teaching and learning resources which were inadequate, use of mother tongue and Sheng among students and the schools’ language policies that favored the use of English. Chomba (2013) did a study on the influence of Sheng and non-target structures on performance of Kiswahili composition in Nairobi, and established that; the oral and written form three compositions had various Sheng–related morphosyntactic errors.
All these studies have focused on the students and institutional factors as the causes of students’ poor performance in Kiswahili and did not investigate the role of the teacher. Studies which were done on the role of the teacher by Ferguson and Gilpin (2001) and Kuenzi (2008) have confirmed that the teacher is a very significant factor in determining students’ performance in any subject, as well as the general academic achievement. This study was therefore an attempt to find out how teacher pedagogical competencies influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Kiswahili is an important second language in Kenya and also in other countries in the world. In Kenya it is both a national as well as an official language and it is also a compulsory subject in the Kenyan school curriculum. Being a compulsory subject, it is examined at the end of primary and secondary school levels in both KCPE and KCSE examinations. Performance in this subject is very significant in determining the students’ overall performance in both KCPE and KCSE examinations. At the secondary school level, good performance in Kiswahili is particularly important because it provides the students with opportunities for further studies in the subject and training in various courses for various job placements.

Despite the significant role of Kiswahili, results in the KCSE examination have been poor whereby from 2009-2015 the highest overall mean score was 48.82 in 2010 (KNEC 2009-2015). Poor performance in Kiswahili examination in public secondary schools is a major concern to the government of Kenya and to the parents because of the
investment put in the education of every child especially in the secondary school. The recommendations by KNEC for improving the Kiswahili results in the KCSE examination have focused on the role of the Kiswahili teachers in preparing their students well in all areas of Kiswahili according to the Kiswahili syllabus, but with more emphasis on giving their students more practice in writing. Competence in writing skills in Kiswahili is important because, writing skills enable the students to improve in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) paper and consequently do well in the overall Kiswahili examination in the KCSE examination since, students also use Kiswahili to answer questions in the other writing skills in Kiswahili papers of the KCSE examination. In order to acquire writing skills in Kiswahili, students have to be facilitated by their teachers who have appropriate pedagogical competencies since writing is only acquired by being taught.

Studies which have been carried out in Kenya on students’ performance in Kiswahili have not focused on the Teacher competencies in teaching writing despite their role in determining students’ performance in the overall Kiswahili examination results. These studies have identified factors that relate to the students and the learning environment as being the causes of poor performance in Kiswahili but they have not mentioned any aspect about the teacher, despite studies indicating that the teacher is a dominant factor in determining students’ achievement in any subject. Writing skills which are also important in determining students’ performance in Kiswahili generally, have not been identified in these studies as one of the factors that could contribute to the general poor performance in Kiswahili despite KNEC having emphasized that teachers should teach writing skills.
In view of the poor performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) paper for the KCSE examination, and given the important role of the teachers in teaching writing skills, this study was therefore, intended to investigate how teacher pedagogical competencies influenced students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili. The study specifically focused on writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). The teacher pedagogical competencies which the study focused on were; teacher planning to teach, teaching methods, learning resources, classroom management, and design and use of assessment techniques to evaluate learners’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*).

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) in public secondary schools in Kenya. In this study the teacher pedagogical competencies were the independent variables and these were: planning to teach, teaching methods, use of learning resources, classroom management and design and use of assessment techniques. Students’ performance was derived from using their pretest and post-test scores of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing which formed the dependent variable.
1.4 Research Objectives

The main research objective of the study was to establish any significant differences in the mean scores of students taught by teachers of different pedagogical competencies.

The specific objectives of this study were to:

i. Establish how teacher pedagogical competencies in planning for teaching influenced students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

ii. Determine the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies in teaching methods on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

iii. Examine the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

iv. Establish how teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom management influenced students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

v. Determine the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies in design and use of assessment techniques on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).
1.5 Research Questions

The main research question was: Were there any significant differences in the mean scores of students taught by teachers of different competencies? The specific research questions which guided the study were as follows:

i. How do teacher pedagogical competencies in planning for teaching influence students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha)?

ii. Is there any influence of teacher pedagogical competencies in teaching methods on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha)?

iii. How do teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources influence students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha)?

iv. Do teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom management influence students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha)?

v. How do teacher pedagogical competencies in design and use of assessment techniques influence students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha)?

1.6 Hypothesis of the Study

The main hypothesis of the study was: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies to teaching them.
1.7 Significance of the Study

It was expected that the findings of this study would be able to inform the Kiswahili teachers of secondary schools in Kenya on how to improve their students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) and consequently improve overall KCSE Kiswahili examination. It was expected that the results of this study would equip the Kiswahili teachers with knowledge on appropriate pedagogical skills and inspire them to evaluate their current pedagogical practices in order to refine their pedagogical competencies for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). The study is expected to inform the Ministry of Education on the need to review the Kiswahili syllabus and allocate more lessons for Kiswahili teaching in form three and four in order to have sufficient time for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing using modern methods. The study is also expected to benefit book writers by providing them with guidelines for writing books for teachers, on how to teach writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) to secondary school students.

The results of this study were also expected to benefit the colleges and universities that train Kiswahili teachers so that they can use appropriate methodologies to train them for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*).

1.8 Limitations of the Study

One limitation in carrying out this study was the delay in collecting data which made the process of data collection to take longer than it was anticipated. This delay was caused by the fact that; since this was a field study, carried out in different parts of Kenya, and in different counties it was affected by unfavourable geographical
conditions and school programmes such as, different dates of co-curricular activities and academic activities of different schools in different counties. The delay caused by geographical conditions was due to the heavy rains which caused floods in one school in the Coast Region and in another school in the South Rift Valley Region such that these two schools could not be reached at the same time with the rest. Another delay was caused by having to wait for students in the study who attended co-curricular activities of their counties which took place on different dates for different counties. The administration of continuous assessment tests in schools at different times also meant that the study schools could not be reached at the same time. The researcher, therefore had to exercise a lot of patience with the teachers who kept on postponing the visits to their schools, especially in conducting the observations, until such a time they were psychologically ready for the observations to be carried out. This was because such teachers felt uneasy to be observed.

Though these factors caused delays in data collection they did not affect the quality of the data collected since the researcher mitigated by ensuring that the period for data collection was long enough to accommodate any delays. The researcher also coordinated with the principals of the schools of the study, so that they could intervene when the teacher became uncooperative.

Another limitation of this study was that; students’ performance in their pretest and posttest mean scores of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing was likely to have been influenced by factors other than Teacher pedagogical competencies. Such factors were those which were related to students’ characteristics, such as intelligence, achievement motivation, and students’ attitudes to the teacher and to Kiswahili, gender, ethnic
language, class size and the school environment in general. The researcher mitigated on these factors by considering to choose a sample of students in schools of similar category and which had similar performance in Kiswahili.

The study was also faced by the limitation of a possibility of the teachers in the control group applying the pedagogical competencies intended to be used as intervention for the experimental group in teaching for the post-test since they were also professionally trained and experienced like those in the experimental group. The researcher, however, mitigated on this, by training the teachers in the experimental group on pedagogical competencies that were based on process-oriented approach, which the researcher had established that the teachers in this study had not been using. The teachers in the control group were also controlled in terms of being allowed to use only one period in which they had to teach and have their students to write their posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha).

1.9 Delimitation of the Study

This study was done in the rural areas of Kenya in the seven regions or former provinces which were: Coast, Eastern, Central, North-Eastern, Rift Valley, Western and Nyanza. The reason for selecting the rural areas was because, in rural areas Kiswahili is only learned as a second language in the classroom and the teacher factor is very significant in determining how the students learn Kiswahili language skills. Since the study was investigating the influence of teacher on students acquiring writing skills in a second language, the rural area is more appropriate unlike the urban areas where most children acquire Kiswahili as a first language or learn it informally through contact. It
was also expected that the choice of schools from the rural areas was to reflect the regional and ethnic linguistic diversity of Kenya in the four major linguistic groups; which are; Bantu, Nilotic, Semi-Nilotic and Cushitic in their proportions and therefore be a more authentic representation of Kenya.

The schools selected for this study were sixteen public sub-county single streamed, day mixed secondary schools, in which their Kiswahili teachers and form four students were the respondents of the study. The choice of public schools of this category was because these schools form the largest number of the secondary schools in Kenya with the largest number of secondary school students as compared to other categories of schools like the private schools which have a very small number. Furthermore these are the schools which do not perform well and yet the government and the community invests heavily in them. A study in such schools is therefore justified due to the impact the findings of this study are have on teaching Kiswahili to the majority of students. The choice of mixed secondary schools was to ensure that there was equal gender representation. The sixteen schools were those in which students had done the KCSE examination for at least two years so as to establish their level of performance especially in Kiswahili because they had to be those which achieved a mean score of less than 5.0 in each of those two years. The purpose of selecting such schools was to ensure that the schools studied were almost of the same level and the low mean was to justify the need for using an intervention in the study. The use of form four students was to establish whether those students who were about to do the KCSE examination at the end of form four in that year had been prepared adequately in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) The study focused on investigating how the Kiswahili Teacher
pedagogical competencies influenced students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). The pedagogical competencies which the study focused on were: planning to teach, teaching methods, use of resources, classroom management and design and use of assessment techniques.

**1.10 Basic Assumptions**

The assumptions of this study were as follows:

Students could only learn writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) when taught by teachers who had adequate pedagogical competencies.

The students who were selected to take part in this study were similar in terms of their academic level, and since they had low scores in Kiswahili, they also did not perform well in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) and therefore, this justified the need for using an intervention for this group of students.

Kiswahili teachers in this study were professionally trained to teach Kiswahili and had the necessary pedagogical competencies for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) but they lacked the commitment to use appropriate pedagogical competencies.

The performance of students in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) was expected to improve if teachers used process oriented approach in teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).
Students’ acquisition of writing skills in Kiswahili contributes to an improvement in the performance of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing and consequently improvement in the overall Kiswahili performance. Since the study was done among the form four students in second term, it was assumed that the students had been taught writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

1.11 Definition of Key Terms

Assessment - This is a way of measuring students’ abilities in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) by using analytic scoring scale.

Classroom management - This is the teacher’s ability to create a conducive learning environment which involves arranging the classroom, organizing an effective teaching and learning process, being in control of the learners and appropriate utilization of time and space.

Composition – This is a piece of writing or an essay.

Insha - This is the Kiswahili word for composition. In this study the word Insha means a piece of writing in Kiswahili.

Instructional resources - These are tangible materials used to facilitate learning.

Language teaching - This is a deliberate effort by a teacher to facilitate a language learner to acquire the four language skills which are: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In this study the focus is on the writing skill.

Pedagogical competency - This is the art of teaching that causes effective learning by the teacher practicing teacher pedagogical competencies such as: planning to teach, using effective teaching methods, using appropriate learning resources, applying
relevant classroom management styles and designing and using assessment techniques.

**Performance** - This is the ability of the student to demonstrate acquisition of correct writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) by using correct content organization, cohesion, vocabulary, grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Planning for teaching** - This is decision about how to teach in the future by means of selecting areas of language which will be taught from the syllabus and showing how the teaching will be carried out by drawing up the schemes of work and lesson plans.

**Process-oriented approach** - A teaching method which provides the students with self-discovery skills in the process of learning writing as they work in groups where they are involved in the steps of prewriting, drafting, revising and editing activities.

**Product-oriented approach** - A teaching method which emphasizes the mechanical aspects of writing such as grammar, vocabulary, spelling, organization and cohesion, which are evaluated at summative evaluation.

**Second language** - This is any language which is learnt after the acquisition of the first language. In this study the second language which the study focused on was Kiswahili.

**Teacher** - This is the person who facilitates learning, who, in this study is the Kiswahili teacher, who is expected to enable the Kiswahili students to acquire competence in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*).

**Teaching methods** - These are planned teaching and learning activities which learners participate in during a Kiswahili lesson, which in this study, are either based on product oriented approach or process oriented approach of rewriting skills.
Writing skills - This is communicating ideas by use of a paper. In this study, it means the process of composing in Kiswahili which is a result of thinking and developing ideas on some content area, organizing those ideas coherently, use correct grammar, appropriate vocabulary, correct spelling and punctuation to communicate that content to an audience.

1.12 Organization of the study

Chapter one is an introduction which has the background to the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research objectives, research questions, limitations of the study, delimitation of the study, basic assumptions of the study, definitions of terms and organization of the study. Chapter two is a review of related literature and it focuses on teaching writing skills in Kiswahili, Teacher pedagogical competencies in teaching writing:- planning for teaching writing skills, methods of teaching writing, use of instructional resources, classroom management, designing and use of assessment techniques, theoretical framework and conceptual framework. Chapter three is research methodology which focuses on the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, validity of research instruments, reliability of research instruments, procedure for data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations. Chapter four contains the research findings and the discussion of the findings. Chapter five contains the summary, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

Literature review, according to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), involves identifying, locating and analyzing documents that contain information that relates to the research problem which is being investigated. In this study, the research problem is concerned with how the Teacher pedagogical competencies influence students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The literature reviewed for this study, focused on teacher pedagogical competencies, students’ performance in writing skills, and specific pedagogical competencies which were: planning for teaching, methods of teaching, use of instructional resources, classroom management and design and use of assessment techniques. This study reviewed studies which have been done on teaching writing skills in English as a second or foreign language and Kiswahili. It is expected that, since Kiswahili is taught as a second language in Kenya, the views expressed in such studies will enrich this study. This chapter has also included towards the end the theoretical framework and conceptual framework for this study.

2.2 Teacher pedagogical Competencies and Students’ Performance

According to Stern (1983) the language teaching/learning model identifies two principal players – the language teacher and the language learner. Studies which have been carried out and views of various scholars on the role of the teacher have supported the fact that, teacher quality is the most important school resource in the teaching/learning process because it predicts students’ performance. According to Kuenzi (2008) teacher
quality, consists of qualities like verbal ability and pedagogical knowledge which are aspects that influence students’ achievement. Ferguson and Gilpin (2001) also state that Teacher quality is a broad category which includes dimensions such as experience, subject knowledge, scholastic attitude and their teaching ability. In a review of various studies on Teacher qualifications and its implication on students’ academic achievement in Nigerian schools, Kola and Sunday (2015) have also established that teacher qualification is one of the critical factors that drive students’ higher achievement. The study refers to Teacher qualifications as all the skills a teacher requires to teach which include academic qualification, experience, subject matter knowledge, pedagogy studies, and duration of training, certificate/licensing and refresher courses for professional development. The study further emphasizes that apart from these teacher qualities, the commitment of a teacher is the driving force for improving students’ achievement.

In a study carried out by Sanders and Horn (1994) in Tennessee to determine the effectiveness of school systems, schools and teachers on student academic growth, it was indicated that classes of most effective teachers gained 52% points in their achievement over a year’s time as compared to those of the least effective teachers who gained only 14% points over a years’ time. The study concluded that the teacher is the major determinant of student academic progress. Another study carried out by Wright, Horn and Sanders (1997), in Tennessee, also confirmed that the teacher is the single most important factor affecting students’ achievement. In their study in Tennessee, Wright et al noted that, since the most important factor affecting students’ learning is the teacher, more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of
the teacher than any other single factor. Furthermore, they stated that effective teachers are successful with students at all achievement levels regardless of the levels of heterogeneity.

The role of the teacher in second language learning is also crucial in facilitating learning. According to Yalden (1987), the teacher’s role in teaching a second language, like Kiswahili, is to foster communication. In order to do this the second language teachers, according to Shulman (2012), need to have both pedagogical and content knowledge. Pedagogical knowledge means the “how” of teaching which is generally acquired through education course and personal experience. Content knowledge on the other hand is the “what” of teaching. Ferguson and Gilpin (2001) however, state that the teacher quality is a broad category, which includes dimensions such as: experience, subject knowledge, scholastic attitude and their teaching ability. In addition, Kuenzi (2008 proposes that qualities like verbal ability and pedagogical knowledge are aspects that influence students’ achievement.

In an exploratory study into the distinctive characteristics of language teachers, especially teachers of English as a foreign language, Borg (2006) states that the teacher should have adequate knowledge of the second language by being able to speak and write the language with a high level of proficiency. He/she should be able to explain how the second language functions in terms of grammar and vocabulary to learners in a way that is both logical and informative. He/she should strive to master the second language by realizing that learning a language is a lifelong task and therefore should endeavor to learn new vocabulary and expressions as they arise in the target language.
Borg (2006) also states that teachers need to have pedagogical knowledge which they ought to apply in their classroom teaching. He explains that, pedagogical knowledge refers to knowing how to create an environment that is conducive for learning. It also means sharing information and experiences with others by taking part in activities outside his or her classroom, such as attending workshops, seminars or conferences so that he/she can develop professionally. In fact to be a professional teacher requires that the teacher should keep up-to date by reading about recent pedagogical developments. The teacher should have knowledge of different language teaching methods and how these methods have developed historically. Knowledge of these methods and others will enable the teacher to choose the appropriate methods.

In teaching second language like Kiswahili, Suciu & Mata (2011) state that the main aim of a second language teacher is to develop and encourage ability of his/her students to communicate with each other by using the correct structures and vocabulary in the target language. In order to develop the communicative ability of the students, Suciu and Mata suggest that the teacher has to carry out the following typical pedagogical tasks: - planning, preparing and delivering lessons to a range of classes and age groups using appropriate methods, resources, classroom management, preparing and setting tests, examinations papers and class exercises. The teacher has also to mark and provide appropriate feedback on oral and written work.

Studies which have been done on the role of the teacher have supported the fact that teacher quality is the most important school resource because it predicts students’ performance. A study carried out by Sa’ad and Usman (2014) in Jigawa state in Nigeria on causes of poor performance in English, established that the reason for poor
performance in English was because there were no qualified teachers for English language. In another study carried out by Kemboi, Andiema and M’mbone (2014) in Pokot County in Kenya, on challenges in teaching composition writing, it was established that, the challenges which related to teachers were some of the causes of students’ poor performance and they were: teachers lacked teaching skills and they had negative attitudes towards English.

The studies and views of scholars which have been reviewed have indicated that, academic qualifications, professional development, experience, knowledge of the subject matter, pedagogical competencies, duration of training, communication skills refresher courses or trainings and teacher commitment are the most important qualities of a teacher. All these teacher qualities emphasize the need for an effective teacher in students’ appropriate learning and they have an impact on students’ academic achievement.

Despite research findings confirming that teacher expertise is the most significant factor in students’ performance, research on teacher pedagogical influence on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) in Kenya is lacking. Studies which have been carried out on the teaching of Kiswahili have been on other causes of poor performance in Kiswahili and have not focused on the teacher. However, a study by Ogero (2012) established that, the teachers were also one of the factors that caused students’ poor performance in Kiswahili. This was because the district schools had untrained teachers who lacked the content and pedagogical skills in teaching Kiswahili. Due to the important role of the teacher in determining the performance of students, and, yet there are no elaborate studies which have been done on the Teacher
influence in Kiswahili, this study is an attempt to address this gap. This study focuses on the essential components of Teacher pedagogical competencies which consist of planning to teach, teaching methods, the use of teaching and learning resources, classroom management and design and use of assessment techniques and their influence on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

2.3 Students’ Performance in Writing Skills

The definition of writing skills by Hampton and Humphrey (1989) is that; these are specific abilities which help writers to put their thoughts into words in a meaningful form and mentally interact with the message, so that they can understand what they write and also be understood by others. Writing skills therefore, enable a person to communicate the message clearly and easily. Gower, Philips and Walters (1995) also assert that writing is like speaking because it is a way of communicating ideas. Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) concur with this view and state that, writing, like speaking is a productive skill which is used by students to communicate ideas, formulate their thoughts and reflect on what they say. They further state that writing requires the writer to form letters on paper or other media and also to be aware of the position or role of the reader in their communicative relationship. Writing as a means of communication is therefore made possible by use of graphic symbols or letters which have to be arranged to form words and words have to be arranged to form sentences.
Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) categorize writing skills into two broad groups: basic and advanced skills. They state that, basic or primary skills constitute good handwriting, proper spelling and right punctuation. The more advanced skills relate to visual presentation, grammatical skills, stylistic skills and organizational skills. Gower, Philips and Walters (1995) on the other hand state that writing skills involve many aspects such as handwriting, spelling, punctuation, sentence construction, organizing a text and paragraphing, text cohesion and register or style.

In trying to elaborate further on the more advanced skills, Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) explain that visual presentation is concerned with the use of specific formats of writing such as a format for: a letter, memorandum and a report and also use of correct punctuation marks as well as capitalization. Grammatical skills relate to the ability to use a variety of sentence patterns and constructions correctly. Stylistic skills are concerned with the ability to express precise meaning in a variety of styles and registers. This is done by selecting appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures. The students’ habits, specifically of reading widely, have a lot to contribute to the development of this skill.

Organizational skills are concerned with the ability to write coherently, that is to use linguistic cohesive devices such as use of right connectors in sentences, note making skills as well as the ability to summarize are all closely related to this ability. In the Kiswahili syllabus, the two broad categories of writing; creative and functional as stated by Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), have been outlined. Examples of creative writing are like dialogue, conversations, miniature plays, poetry, stories and anecdotes. Functional writing includes reports, book reviews, articles, letters, announcements,
speeches, broadcast talks, factual essays, invitations, condolence messages, notices, advertisements, telegram messages and memorandum.

All the categories of writing have been outlined in the Kiswahili syllabus for teaching form three and form four writing skills in Kiswahili and are they are indicated as the skills of writing (kuandika). The fact that Kiswahili syllabus has allocated a section to the teaching of writing shows that the teaching of writing skills is considered to be an important part of teaching Kiswahili.

Key aspects in writing skills can therefore be stated as: the message or content which has to be communicated to the audience, the writing skills for communicating the message such as; vocabulary grammar, spelling, punctuation, handwriting coherence and organization. Acquisition of these skills is essential for effective communication but according Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), in second language acquisition, they are the most difficult to master. Students therefore often find writing to be hard because they cannot compose a piece of writing and they, therefore, make many errors in these key aspects of the writing skills.

Studies which have been done on students’ performance in composition writing in second language like English and Kiswahili have indicated that students perform poorly in composition writing because they lack the various skills of writing which have been outlined above. For example in a study carried out by Oyedele and Chikwature (2016) in Mutare District in Zimbabwe to establish students’ writing skills in English composition, at ordinary level, the study findings established that; the English language students had many writing skills problems in composition writing. These problems
included mother tongue interference, inconsistent use of tenses, and spellings. The study also established that, the teaching methods used by the teachers, which were traditional rather than interactive, was another factor which contributed to students not mastering the writing skills.

In another study on factors contributing to poor performance in English composition writing among grade 12 pupils in Kabwe District –Zambia carried out by Ng’ona (2016), it was established that teachers lacked skills in various areas of teaching composition skills. As a result students did not write coherently, could not communicate, did not have logical organization of ideas, and had errors in spelling, vocabulary and grammar. Time for composition writing was also insufficient resulting to students not being able to complete writing their compositions.

Problems in writing also tend to affect performance in language generally as reported by KNEC in the annual reports on the performance of Kiswahili in the KCSE examination reports of 2009-2015. In these reports it had been indicated that performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) had been very low in the KCSE examination due to students lacking writing skills. Studies which have been done in other parts of Kenya have also indicated that students’ performance in Kiswahili has been general low. A study by Ouma (2015) in Winam division, Kisumu County, indicated that the cause of the poor performance was inexperienced teachers who used poor teaching methods, and lacked resources.
Studies which have been done on writing Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) have indicated that students performed poorly by exhibiting grammatical and spelling problems, Maina (2003) and also Sheng related morphosyntactic errors, Chomba (2013). These studies have indicated that students have problems in writing skills in Kiswahili and they have been done without focusing on the influence of the teacher despite the teacher being the main determinant factor that determines students’ performance in writing. This study is therefore, an attempt to investigate how Teacher pedagogical competencies influence students’ performance in Kiswahili composition writing skills.

In order to improve students’ Kiswahili performance in the KCSE Examination, KNEC has recommended that, it is important for the teachers to teach all the writing skills adequately, since these skills are only acquired by being taught. If the teaching of writing skills is not done competently it is likely to affect the overall performance of Kiswahili and that is why it is important to investigate how Teacher pedagogical competencies affect students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*).

**2.4 Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Planning for Teaching and Students’ Performance in Writing Skills in Kiswahili**

Planning is one of the basic pedagogical competencies and an essential requirement of a second language teacher, especially forward planning. (Stern 1983, Gathumbi & Masembe, 2005). According to Spencer (2003), the need for planning is one of the most important principles of good teaching. He asserted that, planning provides a structure and content for both the teacher and the students and, also a framework for
reflecting on the evaluation of learning. Stern (1983) further stated that planning includes teacher’s professional knowledge, an analysis of the content areas to be taught setting educational objectives, designing instructional procedures, identifying and developing learning resources and learning activities. Both Stern (1983) and Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) agree that planning involves drawing schemes of work from the subject syllabus and lesson plans as well as preparation for in-class and out of class activities and learning resources related to language learning.

The syllabus, according to Wilkins (1981), gives a summary of the content to be taught and also contains the long-term objectives of teaching that subject. Another definition of a language teaching syllabus is the one presented by Mohsen (2008) who states that there are various types of syllabuses but the actual language teaching syllabus is an integration of two or more types. In his paper, he discusses the types of syllabuses that are relevant for language teaching/learning competence. These are skill-based syllabi, which emphasize on the skills people must be able to acquire to be competent in a language and task-based syllabus that supports using tasks and activities to encourage learners to utilize the language communicatively. Most of them, however, agree that a syllabus contains what is to be taught or learnt and how to teach it.

The Kiswahili syllabus for teaching Kiswahili in secondary schools in Kenya prepared by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (2002) incorporates the skills which have to be learnt and how to teach them. It provides an introduction, which is a general guideline on the importance of Kiswahili and how to teach the various language skills. The syllabus provides general objectives of learning Kiswahili for the four years of secondary education, objectives for all the four language skills, grammar and
language use and also topics for each area. The Kiswahili syllabus has outlined the objectives for teaching Writing skills in Kiswahili in form four, which is the focus of this study, as well as the areas of writing to be taught and learnt. According to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) a syllabus is not detailed and only provides a framework for language teaching and the teacher uses it to develop schemes of work.

The scheme of work is another important document for planning which teachers who are competent in planning must prepare it for teaching. From Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, the scheme of work is the one adopted from the United Kingdom (UK), where it is defined as a guideline that defines the structure and content of an academic course. It maps out clearly how resources, class activities and assessment strategies will be used to ensure the learning objectives of the course are met. It is an interpretation of the syllabus. According to Ayot and Patel (1992) a scheme is a teacher’s breakdown of a given syllabus into units on topics that can be easily taught in each lesson covering a certain period of time which could be one term or one year. They, further state that, the syllabus topics are again divided into sub-topics where the objectives to be achieved in each lesson sub-topic, learners’ activities and resources and references to be used are indicated. The scheme of work being a forecast of what is to be taught, gives the teacher enough time to sort out the requirements for teaching every topic. and according to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), it guides the teacher in preparing a lesson plan. The teacher’s adequate preparation of a scheme of work signifies the teacher’s pedagogical competency in planning to teach.
The lesson plan is another important document in planning to teach which according to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), is a teacher’s detailed work plan of what is to be covered in a lesson. It takes the teacher step by step through the lesson. It also guides the teacher on the time available the topic to be taught, the instructional objectives to be achieved, the content to be covered, the learning activities which are determined by teaching methods, the resources to be used and the assessment procedures. The planning component in teaching is essential because it enables the teacher to ensure that all the syllabus topics are adequately covered and teaching is done systematically.

Studies which have been done on planning to teach have focused more on lesson plan because according to Clark and Yinger (1979) it is the one that enables the teacher to demonstrate effective teaching behavior. Wood and Miederlof (1988) concur with Clark and Yinger by asserting that effective teaching starts from well planned, well organized and well-presented lesson plans. Hoover and Hollingsworth (1975) have outlined some educational benefits of a good lesson plan to teachers. They suggest that a good lesson plan provides guidelines, allows the teacher to motivate students, prepares for individual differences, and allows the teachers to evaluate and improve their teaching skills. In the study by Clark and Yinger (1979) where the teachers were asked why they planned, they said that they do so in order to reduce uncertainty and anxiety, to find a sense of direction, confidence and security, to learn materials by collecting and organizing them, to organize students, time and activity flow, and to aid memory and to provide a framework for instruction and evaluation. The benefit of lesson planning for instruction was demonstrated by Byra and Coulon (1994), in a research carried out to compare two groups of pre-service teachers. In this study, one group taught a planned
lesson and another group taught an unplanned lesson. The results indicated that planning had a positive effect on some pre-service Teacher instructional performance, which transferred to a positive student learning experience. Brophy and Good (1986) reported, after reviewing several researches on teaching, that teachers who had daily lesson plans had higher student achievement.

Despite research findings establishing that instructional planning is critical for instructional effectiveness, Clark and Dunn (1991) stated that there is no evidence that teachers plan their lessons effectively. This was supported by Clark and Yinger (1980) who reported that teachers do not follow the planning procedures acquired in their teaching training programs. Ball, Knobloch and Hoop (2007), in their study, found out, that novice and interns spent many hours thinking about planning versus writing the actual lesson plans and absence of resources, influenced their planning. In reviewing studies on planning, Ball et al (2007) outlined the following factors that influence teacher planning: teacher experience, the nature of content, age of the learners, administrator demand, materials and resources and time.

The aspect of planning for teaching Kiswahili has been recognized as a significant factor in determining students’ performance in their KCSE Examination. That is why, in the KCSE Examination Reports (2009-2015), the Kenya National Examination Council suggests that in order to improve performance in Kiswahili, the teachers should use the syllabuses from K.I.E and KNEC in their teaching. Since studies which have been done in Kenya on the students’ poor performance in Kiswahili have not focused on this aspect, this study is, therefore, an attempt to establish the influence of Teacher
pedagogical competence in planning to teach, on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

2.5 Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in the Methods of Teaching and Students’ Performance in Writing Skills in Kiswahili

According to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) competence in second language writing skills is only acquired by being taught in a classroom setting. Language teaching is defined by Stern (1983) as the activities which are intended to bring about language learning. The activities for learning a language are determined by the language teaching method the teacher uses. A language teaching method is explained by Yalden (1987) as a plan for presenting the language materials to be learned and should be based upon an approach. Yalden further states that, in order to translate an approach into a method an instructional system must be designed by considering the objectives of the teaching/learning, selection of the content and organization of the types of tasks to be performed and the roles of the students and the teachers. Richards and Roggers (1986) on the other hand define a method as a way of teaching a language which is based on systematic principles and procedures.

In teaching a second language the main aim according to Suciu and Mata (2011) is to develop communicative competence, which requires effective Teacher pedagogical competencies that are internationally recognized in conducting student centered teaching process. They also suggest that, in using communicative learner centered instructions, the teacher has to provide appropriate input. This is when the teacher exposes the students to teacher talk, listening activities, reading passages and the
language heard and read outside of class. Input gives learners the materials they need to develop their ability to use language on their own. The teacher’s task therefore is to present content and learning activities that provide opportunities for learners to practice these skills for interpersonal language use in both formal and informal situations. Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) state that, these activities have to incorporate all the language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Whereas, listening and reading are receptive skills, speaking and writing are productive communication skills.

Teaching writing skills in a second language is very difficult to master and this requires to be taught by effective teachers. According to Conley (2011) effective teaching of writing is anything that helps students to develop greater knowledge about writing, increase students’ ability to manage writing and promote positive attitude about writing.

In teaching writing skills, Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) state that, current approaches to the study of writing and teaching of English, as a second and foreign language, has been documented under two main headings: Traditional Approach and Modern Approach. Since Kiswahili is taught as second language, these approaches are also applicable to teaching writing skills in Kiswahili. In the Traditional Approach which is also referred to as the product-oriented approach to writing, Parson (1985) points out that form and correctness are the major concerns of the teacher. The teacher provides drill work on specific skills, makes many of the major writing decisions for the students and serves as the sole judge. The students work alone on their writing assignments. Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) states that the following common features are typical of product–oriented approach. The teacher gives little information and asks learners to write a composition of a certain number of words. The students hand in their
compositions and the teacher marks and return them to the students and that marks the end. The traditional approach is based on the assumption that the creative aspects of the writing process cannot be taught and is limited to the conventions and mechanics of discourse. It only includes the teaching of grammar and the correct choice of vocabulary. However, Hillock (1984) in a research carried out on the various pedagogical methods of composition, outlined what worked and what failed. The research found out that the formal approaches of teaching the traditional school grammar for many hours with an aim of teaching writing did not raise the quality of students’ composition writing.

Parson (1985) noted that students taught using the product oriented approach do not own the writing or invest in it. They see writing as tedious and a burden since they are not given any direction. They are also not interested in what they write because they are not consulted in the choice of the topic and the audience. The teacher does not take time to find out whether they are familiar with the topic or not. Lastly there is delayed feedback. Parson (1985) further asserted that, this kind of approach is not effective in producing capable writers. In having similar views about the product oriented approach, Graham and Perin (2006) noted that it makes most students view school writing as something to be avoided because they are not motivated to write.

Despite the product oriented approach being ineffective, studies carried out in teaching writing skills in English and Kiswahili as second languages have indicated that teachers still use the product-oriented approach and it is one of the causes of students’ poor performance in composition writing. Magut (2000) who carried out a study in Uasin Gishu district in Kenya, on teaching writing skills in English, established that teachers
just gave a topic to the students and asked them to write a composition. This was a clear demonstration of product-oriented approach. Studies carried out in Karachi by Kapka and Oberman (2001) showed that students, taught by teachers who did not seem to have used a proper writing approach, lacked good writing skills. These researchers stated that if teachers would be aware of the appropriate writing process, they would use appropriate strategies which would improve the writing abilities of their students. The general view from research findings on teaching writing is that students’ achievement is higher when the teaching approach emphasizes writing as a process rather than writing as a product (Parson 1985).

According to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) and Brown (2007) the process-oriented approach to writing is a modern approach which has been developed from the experiences of classroom teachers and research. It combines communicative approach and the process approach and is based on the assumptions that people write to communicate to readers and to accomplish specific purposes. The process oriented approach to writing is a composing process that requires multiple drafts before an effective product is created. The teacher’s role in the process model, according to Hillock (1984), is to facilitate the writing process rather than to provide direct instruction which, according to Brown (2007), is to make sure that students are carefully led through appropriate stages in the process of composing. In supporting the use of the process approach, for teaching writing, Graham and Perin (2007b) recommended that, the teachers have to teach students planning, drafting, revising and editing strategies that they can use independently. In this approach Brown (2007)
asserts that, the process of writing is divided into three main stages which are pre-writing, composing and revision.

Brown (2007) explains that, at the pre-writing stage learners are given the freedom to think and generate ideas on the basis of their interests, experiences and knowledge, without much interference and restrictions from the teacher. He suggests that this can be facilitated by reading extensively, skimming and scanning passages, brainstorming, free individual writing and discussing a topic through teacher initiated questions and probes. This is an active stage where the students are encouraged to work in groups, exchanging ideas and opinions concerning the information structure, language supporting arguments and the best approach required. Yalden (1987) acknowledges that pair and group work give opportunities for more students to participate more actively and also provide opportunities for peer teaching where weaker learners can find support from stronger classmates. In supporting group writing, Harmer (1998), reports from a study by Boughey (1997) that, group writing benefits all those who are involved; it allows the teacher to give more detailed and constructive feedback, since the teacher is dealing with small numbers of groups rather than many individual students. Harmer further states that writing in groups can be part of a long process or a short game-like communicative activity which can be motivating. However, Yalden (1987) cautions that, supervision of pairs and groups is important to make sure, everyone participates equally.
The composing stage, according to Brown (2007), is the writing stage which can be described as a writing workshop, where the learners are encouraged to write their ideas by putting them in a paragraph form and discover how best to express their ideas. The learners have to work together by sharing and consulting one another to see if they have been able to convey what they intended. This is seeing what we have created through the eyes of others which Brown refers to as peer editing. The teacher’s role is to facilitate and provide guidance whenever it is needed.

At the revision stage Brown (2007) states that the learners revise their composition after getting feedback from their classmates so as to improve their writing by making the suggested changes. Brown further suggests that after making the necessary changes from the feedback the learner can rewrite the composition while making more changes that would improve the work more. After rewriting the learner should go over his/her work carefully and then finally submit to the teacher. When the teacher returns the marked work the learner should spend time examining the comments from the teacher and compare the classmates’ responses to the teacher’s.

Gower, Philips and Walters (1995) agree that writing, being a technical skill and also a process, has to be taught by teachers who plan carefully for it so as to use appropriate approaches or techniques in order to prepare their students for writing. This will ensure that their students improve their writing skills and produce good work. That means, the teacher needs to provide the structure of writing by focusing on the process rather than on the finished product. Even though the finished product is important, the students learn by being led through the necessary steps. Teachers can also provide a model for writing by using a written text, for example a layout of a letter.
Use of appropriate teaching and learning strategies can improve students’ performance and the reverse will be the case in any subject if inappropriate teaching and learning strategies are used. Effective teachers, according to Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering (2003), have a wide array of instructional strategies at their disposal. They know when each strategy should be used with specific students and for specific content. In a study carried out on teaching style and learners’ achievement in Kiswahili in secondary schools in Hamisi District in Kenya by Kang’ahi, Indoshi, Okwach and Osodo (2012), it was established that achievement in Kiswahili increased with more learner-centered teaching style. Studies which have been done on teaching writing skills in second language have indicated that use of inappropriate methods is one of the factors contributing to the poor performance of students. Since writing skills in Kiswahili are significant in determining students’ overall performance in Kiswahili, they have to be taught by effective teachers in order to improve students’ performance. This study is therefore aimed at determining how the methods used by teachers in teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) influence learners’ performance in these skills and consequently in the overall Kiswahili.

2.6 Teacher pedagogical Competencies in Instructional Resources and Students’ Performance in Writing Skills in Kiswahili.

In their definition of pedagogical competence, Suciu and Mata (2011) state that it is the ability to use tangible resources which are instructional materials such as books, articles and technology such as software and hardware and also intangible resources, such as knowledge skills and experience to achieve efficiency and or effectiveness in pedagogy. Stern (1983) asserts that planning for teaching and learning resources is an important
component in the schemes of work and also in the lesson plan; this is because when resources are planned beforehand, it provides the teacher with sufficient time to acquire them before the teaching time. Farrant, (2004) and Gower, Philips and Walters (1995) agree that use of teaching/learning resources make a lesson more interesting and effective. They further state that, though schools vary in the number and types of resources available to the teachers, there are many ways that teachers can make the required resources available.

According to Farrant (2004) and Gower and Philips (1995) some of the resources a language teacher can use include the chalkboard, overhead projector, wall charts, pictures, maps, models, real objects, immediate environment, and artifacts. Other important resources are also like published materials such as course books, reference books, and other print materials like newspapers, journals and magazines. Language teachers can also make use of audio and video recorders, radio, films, photo copier and computers. Even if schools will not have most of these resources, Farrant (2004) and Gower and Philips (1995) say that almost all schools have some form of chalkboard, which is the most common and useful teaching resource. In order to obtain the maximum effect of chalkboard and any other teaching resource in teaching and learning, the teacher has to organize well how to use it while presenting the content.

Studies which have been done on the effect of instructional resources have indicated that their use enhances academic performance and lack of them means students will perform poorly. In a study by Ogero (2012), on the performance of Kiswahili, it was established that teaching/learning resources were inadequate in all the public secondary schools sampled, but more so in the district category and it was confirmed to be a major
cause of poor performance in Kiswahili in public district secondary schools. Another study carried out by Maina (2003) also confirmed that lack of resources was the main cause of poor performance in Kiswahili. These studies indicated that the schools lacked the necessary course text books, class readers, newspapers in Kiswahili among many other learning resources. Another important factor established by the study done by Ogero (2012) was that the school management did not allocate funds for the acquisition of the resources. This kind of situation is in concurrence with the view expressed by Shiundu and Omulando (1992) that the head teacher as the manager makes important decisions in the acquisition of learning resources for different subjects.

Given that teaching/learning resources are very important; this study was an attempt to establish whether Kiswahili teachers in public secondary schools in Kenya demonstrated their pedagogical competencies in acquiring and using the relevant resources for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) and what influence this has on the performance of students in these skills.

2.7 Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Classroom Management and Students’ Performance in Writing Skills in Kiswahili

Everton and Weinstein (2006), drawing on the work of a number of educational theorists, state that classroom management as, the actions teachers take to create an environment that supports and facilitates both academic and social-emotional learning. Marzano, Marzano and Pickering (2003) explain that, research analysis indicates that, classroom management has four general components that affect all students’ achievement. The four components are: rules and procedures, disciplinary interventions,
teacher–student relationship and mental set, which is way the teacher approaches his/her classroom management. Classroom management, according to Suciu and Mata (2011), is the ability to manage the teaching and learning process by considering optimum use of space and time factors, as well as managing the learners.

One integral part of classroom management, according to Bull and Solity (1987) is the arrangement of the classroom. They agree that a second language classroom has to be made an effective learning environment by ensuring that appropriate learning resources are available and learners participate actively in learning. On the other hand Everton and Weinstein (2006) consider the aspect of physical classroom, that is, space in relation to capacity of students. They suggest that, since the main consideration in the language classroom is to provide opportunity for active participation and interaction so as to develop students’ communicative competence, the class should be of medium size with a capacity of 45 students. Students’ active interaction in class is also facilitated by the way the teacher organizes the students seating arrangement and the teacher’s teaching methods which will also require different classroom arrangement such as:- whole class teaching, group work or individual learning.

Apart from the physical environment the social environment is also very important in classroom management. According to Bull and Solity, (1987) social environment involves the social context in which students’ behaviors take place. The study stresses that the teacher has to establish himself or herself as a leader right from the beginning of a lesson to the end. This requires the teacher to ensure that the classroom is properly arranged and he/she has control over all the activities of different groups of students. It also means that the teaching/learning sessions progress smoothly and efficiently.
Focusing on classroom management, Weinstein, Clarke, and Curran (2004) advocate that the role of the instructor in a language classroom is to create an environment in which the desire to communicate abounds since language is about communication. They suggested that the instructor should have knowledge of students as individuals, create a norm of sharing and group work, while determining for students, areas where they are expected to work on their own. Furthermore, the instructor has to move around to check on what the students are doing, encourage students to talk in low voices as they share their creative ideas to enrich one another. In the course of classroom activities, the instructor should allow students to mentor peers with language problems.

In teaching writing skills the process-oriented approach has been recognized as being more effective than the product oriented, because, according to Parson (1985) research shows that students’ achievement is higher when the teaching approach emphasizes writing as a process rather than writing as a product. In the process-oriented, approach, the students’ writing skills are developed through collaborative learning. According to Graham and Perin (2007a, 2007b), productive collaboration occurs when students help each other as they plan, daft, revise, edit and write the final draft. All these collaborative learning strategies require students to meet in groups. Burke (2011) asserts that when students spend time meeting in groups and participate in collaborative activities, they learn better and they are able to get better grades. Cohen (1994) recommends that students need to work together in groups which are small enough so that everyone can participate in the learning task. Burke (2011) affirms that group size is an important component of group work and states that a small group is often considered to consist of 3 or 5 people. The role of the teacher in using group work in classroom management is,
therefore, to arrange the students in groups that can facilitate their effective participation in learning writing skills.

In managing a language classroom, the teacher’s personal qualities, technical skills or professional competence are very essential for effective learning to take place. According to Marzano, Marzano and Pickering (2003), when teachers use specific techniques of management they become effective classroom managers. Awareness of these techniques through training can change a teacher’s behaviors which in turn can change students’ behaviors and ultimately affect students’ achievement positively. One of the most promising research finding by Emmer, Sanford, Clements, and Martin (as cited in Marzano et al 2003), indicates that a teacher can very quickly become a skilled classroom manager. In their study, they found out that teacher skills at classroom management could be significantly improved even by a simple intervention of providing them with a manual and two half day workshops.

Literature on classroom management indicates that, it is an important component for effective teaching and learning of writing skills. The teacher role in classroom management has also been illustrated as that which requires teachers who should have appropriate pedagogical competencies in order to be effective classroom managers. Studies which have been done in Kenya on the students’ performance in Kiswahili, for example, (Maina, 2003, Maloba, 2010, and Ogero 2012) and other studies on teaching writing in English for example (Magut 2000, Kemboi, Andiema and M’mbone 2014) and writing in Kiswahili (Chomba 2013) have not mentioned classroom management as one of the factors associated with students’ performance. This study is therefore an attempt to establish the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom
management techniques on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

2.8 Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Designing Assessment Techniques and Students’ Performance in Writing Skills in Kiswahili

In teaching second language the aim is to develop communicative competence. The type of assessment methods for this, should, therefore, focus on how the learner can speak and write the target language through tasks that require performance of language. Suciu and Mata (2011), state that, teachers can measure students’ language abilities by use of tests, quizzes or through other informal methods. Alderson, Claphan and Wall (1995) assert that test constructors need test specifications when designing a test. These are clear statements about whom the test is aimed at, what its purpose is, what content is to be covered, what methods are to be used for assessing, what language elements should be tested and how long the test will take. In addition Brown (2007) names five principles that serve as guidelines for the design of a good test or assessment. These principles are practicality, reliability, validity, authenticity and wash back.

According to Brown (2007) a good test is practical if it is within the means of financial limitations, time constraints, ease of administration and scoring and interpretation. Reliability refers to a test being consistent and dependable. That means if the test is administered more than once under similar conditions it will produce similar results. Validity is the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure. Authenticity is how a language task is likely to enact in the real world or how the language test is as natural as possible. Wash back means the effects of an assessment on
teaching and learning prior to the assessment itself. When students take a test, the feedback they receive about their competence should “wash back” to them in the form of useful diagnoses of strengths and weaknesses.

Though assessment of writing is important in teaching writing, according to Brown (2007) and Alderson (1995), assessment of writing is complicated, especially, in a process-oriented approach. Brown states that in the process-oriented approach the teacher is a guide and a facilitator of students’ activities in the ongoing process of developing the written work. Brown therefore wonders how the same teacher can also be the judge. However, Graham and Perin (2007b) suggest that during the actual writing, the teacher should provide clear instructions on what he/she wants the students to do in the writing task and also the teacher needs to identify the writing components to be assessed and the rating scales to be used. Gathumbi and Masebe (2005) also suggest that during the writing tasks the teacher should monitor the learners’ interactive activities and, where necessary, correct and advise on the spot. This type of correction is referred to as formative evaluation or feedback. Graham and Perin (2007b) also suggest that assessing students’ writing should not be limited to teachers but it is also useful to students who assess their own writing progress.

Studies which have been done on students assessing their own work or by peers, have indicated that it provides an opportunity for students to improve in their writing skills. Villamil & de Guerrero (1998) investigated the impact of peer revision on second language and found out that it had a positive effect on the quality of the final draft. Another study by Berg (1999) in which students were trained on how to give effective
peer response to writing, found out that this training had positive effect on the quality of the students’ texts.

Once the students have completed the writing tasks, Gathumbi and Masebe (2005) state that, summative evaluation is used by testing, marking and or grading students’ writing work to establish their level of writing performance. Alderson, Claphan and Wall (1995) and Brown (2007) suggest that there is need to use rating scales that indicate to the students their areas of strengths and weaknesses. Silva (1993) and Alderson (1995) propose holistic scoring scale and analytic scoring scale, as ways of assessing students’ writing work. Silva, however, adds primary trait scoring scale.

Holistic scoring scale is referred to by Alderson et al (1995) as an impression scale, especially when examiners are asked to make their judgments quickly. It is a more general description for categories but includes the different elements of writing implicitly or explicitly. The scale may use statements such as; excellent, very good, good, pass, weak and very poor which are called descriptors. The result is usually a global grade such as A, B, C, D, and E. According to Coombe (2010) this scoring scale is only reliable if 3-4 people mark each script and it tends to emphasize the writer’s strengths. Though by using holistic scoring scale, the teacher is able to mark students’ writing faster. However, several disadvantages of holistic marking have been identified. Heaton (1990) asserts that it is unreliable, Hamp-Lyons (1990) states that it does not provide a profile of a student’s writing ability and Cohen (1994) cautions that longer essays tend to receive higher marks. The most serious problem of this scale is the inability to provide wash back that means indicating to the students their strengths and weaknesses.
In analytic scoring scale, Silva (1993) and Alderson et al. (1995) explain that, evaluation of students’ writing is based on detailed grades for each element of writing such as content, organization of the composition, cohesion, vocabulary, grammar, mechanical accuracy—punctuation and spelling. Descriptors are also given for each element. Results are based on multiple sub-grades; for example, 4 out 5 for vocabulary plus 3 out of 5 for grammar and others using different grades. According to Brown (2007) the only issue in this system of weighting each of these elements is to decide which is the most important. He, nevertheless, suggests that content seems to be the most important. These different ratings are then combined to provide an overall mark or grade.

In primary trait scoring, Silva (1993) states that, the class or the assignment focuses on a particular aspect of writing, or a specific linguistic form, or the use of certain semantic group. This scoring allows the instructor and the students to focus attention on their feedback and revision very specifically.

Silva (1993) is, nonetheless, of the view that the three forms of evaluation, depend on the purpose of the writing task. He suggests that in the process-oriented writing, the first draft could be evaluated holistically, the second by use of primary trait scoring and the final draft analytically. However, according to Underhill (1987), the goal of evaluation should not be just to assign a grade but to improve writing instead. He therefore suggests that, the criteria for evaluation should be shared with the students as soon as the writing is assigned so that the students can be part of the assessment process and benefit from it at every step of the writing process. The grades allocated to students for
their writing assignments are, however, an important assessment element in planning the process of teaching and learning.

Assessment, which Stern (1983), has identified as a key element in planning for teaching and in the learning process, can only be achieved in a thorough record keeping process of students’ grades. This will enable the teachers and the learners to track the learning progress and thereby improve teaching and learning. In support of the importance of record keeping, Maxim and Lee (1997) assert that effective and continuous record keeping enables teachers to plan, to organize and to create the best learning environment for each student. They further state that it is an effective tool for tracking contributions made by individual students in the classroom. They further advise that teachers need to create their own record keeping systems to fit the environment in which they teach.

The main purpose of designing assessment techniques for assessing students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) is to help students improve in their writing skills in Kiswahili and consequently improve in their performance. Designing assessment techniques is therefore an important Teacher pedagogical skill which has not been investigated in the studies which have been done in Kenya on students’ performance in Kiswahili. This study is therefore an attempt to determine the Teacher pedagogical competencies in designing and using assessment techniques on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).
2.9 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study was based on Gerlach and Ely model of Instructional System developed in 1971 and described by Gerlach and Ely (1980). This model provides an elaborate instructional system which illustrates fundamental principles of teaching and learning. These principles of the model are within the ten components of teaching which are: specification of the objectives, selection of content, entering behavior, instructional strategy and techniques, organizing students into groups, time allocation, allocation of learning space, selection of learning resources, evaluation of performance and analysis of feedback.

Specification of the objectives component is whereby objectives are expected to give direction of what the learners should be able to do at certain points along the instructional continuum and also in the selection of what should be taught. The Kiswahili Syllabus of 2002 conforms with this component of the model by stating the general objectives of teaching Kiswahili at the secondary school level and it also indicates the objectives for each of the four language skills, listening, speaking, reading and writing, as well as for grammar and language use. The objectives for the writing skills have been well outlined from form one to form four. These objectives guide the Kiswahili teacher in designing specific instructional objectives when preparing schemes of work and lesson plan for teaching writing skills Kiswahili composition (Insha) in relation to the specific topics.
In the selection of content component, it is expected that the content selected or subject matter, is to help the learner to attain the instructional objectives. The content is normally determined by the lesson topic. In the Kiswahili syllabus, writing is indicated as one of the main sections, where the three different types of writings have been outlined, whereby compositions (Insha) writing is one of them. The Kiswahili Syllabus by Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) (2002) has outlined five different types of composition under the main section of “Uandshi wa Insha” (composition writing). These types are: - Maelezo (Descriptive), Mawazo (Imaginative), Mazungumzo (Dialogue), Masimulizi (Narrative) and Methali (Proverbs). This study focused on the descriptive type (Insha za maelezo), in which the content was the main element of assessment for students’ performance in both their pre-test and the post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.

Entering behavior is the knowledge level of students in that particular course. This is established by the teacher giving a pre-test, so as to test the general achievement of a class before starting a course. In this study, the form four students were given a pre-test of writing a descriptive Kiswahili composition (Insha) before the use of an intervention by the experimental group.

Instructional strategy and techniques refers to the way content is presented in the instructional environment, taking into consideration the learner’s entry level and the instructional objectives set by the teacher. Technique or method is the specific way of presenting content. This study has illustrated the use of product-oriented and process-oriented methods in teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.
Organizing students into groups depends on the objectives to be achieved and the instructional methods to be used. Some methods require individualized instruction, small groups or large groups. This study adopted the suggestion by Brown (2007) for organizing the students in small groups of 3-5 members in using the process -oriented method for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing by the experimental group.

Time allocation is the use of time depending on the subject matter to be covered, objectives to be achieved and learning activities planned. Time allocation is also controlled by the syllabus which indicates the number of lessons per week for a subject and the school time table. For example, in secondary schools, the teaching of Kiswahili, form four has been allocated six lessons per week according to the Kiswahili Syllabus by (KIE) (2002), and each lesson lasts for 40 minutes. According to Brown (2007), process-oriented approach to writing is interactive and learner-centered so it requires sufficient time for the students to initiate activity and exchange ideas as they prepare for the actual writing. In this study the experimental group used a double period lesson of 80 minutes when teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

The learning space can be handled differently depending on whether the activities are to be done inside the classroom or outside the classroom, if there is need to extend the learning experiences beyond the classroom. Since most of the learning takes place in the classroom, the teacher’s role is to organize the classroom allocated for effective learning. The classroom space can be arranged for whole class teaching or for teaching students in groups. In this study, the experimental group used process-oriented approach which required students to be organized in small groups of 5 students, while the control group had whole class arrangement.
Selection of learning resources is done in relation to the content to be taught and the instructional objectives to be achieved. In teaching writing, using process-oriented approach to writing, Brown (2007) states that students need a variety of relevant text books as reading resources, because they have to connect reading and writing. They also have to use resources like real objects, films and other audio-visual resources that stimulate generation of ideas for writing. This requires teachers to plan for the acquisition and use of these resources. However as stated by Gustafson and Branch (1997), due to time constraints, teachers would rather select the resources from what is available in the school rather than develop them.

Evaluation of performance is the point at which the assessment of the behavior stated in the instructional objectives is done. In assessing students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) writing skills where the teaching has used process-oriented approach to writing, formative and summative evaluation are used. The formative evaluation should be done during the pre-writing activities so as to serve the purpose of facilitating improvement of students’ written work before the evaluation of the final product in summative evaluation. During summative evaluation, the teacher may decide to use holistic, analytic or primary trait scoring scales. However, the analytic scoring scale, which was used in this study to assess the students’ pretest and posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha) provides a better feedback.

Analysis of feedback is the final step of Gerlach and Ely model (1980) and it is the response we get from others on whether what we do realizes the objectives corresponding to the terminal behavior. According to Brown (2007) in the process-oriented approach to writing, a student gives feedback to fellow students and is also
given feedback by them during the peer editing process, which he/she uses to improve his /her writing. The final writing submitted to the teacher is also returned with teacher’s feedback. The student needs to spend time examining the comments from the teacher and compare with those from the class-mates to see whether there was any improvement. The feedback from the teacher only serves a useful learning purpose if the students are able to correct their writing errors according to the teacher’s feedback.

The Gerlach and Ely model was found to be an appropriate theoretical framework for this study because according to Grabowski and Branch (2003) this model has a phenomenological and philosophical origin which can be accredited to communication theory and learning theory. Both theories are incorporated into educational settings as well as in the teaching and learning strategies. This model therefore, forms a physical representation of the learning theory which explains how learning takes place and since the model advocates learner-centered instruction, it forms the appropriate theoretical framework for this study.

The ten components of the System Model form the backbone of any instructional process that provides an elaborate instructional system which illustrates fundamental principles of teaching and learning. These principles can be applicable to the teaching and learning of any subject and therefore were found to be an appropriate model for the theoretical framework of this study. Effectiveness of teaching and learning according to Gerlarch and Ely’s model (1980) is facilitated by teachers who have appropriate pedagogical competencies. The Teacher pedagogical competencies which this study focused on were:-planning for teaching, teaching strategies or methods, learning resources, classroom management styles and in designing and using assessment
techniques which are all derived from the ten components of the module. The performance of students in any subject is therefore, a reflection of the Teacher pedagogical competencies in applying the ten components holistically in the teaching and learning process. The purpose of this study was, therefore, to establish how Teacher pedagogical competencies, which are derived from the Systems Model, influenced students’ performance in writing skills Kiswahili composition (*Insha*).

### 2.10 Conceptual framework

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), conceptual framework is a diagrammatical illustration of the relationship between the variables in the study. The conceptual framework of this study is illustrated in figure 1.
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

Teacher Pedagogical Competencies and Students’ Performance in Kiswahili Composition Writing Skills
Figure 1 shows the independent variables which are the Teacher pedagogical competencies in planning for teaching, methods of teaching, instructional resources, classroom management and designing and use of assessment techniques and the dependable variable which is the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. Both the independent and dependent variables are likely to be affected by certain intervening variables that might interfere with the effectiveness of the independent variables on the dependent variable. That means the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies can be affected by the school practices and policies, teachers characteristics and learners’ characteristics and result in either positive or negative performance.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter includes the following sections: research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, validity of research instruments, reliability of research instruments, procedures for data collection, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design

This study adopted a Quasi-experimental research design, which according to Cook (2014) tests the causal effects of treatments outside the laboratory. The quasi-experimental research design which was used in this study was of the pretest-posttest type. The respondents of the study were divided into two study groups which were the experimental group and the control group. Both groups did a similar pretest after which, the experimental group was given an intervention or treatment for teaching the posttest topic, while the control group taught without any intervention, then both groups did a similar posttest. The study groups in this study were all the form four students and their Kiswahili teachers from the sampled schools. The two study groups were constituted by assigning one of the two schools in each sub-county to either in the experimental group or in the control group through randomization. The two study groups which were the experimental and the control groups are shown in Table 2.
Table 2: Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>PRT1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PTT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRG</td>
<td>PRT1</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>PTTR2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

CG represents Control Group

EG represents Experimental Group

PRT1 represents pre-testing for control and experimental groups

TR represents treatment (which is the intervention.)

PTT2 represents post-testing for control group

PTTR2 represents post-testing for experimental group

Table 2 shows that the students who were involved in the study were divided into the experimental group (EG) and control group (CG). Both groups were given a pre-test to write the same descriptive Kiswahili composition (*Insha ya maelezo*) (PRT1). The purpose of this was to establish the students’ levels of performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. After the pre-test both groups were taught Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills for the second composition of the posttest, which was also a descriptive Kiswahili composition (*Insha ya maelezo*), but they were not taught using the same method. The teachers in the experimental group taught their students using guidelines in the intervention module which was also the treatment (TR) described in Section 3.5.6 below, while the teachers in the control group were not instructed to use any particular method but they were required to teach the same way
they had been teaching. The teachers in the experimental group taught for 2 periods of 80 minutes each and then they used 60 minutes for their students to write their post-test Kiswahili compositions (Insha). The teachers in the control group, who had been allocated one double lesson of 80 minutes, used the time allocated to them to teach and give the post-test within the same lesson. After the teaching, the students in both groups were given a post-test which is indicated as (PTT2) for the control group and (PTTR2) for the experimental group. The post-test also required the students to write another descriptive Kiswahili composition (Insha) which was almost similar to the one of pretest.

3.3 Target population

The target population for this study was all the form four students and all the teachers who taught Kiswahili to all the form four students in all the public secondary schools from the seven regions of Kenya. Records from the Ministry of Education, Kenya 2016, showed an estimated number of 208,280 students in 5157 public secondary schools and about 5,500 teachers who taught Kiswahili to form four students in the public secondary schools from the seven regions in Kenya.

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Procedures

The sample size for this study was arrived at by using purposive stratified random sampling technique to select the seven regions or former provinces of Kenya, the public secondary schools from these regions and the students and their Kiswahili teachers who participated in this study.
3.4.1 Sample Size

The sample size for this study is indicated on Table 3 which shows how the sample size was selected.

Table 3: Selection of the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Sampled Counties</th>
<th>Public Secondary Schools</th>
<th>Sampled Schools</th>
<th>Sampled Teachers</th>
<th>No of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rift Valley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanza</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5157</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3 shows how the sample for the schools in this study was arrived at from the target population of the schools in the seven regions. The sample size of the study constituted seven regions in Kenya, 8 counties, 16 public sub-county public secondary schools, 16 Kiswahili teachers; one from each school and a total of 637 students from the sampled secondary schools. During the study the sample size of the schools,
teachers and students did not remain constant throughout the study period. For example initially the schools in which the students did the pretest were 16, the Kiswahili teachers who answered the questionnaire were 16 and the students who did the pretest and answered the questionnaire were 531. The sample size reduced to 14 schools, 14 teachers and 491 students during the post test and observation, after two teachers declined to continue with the study.

3.4.2 Sampling Procedure

The sampling procedure started with a purposive random sampling of seven regions out of the eight regions of Kenya which left out Nairobi region because it was an urban area, while the study focused on schools in the rural areas. The strata therefore included the following regions; Coast, Eastern, Central, North Eastern, Rift Valley, Western and Nyanza. This was followed by random sampling of one county from each of these seven regions except the Rift Valley region, where two counties were randomly sampled- one from the North Rift and the other one from the South Rift. Two counties were sampled from the Rift Valley region because of its extensive size and large population. In total there were 16 counties which were randomly sampled.

In each of the randomly sampled counties, a sub-county which had the lowest overall mean score in KCSE examination for at least two years, that is; in 2014 and 2015, was purposively selected. From the selected sub-county, two day mixed single streamed secondary schools which had had the lowest mean in KCSE for two years and a mean score of less than 5.0 in Kiswahili were purposively sampled. The secondary schools which participated in the study were therefore of the sub-county category and were
from the same sub-county. The samples for the students and the teachers who took part in this study were derived from all the form four students and their Kiswahili teachers from the schools which had been sampled for the study.

After the teachers and the students had responded to their respective questionnaires the students had done the pretest the schools were divided into two groups, half of them were in the experimental group and the other half in the control group. This grouping was dependent on the teachers who accepted to take part in the training when they were asked by the researcher, for the schools which had to be in the experimental group. This was to be one school from each of the two sub-county schools.

### 3.5 Research Instruments

The research instruments used for this study consisted of questionnaire for Kiswahili teachers, questionnaire for form four students’ observation schedule, documentary analysis schedules, pretest, posttest and an intervention instrument.

#### 3.5.1 Questionnaire for Kiswahili Teachers

The Teacher questionnaire which is indicated in Appendix III had section A, B and C. Section A was meant to seek information for the teacher’s personal data in terms of their gender, age, academic and professional qualifications, the teaching subjects they trained in, their teaching experience in Kiswahili and the university or college they attended. Section B focused on the objectives of the study and it sought information from Kiswahili teachers on the way they applied their pedagogical competencies in planning to teach, use of teaching methods, use of teaching resources, classroom management and in designing and assessing writing skills in Kiswahili composition.
Section C of this instrument investigated teacher views, using items which focused on the study objectives and they were based on the Likert Scale, of Likert (1932). This last Section was intended to establish whether the teacher views concurred with what they practiced in terms of Teacher pedagogical competencies.

3.5.2 Questionnaire for Form Four Students

The students’ questionnaire which is indicated in Appendix IV, had questionnaire items covering what the teachers had responded to in relation to the study objectives. The purpose of the students’ questionnaire was to ascertain the teacher responses in the items in their questionnaire on the objectives of the study.

3.5.3 Observation Schedule

The observation schedule instrument provided in Appendix V, was used by the researcher to observe how the Kiswahili teachers in both the experimental and control group taught the post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing topic entitled teacher pedagogical competencies, that is; planning to teach, methods of teaching, use of learning resources, classroom management and designing of assessment techniques, for both the teachers in the experimental group and those in the control group, during the lesson presentation. Since the teachers in the experimental group had been trained to teach using the guidelines in the intervention module, the researcher had to observe whether they taught as guided by the intervention module. The teachers in the experimental group were required to prepare two lessons of 80 minutes each, whereby they were to be observed teaching the first two lessons using the process-oriented approach for teaching writing skills, while in the third lesson they were to use 55
minutes for the students to write their Insha. The teachers in the control group were observed in one lesson of 80 minutes in which they taught in their own ways, without any guidance, and then they gave the students the Insha to write on the same topic.

3.5.4 Documentary Analysis Guide

The study carried out documentary analysis using the instrument indicated in Appendix VI, for the documents which the teachers in both groups had been using for planning to teach, such as the KIE and KNEC syllabuses, schemes of work and lesson plans. For the schemes of work and the lesson plan the analysis was based on the format indicated in appendix VII and VIII of the University of Nairobi which was designed by the Department of Educational Communication and Technology. The other documents which the study analyzed were: the records of work books, marked students’ exercise books for Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing and the assessment records. Documentary analysis was done at a time when the teachers taught the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic for posttest.

3.5.5 Pre-test

In the pre-test the form four students in all the sampled schools were required to write a descriptive Kiswahili composition (Insha ya maelezo) of 400 words on the topic “Maisha yangu katika shule ya sekondari” “My life in secondary school.” The purpose of giving this pretest was to establish the level of performance of the form four students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills before giving an intervention to the experimental group. The students’ pretest Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were marked by the researcher using the analytic scoring scale which, according to Silva (1993) and
Alderson (1995), considers several elements of writing. In this study, the elements which were considered for assessing the students’ pretest Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were: content, organization, cohesion, grammar, vocabulary, spelling and handwriting. The students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were evaluated on the basis of detailed grades for each element of writing. The element which was given more weight in the allocation of marks for marking the students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) in this study was content which was suggested by Brown (2004) to be the most important. The other elements were, however, also considered for the allocation of marks and, therefore, they were also significant in determining the students’ performance in their pretest overall mean scores. The allocation of marks for each element was determined by how the students performed in each element and the errors in every element. The students’ pretest Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were marked out of 20 marks after which the mean score for each school was computed. The pretest mean scores were important in establishing the level of performance of these students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing before using an intervention for the experimental group.

The overall pre-test mean scores for both the experimental and control groups were computed in order to establish whether there was any difference between the means of the two groups during the pre-test. The marked students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) papers were returned to the respective schools and the teachers were requested by the researcher to analyze the students’ errors with them and ensure that the students corrected their errors.
3.5.6 Intervention Module

The intervention module in this study was an instrument which was used as a treatment for the experimental group. The module contained instructions and guidelines on how to teach a Kiswahili descriptive composition (*Insha ya maelezo*). It was used by the teachers in the experimental group for teaching their students the posttest Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) entitled “*Shule yangu ya Sekondari*” “My Secondary School” before the students did the posttest. The guiding principle of the intervention module was how to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing using the process oriented approach. The teachers who used the intervention module were inducted on how to use it in a one day workshop. The intervention module was an instructional guide which had an introduction that emphasized on the role of the teacher in teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing. The teacher’s role was outlined in the objectives of the module which were based on Teacher pedagogical competencies in planning to teach, use of appropriate teaching methods, use of relevant references and resources, use of conducive classroom management styles that ensured sufficient learner participation and design of suitable assessment techniques when teaching students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) writing skills using process oriented approach.

In planning for teaching, the module provided formats of the schemes of work (Appendix VII) and lesson plan (Appendix VIII) which the teachers of the schools in the experimental group were to follow. These teachers were required to prepare a special scheme of work for three weeks for teaching two Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) lessons for eighty minutes each. These lessons were to be taught, one lesson in every
week and the third lesson was for the students to write their Kiswahili composition (Insha).

For teaching and learning resources, the module provided a list of relevant textbooks which the teachers in the experimental group were required to use. Where the teachers could not get the textbooks, or where they were not enough, they were provided with extracts by the researcher for the sections which were relevant for teaching a Kiswahili descriptive composition (Insha ya maelezo). The students were required to read these sections as part of pre-writing activities. The module also suggested to the teachers to use the school environment as part of the teaching and learning resources since the topic was about my school.

In teaching the students in the experimental group writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) using the process oriented approach, the module emphasized on the use of methods which involved group work or collaborative learning. The teacher’s task was to prepare the learners adequately for the process of composing. The module therefore provided for two double lessons of 80 minutes each for teaching. In the first lesson, the teacher was required to introduce the lesson by giving a highlight of what a descriptive composition is, and give examples of topics for this type of composition and then give the students the composition topic entitled “Shule yangu ya Sekondari” (My Secondary School). After this, the students were to be put in groups of five, which according to Cohen (1994) and Burke (2011) was the most appropriate group size. In their groups the students were involved in pre-writing activities of brainstorming on the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic which was given. Group work was considered to be the appropriate way of organizing students so that they could be engaged in
collaborative activities which according to Graham and Perin (2007b) facilitate learning writing skills. The teacher monitored the group activities by visiting each group and guiding the students where necessary. After the group discussions in class, the group members were directed to meet after the class at their own time so as to identify and name the features found within their school compound. Each student was also required to prepare the first draft of the Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) in readiness for the next lesson which followed after a week.

The second lesson was also for 80 minutes, where the students were to exchange their first drafts in order to identify each other’s errors and then correct them in their groups. The teacher was also expected to go round each group to make sure that the students were engaging in the right activities in their groups and assist them where necessary. During this lesson the teacher requested each group to read, before the class, one Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) which they considered to be the best in their group. The other students and the teacher were to give their comments which were to focus more on positive criticism. This was peer evaluation which is recommended by Graham (2008) for making students to enjoy writing since they are motivated to write when the classroom environment is supportive and a pleasant place. Graham further affirms this by stating that, one way of doing this is by the students and the teachers providing a positive feedback, by commenting on what is best about the composition a student has shared. In this study the teachers encouraged students to continue with the corrections of the errors which were identified.
The third lesson was for writing the final copy of the Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) in accordance with the recommended time of 53 minutes by Kenya National Examination Council, after which the students’ compositions (*Insha*) were collected for marking by the researcher. The module instructed the teachers that, after the researcher had marked the students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) and returned the students’ papers, the Kiswahili teachers were to discuss with the students the feed-back given in the marked work and then the students to correct their errors.

3.5.7 Post-test

During the posttest the students in both the experimental group and control group were given a post-test of writing a descriptive Kiswahili composition (*Insha ya maelezo*) on the topic; “*Shule yangu ya sekondari*” “My Secondary School” after both groups were taught. The students in the experimental group were taught using guidelines in the intervention module, while those in the control group were taught using the conventional method. The post-test topic was closely related to the one for pretest because both topics were about the students’ secondary school. In the post-test as it was in the pre-test, the students were required to demonstrate their ability in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills by writing a descriptive Kiswahili composition of 400 words on the topic which was taught. The students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) for both groups were marked out of 20 marks using the analytic scoring scale like it was done for the pretest. The elements of writing which were considered were also content, organization, cohesion, grammar, vocabulary and spelling. After marking the mean scores for each school in the experimental and control groups were computed. The overall pre-test mean scores for both the experimental and control groups were
compared in order to establish whether there was any significant difference between the two groups and whether the intervention had any effect.

3.6 Pilot Study

In order to determine the validity and reliability of the research instruments used in this study, piloting was done. According to Teddlie and Tashakori (2009) a pilot study is a small scale implementation of the project in which a small amount of data is collected. The pilot study in this study used two purposively selected secondary schools in one Sub-County, which had similar characteristics like the study sample. The study involved two Kiswahili teachers, one from each school and 34 students from one school and 39 from the other school. After identifying the study sample for the pilot study, all the research instruments were administered by two different researchers.

3.7 Validity of Research instruments

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) validity refers to whether the research instruments measure meaningfully and accurately what they are intended to measure. Mugenda (2008), further states that, if the data collected is a true reflection of the variable it was intended to measure, then inferences based on such data will be accurate and meaningful. There are three approaches to validation of instruments according to Mugenda (2008) and Punch (2008). These methods are; content validity, criterion validity and construct validity. This study used content validity, whereby, the researcher ensured that, the instruments for collecting data, that is; the questionnaires for teachers and students, the observation schedule and documentary analysis had items that represented the indicators of the objectives of the study and they were designed to give
specific responses. In determining validity Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) suggest two general strategies: to use experts and conduct a pilot study. This study used both strategies in the following steps.

The researcher started by preparing the research instruments which were based on the research objectives and gave them to the experts who were the supervisors of this study. After receiving comments from the supervisors, the researcher corrected the instruments accordingly and carried out a pilot study. The pilot study was done to validate and improve the content validity of the items and it also assisted in identifying the items which were not clear to the respondents and those which were not included.

After the pilot study the instruments which were received back were checked and it was found out that in the teachers’ questionnaire there were items which the respondents had not responded to them. The researcher therefore organized to meet with the respondents and established that the instructions and some items were not clear. From this feedback the researcher was able to revise the items which were checked again by the supervisors for clarity. From the feedback of the pilot study and the supervisors, the items were restructured and reorganized for use in the main study. Content validity was also ensured by selecting the pre-test and post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) topics from the form four Kiswahili syllabuses.
3. 8 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is defined by Mugenda & Mugenda (1999) and Punch (2008) as the consistency of a research instrument in producing similar results in different but comparable situations. In order to ascertain reliability of the research instruments for this study, a test-retest technique was used during piloting. This means that all the instruments were administered twice to the same group at two different points in time during the pilot study in order to determine the degree of reliability.

In estimating reliability for the instruments of pretest and posttest Kiswahili composition topics the first scores were correlated with the second ones in each of the tests using Pearson-Product–Moment Correlation Coefficient. The reliability coefficient value obtained for the pretest was 0.73 while for the posttest it was 0.82. The estimation of reliability for the teachers’ questionnaire and students’ questionnaire was done using Chronbach’s Alpha coefficient whereby the coefficient value for the teachers’ questionnaire was 0.78 and for the students’ questionnaire was 0.65. In estimating reliability for observational schedule the study used Kappa inter-rater reliability coefficient which according to Mugenda (2008) estimates the degree of agreement between two or more people observing and rating the same activity. In this study observational data was collected by two researchers during the pilot study and the degree of inter-rater agreement was established as 75%.
The results of the different ways of estimating reliability for the different instruments used to collect data in this study indicated that they all had high reliability coefficient of more than 0.5. According to Mugenda (2008) these instruments were reliable for collecting data since they had correlation scores which were close to 1.0.

3.8 Procedure for Data Collection

The process of data collection started with the approval of the proposal by the School of Education after which a letter of full registration was issued by the Graduate School, University of Nairobi. This was followed by the researcher applying for a research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). After getting the permit the researcher was able to approach the County Education Directors and County Commissioners of the counties which had been selected randomly for the study. The County Education Directors availed the researcher with data for the public secondary schools in their counties. From this data, the researcher was able to purposively sample the sub-counties which had indicated the lowest performance in the KCSE examination for the previous two years in their counties. After identifying the sub-counties in which the study was to be carried out the researcher was issued with a permit by the County Commissioners to visit these sub-counties. From the selected sub-counties, the researcher was also able to purposively sample two public, single streamed, day, mixed secondary schools. After identifying the schools the researcher was issued with a letter of introduction by the County Education Director for introduction to the head teachers of the schools which had been selected for research. The researcher then proceeded to visit the sampled schools, in order to explain the purpose of the study, get the consent of the heads of those schools to carry out
research in their schools and to agree on the procedure for carrying out the study with them and the Kiswahili teachers.

After identifying the schools, which were to participate in the study, the researcher organized for a training of the research assistants on how to administer all the research instruments. The research assistants were assigned two schools in one sub-county to issue the questionnaires to all the form four Kiswahili teachers and to the form four students and collect them, administer the pre-test and the post-test to the students, observe the teachers while teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing lessons for the posttest topic and carry out documentary analysis. The pre-test, was administered on the same day the teachers and students were issued with the questionnaires. In order to ensure that, a high return rate of these instruments was realized the researcher pre-notified the participants, especially the Kiswahili teachers on the day of issuing the research instruments, and then applied the drop and pick method, whereby the research instruments were issued and collected on the same day. In this study the drop and pick method involved giving the students’ questionnaires and the researcher waited to pick them immediately they finished filling them. The same method was used to pick the students’ pre-test and post-test Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) papers. For the teacher questionnaires, where it was not possible to pick on the same day they were administered, they were picked a few days after, as agreed with the respondent so as to allow the respondents ample time to fill the questionnaires. The process of marking the students’ pre-test and posttest Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) started soon after they were collected from all the study schools.
After all the students’ pre-test Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) had been marked, the marks were recorded and the students’ scripts were returned to them. The next step was to group the schools into experimental and control group. Half of the schools had to be in the experimental group and the other half in the control group. Since there were two schools in every sub-county, one school was to be in the experimental group and the other one in the control group. The selection of the schools into the experimental group was done by using convenience sampling technique, whereby, the teachers who were available and willing to participate in the training were the ones who were selected into the experimental group. In some sub-counties where none of the two teachers was willing to be in the experimental group and thereby be trained, even after persuasion, the teacher was replaced by another one from a sub-county where both teachers accepted to be in the experimental group. That is why in the Eastern region both schools were in the experimental group while there was no school in the experimental group from the sub-county in the North Rift.

After the schools had been grouped into experimental and control group, the researcher organized for a one day workshop to induct the teachers into how to use the intervention module which was the treatment for the experimental group. After this induction for the experimental group, teachers in both groups were observed while teaching the posttest Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) topic whereby those in the experimental group taught using the process-oriented-approach while those in the control group used the conventional method.
3.9 Data Analysis

The instruments which were used for collecting data in this study were questionnaires for Kiswahili teachers and for form four students, observation schedule, documentary analysis guide, pretest and posttest scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. After the research instruments were collected, they were validated by checking their return rate in proportion to what was issued, so as to determine whether the return rate was acceptable for analysis of these instruments. The questionnaires were further checked for any errors, and then they were edited, coded and classified in preparation for data analysis according to the research objectives. The analysis of the data collected was done by using two statistical methods which were: descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistical method used frequency distribution tables, mean scores, standard deviation and percentages, to analyze data on the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) under the objectives of the study. These objectives were the Teacher pedagogical competencies in: planning to teach, teaching methods, use of learning resources, classroom management and designing assessment techniques. Descriptive data was collected using the teacher and students’ questionnaires, observation schedule and documentary analysis. Inferential statistical method was used to analyze data collected by using students’ pre-test and post-test scores of their performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The analysis involved calculating the mean scores of the students’ pretest and posttest performance and the standard deviation. From this data the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for computing the t-test. The results of the t-test
were used to test the main hypothesis of the study which was that; there are no significant differences of the students’ mean scores in Kiswahili composition writing skills when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies and the other subsequent hypotheses. This was done by comparing; students’ overall pretest mean scores between experimental and control groups, between post-test and pre-test overall mean scores and overall posttest mean scores between experimental and control groups, in order to establish the levels of significant differences. The level of significant difference was used to determine the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The test of the hypothesis was done at 5% level of significance.

3.10 Ethical Consideration

According to Gatara (2010) ethics in research refers to moral principles or codes of behavior that call for respect of the rights of the research participants by researchers. Ethics is particularly important where human beings are involved as participants in research because it ensures that they are protected from any risks, their interests are served and there is respect for human dignity by ensuring that there is privacy and protection of their confidentiality.

In this study the following ethical consideration were adhered to. First and foremost, the researcher visited the schools which were sampled for the study and informed the principals so as to get their consent for their schools to participate in the study. After getting the consent of the principals, the researcher sought the willingness of the Kiswahili teachers to participate in the study. After the teachers, accepted, they were
requested to inform their students about participating in the intended research. The researcher assured the participants of confidentiality of their identities, their schools and that the information collected from them would not be used against them but only for the purpose of the study findings. The identities of the schools which were used for this study were concealed by being given codes instead of using their actual names. The codes which were used to identify the schools were letters of the alphabet, from letter A to G, whereby each letter represented one of the eight regions indicated on Table 3. The two schools from the same region used the same letter except one was indicated as 1 and the other one as 2, for example, for code A, the two schools in that region were given codes A1 and A2.

Another ethical consideration which the researcher observed was the voluntary participation of respondents without any inducement or force. Furthermore the researcher carried out the research activities without interfering with the school programs such as administration of examinations or students’ participation in co-curricular activities. This required the schedule for carrying out the research to be adjusted and agreed upon with the principals and the Kiswahili teachers of the individual schools so long as it was within the time duration of the period set for data collection. This was in consideration that carrying out the research had to be done at the convenience of the participants where possible but within the stipulated period.

In order to ensure that the research benefited the students and it did not waste their learning time, the researcher made sure that the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topics used for the pre-test and post-test were in accordance with the Kiswahili KIE (KICD) and KNEC syllabuses and the topics were within the learners’ experiences. The
students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were marked and returned to them with the appropriate comments so that they could provide a useful feedback which could help them to improve in their writing skills. The intervention module which was used as the guideline for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing was also of benefit to the teachers. This was by exposing the teachers in the experimental group, to the process-oriented approach of teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha), which was a better method than the product oriented approach which they had been using.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is a presentation and discussions of the research results for the study of the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili in Kenya’s public secondary schools. The study results presented in this chapter are on the return rates of the research instruments, the demographic data of the respondents, who consisted of the teachers and the students and the performance of students in their pretest and posttest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The study also presented and discussed results on the influence of the Teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The pedagogical competencies which the study focused on consisted of planning to teach, methods of teaching, resources for teaching, classroom management and designing assessment techniques.

4.2 Return Rate of the Research Instruments

The research instruments which were used in this study consisted of teacher questionnaire, students’ questionnaire, documentary analysis, observation schedule and pre-test and post-test results of students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. These instruments were administered to the teachers and students of the 16-sampled public secondary schools and their return rate is as indicated in Table 4.
Table 4: Return Rate of the Research Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Instrument</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
<th>Administered</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers questionnaires</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students questionnaires</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>531</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation schedule</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary analysis guide</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test composition</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>531</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test composition</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Return Rate</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 4 shows that out of the 16 questionnaires administered to the Kiswahili teachers in the sampled secondary schools, 16 were successfully filled and returned representing a return rate of 100%, while out of 637 questionnaires administered to the form four students, 531 were filled and returned representing 83.4% return rate. The study carried out an observation and documentary analysis in 14 secondary schools which had a 100% return rate for both instruments. The 14 schools were out of the 16 schools which had been sampled for the study since, 2 schools had declined to continue with the study and consequently their students did not do the post-test. From the 637 students registered in form four, those who did the pre-test were 531 students; representing 83.4% and those who did the post-test were 491 students representing 77.1%. In both cases, the same number of students to whom pretest and posttest was administered were able to hand in their written Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) thereby representing a 100% return rate for each. Though the return rates of the
instruments issued to the students was high, the number of students was not the same as the total number of the students enrolled in form four due to some students being absent at the time the instruments were administered.

The overall return rate of all the research instruments was 97.3%, which indicated quite a high response rate. According to Aday and Cornellius (2006), response rate, is viewed as an important indicator for determining the quality of a survey. A high response rate of a small sample which is more than 80% is quite appropriate for quality survey and is preferable to a low response rate from a large sample. The high return rate in this study is therefore considered to be very appropriate for making conclusions for this study.

4.3 Demographic Data of the Respondents

This section presents the results on the demographic data of the respondents who were the Kiswahili teachers and the form four students of the 16 sampled secondary schools. The study was carried out in 16 public day single streamed, mixed secondary schools involving one form four Kiswahili teacher per school and that means there were 16 Kiswahili teachers who participated in the study initially, but during the observation, carrying out documentary analysis and when the students did the post-test, the number of schools reduced to 14 and consequently the number of teachers also reduced to 14. The students who participated in the study were form fours who, were drawn from the 16 secondary schools and they were 637 in total. However, not all the students did the pre-test, furthermore, when the two teachers declined to continue with the study the number of students also reduced further as reflected in the post-test returns. The Kiswahili teachers and the form four students, whose demographic data has been analyzed herein, thus constituted the respondents of this study.
4.3.1 Kiswahili Teacher Demographic Characteristics

The Kiswahili teacher demographic information, which the study sought to find out was the one concerning their gender, age bracket, academic and professional qualifications, their experience in years and the teaching subjects. Their gender was intended to capture equal representation of males and females in the sample of Kiswahili teachers in this study. Their age was intended to establish whether their teaching experiences related to their age in terms of handling issues of professional teaching. Information on their highest academic qualification was intended to establish their pedagogical preparedness in the teaching profession. The results of Kiswahili Teacher Demographic Characteristics are presented by their respective sub-sections in Table 5.
Table 5: Demographic Characteristics of Kiswahili Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Professional qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Arts)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili and CRE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili and History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili and Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili and Business Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows the demographic information of the Kiswahili teachers who took part in this study. The table shows that 12 (75.0%) teachers were females while 4 (25.00%) were male. This shows that there were more female teachers than male teachers teaching Kiswahili in the schools used for this study. Since the ages of the teachers are likely to be associated with rich teaching skills, in this regard, the study sought to establish the age distribution of the Kiswahili teachers who took part in this study. The table shows that 5 (31.25%) teachers were aged between 21-30 years, 9 (56.25%) teachers were aged 31-40 years while 2 (12.50%) teachers were aged above 40 years. Majority of the teachers in this study, who were 11 (68.75%) teachers were therefore, aged above 30 years, which is a fairly mature age for the teachers to have acquired enough teaching experiences which could enable them to adequately writing skills in Kiswahili. The study also established that the ages of the teachers who participated in this study were closely related to their experiences. For example 11 (68.75%) teachers had experiences of above 7 years like the teachers who were aged above 30 years while 5 (31.25%) teachers had experiences of less than 7 years in teaching Kiswahili like the teachers who were aged below 30 years.

The Kiswahili teachers in this study were requested to indicate their highest academic and professional qualifications. The study found out that 13 (81.25%) teachers had Bachelor of Education (Arts) degree while 3 (18.75%) teachers had a Diploma in Education. This shows that most of the teachers had acquired a Bachelor of Education degree as the highest academic level. In Kenya, the Diploma in Education, though lower than Bachelor of Education degree, is also recognized by the Ministry of Education and
Teacher Service Commission as an adequate professional qualification for teaching in secondary schools.

The study also sought from the Kiswahili teachers the teaching subjects they had specialized in. According to the results from table 5, all the teachers 16 (100%) had specialized in Kiswahili and another teaching subject. The combination of Kiswahili with another subject was indicated as follows; 8 (50.00%) of the teachers had specialized in Kiswahili and CRE, 5 (31.25%) of the teachers had specialized in Kiswahili and History, 2 (12.50%) teachers had specialized in Kiswahili and Geography and 1 (6.25%) teacher had specialized in Kiswahili and Business Studies. These results show that all the teachers in this study had been trained in teaching Kiswahili and the most popular combination was Kiswahili and CRE.

In addition to the information in the Table 5, about the combination of Kiswahili and other subjects, the study also sought to find out the number of Kiswahili lessons the teachers taught in form four. It was established that all the teachers 16 (100%) indicated that they taught six (6) Kiswahili lessons per week in form four, which was in accordance with the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (2002), requirement as specified in the Secondary Education Syllabus for Kiswahili. The study results also indicated that all teachers also taught other classes Kiswahili with the number of Kiswahili lessons taught per week by the teachers in this study ranging from 12 to 24 out of a total of 24 to 28 lessons the teachers taught per week. From these results it is evident that the Kiswahili teachers in this study had ample teaching exposure to Kiswahili even if they also taught other subjects. These teachers, therefore,
were expected to use this experience for a positive achievement of their students in Kiswahili.

The teachers in this study were also requested to indicate the college or university they attended. From the teachers’ responses, it was established that 6 (37.50%) teachers attended Kenyatta University while in each of the following universities; Moi University, Masinde Muliro, University of Nairobi and Mount Kenya University there were 2 teachers, making a total of 8 (50%) teachers. Only 1 (6.25%) teacher attended University of Eldoret and 1 (6.25%) teacher attended Kagumo Diploma Teacher Training College. The Universities and Colleges which the Kiswahili teachers in this study attended for their training are all accredited universities and certified college for training teachers for secondary schools in Kenya and therefore these teachers were expected to have been adequately trained.

From the biographic data of the Kiswahili teachers it was evident that most of the teachers who participated in the study were female, they were aged above 30 years, they had experiences of over 7 years, they had appropriate academic and professional qualifications and they were all trained in teaching Kiswahili. The results, therefore, indicate that the teachers in this study had the appropriate professional qualifications and experience, which are an indication of teachers with appropriate pedagogical competencies to steer their students to perform well in Kiswahili generally and in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). Studies which have been reviewed in this study, on the role of the teacher, have supported the fact that teacher quality is the most important school resource because it predicts students’ performance.
However, apart from teacher qualities in terms of academic and professional qualifications, Ferguson and Gilpin (2001) also state that teacher scholastic attitude and their teaching ability are important dimensions of a teacher. Kola and Sunday (2015) also indicated that, the commitment of a teacher is the driving force for improving students’ achievement.

In view of the teacher characteristics established in this study, it is indicated that all the teachers had what is required to make a competent teacher. The only thing which could make the teachers in this study not to use their pedagogical competencies for the successful performance of their students in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) could have been only their personal characteristics, such as scholastic attitude and commitment.

4.3.2 Students’ Demographic Information

The study sought to establish the demographic data of the form four students, who participated in the study from the 16 public secondary schools. The total number of the students enrolled in the schools that took part in the study was 637, who comprised of 353 (55.4%) boys and 284 (44.6%) girls. That means, in the schools selected for this study, there were more boys than girls enrolled in form four. The students who responded to the students’ questionnaires and did the pre-test, however, reduced to 531 (83.4 %.) and they comprised of 267 (50.3%) girls and 264 (49.7%) boys. That means more girls responded to the questionnaire and did the pre-test than the boys, though in both cases the numbers were less than those registered in form four. The students who did the post-test reduced from 637 to 491 representing 77.1%. The numbers of students
kept fluctuating because of students being absent when the instruments were
administered, due to having been sent home for fees or some of them decide in not to
come to school, for reasons known to them. Another reason why the number of
students dropped further during the post-test was due to the fact that, participants from
two schools, (C1 and E1), declined to continue with the study.

Another characteristic about the students who participated in the study, which the study
sought to find out, was their level of performance in writing skills in Kiswahili
composition (Insha) in form four as reported by their teachers. The results of the teacher
responses were as follows: those who indicated that their students had an overall mean
score of 4.0 were 5 (31.25%) teachers, a mean of 4.5 were 5 (31.25%) teachers, a mean
of 4.6 were 4 (25%) teachers and those who indicated a mean of 4.8 were 2 (12.50%)
teachers. These results show that the form four students’ performance in writing skills
in Kiswahili composition (Insha) was low, since all the schools had overall mean scores
of less than 5. With such low mean scores in (Insha) writing, it is most likely that the
result of the students’ performance in Kiswahili generally was also low. This would be
in concurrence with the assertion of Cumming (1989) that proficiency in writing is
somewhat related to overall language proficiency. He alleges that writing skills, learned
through writing instructions, can help to improve proficiency in language.

When the teachers were asked about the causes of their students’ low performance in
Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing, they gave the following reasons: lack of
resources 8 (50%) teachers, time for teaching was not enough 8 (50%) teachers, mother
tongue interference 6 (37.50%) teachers, students’ low entry behavior 6 (37.50%)
teachers, poor foundation of students Kiswahili in primary 5 (31.25%) teachers,
students’ negative attitude to Kiswahili 4 (25%) teachers, use of Sheng 3 (17.18%) teachers and the influence from short telephone messages (sms) 2 (12.50%) teachers.

All the reasons which the teachers gave for the cause of their students’ low performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing related to the students’ characteristics and the teaching environment. These reasons concur with what the findings of the studies which have been carried out in Kenya on the causes of poor performance of students in Kiswahili by Maina (2003), Maloba (2010), Ogero, (2012) and Chomba (2013). These reasons do not however implicate the teachers, despite the teacher being a significant factor in determining students’ performance. This study, therefore, sought to find out how the Teacher pedagogical competencies influenced the students’ performance in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. This was done by analyzing the results of students’ performance in relation to the data obtained from the teacher and students’ questionnaires, observation schedules, documentary analysis and the effect of the treatment provided by the intervention module.

4.4 Students’ Performance in Kiswahili Composition (Insha) Writing

This study sought to find out how the performance of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing was influenced by teacher pedagogical competencies. In order to do this the students wrote two Kiswahili compositions (Insha); one for pretest and another one for posttest.
4.4.1 Students’ Pre-test Performance in Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*) Writing

In this study a pre-test was administered to all the form four students in order to establish their level of performance in writing skills in Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*). The pretest Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) topic was “*Maisha yangu katika shule ya sekondari*” My life in secondary school.” The individual school means scores for the pre-test results were obtained by marking the students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) out of 20 marks. The students’ marked scripts for the pre-test Kiswahili (Insha) writing results were analyzed and the mean scores of each school are indicated on Table 6. Though the schools are categorized into experimental and control groups, during the pre-test they had not been categorized as such. This was done for purposes of analysis.

**Table 6: Pre-test Mean Scores of Schools in the Experimental and Control Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>G1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>41.85</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall mean score = 8.78 (43.9%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>G2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of students</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>41.65</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>47.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall mean score = 8.33 (41.65%)

**Key** A1, A2.........................G1 and G2 are codes
Table 6 shows a total of 16 schools that took part in the pretest, the number of students in every school and the pre-test mean scores of the form four students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) for every school for the experimental and control groups. The highest pre-test mean score was 10.32 (51.6%) from school E2 which was in the experimental group while the lowest mean score was 6.73 (33.65%) from school D2 in the control group. The performance of the schools in table 6 can be put in the following groups in order to have a clear view of their performance. There were 2 schools with a mean score of between 6.5 (32.5%) to 7.49 (37.45%), with both schools being from the control group, 7 schools had a mean of between 7.5 (37.5%) to 8.49 (42.45%) with 4 being from the experimental group and 3 from the control group. The schools which had a mean score of between 8.5 (42.5%) to 9.49 (47.45%) were 5 schools; whereby 3 schools were in the experimental group and 2 schools were from control group. The schools which had a mean score of 9.5 (47.5%) to 10.49 (52.45%) were 2 schools which were 1 school from the experimental group and 1 from the control group. In Table 6 it is indicated that only 1 school in the experimental group, had a mean score of above 50% while 15 (93.75%) schools had mean scores of below 50%. This is an indication that almost all the schools, except one in the experimental group, had low pre-test mean scores. The overall mean score of students in their pre-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing for the control group was 8.33 (41.65%) while for the experimental group it was 8.78 (43.9%) with a standard deviation of 2.156 and 2.381 respectively. The overall pretest mean scores and standard deviation for experimental and control groups are indicated in table 7.
Table 7: Pretest Overall Mean Scores and Standard Deviation of Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>2.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>2.156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that overall mean scores of pretest for 244 students who were in the experimental group was 8.78 (43.9%) with a standard deviation of 2.38, while the overall mean score of 287 students who were in the control group was 8.33 (41.65%) and a standard deviation of 2.16. Though both groups had a low overall mean score, the experimental group had a slightly higher overall mean score than that of control group, with a mean difference of 0.45 (2.25%). In order to establish whether this difference in the mean was significant, an independent t-test was computed to test the hypothesis that:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the Experimental group and the Control groups in the pretest mean scores.

The results of the Independent Samples t-Test are indicated on table 8.
Table 8: Independent Samples t-Test on Pretest scores between Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 contains the statistics that are critical for evaluating the current research hypothesis. The table shows a mean difference of 0.452, a T value of 2.29 with a degree of freedom of 529 and a 2-tailed significance of 0.22. The 2-tailed significance of 0.22>0.05 which means that we accept the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the overall pre-test mean score of the experimental group and the overall pretest mean score of the control group. That means the two groups had almost similar performance in their pretest scores.

The almost similar low performance for both experimental and control groups was due to the fact that the students had not been taught the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic before writing it. This low performance for both groups was also an indication that the schools selected for this study were actually those of low performing category and it also shows that the students had not mastered the writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).
The students’ pre-test results for both experimental and control groups, were obtained from the students’ marked Kiswahili compositions (Insha) on the topic, “Maisha yangu katika shule ya sekondari” (My life in secondary school.”) In this composition (Insha), the students were required to write a Kiswahili composition (Insha) of not less than 400 words, which was marked out of 20 marks using analytic scoring scale. According to Silva (1993) and Alderson, Claphan, and Wall (1995), analytic scoring scale considers each of the following elements of writing: content, organization, cohesion, grammar, vocabulary and spelling. The performance of students in their pre-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing was determined by how the students performed in each of these elements and in accordance with the marks allocated for each element. The pretest marking scheme (Mwongozo wa kusahihisha) is indicated in Appendix VIII. The study analyzed the students’ pre-test Kiswahili compositions (Insha) so as to establish how the students performed in each of the elements. An analysis of students’ marked pre-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) scripts indicated that the students in both the experimental and control groups had common errors in all the elements of writing such as: content, organization, cohesion, grammar, vocabulary and spelling.

In analyzing the students’ pre-test marked Kiswahili compositions (Insha) for the element of content, it was established that in the pre-test Kiswahili composition (Insha), some students did not understand the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic as well as how to write a descriptive composition (Insha ya maelezo). Those students who did not understand were, therefore, not able to give an adequate description of the content as required and that means they had few content points. As a result of not understanding the composition topic, such students did not have the required 400 words. The majority
of such students had Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) which were three quarters or half the required length. Although all the students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) were marked out of 20 marks, those which were three quarters long were considered out of 15 marks and those which were half were considered out of 10, though the final score was out of 20 marks.

In marking the students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) it was noted that, whereas, in that particular Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) required the students to use the first person voice, because they were describing about themselves, some students used second person voice. This was also an indication that, either; those students did not take time to understand the composition topic or they did not take time to reflect on it before they started to write. This is an important skill which the students in this study had not mastered due to not having acquired appropriate pre-writing skills on how to write a descriptive composition.

In the grammar element, the common grammatical mistakes involved errors in punctuation, noun agreement, wrong use of capital letters and starting a sentence with a small letter. These grammatical errors established in this study concur with what Chomba (2013) had found among the form three students. These are basic grammatical elements which students at this level were expected to have mastered. Furthermore, some students omitted important words in sentences and others had sentences which were exceptionally long and lacked appropriate punctuation marks. Some common noun agreement errors in students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) reflected the mother tongue influences of different ethnic languages with the majority of such errors from the non-Bantu speakers. Mother tongue influence has been indicated by studies as a
common cause of students’ errors in second language which become more evident in writing, (Chomba, 2013, Sa’ad and Usman 2014 and Kemboi, Andiema and M’mbone 2014). Some examples of such errors in the students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) in this study were mainly in grammar, such as “Shule hicho instead of “shule hiyo”(that school), “shule unapatikana” instead of “shule inapatikana” (school is found) , “ndiye shule” instead of “ndiyo shule” (is the school).

In the vocabulary element and language use, some students had substandard vocabulary which did not reflect their level of education. They lacked appropriate and sufficient vocabulary for naming the various buildings and places in their school. Use of proverbs, idiomatic expressions or other sayings and captivating language was lacking. This could be attributed to the teaching methods which did not provide students with opportunities to listen to appropriate use of Kiswahili. It could also reflect lack of exposure to appropriate resources, and especially books to read. Suciu and Mata (2011) have suggested that teachers need to provide appropriate input which includes exposing the students to teacher talk, listening activities, reading passages and language heard and read outside of class. All these experiences provide students with appropriate vocabulary for use in talking and writing. Studies which have been done to establish the causes of poor performance in Kiswahili in Nyandarua by Maina (2003) and in Kisii by Ogero (2012) established that lack of textbooks, class readers and other reading materials contributed significantly to students’ poor performance. In this study some students had a number of spelling mistakes which involved adding and omitting letters in words and joining or separating words. The main cause of this was attributed to lack of books for them to read.
As for handwriting, though, categorized as a basic or primary skill by Graham (2008) it is important at all levels of writing. In this study, about 20% of the students had very poor and illegible handwriting. The written work was also made untidy by crossing a number of words. This made the students lose marks in the element of style. Since handwriting is a basic skill which should have been mastered earlier, it shows that the skill was not taught adequately at the lower levels of primary and lower secondary school.

Organization of paragraphs and cohesion of the text did not flow well in some students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) and paragraphs were not logically organized. The main points of the composition were also not well elaborated as required in each paragraph. Infact this was the main cause of short Kiswahili compositions (Insha) for the students whose (Insha) were half the required length of 400 words.

Having established that the students had low pretest mean scores for their pretest Kiswahili composition (Insha) which they wrote before they were taught, this study sought to find out the influence of teaching the students before writing their Kiswahili composition (Insha). The study therefore, organized for the students to be taught how to write the post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic, using different approaches for the control group and for the experimental group.
4.4.2 Students’ Posttest Performance in Kiswahili Composition (Insha) Writing

This study administered a post-test to form four students after they had been taught in order to establish whether the teaching had any influence on the students’ level of performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The posttest Kiswahili compositions (Insha) topic was “Shule yangu ya Sekondari” “My Secondary School.” The students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were marked out of 20 marks like it had been done in the marking of the pre-test (Insha). The students’ scores for their marked post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) were analyzed and the mean score for each school was computed and compared with the pre-test mean scores as indicated on Table 9.
Table 9: Pretest and Posttest Mean Scores for Experimental and Control Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>School Codes</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Pre Test Mean Scores (%)</th>
<th>Post Test Mean Scores (%)</th>
<th>Post Test Mean Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>44.75 0.82 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>49.85 0.87 4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>37.8 0.83 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>42.25 0.98 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>41.65</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>44.5 0.57 2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>51.15 0.94 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>51.15 0.68 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Mean: Pre-test=8.55  Post-test=9.85
Table 9 shows the pretest and the posttest mean scores for each school in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing for both the experimental and control groups. The highest post-test mean score is indicated as 11.97 (59.85%) as compared to the highest pre-test mean score of 10.32 (51.6%) from the same school, E2, in the experimental group. The lowest post-test mean score was 7.56 (37.8%) as compared to the lowest pre-test mean score of 6.73 (33.65%) from the same school, D2, in the control group. The study results on Table 9 show that 7 (50%) schools, which were five schools from the experimental group and 2 from control group, had a post-test mean score of more than 50% while in the pre-test it was only one school which had more than 50%. The schools which had a post-test mean score of less than 50% were 7 (50%) schools which were 5 from the control group and 2 from the experimental group as compared to 15 (93%) schools which had a mean score of less than 50% in the pre-test. The overall pre-test mean score was 8.55 (42.75%) while the overall post-test mean score was 9.85 (49.25%). Table 9 also shows the post-test mean gains of every school, and the overall mean gain of each group whereby for the experimental group it was 1.69 (8.45%), while for the control group it was 0.81 (4.05%).

These results on Table 9 are an indication that the students performed better in the posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha) than in the pretest, with the experimental group performing better than the control group. The overall mean scores of the pre-test and post-test and the standard deviation for both groups are indicated on Table 10.
Table 10: The Overall Pre-test and Post-test Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Scores</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>2.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Scores</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>2.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on Table 10, show that the N value of pretest was 531 with an overall mean score of 8.55, (42.75%), a minimum of 2, a maximum of 16 and a standard deviation of 2.27. The post-test N value was 491, with an overall mean score of 9.85 (49.25%), a minimum of 2, a maximum of 15, and a standard deviation of 2.06. The standard deviation for the pre-test was higher than that of the post-test which was an indication of greater variability of students’ individual marks for pre-test scores. The overall mean score for post-test, though still less than 50% was higher than that of the pre-test with a mean difference of 1.30 (6.5%). In order to establish whether this difference in the mean was significant a paired samples t-test was computed, as indicated on Table 11, to test the hypothesis that:

Ho2 There is no significant difference between the overall pre-test mean score and the overall post-test mean score for the students who did both tests.

Table 11: Paired Samples t-Test of Pretest and Post-Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples t-Test of Pre-test and post-test scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

=0.05
Table 11 shows a paired sample t-test which was computed to test the null hypothesis of whether there is a significant difference between pretest and post-test mean scores of the students who did both tests. The table shows a mean difference of 1.30 a T value of 13.98 and a two tailed significance of 0.000. Since a two tailed significance of 0.000<0.05 was observed, this means we reject the null hypothesis and adopt the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between the post-test and pre-test mean scores. This significant difference between pre-test and post-test mean scores could be attributed to the teaching of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills to the students, both in the experimental and control groups before the students were given the post-test. The results show that the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing can be improved when the students are taught Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

The students in the control group and in the experimental group were, however, taught using different approaches. The teachers in experimental group were guided on how to teach writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha), using an intervention module which was based on the process oriented approach. The procedure for the administration of the intervention is outlined in Section 3.5.6 above. The teachers in the control group were requested to teach in the conventional way, in a period of 80 minutes in which they taught the posttest Kiswahili topic and their students wrote the posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha). The different approaches used by the teachers also signified different Teacher pedagogical competencies. The purpose of using different approaches to teach students in the experimental and control groups was to test the main hypothesis of the study which was stated as:
There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students taught by teachers of different competencies.

The study tested this hypothesis by comparing the results of the students’ post-test performance between the experimental and control groups in order to establish the influence of using different approaches to teach writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The results of post-test mean scores for experimental and control groups are indicated in Table 12.

**Table 12: Post-test Mean Scores for Experimental and Control Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>G1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>59.85</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean score</td>
<td>10.52 (52.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>G2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of students</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>49.85</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>51.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean score</td>
<td>9.18 (45.92%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that the highest post-test mean score was 11.97 (59.85%) from school E2 in the experimental group while the highest post-test mean score from the control group was 10.23 (51.15%) from schools F2 and G2. The lowest post-test mean score for the experimental group was 9.78 (48.9%) from school A2 while the lowest post-test mean score for the control group was 7.56 (37.8%) from school D2. In Table 12 the
schools with a post-test mean score of above 50% in the experimental group were 5 while in the control group there were 2 schools with a posttest mean score of above 50%. The schools which had a posttest mean score of less than 50% in the experimental group were 2 while in the control group there were 5 schools which had a post-test mean score of less than 50. These results were an indication that when students were taught using the process oriented approach, there was an improvement of their performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing, which was the case for the post-test mean scores of the experimental group in this study.

The overall post-test mean scores of the experimental and control groups are indicated in table 13

**Table 13: The Overall Post-test Mean Scores of Experimental and Control Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Test Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>2.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>1.924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the overall post-test mean scores for experimental and control groups. The table shows that 217 students who were in the experimental group had an overall mean score of 10.52 (52.6%) and a standard deviation of 2.145, while 274 students who were in the control group had an overall mean score of 9.18 (45.95%) and a standard deviation of 1.924. This is an indication that the overall mean score for the experimental group was higher than that of the control group with a mean difference of 1.34, while the standard deviation for the experimental group was higher than that of the control group, indicating more variability of students’ individual marks than in the
control group. In order to establish whether this difference in the mean scores was significant, an independent samples t-test was computed as indicated in Table 14 to test the hypothesis that:

Ho3: There is no significant difference between the experimental and the control groups in their overall post-test mean scores.

**Table 14: Independent Samples t-Test on Post-test Scores between Experimental and Control Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 contains the statistics that are critical for evaluating the current research hypothesis. An independent T-test was carried out to test the null hypothesis whether there was any significant difference between the experimental and the control groups in their overall post-test mean scores. The table shows a mean difference of 1.34 and a T value of 14.41 was obtained with a degree of freedom of 489 and 2-tailed significance of 0.000 was observed which was 0.000<0.05. These results mean that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted that there is a significant difference between post-test scores for experimental and control group. Consequently we also reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of students taught by teachers of different competencies and accept the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of
students taught by teachers of different competencies. The higher posttest mean score for the experimental group was an indication that when teachers taught Kiswahili compositions (Insha) writing using process-oriented approach the students were able to acquire better writing skills and therefore performed better.

The students’ post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic was “Shule yangu ya sekondari” “My Secondary School.” The students’ post-test results were obtained from the students’ marked Kiswahili composition (Insha) scripts which were marked out of 20 marks using analytic scoring scale in the same way it was used in marking the students’ pretest Kiswahili composition (Insha). The posttest marking scheme (Mwongozo wa kusahihisha) is indicated in Appendix IX. The students’ posttest Kiswahili compositions (Insha) indicated a slight improvement which was mainly in the content element for both experimental and control group, but more in the experimental group. Another notable improvement in the experimental group for the posttest results was in the spelling and vocabulary elements.

From the analysis of the students’ mean scores it was evident that the students’ pre-test performance in Kiswahili compositions (Insha) writing was low with an overall mean score of 8.55 as compared to the improved post-test overall mean score of 9.85. The post-test results for the experimental group with an overall mean score of 10.52 were even better than for the control group which had an overall posttest mean score of 9.18. This improvement in the students’ posttest results could have been due to the teaching of the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic before the students wrote their Kiswahili composition (Insha) on it. This was an indication that, students’ performance in Kiswahili (Insha) writing can be improved when the students are taught Kiswahili
composition (Insha) writing skills. These results concur with the assertion by Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) that, since writing skills are the most difficult in second language, they can only be acquired by being taught.

The study also established that students’ performance for the experimental group, improved even better than for the control group, because teachers in the experimental group, used the process oriented approach in teaching Kiswahili composition Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills for the posttest, as guided by the intervention module, unlike the teachers in the control group who used product oriented approach. In using the process oriented approach, the students in the experimental group were able to brainstorm on the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic in their groups, and therefore understood it better, which enabled them to come up with better content and vocabulary. Furthermore, as they read each other’s’ drafts and corrected, they were also able to reduce each other’s’ spelling mistakes. These results are therefore an indication that, it is possible to improve students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills if teachers use appropriate pedagogical competencies. These results also concur with the findings by Parson (1985) who states that students’ achievement in writing is higher when the teaching approach emphasizes writing as a process rather than as a product.
4.5 Influence of Teacher Pedagogical Competencies on Students’ Performance in Writing Skills in Kiswahili Composition (Insha)

The analysis of students’ pre-test and post-test scores, in this study indicated that students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition was low for pretest scores in both the control and the experimental group. The scores for both groups however improved for posttest scores and there was even better improvement for the experimental group when they were taught by teachers who used relevant pedagogical competencies as asserted by Gathumbi and Masembe (2005). This study therefore focused on investigating the pedagogical competencies of the Kiswahili teachers in this study in order to establish their influence on students’ pre-test and post-test performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The pedagogical competencies which this study focused on were: planning to teach, methods of teaching, resources for teaching, classroom management styles and designing assessment techniques. In trying to investigate the Teacher pedagogical competencies, this study analyzed the results obtained from the research instruments which consisted of: teacher and students’ questionnaires, observation schedule and documentary analysis of the documents used for planning to teach.

4.5.1 Influence of Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Planning to Teach

This study sought to find out how the Kiswahili teachers in this study, both in the experimental and control group had been planning to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills using the documents which are used for planning. Planning to teach, especially second language has been supported by Stern (1983) and Gathumbi.
and Masembe (2005) as a very essential component of the teacher’s pedagogical competencies which has profound influence on students’ performance. Stern and Gathumbi et al also state that, in planning to teach any subject the documents which are considered to be important are: the syllabus, the schemes of work and the lesson plan. This study therefore sought to establish whether the teachers in this study had been using these documents in planning to teach and the influence of the use of these documents on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. The study analyzed the way these teachers planned to teach both in the control group and in the experimental group. The results of how the teachers in this study used the documents for planning to teach are as shown in Table 15.

**Table 15: Documents for Planning to Teach Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*) Writing Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of documents</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIE Kiswahili Syllabus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNEC Kiswahili Syllabus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows how the teachers indicated they used the two Kiswahili syllabuses, the scheme of work and the lesson plan for planning to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills.
4.5.1.1 Use of the Kiswahili Syllabus

In Table 15 it is indicated that, 3 Kiswahili teachers from the experimental group and 3 from the control group, who totaled to 6 (37.5%) teachers reported that they used KIE (KICD) Kiswahili syllabus while 5 from each group who totaled to 10 (62.5%) did not use it. On the use of KNEC Kiswahili syllabus, 2 teachers from the experimental group and 4 from the control group reported that they used it, thereby adding up to 6 (37.5%) teachers while 6 from experimental group and 4 from control group who totaled to 10 (62.5%) did not use it. From these results, it means that a total of 12 (75.0%) teachers used either of the two syllabuses which, basically, outlined the same topics, though the one for KNEC was more current, since it was produced every year and was examination oriented, while the one for KIE (2002), was old even though it had the same topics like the one for KNEC.

From the results presented on table 15 on the use of the two Kiswahili syllabuses, there were 4 (25%) teachers who did not use either of the syllabuses. The results obtained from documentary analysis and observation established that all the 14 schools observed had the KIE (KICD) syllabus and of these 14 schools, 6 schools also had the KNEC Kiswahili syllabus. In the 14 schools which were observed, it was established that 8 (57.1%) teachers used the KIE (KICD) syllabus while only 2 (14.3%) teachers used the KNEC Kiswahili syllabus. Since a total of 10 teachers were observed to have used the KIE (KICD) syllabus and the KNEC Kiswahili syllabus, it means 4 (28.6%) teachers did not use any syllabus to plan for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. These were the same teachers who had reported that they did not use any syllabus for planning.
Though the Kiswahili syllabus was available in their schools the 4 teachers did not use it but instead they were observed to have used textbooks for getting the topics they taught. On further analysis of these teachers it was established that they all had a Bachelor of Education (Arts) degree, they were 2 female and 2 male and 3 of them were from the experimental group while only one was from the control group. These results show that, lack of using any of the syllabuses for planning was not determined by teacher qualifications, but it was a personal choice of the teacher based on the teacher’s attitude on the importance of using the syllabuses for planning to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha).

From documentary analysis of the syllabuses, it was established that the Kiswahili syllabus by KIE (KICD) (2002) available in some schools was old and tattered and that was the reason why some teachers did not use it. This was because they thought it was outdated. The teachers felt that there was need to review the KIE Kiswahili syllabus so that it could be more current. The KNEC Kiswahili syllabus available in some schools however, was more current and in good shape.

This study confirmed 2002 that 4 teachers did not use the syllabus, and yet it is an important document for planning to teach, since it contains all the topics to be taught in a subject. From the syllabus topics a teacher is expected to draw up schemes of work by breaking down these topics into subtopics and then prepare a lesson plan. This is the only way to ensure that all the syllabus topics are covered in a systematic and organized way. By not using the syllabus to plan, it was possible that the performance of the students in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing was affected. This study
therefore, sought to establish whether use of the syllabus for planning influenced the students’ performance.

In order to establish whether use of the syllabus for planning influenced the students’ performance, this study focused on students’ pre-test scores. The study analyzed the performance in the overall pre-test mean score of the schools which had not been using the syllabus for planning and compared that with the overall pre-test mean score of those schools which had been using the syllabus so as to establish whether there was any difference. The schools in which the teachers indicated that they had not been using any syllabus for planning were the following with their mean scores in the pre-test as indicated on table 6 are: A1 (8.13), A2 (8.16), B2 (8.36) and C1 (8.52). These schools were; A1 from the control group while A2, B2 and C1 were in the experimental group and their overall pre-test means score was 8.29. The schools which indicated that they had been using the syllabus for planning were B1, D1, E2, F1 and G1 from the experimental group and C2, D2, E1, E3, E4, F2 and G2 from the control group which had an overall mean score of 8.64. The overall pre-test mean score of the schools where the teachers indicated that they had been planning using the syllabus was higher by 0.35. Though this mean difference is minimal it is likely to be an indication that the schools where the teachers had been using the syllabus for planning performed better in their overall pre-test mean scores than those which the teachers had indicated that they had not been using the syllabus.
Though a small proportion of the teachers, 4 (25%) did not use the Kiswahili syllabuses, neither did they consider them to be important, the majority of the Kiswahili teachers involved in the study, 12 (75%) teachers supported that the two Kiswahili syllabuses were important documents for providing the necessary guidelines in teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The 4 (25%) teachers, who had a contrary view and were uncertain about the importance of the Kiswahili syllabus, were the same ones who had indicated that they did not use any syllabus for planning to teach.

In emphasizing the importance of the syllabus, the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC), in the Examination Reports of (2009-2015), commenting on the performance of Kiswahili, in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE), suggests that the only way to improve performance in Kiswahili is for the teachers to use the KIE (KICD) and KNEC syllabuses. These syllabuses provide the general objectives of learning Kiswahili for the four years of secondary education and provide general objectives for different language skills and the topics to be taught at every level. The syllabus is therefore, important for identifying the appropriate topics to be taught at every level and the general objectives that guide the teacher in what needs to be emphasized at every level of teaching. The use of these syllabuses is therefore essential in sharpening the teacher’s pedagogical competencies in planning because without using any of the syllabuses, it may be difficult for the teacher to move to the next level of planning to teach which is preparing schemes of work and lesson plan so as to be able to teach effectively. The intervention module which was used in this study was prepared by drawing the main topic of descriptive composition from the Kiswahili syllabus of the Kenya Institute of Education (2002).
4.5.1.2 Use of the Schemes of Work

Another document for planning to teach which the study focused on was the schemes of work. In preparing schemes of work for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, Table 15 shows that 6 (37.5%) Kiswahili teachers from the experimental group and 6 (37.5%) from the control group, who totaled to 12 (75%) Kiswahili teachers in the study reported that they had prepared schemes of work while 2 teachers from each group that is 4 (25%) teachers indicated that they did not have schemes of work at the time of the start of the study. The schools where the teachers had not prepared schemes of work were, A2 and B2 in the experimental group while D2 and E3 were from the control group. The other 12 (75%) teachers in the rest of the schools in the study, which are indicated in table 10, had reported that they had prepared their schemes of work for teaching Kiswahili for that term.

A further analysis of the 4 teachers who reported not to have prepared their schemes of work, established that 2 of them that is; from schools, A2 and B2 had confirmed that they had not been using any of the Kiswahili syllabuses. As per their qualifications, 3 of the 4 teachers had Bachelor of Education (Arts) degrees, while one had a Diploma in Education, 2 were female and 2 were male. Since these teachers had the appropriate qualifications, their lack of preparing schemes of work may not have been due to insufficient training, but could be as a result of what Clark and Yinger (1980) claim to be, the Teacher lack of commitment to follow the planning procedures acquired from their teacher training colleges.
In carrying out observation and documentary analysis on the schemes of work, the study analyzed the schemes of work which the teachers in this study had prepared for teaching their form four class prior to the commencement of this study, and the special schemes of work which had been prepared by the teachers in the experimental group as guided by the intervention module. The study analyzed schemes of work for 14 teachers since, at this juncture, 2 teachers had dropped out of the study. From the analysis it was confirmed that the same 4 (28.6%) teachers who had indicated that they did not have any schemes of work for that term were the same ones who were found not to have completed preparing their schemes of work for that term. On the other hand the same 10 (71.4 %) teachers; 5 from experimental group and 5 from control group who had indicated that they had prepared their schemes of work were the same ones who were found to have prepared their schemes of work for teaching their form four students Kiswahili for that term. In analyzing the teacher schemes of work, the study established that there were different formats of schemes of work as per the different schools. Some had 7 columns and others had up to 10 columns but they all had the necessary information.

The study also sought to find out how many Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing lessons the teachers had indicated in their schemes of work, since the focus of this study was about teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. When the teachers were asked to state how often they planned, in their schemes of work, to teach (Insha) writing, 11 (68.75%) teachers; 6 from experimental group and 5 from control group indicated that they planned to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills once every week, while 5 (31.25%) teachers, 2 from experimental and 3 from control group
indicated that they planned to teach once every two weeks. The information gathered from documentary analysis about the schemes of work which had been presented by teachers, revealed that 8 (57.1%) teachers out of the 10 who had the schemes of work, had indicated only 2 Kiswahili composition (Insha) lessons of 40 minutes each for the whole of that term, while the other 2 (14.3%) teachers had indicated only one Kiswahili composition (Insha) lesson of 40 minutes for the whole of that term. If the 40 minutes lesson planned was for teaching and writing the Kiswahili composition (Insha), it means that, the teachers could only use product oriented approach because it does not require as much time as process-oriented approach, which requires more time for students to be involved in the processes of pre-writing activities as stated by Brown (2007) and Graham and Perin (2007a). Furthermore, according to Graham and Perin (2007b), the two Kiswahili composition lessons planned per term could not provide sufficient frequency for teaching and assessing students writing skills, which is necessary for developing competent writers.

When the students were asked how often they were taught Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, the results indicated that 296 (55.7 %) students said that they were taught every week, 118 (22.2 %) said once every 2 weeks, 71 (13.4 %) said once every term and 46 (8.7 %) said once every month. The results from the students show that there was more frequent Kiswahili composition (Insha) teaching than what the planning for it had been indicated from documentary analysis. The implication of these results is that these teachers were likely to have been teaching their students Kiswahili composition (Insha) lessons which they had not schemed for since they had indicated
very few lessons in their schemes of work, contrary to the frequency of the lessons taught, which were reported by the teachers and the students.

The frequency of planning to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills once per week could have been the ideal situation even if the students were not going to write a Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) every time they were taught. This would have been in accordance with the recommendation by Graham and Perin (2007b) who stated that teachers can only achieve success in teaching writing if they plan to teach it frequently. This study, however, established that the teachers did not plan in their schemes to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing frequently as suggested by Graham and Perin, since it was not indicated in their schemes of work which they had prepared. In addition 4 teachers did not have any schemes of work which they had prepared for that term when the study was carried out. This lack of planning for teaching Kiswahili *Insha* lessons in their schemes of work, is an indication that these teachers did not consider planning for teaching Kiswahili *Insha* writing skills to be necessary. Consequently this meant that Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing was likely not to have been taught as frequently as recommended and that could have been one of the factors which resulted to students’ low pre-test performance in their Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) pre-test mean scores.

The Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing lessons indicated by the teachers in their schemes of work were single lessons of 40 minutes which was in accordance to the teaching periods which the school time table had indicated. When the teachers were asked how much time they planned to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing lessons their responses are indicated in Table 16.
Table 16: Duration of Time Planned for Teaching Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Exper.</th>
<th>Contr.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single lesson of 40 minutes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A double lesson of 80 minutes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that 14 (87.5%) teachers who constituted 8 from experimental group and 6 from the control group had indicated that they planned to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills in a single lesson of 40 minutes while 2 (12.5%) teachers, all from control group indicated that they planned in their scheme of work to teach in a double lesson of 80 minutes. In order to confirm whether the teachers taught as they indicated, their responses were compared with students’ responses on how long they were taught Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*) writing skills. From the students’ responses, it was indicated that 489 (92.1%) students reported that they were taught Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing lesson in a single lesson of 40 minutes while 42 (7.9%) students indicated that they were taught Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing lesson in a double lesson of 80 minutes. The students’ responses concurred with what the teachers had reported to have planned. That means most of the teachers planned and taught Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills for 40 minutes.
From Teacher and students’ responses and also from documentary analysis it is evident that most teachers in this study schemed for very few Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing lessons which were to be taught in a single period of 40 minutes. The schemes of work prepared by the teachers in this study provided for very limited teaching of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills because of their schemes of work indicated very few lessons of single period only which allowed the teachers to use product-oriented approach. This approach did not involve the process of teaching students how to write but only required the product of writing from students. According to Parson (1985) this approach is unlikely to produce capable writers and therefore it is possible that this contributed to the students’ low pre-test mean scores. Studies which have been done on teaching writing, Parson (1985, suggest that the process oriented approach is a better approach for teaching writing than the product oriented one. The process oriented approach requires planning for lessons that take a longer time possibly 80 minutes than 40 minutes period reported by the teachers and reported by their students in this study.

In view of what the study had established regarding how teachers prepared their schemes of work, the study sought to establish whether preparation of schemes of work as an aspect of planning, had any influence on the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. This was done by the analyzing the students’ pre-test mean scores and post-test mean scores in relation to the preparation of schemes of work. The study compared the overall pre-test mean scores of the schools which had not prepared the schemes of work with the ones that had prepared, in order to establish whether there was any difference in their overall means scores. The schools where the teachers had not prepared their schemes of work were identified as A2, B2, D2, and E3.
with their pre-test mean scores indicated in table 9. These schools had an overall pre-test mean score of 7.68 while the other 12 schools where the teachers had prepared their schemes of work had an overall mean score of 8.85 in their pre-test performance. The overall mean score of the schools where the teachers had prepared schemes of work was higher by 1.17. Furthermore, school D2, which was one of the schools where the teacher had not prepared the schemes of work, had the lowest pre-test mean score of 6.73. This is an indication that preparation of schemes of work had a positive influence on students’ performance in their pre-test scores since the schools which had been preparing schemes of work had better pretest performance.

Another aspect of the influence of the preparation of schemes of work was observed in this study when the students’ performance in their post-test scores in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing was compared with the pre-test scores. The schools which were in the experimental group were guided by the intervention module on how to prepare special similar schemes of work using the format which is indicated in Appendix VI, for teaching 2 double lessons of 80 minutes each and a third lesson of 60 minutes for writing the Kiswahili composition (Insha). The results of the study in Table 9 show that the post-test mean scores of the schools in the experimental group, which had all prepared schemes of work for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills for posttest, had improved their overall posttest mean score to 10.52 from a pretest overall mean score of 8.78. When these results are compared with those of the control group, which are indicated in Table 9 they show that the improvement of the overall posttest mean score for the control group of 9.18 from 8.33 was less than that of the experimental group. Another notable improvement in post-test mean scores was for
schools A2 and B2 which did not have any schemes of work, but being in the experimental group, they had to prepare special schemes of work for posttest teaching, and therefore, were able to improve in their post-test mean scores by 8.1% and 9.9% respectively. When the posttest mean scores for schools A2 and B2 are compared with schools D2 and E3 which were in the control group and had not prepared any schemes of work, the results show that schools D2 and E3 only improved in their post-test mean scores by 4.15% and 4.9% respectively. The higher posttest mean scores for the schools in the experimental group are likely to be attributed to, not only, preparing schemes of work, but preparing schemes of work which were based on the process oriented approach.

This study results therefore confirmed that preparation of schemes of work is an important pedagogical requirement in planning to teach, and can help to improve students results. A scheme of work is important as stated by Ayot and Patel (1992) and Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), because as a forecast of what is to be taught; it gives the teacher enough time to sort out the requirements for teaching every sub-topic and guides the teacher in planning a lesson plan. This, therefore, means that teachers who teach without preparing schemes of work are not likely to be effective because they will lack prior preparation and therefore contribute to their students’ low performance.
4.5.1.3 Use of the Lesson Plan

Another important document in planning to teach, which this study analyzed, was the lesson plan. Table 16 shows that, in using the lesson plan to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, 10 (62.5%) teachers indicated that they had used it. These 10 teachers were 6 from schools; B2, C1, D1, E2, F1 and G1 in the experimental group and 4 from schools C2, E4, F2 and G2 in the control group. The teachers who indicated that they did not use the lesson plan to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills were 6 (37.5%) teachers. These teachers were 2 from schools A2 and B1 in the experimental group and 4 teachers from schools A1, D2, E1 and E3 in the control group. The overall pretest mean score of the schools where the teachers indicated that they had been using the lesson plan to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills was 8.91, while the overall pre-test mean score of the schools where the teachers did not use the lesson plan was 7.96. These results indicate that the overall pre-test mean score was better where the teachers had used the lesson plan to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills than where they did not use. The results also indicated that more teachers from the experimental group had reported that they used the lesson plan than those from the control group.

A further analysis of the 6 teachers who indicated that they did not use the lesson plan showed that 3 teachers were female and 3 were male and 4 had Bachelor of Education degrees while 2 had Diploma in Education certificates. Since in this study the male teachers were only 4 and the teachers who had Diploma in Education were only 3, it therefore means that most of the male teachers and most of the teachers who had
Diploma in Education certificates in this study did not prepare lesson plans for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills.

In carrying out documentary analysis for the lesson plans which the teachers in this study were expected to have been preparing for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, it was established that all the teachers in the study did not show any evidence of previous lesson plans which they had been using for teaching Kiswahili composition *Insha* writing skills. This was despite 10 teachers stating that they had been using lesson plans for teaching Kiswahili composition *Insha* writing skills. In probing these teachers further, they alleged that they discarded the lesson plans after using them because they did see any reason to keep them. This was contrary to Conley (2011) who states that; being the most essential document in planning, the lesson plan provides a record of what the class has done and therefore should be kept. He further states that the lesson plan is actually the most important component of the Teacher pedagogical competencies in planning to teach since it carries the lesson topic, the objectives of the lesson topic, the content, instructional procedures, learning activities the resources to be used and procedures for evaluation. The lesson plan has most of the components of the instructional model of the instructional system by Gerlach and Ely (1980). Without the lesson plan, it is unlikely that any organized, meaningful and adequate teaching can take place. It is therefore possible that lack of lesson plans for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing among the teachers in this study influenced the students’ low performance in their overall pre-test mean scores in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing.
Though the teachers did not produce previous lesson plans, an analysis of the records of work for all the teachers indicated that they were available and appropriately filled in line with the timeline for all the previous lessons taught. In addition, the format of the records of work was properly designed for filling in the information which was required to indicate what had been taught. The analysis of the record of work indicated that it concurred with the schemes of work, most likely, because, these being the documents which the school administrators were concerned with, the teachers paid more attention to them than they did in preparing and keeping the lesson plans of the lessons taught.

The documentary analysis carried out on the lesson plans which the teachers had prepared for teaching the Kiswahili composition (Insha) for the post-test, indicated that the lesson plans of the experimental group were different from those of the control group. All the 7 teachers in the experimental group had prepared two lesson plans of 80 minutes each which had been derived from the special schemes of work and were of similar format like the one in Appendix VI, as guided by the intervention module. The lesson plans for the experimental group had been filled in all the sections and also indicated the necessary information required for the content section.

As for the 7 teachers in the control group, it was observed that only 5 teachers had prepared one lesson plan of 40 minutes while the other 2 teachers from schools E4 and G2 had not prepared any lesson plan. From table 9 it is indicated that, these two schools (E4 and G2) had very low posttest mean score improvement of 2.85% and 3.4% respectively as compared with the others in the control group which had prepared lesson plans. The lesson plans of the teachers in the control group were not similar and some did not indicate all the sections. For example, those which had been prepared by three
teachers in the control group had sketchy content and for the other two teachers the content was not indicated, except the subheadings for the content, did not have the objectives and looked like they were prepared in a hurry. The lesson plans for these teachers did not indicate the writing skills which were to be taught.

In observing how the teachers in this study used their lesson plans to teach the post-test Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) topic, the study established that all the teachers who had prepared the lesson plans from the experimental group and in the control group used their lesson plans when teaching according to the time duration they had indicated. It was also observed that the two teachers in the control group, who had not prepared any lesson plans, taught their post-test Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) topic using a text book. The teachers in the experimental group taught the first and second lessons for 80 minutes each, as they had had planned according to the intervention module, whereby they utilized the time adequately by indicating how they would engage the students in the process oriented steps and activities of teaching and learning writing skills. The third lesson of 60 minutes had been planned to be used for writing the post-test Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). The teachers in the control group had planned to teach for 20 minutes or less and immediately after the teaching their students were to write the post-test Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) for another forty minutes.

This study sought to establish whether lesson planning, had any influence on the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills after observing the teaching of the post-test topic and analyzing the lesson plans which had been prepared by the teachers in the experimental and in the control group. From Table 9 the study results show that the students performed better in their posttest mean scores where
the overall mean score was 9.85 as compared to the overall pre-test mean score of 8.55. In comparing the posttest mean gains of the schools in the experimental group and control group it is indicated in Table 9 that the schools in the experimental group which had prepared more organized and similar lesson plans, had higher mean gains ranging from 7.2% to 9.8% and an overall posttest mean score of 10.52. The schools in the control group had lesson plans but they were not well organized and therefore resulted to low posttest mean gains, ranging from 2.85 % to 4.9% and an overall posttest mean score of 9.18 which was lower than 10.52 of the experimental group. Furthermore the study results showed that the schools E4 and G2 in the control group which had not prepared any lesson plans had very low posttest mean gains of 2.8% and 3.4% respectively. These results confirm that a lesson planning is important and, therefore, influenced the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

The results in this study show that teaching students Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills without preparing lesson plans was the likely cause of students’ low performance in their pre-test scores. The study results also indicated that, when the lesson plans for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili in the control group were not prepared properly the students did not perform well as compared to the performance of the students in the experimental group where the teachers prepared appropriate lesson plans. The results in this study, therefore, confirm that the lesson plan is a very effective tool in teaching and concur with the statement by Wood and Miederloff (1988) who assert that, effective teaching springs from well planned, well organized and well-presented lesson plan. The results in this study also concur with the findings of Byra and Coulon (1994) where their findings indicated that planning had a positive effect on
some pre-service teacher instructional performance, which transferred to a positive student learning experience.

The results of this study have established that some teachers did not use the necessary documents for planning to teach, which were; the Kiswahili syllabus, the schemes of work and the lesson plan though they all had appropriate academic and professional qualifications and sufficient experience. This study therefore sought to find out from the teacher whether they supported the statement that; teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing Skills requires adequate planning in order to improve students’ performance. The teacher responses to this statement are indicated on table 17.

**Table 17: Teachers’ Views on Planning for Teaching Kiswahili Composition (Insha) Writing Skills.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Kiswahili Insha writing Skills requires adequate planning in order to Improve Students’ Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows that 10 (68.75%) teachers strongly agreed with the statement that; teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills required planning adequately in order to improve students’ performance. These teachers were 4 from experimental group and 6 from control group, while 2 teachers from experimental group and 1 from control group agreed with the statement. That means a total of 13 (87.5%) teachers
agreed with the statement which means most of the teachers in this study were aware of the importance of planning for teaching as a requirement for improving students’ performance. The teachers further indicated that in planning to teach they considered the following aspects: the syllabus for each class, topic to be taught, provision for speaking aspect and reading, the level of learners, relevance of the topics, steps of teaching, the types of Kiswahili composition (Insha) to be taught and availability of learning resources and textbooks. These responses from teachers were an indication that the teachers in this study had the pedagogical knowledge of the importance of planning for improving students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili. They however, did not demonstrate pedagogical competence of planning for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, since they did not produce the lesson plans they had been using to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing before the commencement of the study. The teachers in this study illustrated the assertion by Clark and Dunny (1991) that; even though it is widely believed that instructional planning skills are critical for effective classroom, instruction, there is no strong evidence that teachers practice these skills.

4.5.1.4 Challenges in Planning to Teach

This study sought to find out why despite the teachers in this study, having appropriate qualifications and pedagogical knowledge of the importance of planning, some of the teachers in this study did not plan adequately for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The study established that 8 (50%) teachers indicated that they did not have enough time for planning to teach, 7 (43.75%) teachers indicated that, it was because of lack of enough teaching and learning resources, reference books and
inadequate text books for revising. The two factors of time and resources reported by
teachers in this study concur with what Ball, Knobloch and Hoop (2007) established in
a review of various studies. These two problems are a reflection of what the school
provided thereby influencing the Teacher pedagogical competence in planning to teach.
Other problems reported by teachers in this study were those which were related to
students’ characteristics such as: poor entry behavior, lack of exposure to Kiswahili
composition (Insha) writing in the lower classes and lack of creativity which made it
difficult to plan for appropriate Kiswahili composition (Insha) topics for the students of
varied abilities. Large numbers of students per class was also a problem in planning for
frequent Insha lessons and the appropriate teaching methods especially for classes
which had over 50 students. In this study the most serious problems which challenged
teachers pedagogical competencies in planning for teaching were insufficient time and
lack of teaching and learning resources. The teachers in this study claimed that these
factors made them to be ineffective in the pedagogical competencies of planning to
teach.

Studies reviewed by Ball, Knobloch and Hoop (2007), which have been carried out on
the factors that influence Teacher pedagogical competence in planning to teach, name
some factors that concur with what the teachers in this study reported. In a review of
various studies, Ball, et al mention factors such as: teacher experience, nature of
content, age of the learners, administrator demands, materials and resources and time.
Factors like time and resources concur with what the teachers in this study reported.
Teacher pedagogical competence is, however, defined by Mardia (2014) as the ability to
manage learning which in this case would require the teacher TO deal with the
problems that might challenge the teacher’s pedagogical competencies in planning. This study therefore, sought to find out how the Kiswahili teachers dealt with the problems which they mentioned as challenging their pedagogical competence in planning to teach.

The results of the study on how the teachers dealt with the problems they encountered in planning to teach also reflected their pedagogical competencies in planning to teach. In order to manage insufficient time, 12 (75%) teachers reported that, they fixed extra time whenever the students were free, especially over the weekend, and taught them Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing for longer time. Such lessons were, however not indicated in the schemes of work and there were no lesson plans for them because teachers fixed extra time “whenever the students were free” without having planned in advance. The teachers explained that, since the availability of the “free time” was not certain it was not possible to plan for the lesson in advance. The problem of teaching unplanned lessons was, therefore, not solved by creating more time, unless the time was provided earlier so that the teaching of that lesson could be planned.

In this study, the extra time, for the double lessons, which was used by the experimental group, for planning to use process-oriented approach, was requested from other teachers. This was because process oriented –approach requires more time. These lessons were well planned for, since the request had been granted in advance to allow time for planning by the teachers in the experimental group.
The problem of insufficient resources and books was dealt with by using improvisation of teaching resources as a department, whereby they sourced examples of different types of Kiswahili composition (Insha) and read them to students so that they could learn how they were written. They also encouraged students to bring some resources and to read more of Kiswahili story books and Kiswahili newspapers on their own. Other teachers indicated that they outsourced information from personal textbooks they bought or even from the internet. For the weak students the teachers indicated that they gave them particular questions to do and after marking, they identified their weak points and fixed remedial time and summoned the students for further explanations. In dealing with those students whose teaching of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills had been ignored in the lower classes, the teachers suggested that there was need to go back and plan for all types of compositions which had not been covered at that time but the problem was availability of time.

The results of this study established that the Teacher pedagogical competencies in planning to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills’ for teachers in both experimental and control groups had an influence in the overall pre-test and post-test mean scores of students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) performance. The low pre-test performance was due to some teachers not using the Kiswahili syllabuses to prepare their schemes of work and even though most of the teachers had prepared the schemes of work they had planned for very few Kiswahili compositions (Insha) lessons of 40 minutes. Another important aspect of teachers pedagogical competence in planning, which the teachers in this study had ignored was in lesson planning for teaching Kiswahili Composition (Insha). The study established that all the Kiswahili teachers in
this study had not been preparing lesson plans for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) and this was likely to have influenced students’ pre-test performance. The schools in the study did not show any difference in planning between experimental and control, and as a result there was very little difference in their overall pretest mean scores.

The students’ posttest results in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing improved as compared with the pretest results. This was due to teachers preparing lesson plans for teaching the post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic. The improvement of the posttest mean scores was even more for the experimental group as compared with the control group due to the experimental group having more elaborate and organized lesson plans which were prepared as guided by the intervention module prepared by the researcher. This intervention module focused mainly on planning a lesson for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing in the process oriented approach.

4.5.2 Influence of Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Methods of Teaching

The second objective of this study was to determine the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies in teaching methods on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. In addressing this objective, the study sought to establish the methods which the Kiswahili teachers had been using to teach writing skills in Kiswahili and analyzed the influence of these teaching methods on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili. Writing skills according to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) are the most difficult to master especially in a second language, and, can only be acquired by being taught. This assertion is supported by Gillespie and
Graham (2010) who also assert that, due to writing being complex many students find it challenging and that is why they have to be taught. The implication of this for this study is that the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing in this study is likely to have been influenced by the way it was taught, that is; the methods which were used.

Since the students in this study had low pretest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing, the study sought to investigate whether the methods the teachers had been using to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills had any influence on students’ performance. The study therefore analyzed the methods which the teachers in this study reported to have been using. The study also compared the students’ pretest and posttest scores for the control and experimental group in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing in order to establish the influence of the methods used for teaching especially after the intervention for the experimental group.

### 4.5.2.1 Methods Used for Teaching Writing Skills in Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*)

The methods which the Kiswahili teachers in this study indicated that they had been using for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili are shown on Table 18.
Table 18: Methods Used by Teachers for Teaching Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*)

**Writing Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used for teaching Kiswahili writing skills</th>
<th>Exp Used</th>
<th>Control Used</th>
<th>Total Used (%)</th>
<th>Exp Did not use</th>
<th>Control Did not use</th>
<th>Total Did not use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give students a topic and they write on it</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher gives a brief explanation about the topic before the students write on it.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students choose their own topic and write a Kiswahili composition (<em>Insha</em>) on it.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows that the most popular method which was used by all the 16 (100%) teachers in the study was, *Give students a topic and they write on it*. This was followed in popularity by the method of: *The teacher gives a brief explanation about the topic before the students write on it*; which was used by 15 (93.75%) teachers, who were distributed as 8 from the control group and 7 from the experimental group. The teachers who used the method of: *Students choose their own topic and write a Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) on it*; were 7 (43.75%) teachers who were 5 from experimental group and 2 from control group. The least popular method used by the 5 (31.25%) teachers who were 3 teachers from experimental group and 2 teachers from control group was: *Group discussion*.  
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In trying to probe further on the methods the teachers used for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, the students were also asked to indicate whether their teachers used the methods shown in Table 19 when teaching them Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. The results of the student’s responses are as shown on Table 19.

**Table 19: Students’ Responses on the Methods used by their Teachers for Teaching writing skills in Kiswahili**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used by teachers</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>323  60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class discussion</td>
<td>434  81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read a passage about a topic and then students write a Kiswahili composition</td>
<td>380  71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher gives a short explanation on the topic and then the students write the Kiswahili composition (<em>Insha</em>)</td>
<td>479  90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives the topic for Kiswahili <em>Insha</em> writing and tells the students to write</td>
<td>374  70.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the study in Table 19 show that 479 (90.2%) students indicated that the teachers used the method of: “The teacher gives a short explanation on the topic and then the students write the Kiswahili composition (*Insha*)” as compared to 93.75% of the teachers who reported the same. Table 19 shows that 434 (81.7%) students
indicated that their teacher used the method of, “Whole class discussion”, 380 (71.6%) students indicated that their teachers used the method of; “Read a passage about the topic and then the students write a Kiswahili composition”, 374 (70.4%) students indicated that the teacher “Gives the topic for Kiswahili composition writing and tells the students to write” and finally 323 (60.8%) students indicated that their teacher used “Group discussion”, as compared to 31.25% of the teachers who had indicated the use of group discussion.

The results of the students’ responses in table 19 portray an almost similar trend like the one indicated by their teachers in Table 18. The results on Table 18 and 19 show that the Kiswahili teachers in this study used various methods to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) skills, whereby the most popular method was: the teacher gives a brief explanation about the topic and the students write on it while the least popular method was group discussion. During the observation of teaching live lessons among the schools in the control group, where the teachers were free to use the conventional methods of teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, 4 out of 7 or 57.1% teachers used this method while 3 out of 7 or 42.9% teachers used whole class discussion but no teacher used group discussion method in this group.

The results of this study indicate that group discussion method was not popular among the teachers for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, though research findings (Richards, 1990; Burke, 2011 and Gillepie and Graham, 2011) show that learners benefit from it. Organizing students into groups is also an important component of the theoretical framework which has been used for this study, and like all the other components of the systems models, it is applicable to the teaching of Kiswahili
composition (Insha) writing skills. This study, therefore, sought to find out about the
teacher views on the statement; *Group discussion is an effective method of teaching form 4 students Insha writing skills*. The teacher views are indicated in Table 20.

**Table 20: Teachers’ Views on the Use of Group Discussion Method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exper.</th>
<th>Contr.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows the results of the teacher views on the statement that: *Group discussion is an effective method of teaching form 4 students Insha writing skills*. The results on Table 20 indicate that 5 (31.25%) teachers that is, 3 teachers from experimental group and 2 teachers from control group strongly disagreed with the statement. Those who agreed with the statement were 4 (25%) teachers that is, 2 teachers from experimental and 2 from control group while those who strongly agreed were 3 (18.75%) teachers who were all from the experimental group, making a total of 7 (43.75%) teachers who agreed with the statement. The 4 (25%) teachers who were uncertain were 3 from experimental and 1 from control group. These results indicate that the teachers, who supported the use of group discussion method, were 7 (43.75%) teachers, which means they were more than those who indicated that they used the method in table 18, who
were 5 (31.25%) teachers. These results indicate that, more teachers supported the use of group discussion method than those who actually used it but still group discussion method was the least popular in teaching form 4 students Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills.

During the observation of teaching live lessons, all the 7 teachers in the experimental group used the group discussion method while none of the teachers in the control group used this method though in table 20 it was indicated that 2 (25%) teachers had reported that they used it. Furthermore in table 20 it was indicated that 2 (25%) teachers in the control group agreed that group discussion method was an effective method of teaching form 4 students Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. These results show that though some teachers in this study were aware of the usefulness of group discussion method they did not make an effort to use it in their teaching of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills.

The results of this study, on the methods used by Kiswahili teachers, to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, show that, the methods which were popular among the majority of the Kiswahili teachers in this study from both the experimental and control groups were actually not methods of teaching writing but rather assigning students writing work without any teaching of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills having been done. The methods which the teachers preferred and the students reported that their teachers used to teach them, focused only on the product of writing. These methods are referred to by Gathumbi and Masembe (2005) as product-oriented or traditional approach in teaching composition writing skills. According to Gathumbi and Masembe (2005), in this approach, the teacher gives little information and asks the
students to work alone in writing their compositions. Parson (1985) noted that students taught using the product-oriented approach do not own the writing or invest in it and therefore it is not effective in producing capable writers. Since the teachers in this study had been using product oriented approach, it is evident that, the low performance of students in their pre-test results, with an overall mean score of 8.55 as indicated on Table 9 was influenced by the methods which the teachers indicated they had been using to teach their students Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills which were product oriented.

The teachers in this study further confirmed that they used product oriented approach, when they outlined the steps they followed when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. These teachers indicated that the first step was introduction, followed by a brief explanation of the main points by the teacher, then the student-teacher interaction by asking and answering questions and finally giving out the composition topic to the students to write on. The teachers also indicated that they started by teaching and discussing the writing skills with the students and after that they gave them a topic to write on. When the students finished writing, their Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were collected by the teacher to mark by pointing out where the students were wrong and then returned the students’ marked Kiswahili composition (Insha) to them.
4.5.2.2 Use of Language Skills to Teach Writing Skills in Kiswahili Composition

(*Insha*)

In investigating the teaching methods the teachers in this study used for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, the study also sought to find out how the teachers in this study considered the use of language learning skills of listening, speaking and reading in teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. The results of how the teachers considered the use of the language skills as shown in Table 21.

**Table 21: Language Skills Used for Teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language skills</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results indicated on Table 21, on whether the teachers in this study used language learning skills to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills; 12 (75%) teachers indicated that they used listening skill. These were 6 from experimental group and 6 from control group. Those who considered using speaking were 14 (87.5%) teachers, who were 8 from experimental group and 6 from control group. Those who considered using reading skills were 14 (87.5%) teachers. These were 7 teachers from
experimental group and 7 teachers from control group. The distribution of the teachers in terms of experimental and control was equal for listening skill and reading skill but for the speaking skill there were 8 teachers for the experimental group while for control group there were 6 teachers. The teachers in this study reported that, they regarded the teaching of these language skills as an important prerequisite for teaching writing skills because these language skills could be used in the pre writing activities. This clearly shows that most of the teachers demonstrated their professional skills by being aware of the importance of using the various language skills for teaching.

The Kiswahili teachers in this study further demonstrated the importance of listening skill by using standard Kiswahili in class and out of class. This was confirmed by the students when they were asked to indicate whether their teachers used standard Kiswahili and 507 (95.5%) students confirmed that their teachers used it in class, while 373 (70.2%) students confirmed that they used it out of class. This shows that most of the teachers used standard Kiswahili in class more while teaching Kiswahili but they did not use it as much when they were out of class. Though the proportion of the teachers who used standard Kiswahili out of class was still high as reported by 70.2% students, it should have been equal to the use in the classroom. This is because when students listen to the correct form of language in different situations it promotes their ability to communicate, which will promote writing since writing is a way of communicating (Conley 2011).
The results in this study, therefore, concur with the suggestion made by Suciu and Mata (2011) that teaching writing has to develop communicative competence, which requires the teacher to prepare the students by exposing them to listening activities both in class and outside the class and also reading passages. In support for the need to prepare the students before writing, Gower, Philips and Walters (1995) also suggest that writing skills require adequate preparation of students for writing. The teacher needs to help the students to gather ideas for writing by listening and talking to one another and by reading.

Despite the teachers in this study being aware of the prerequisite skills of listening, speaking and reading and using them for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, the students’ performance in the pre-test was low as indicated on Table 9. The study therefore sought to find out whether the methods the teachers used when teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills had any influence on the students’ performance in their pre-test scores.

In order to establish whether the methods which the teachers in this study had used for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, had any influence on the students’ performance in their pre-test scores, the study compared the overall pretest mean scores of the schools as per the methods the teachers indicated that they had used. In table 18, the schools in which the teachers indicated that they used *group discussion method* for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*), writing skills were 5, and they were identified from table 10, as schools B2, C2, E2, E4, and G1 which consisted of 3 from experimental group and 2 from control group. The overall mean score of these schools in their pre-test was 8.89. The study also established that all the
16 schools which took part in the study used the teaching method of: *Give the students a topic and they write on it*. The overall mean score of all these schools in the pre-test was 8.55. The schools which used the method of: *the teacher gives a brief explanation about the topic before the student write on it* were 15 schools, which consisted of the following 7 schools from the experimental group: A1, B1, B2, D1, E2, F1 and G1 except school C1 and all the 8 schools from the control group. The overall mean score of these 15 schools was 8.53. The schools which used the method of: *students choose their own topic and write a Kiswahili composition (Insha) on it*, were 7 schools, which consisted of the following 5 schools from the experimental group: A2, B1, B2, D1 and G1 while in the control group there were 2 schools which were schools C2 and E4, which had an overall pretest mean score of 8.56. These results indicate that the schools which indicated that they had been using group discussion method had the highest overall pretest mean score of 8.89 as compared to those which used other methods. This was therefore an indication that group discussion method was an appropriate method of teaching writing. In fact school E2 which had used group discussion method, had the highest pre-test mean score of 10.32. The effectiveness of group discussion method was also confirmed by the better posttest results for the schools in the experimental group, which had used group discussion method, than for control group which had not used it.

The results of this study, which indicate that the schools which had used group discussion method had better results, therefore, concur with research findings which emphasize group work or collaborative writing because of the benefits it has to learners. According to Richards (1990), when students interact in groups it helps them to develop cognitive skills that involve generating ideas, and Burke (2011) states that they are able
to bring more knowledge and stimulate creativity. Collaborative writing, according to Gillespie and Graham (2011), allows students to work together, to plan, write, edit, and revise their writing. These are the steps involved in the process oriented approach in teaching writing skills. According to Parson (1985), studies which have been done on teaching writing, suggest that the process oriented approach is a better approach for teaching writing than the product oriented approach. Though process oriented approach and group work are suitable methods of teaching writing the Kiswahili teachers in this study, both in the experimental and control groups used product oriented approach in teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. As a result of this, the students in both groups had low pre-test mean scores. Though the 8.78 pre-test mean score for the experimental group was higher than the 8.33 pre-test mean score for the control group the difference between the two groups was very minimal.

After establishing that the product oriented approach which was used by the Kiswahili teachers in this study could have contributed to the low pre-test mean scores of the students in the experimental and control groups, the study sought to test the hypothesis that; Ho - There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students taught by teachers of different competencies. This was done by the researcher designing an intervention module which was based on the process-oriented approach, to be used by the teachers in the experimental group to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic for the post-test, while the teachers in the control group taught using the conventional method. During the teaching the 14 teachers, who comprised of 7 from the experimental group and 7 from the control group, were observed as they taught. The topic for the Kiswahili composition (Insha) post-test topic for both groups was Shule yangu ya
“My secondary school.” The results from the observation indicated that the teachers in the two groups did not use the same methods of teaching the post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic given to both groups.

The observation of the teachers in the control group indicated that, they all taught their Kiswahili composition (Insha) by starting with an introduction, in which some highlighted the lesson topic or the composition topic which was being taught, and others related the composition topic to learner experiences. After the introduction which took about 5 minutes, it was observed that in schools A1, D2 E3 and E4 the teachers followed with a brief explanation of about 10 minutes, on how the students were expected to write their Kiswahili composition (Insha). After the brief explanation the teachers in those schools asked their students to write their Kiswahili composition (Insha) for 40 minutes after which they were collected immediately for marking. These schools had posttest mean scores of A1 8.95, D2 7.56, E3 8.45 and E4 8.90 with an overall mean of 8.47. In schools C2, F2 and G2 it was observed that, after the introduction, the teachers asked the students a few questions on the composition topic whereby they involved a whole class discussion, for about 20 minutes and then the teachers summarized the main points of the composition which were derived from the whole class discussion. After this the students were given 50 minutes to write their Kiswahili composition (Insha) which was collected immediately for marking. These schools had posttest mean scores of C2 9.97, F2 10.23 and G2 10.23, with an overall posttest mean score of 10.14.
From the observation of the teaching in the schools of the control group, the study established that, the schools where the teachers used whole class discussion did better in their posttest with an overall mean score of 10.14 while those where the teachers used explanation had an overall mean score of 8.47. The method of whole class discussion provided an opportunity for learners to be interactive and was therefore closer to learner-centered method as compared to the one where the teacher gave an explanation which is more of teacher-centered method. From these observations the study results concur with the findings of King’ahi, Indoshi, Okwach and Osodo (2012) where it was established that students’ achievement in Kiswahili was better in learner-centered teaching style.

The observation of the 7 teachers in the experimental group, who used the intervention module, indicated that in the first lesson of 80 minutes, the teachers used 10 minutes to introduce the lesson by asking the students in a whole class discussion to explain what a descriptive composition was and give examples of this type of composition. After the students gave their examples, the teacher gave the example of the posttest composition topic, which was entitled *Shule yangu ya Sekondari*”) “My Secondary School”. (“After this, the students were put in groups of five, where the teacher instructed them to read the relevant sections from the textbook or from the extracts provided by the teacher about a descriptive composition, and then brainstorm for about 30 minutes on the content and vocabulary of the posttest composition topic given. As the students engaged in these learning activities, in their groups, it was observed that the teachers monitored the groups by visiting each group and guiding the students where necessary. The group discussions was followed by the teacher asking every student to use the remaining
time of the lesson to prepare the first draft of the posttest Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) on the topic which they had brainstormed on, and be ready with the draft for the next lesson.

In the second lesson of teaching for the posttest Kiswahili composition, which was also for 80 minutes, it was observed that all the 7 teachers from the experimental group had a motivating introduction which was a highlight of what had been covered in the previous lesson. After the introduction, which took about 10 minutes, the students were asked by the teacher to be in their groups and exchange their first drafts in order to read each other’s drafts and identify each other’s errors and then correct them in their groups. The teacher went round each group to make sure that the students, engaged in the right activities in their groups. The students were also asked to identify one draft \((Insha)\) which they considered to be the best in their group so as to read it before the class. The other students and the teacher gave their comments which were mainly positive feedback on what was best about the Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) which was read.

In the third lesson which was for the students to write the final copy of their Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\), it was arranged by the researcher that the following schools; A2, B2, E2 and G1 had their students to write their Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) on the same day they conducted the second lesson. The remaining schools B1, D1 and F1 had their students write their final copy of their Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) in the following week. In both cases it was observed that all the schools in the experimental group wrote their post-test Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) for 53 minutes in accordance
to the recommendation of the Kenya National Examination Council. At the end the students’ Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) were collected for marking by the researcher.

The observation of the teaching of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills for the post-test for the schools in the experimental group indicated that the students were taught using the process oriented approach while the schools in the control group used product oriented approach. The post-test overall mean scores of the experimental and control groups are indicated in tables 13 and 14 as 10.52 and 9.18 respectively, whereby for the experimental group was higher than that of the control group. The higher post-test overall mean score for the schools in the experimental group is an indication that when students are taught writing skills using process-oriented approach they perform better than when they are taught using product-oriented approach. These results therefore reject the hypothesis, Ho - There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students taught by teachers of different competencies. These results also concur with major general research findings on the teaching of writing which confirm that, students’ achievement is higher when the teaching approach emphasizes teaching writing as a process rather than as a product (Parson 1985, Kapka and Oberman, 2001). This is because according to Murray (1990), using the process approach enables the teacher to identify the problems students have with writing and to provide appropriate instruction and support.

The teachers who participated in this study had the appropriate academic and professional qualifications, and also sufficient experience. It was therefore expected that they would use the appropriate methods for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. The study results however indicated that most of the teachers used
product oriented approach which did not prepare the students adequately for writing
skills. The study therefore sought to find out the problems the Kiswahili teachers
encountered which could have affected their pedagogical competencies in using the
appropriate methods of teaching writing skills in Kiswahili. The problems reported by
teachers were as follows: 11 (68.75%) teachers indicated that the time of 40 minutes
periods was not enough, which was reported by 6 teachers from the experimental group
and 5 from control group. The problem of weak students, was reported by 10 (62.5%),
teachers who were 7 from experimental group and 3 from control group. Another
problem reported by 5 (31.25%) teachers, who consisted of 3 teachers from control
group and 2 from experimental group was the inadequate resources, which was
reported. Another problem reported by 2 (12.5%) teachers from control group was,
unmotivated students. The other problems which were reported by 1 (6.25%) teacher
from the control group were: large classes and students thinking Kiswahili was easy.
These results therefore indicate that, the main problems encountered by teachers in their
methods of teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) were insufficient time and teaching
weak students and then followed by inadequate resources. The problems reported by the
teachers in this study were likely to have affected the methods the teachers used to teach
their students Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. For example, though process
oriented approach and group discussion method are the most suitable methods of
teaching Kiswahili composition *Insha*) writing, it could not have been possible to use
these methods in a single period of 40 minutes because they require more time for the
students to participate adequately in a discussion. Group discussions also require
resources for students to use. However, these resources were also not available. It was
also unlikely that weak students could participate effectively in group discussions. The problems the teachers faced could be the reason why group discussion method was the least popular method used by the Kiswahili teachers. Under these circumstances the Kiswahili teachers chose methods which though ineffective, were the only ones they could use and thereby causing poor students’ performance in their pre-test mean scores.

In trying to deal with the problem of insufficient time the teachers faced in the methods of teaching Insha, writing, the study also found out that; 10 (62.5%) teachers who were 5 from experimental group and 5 from control group indicated that they tried to fix extra time to teach Insha whenever the students were free. On the problem of weak students, 8 (50%) teachers, 5 teachers from experimental group and 3 teachers from control group, reported that they encouraged the students to write as many Kiswahili compositions (Insha) as possible and tried to make individual follow-ups in class and punished those who had not submitted their work on time. In addition, 3 (18.75%) teachers indicated that they guided the students to realize their mistakes, penalized them for their mistakes and also some indicated that they dealt with individual students and corrected them wherever necessary. On the problem of resources, 2 (12.5%) teachers from experimental group indicated that they encouraged students to read Kiswahili newspapers and story books on their own.

During the observation of live teaching of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing lesson, the teachers in the experimental group did not experience the problems reported by the teachers regarding teaching methods because the researcher had provided for the problems reported. The observation, therefore, focused on the teachers in the control group, in order to establish how the teachers used their pedagogical competencies to
address the problems related to teaching methods. The study results indicated that the teachers addressed the problems reported by using product oriented approach where the teaching was teacher-centered. For example in dealing with the problem of insufficient time, the teachers gave a brief explanation or whole class discussion, and were able to have the students write their *Insha* and hand it in at the end of the lesson.

The methods the teachers reported to have used to address the problems of insufficient time and inadequate resources did not seem reliable, especially, for inadequate time when the teachers stated that “whenever the students were free.” This means that the teacher had no influence on the availability of the extra time, and so the possibility of that time being available was unpredictable. It would have been better if the teachers could have requested for an additional lesson to be provided on the time table instead of taking chances. The way teachers addressed the problem of inadequate resources and weak students did not also reflect appropriate pedagogical competencies in teaching methods for a lasting solution. The alternative methods used still reflected the use of the product-oriented approach of teaching writing rather than using teaching methods which could motivate the students to develop writing skills. The solutions suggested by the teachers were unlikely to have helped the students to develop adequate Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills and that is why they performed poorly in their pre-test scores.

In this study it was established that students’ low performance in their pre-test was due to the teachers in this study, both in the experimental and control groups, using product oriented approach in teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing. As a result of this the students in both groups had low mean scores in their pre-test with very minimal
difference between the two groups. This was confirmed by the computation of the t-test results shown in table 10.

The results in this study established that the Kiswahili Teacher pedagogical competencies in teaching methods influenced the low pre-test mean scores of both the experimental and control groups because of the teachers having used product oriented approach. After the researcher designed an intervention module, which was based on the process- oriented approach, for use by the experimental group to teach the posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic, the students’ performance for the experimental group was better than that of the control group which used product oriented approach. These results, therefore, confirmed that the only way to improve students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing is to use process-oriented methods of teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.

4.5.3 Influence of Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Using Learning Resources

In the third objective, the study sought to examine the influence of the Teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. In this section the study investigated the types of resources used. These included textbooks available in the schools, how the teachers identified them, whether they were enough or not, how they were acquired and whether the teachers felt lack of them had any effect on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.
4.5.3.1 Identification of Learning Resources and Textbooks

In order to demonstrate their pedagogical competence in the use of learning resources and textbooks the Kiswahili teachers, in this study, were required to indicate how they identified the most relevant resources and textbooks for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills for their form four students. The teachers in this study indicated that they identified the learning resources and textbooks in the following ways: relevance to the syllabus were 5 (31.25%) teachers, the availability of the text-books, were 4 (25%) through teachers seminars/workshops and visits to the bookshop were 2 (12.5%) teachers. There was 1 (6.25%) teacher for each of the following ways of identifying learning resources and textbooks from booksellers, asking a resource person or other teachers from other schools, benchmarking with the better performing schools, searching from the internet and through resource centre. Those who did not indicate how to identify learning resources were 6 (37.50%) teachers and they were from the following schools which also indicate their pre-test mean score; C1 8.52, C2 9.10, D2 6.73, E3 7.47, F2 9.29 and G2 9.55. The fact that the teachers in the 6 schools did not have the initiative to identify the learning resources and textbooks, is an indication that they did not use them, which is reflected in very low pre-test mean scores of 6.73 for D2 and 7.47 for E3 among the schools in this group.

In order to establish the Teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources, the study sought to find out from the teachers whether they could identify the types of learning resources which their schools had for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. Availability of learning resources in their schools was expected to provide the teachers with an opportunity to demonstrate their pedagogical
competence in the use of learning resources for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The learning resources which the Kiswahili teachers named included: chalkboard by 4 (25%) teachers, Kiswahili textbooks by 4 (25%) teachers, samples of the best Kiswahili composition (Insha) of the past mock results 3 (18.75%) teachers and the following resources: charts, resource person, syllabus and newspapers were mentioned by 1 (6.25%) teacher each. It was also established that 2 (12.5%) teachers did not indicate any resources in their schools and they were from schools E1 and E3. By not indicating any resources in their schools, even an obvious one like the chalkboard the teachers in these two schools demonstrated lack of interest in the use of learning resources. This was reflected in the poor performance of these schools in pretest mean scores for Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing where schools E1 and E3 had mean scores of 8.00 and 7.47 respectively.

From the list of the types of resources which the teachers named, it was evident that the teachers named very few resources, which was an indication that, either the schools had very few resources or the teachers named only those which they were using. There are however, various types of easily available and cheap learning resources which teachers did not name but are useful for language teaching and can be used for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. Gower and Philips (1995) and Farrant (2004) have suggested resources such as: overhead projectors, wall charts, real objects, school environments, models, maps, pictures, cassette recorders, radio, video, films, photo copier and computers. The fact that most of these resources were not named by the teachers in this study could be an indication that, either they were not available in their schools or even if they were available, the teachers did not use them, because if
they had been using them they would have remembered to name them. One example of a common and useful teaching resource which was available in all the schools, as established by observation, was chalkboard but it was, mentioned by only 4 (25%) teachers, as one of the resources in their schools. Furthermore, by having 2 (12.5%) teachers, who did not mention any resources available in their schools, could imply that those schools did not have any resources, or the teachers were not aware of the resources that were available in their schools and therefore could not identify them and that means they did not use them. Since some of the resources required the teachers to make them, it further implied that some teachers, in this study, lacked the initiative to make and use such resources. This is contrary to the fact that one of the Teacher pedagogical competencies, according to Susiu and Mata (2011), is the ability to identify and use tangible resources for teaching. The fact that some teachers in this study could not identify the resources and use them, is a reflection of inadequate Teacher pedagogical competencies on the use of learning resources as a result of which the students performed poorly in their pretest.

Use of Kiswahili textbooks is also an important pedagogical competence in teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, because according to Conley (2011) books stimulate learners’ interest to write and give them ideas to write on. The study therefore sought to find out the types of textbook which the teachers identified in their schools. The books which the teachers indicated were: Chemi Chemi ya Kiswahili by 8 (50%) teachers, Kiswahili Kitukuzwe by 7 (43.25%) teachers, Upeowa Insha by 4 (25%) teachers and Kurunzi ya Insha 3 (18.75%) teachers. The following books were indicated by 2 (12.5%) teachers each:- Golden Tips, Stadi za Kiswahili, Kioo cha...
Kiswahili, Kiswahili Fasaha and High Flyer, while the following books were indicated by 1 (6.3%) teacher, Sportlight Revision Books, Gateway Textbooks, Uhondo and Insha Mufti. All the textbooks mentioned by the teachers were the relevant ones recommended by KIE or Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) for teaching Kiswahili in secondary schools in Kenya. The teachers in this study were able to identify and indicate more text books than they did for the other learning resources. The implication of this is that either the schools provided the required text books more than the other learning resources or the teachers may have been using the textbooks more than other resources for teaching. In any case, in teaching language books are useful resources.

4.5.3.2 Availability of Learning Resources

The teachers were further asked to indicate the situation of the availability of the teaching and learning resources in their schools and their responses are shown on Table 22.

**Table 22: Availability of Learning Resources in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not available except chalkboard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available but not enough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school provides enough whenever required</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the teachers responses on Table 22, it is shown that 6 (37.5%) teachers indicated that the resources were not available except chalkboard, 5 (31.25%) teachers indicated that the resources were available but not enough while 5 (31.25%) indicated that the school provided enough whenever required. These responses show that in most of the schools, the resources were not enough but the situation would have improved if the 5 (31%) who indicated that the school could provide whenever required, would have identified the resource materials they required and then requested the school to provide. The implication of this is that the teachers did not have adequate pedagogical competencies for identifying the required resources so that they could ask the school to provide for use in teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.

An important aspect about the available resources is how the teachers demonstrated their pedagogical competencies in the use of the resources for teaching. In order to verify the views expressed by teachers on the availability of learning resources, the study asked the students to indicate how their teachers used the chalkboard and other learning resources. The results of the students’ responses are shown in table 23.
Table 23: Students’ Responses on Use of Resources by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher uses chalkboard to write main points when teaching Kiswahili Insha</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher uses other resource materials like pictures, charts and real objects when teaching Kiswahili Insha</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to students’ responses in table 23 on whether their teachers used chalkboards to write main points when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha), it was indicated that 498 (93.8 %) students said “Yes” while 33 (6.2 %) said No. These response are an indication that chalkboard was the most commonly used teaching resource by the teachers. In order to establish from students whether their teachers used other resource materials like pictures, charts and real objects when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) the students’ responses indicated that 368 (69.3%) students said “No” while 163 (30.7 %) students said “Yes”. Students’ responses confirmed that there was little use of other teaching and learning materials by the teachers while teaching Insha, except chalkboard.
The study further sought to determine the situation in the form four classes regarding the availability of the textbooks which the teachers identified in their schools for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The results of the teacher responses on the availability of textbooks are shown in table 24.

**Table 24: Availability of Textbooks According to Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available but not enough</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Student has a textbook</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the Teacher responses on Table 24 show that: 15 (93.75) teachers indicated that textbooks were available but not enough while only 1 teacher from school E1, which was in the control group, indicated that textbooks were not available, especially for the students. This school had a pre-test mean score of 8.0. In order to confirm the views expressed by teachers on the availability of text books, the study also sought to find out from the form four students whether there were enough textbooks available to them when learning Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The results of the students’ views are as shown in Table 25.
Table 25: Students’ Views on the Availability of Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are enough textbooks to teach Insha in the form four class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 25 it is indicated that 158 (29.8%) students strongly disagreed and 141 (26.6%) students disagreed, making a total of 299 (56.4%) students who indicated that the textbooks were not enough to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) in form four. On the other hand 99 (18.6%) students strongly agreed and 93 (17.5%) students agreed thereby making a total of 192 (36.1%) of the students who agreed that there were enough textbooks to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) in form four while 40 (7.5%) were uncertain. This clearly indicates that the textbooks were not enough.

Apart from the teachers and the students indicating that the textbooks were not enough for teaching and learning Kiswahili composition (Insha) in form four, the study carried out an observation in the 14 schools which had continued with the study, to establish how the textbooks, which were not enough, were distributed among the teachers and students. The study further tried to establish whether there was any relationship between the availability of textbooks and the student’s pretest performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.
The results of the availability of the Kiswahili textbooks and how they were shared for teachers and students, and the pre-test mean scores are indicated in table 26.

Table 26: Availability of Textbooks for Teachers and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>School Codes</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Available Teacher copies</th>
<th>Book ratio for students</th>
<th>Pre Test Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on table 26 indicate that of the 14 schools which were observed, 11 (78.57%) teachers had at least 2 copies of the recommended textbooks while 3 (21.43%) teachers had only 1 copy. The textbooks for the students were shared at a ratio of 1:2 in one school, a ratio of 1:3 in 6 schools, at a ratio of 1:4 in 2 schools and at a ratio of 1:5 in 5 schools. The school which had the best book-student ratio was school
E2 which had a ratio of 1:2, whereas most schools had one book shared by 3-5 students. This kind of situation was clear evidence that these schools did not have sufficient textbooks which are necessary for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. Insufficient textbooks meant that, the teachers in this study could not exercise their pedagogical competencies adequately in using them to motivate the students to write and this explains why the pretest performance was low.

In trying to establish whether the availability of textbooks influenced the students’ pre-test performance, the study compared the availability of textbooks for students with the pre-test mean scores of the schools. The study results in Table 26 show that, school E2 which had the best book ratio of 1:2 for the students and 2 copies for the teacher had the best pre-test mean score of 10.32 which was higher than the pre-test mean score of 8.00 for school E1 where the textbooks for the students were not available. The study further computed the overall means of the schools in relation to the book ratios in order to draw the relationship between the availability of books for students and their performance in their pretest. The schools which had a book ratio 1:3 were:- A2 (8.16), B1 (9.28), C2 (9.10), F1 (8.90), F2 (9.29) and G2 (9.55). The overall pre-test means score for these schools was 9.05. The schools which had a book ratio 1:4 were: C1 (8.52) and G1 (8.36) with an overall mean of 8.44. The schools which had a book ratio 1:5 were:- A1 (8.13), B2 (8.36), D2 (6.73), E3 (7.47) and E4 (8.33) with an overall mean of 7.80. These results show that where fewer students shared a textbook the performance was better than where more students shared one textbook. This was an indication that availability of textbooks for the students influenced their performance in their pretest Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). This was because textbooks play an important role in
language teaching since they provide a useful resource for both teachers and learners. The results of this study therefore concur with studies reported by Suciu and Mata (2011) which have indicated that the use of teaching and learning resources improves the Teacher pedagogical efficiency and ultimately students’ performance. Graham and Perin (2007b) also recommend that students need to be provided with books to read because books help them to acquire knowledge about writing and models for good writing.

The results of this study on the availability of textbooks for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills to the form four students indicated that they were not sufficient for students. This study therefore sought to find out from the teachers in this study how they addressed the problem of insufficient textbooks. The results of how the teachers addressed the problems of insufficient textbooks are indicated in table 27.

Table 27: Ways of Addressing Problems of Insufficient Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of addressing problems of sufficient textbooks</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the school to buy at least a teacher’s copy</td>
<td>15 (93.7)</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow from a public library</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow from another school</td>
<td>4 (25)</td>
<td>12 (75.0)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce photocopies</td>
<td>9 (56.2)</td>
<td>7 (43.8)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy my Personal copy</td>
<td>9 (56.2)</td>
<td>7 (43.8)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the results of the study on table 27, on how the teachers addressed the problems of insufficient textbooks, it shows that 15 (93.7%) teachers indicated that they would ask the school to buy at least a Teacher copy, 9 (56.2%) teachers indicated that they would produce photocopies, another 9 (56.2) teachers would buy their own personal copy, 4 (25%) teachers indicated that they would borrow from another school while no teacher indicated that they would borrow from a public library. Though most teachers; 15 (93.7%) indicated that they would ask their school to buy, which was a very easy option, the fact that these schools still did not have enough books for their students depicts that, most schools may not have had the funds to buy the books for students or may not have prioritized the buying of Kiswahili textbooks. The schools were therefore willing to avail at least the teacher copy and that is why 93.7% of the teachers indicated that the textbooks in their schools were available but not enough. Though all the options provided in Table 27 are possible, the fact that none of the teachers indicated borrowing from a public library, could be an indication that such a facility was either not available within reach of the school or the teachers were not aware of its usefulness in helping them to address the problem of books for themselves and for their students.

During the observation of the teachers when they taught the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic which was used for posttest, the study focused on how the teachers in the experimental and control groups used the teaching and learning resources. In observing the experimental group, on the use of teaching and learning resources, the study results indicated that all the 7 teachers followed the guidelines spelt out in the intervention module provided. The teachers in the experimental group had a well-organized
chalkboard use, where they noted the main content of the lesson right from the introduction. These teachers also used the relevant textbooks written by Wamitila (2004), Wahiga and Kagwa (2005; 2010) or the extracts from these textbooks as provided by the researcher. During the first lesson the students read the relevant sections for teaching a descriptive composition (*Insha ya maelezo*) as part of pre-writing activities. In the second lesson the students reported the features they had identified in the school environment which were part of describing their school. The teachers in the experimental group, therefore, used the school environment as a learning resource and involved the students in the use of learning resources. The study observed that teachers in this group demonstrated adequate pedagogical competencies in use of teaching and learning resources in the way they were instructed. Due to adequate use of the teaching and learning resources the schools in the experimental group were able to improve their posttest overall mean score to 10.52 from the overall pre-test mean score of 8.78.

The observation of the teachers in the control group indicated differences in the way they used the teaching and learning resources since they did not follow any common guideline. It was therefore observed that the teachers from schools A1, D2 E3 and E4 in the control group did not use the chalkboard to note down any content of the teacher’s brief explanation on how the students were expected to write their Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). The teachers in these schools had a teacher’s copy of the relevant textbook, by Wahiga and Kagwa (2010) which was only used by the teacher to derive the content which was explained by the teacher for about 10 minutes, while the students did not use any textbook during the lesson. These schools had posttest mean scores of A1= 8.95, D2= 7.56, E3= 8.45 and E4= 8.90, with an overall mean of 8.4. In schools
C2, F2 and G2 of the control group, it was observed that, the teachers also had a teacher’s copy of the relevant textbook by Wahiga and Kagwa (2010) from which the teachers drew the content they used for teaching how to write a Kiswahili composition (Insha). These teachers also noted on the chalkboard the summary of the main points of the content of the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic, which were derived from the whole class discussion, for about 20 minutes after the introduction. These schools had a post-test mean scores of C2= 9.97, F2 =10.23 and G2= 10.23, with an overall mean score of 10.14. The overall posttest mean score for the schools in the control group was 9.18 from the overall pre-test mean score of 8.33, thus a mean improvement of 0.85 while for the experimental group it was 1.74. The higher overall posttest mean improvement in the experimental group was an indication that Teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of teaching and learning resources had an influence on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

An important aspect of Teacher pedagogical competence in the use of teaching and learning resources is to make sure that they are available for use during the teaching. This requires the teacher to address the problems of insufficient resources and devise ways of acquiring them so that the teacher can use them for effective teaching and learning for the improvement of students’ performance. The study therefore sought to find out how the teachers in this study used their pedagogical competencies to acquire the learning resources. The teacher responses are presented on Table 28.
Table 28: How the Teachers Acquired the Learning Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of acquiring learning resources</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make use of what is within the school environment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher to make resources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request the school to buy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the students to bring from home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study results in table 28, on how the teachers addressed the problems of insufficient resources; it is indicated that 10 (62.5%) teachers opted for requesting the school to buy, followed by 8 (50%) teachers who opted for the teacher to make the resource, 7 (43.7%) teachers indicated that they would make use of what was within the school environment while finally1 (6.3%) of the teachers indicated that they would ask the students to bring from home. These results indicate that, the most popular option was that of asking the school to buy. The fact that these schools did not have sufficient resources could imply that the schools were not financially able to buy or the teacher had not identified the resources so as to ask the school to buy. The other options for acquiring learning resources, though not very popular, they were possible indicators of teachers who have pedagogical competencies in the acquisition and use of learning resources because they implied teacher concern, innovation and effort in availing the resources when the school is not able to buy.
This study established that the schools did not have sufficient resources and textbooks and this influenced students’ low mean scores, especially for the pretest results. The study also sought to find out about the teachers’ views on whether lack of teaching and learning resources was a significant factor in causing the poor performance of their students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The results of the teacher responses are indicated on Table 29.

**Table 29: The Significance of Resources in Teaching Kiswahili Insha Writing Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of teaching &amp; learning resources has contributed to the poor performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on table 29 indicate that 10 (62.5%) teachers agreed and 4 (25.0%) teachers strongly agreed, making a total of 14 (87.5%) teachers who agreed that the poor performance of their students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills was attributed to lack of teaching and learning resources in their schools. The results of this study, therefore, concur with the study by Ogero (2012) which also established that there was inadequate teaching and learning resources, in the sampled district public secondary schools in Kisii, which the study confirmed to have been the cause of poor
performance in Kiswahili. Teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of teaching and learning resources in such a situation would have required the teachers to be innovative in sourcing the resources and making effective use of what was available in the school environment and in the community.

In analyzing the Teacher and students’ responses on the availability of teaching and learning resources, especially textbooks, the study established that they were inadequate and therefore they were not used as expected for effective teaching and learning. As a result, the study established that the students’ performance in the pre-test was influenced by insufficient textbooks. The study further sought to examine the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources on students’ post-test performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills by observing and comparing how the teachers in the experimental and control groups used teaching and learning resources when teaching the Kiswahili composition (Insha) posttest topic. The results of the study, on the observation of how the Kiswahili teachers in the experimental and control groups used the teaching and learning resources, indicated that there were differences between these groups in the way the teachers used the learning resources. These differences reflected the different pedagogical competencies of these teachers in the use of the learning resources. The study results also indicated that there were differences in the overall mean scores of the experimental and control groups due to different Teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources. Consequently the study established that Teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.
The results of this study on teacher pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources to teach writing, established that all the schools had well-organized chalkboards and most of the teachers used them as a teaching and learning resources while teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills but other resources were not used. Apart from the chalkboard, other resources are also important in helping teachers to teach writing and also in helping students to learn how to write. This is because when students use learning resources, it creates interest in them to learn to write and they are motivated to write. In order to select the appropriate resources and support materials, the teachers have to be pedagogically competent. This study, however, established that the teachers did not use other learning resources, except chalkboards, because they were not able to identify or make them and neither did the schools provide enough teaching resources. Under such circumstances, the Kiswahili teachers could not exercise their pedagogical competencies effectively in the use of learning resources and therefore this was a factor which influenced the low performance of students in their pre-test as analyzed above.

The study also established that though the Kiswahili teachers identified appropriate text books which were bought by their schools, they were not enough. Most schools had only one copy for the teacher and that means students had no access to books though reading is important for preparing students for effective writing. Lack of books, for students to read and other learning resources, for teachers to use while teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing inhibited the teacher to use their pedagogical competencies in using resources for teaching and resulted to students’ low pre-test mean scores in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.
4.5.4 Influence of Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Classroom Management

In addressing this objective of classroom management, the study focused on classroom arrangement, the physical conditions of the classrooms, class control problems and the class control measures the teachers had been using. The study tried to establish how these aspects of classroom management were reflected the Teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom management and their influence on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.

4.5.4.1 Classroom Arrangement

In the aspect of classroom arrangement, the study sought to find out how the teachers had been arranging their classrooms when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The study further computed the overall pre-test mean scores of the schools in relation to the type of classroom arrangement so as to determine any influence of classroom arrangement on students’ pre-test performance. The results of how the teachers had been arranging their classes for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills are as shown in Table 29.
Table 30: Classroom Arrangement for Teaching Insha Writing Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class arrangements</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Pretest overall mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>Contr.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of 9-11 students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of 6-8 students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of 2 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of 3-5 students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 shows the types of classroom arrangements which the teachers in this study had been using and the overall pretest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing of the schools in each type. From Table 29, it is indicated that 7 (43.75%) teachers who were made up of 3 teachers from the experimental group and 4 teachers from the control group used whole class arrangement and their overall pretest mean score was 8.52. For the use of individualized learning arrangement, there were 4 (25.00%) teachers, who were made up of 2 teachers from experimental group and 2 teachers from control group and their overall pre-test mean score was 8.81. In the arrangement of groups of 3-5, there were 2 (12.50%) teachers from the experimental group who used it and they had an overall pretest mean score of 9.8. In the arrangement of groups of 9-11 students, only 1 (6.25%) teacher from the control group had used it and the overall pre-test mean score was 6.73. For the arrangement of groups of 6-8
students, there was only 1 (6.25%) teacher from the control group who had used it and the overall pre-test mean score was 7.47. In the arrangement of groups of 2, there was only 1 (6.25%) teacher from the experimental group who used it and the overall pre-test mean score was 8.16.

The results of this study show that, most of the teachers in this study preferred whole class arrangement and individualized learning for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. Though, the classroom arrangement of groups of 3-5 students, was not popular in this study, it had the best overall pre-test mean score of 9.8.

The results in this study show that classroom arrangement had an influence on students’ performance since different classroom arrangements resulted into differences in performance with the best performance being in group arrangement of 3-5 students. These results concur with research findings which have emphasized that the only way to have students write better is to have them work together in groups in what is known as collaborative writing. A number of scholars such as: McCorskey and McVetta (1978), Richards (1990), Cohen (1994) and Burke (2011) have studied the effectiveness of small group as a learning strategy for teaching writing. Both Cohen (1994) and Burke (2011) suggest that an ideal group should be small enough to enable every member to participate effectively. For Burke, a small group is the one that consists of 3 or 5 people. Inversely, groups of 2 students do not have enough members for diverse ideas and generation of creativity. If the groups are large, Cohen (1994) is of the view that there would be problems due to difficulties in communication and controlling the groups. McCorskey and McVetta (1978) affirm that: group work can be an effective method to motivate students, encourage active participation in learning and develop key critical
thinking communication. According to McCorskey and McVetta (1978) seating and sitting arrangements can impact how the instructor or teacher communicates with the students and how the students interact with one another and thereby impact on their motivation.

The results of this study concur with the views of these scholars since they indicated that the schools which had arranged their students in groups of 3-5 had the best performance. The results of this study, therefore, indicated that Teacher pedagogical competence in classroom arrangement influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.

The results of this study on the performance of students in their pretest scores in relation to how the Teacher arranged their classrooms, show that classroom arrangement had an effect on students’ learning writing skills and consequently on their performance. Since most of the teachers, arranged their classrooms in ways which did not facilitate their students learning writing skills, this resulted to low performance in the pretest scores.

The observation of the experimental and the control groups during the teaching for posttest indicated that all the teachers in the experimental group arranged their students in groups of 5 instead of whole class teaching as it was the case with control group. When the post-test results of the experimental and control groups were compared the experimental group had a better posttest performance of an overall posttest mean score of 10.52 (52.6%) while the control group had an overall post-test mean score of 9.18 (45.92%) Since this study has also indicated that students who were arranged in groups
of 3-5 performed better, it is most likely that the class arrangement of the experimental group contributed to the better results for the experimental group than for the control group, which explains why there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the posttest mean score.

4.5.4.2 Physical Conditions of the Classrooms

Another important factor in classroom management is the physical conditions of the classroom because they determine the Teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom arrangement. In this regard this study sought to determine the state of the physical conditions of the classrooms of the schools which were used for this study and to establish their influence on Teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom management and on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The teacher responses on the physical conditions of their classrooms are shown in Table 31.

Table 31: Physical Conditions of the Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical conditions of The classrooms</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has sufficient chairs and desks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has sufficient light</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well arranged</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well ventilated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31 shows the state of the physical conditions of the classrooms of the schools used for this study. The table shows that, 13 (81.30%) teachers indicated that their classrooms had sufficient light. These teachers were from 7 schools in the experimental group which were A2, B1, B2, C1, D1, E2 and F1, and the 6 schools in the control group which were A1, C2, E1, E3, F2 and G2. The teachers who indicated that they did not have this condition were school G1 in experimental group and D2 and E4 from the control group. Those who indicated that their classrooms had sufficient chairs and desks were 12 (75%) teachers and they were from 6 schools in the experimental group which were; A2, B1, C1, D1, E2 and F1 and from 6 schools in the control group which were A1,C2,E1,E3,F2 and G2. Those who did not have these conditions were 4 (25%) schools which were G1 and B2 in the experimental group and schools D2 and E4 in the control group. The teachers who indicated that their classrooms were spacious were 11 (68.75%) teachers, who were from 7 schools in the experimental group which were: A2, B1, B2, C1, D1, E2, and F1 and from 4 schools from the control group which were A1, E3, F2 and G2. Those who indicated that their classrooms were not spacious were 5 (31.75%) teachers. These were 1 teacher from school G1 in the experimental group and 4 teachers from schools C2, D2, E1 and E4 in the control group. The teachers who indicated that their classrooms were well arranged were 11 (68.75%) teachers who were from the following 6 schools; A2, B1, B2, C1, E2, and F1 in the experimental group and from 5 schools in the control group which were A1, E1, E4, F2 and G2. Those teachers who indicated that their classrooms were not well arranged were 5 (31.25%) teachers and they were from schools D1 and G1 in the experimental group and schools C2, D2 and E4 in the control group. The teachers who indicated that their classrooms
were well ventilated were 11 (68.75%) teachers who were from 7 schools in the experimental group which were schools A2,B1,B2,D1, E2,F1 and G1 and 4 schools from control group which were schools A1,C2,E3 and F2. The schools which did not have well ventilated classrooms were indicated by 5 (31.25%) teachers who were from schools C1 and G1 in the experimental group and schools D2, E4 and G2 in the control group.

The results from Table 30 show that majority of the schools had appropriate physical conditions which provided a conducive learning environment for teachers to demonstrate their pedagogical competencies in classroom arrangement. It was also indicated in Table 30 that there were schools in this study which did not have all the conducive physical conditions like schools D1, E4 and G1. School C2 was not spacious and was not well arranged while school B2 did not have sufficient chairs and desks. The study noted that one common factor about these schools was that they had large numbers of students except school C2 and, therefore space was the main problem even for B2 to put enough chairs and desks.

The aspect of space in relation to students’ capacity was viewed by Everton and Weinstein (2006) as the main consideration in a language classroom, where students have to be given an opportunity to participate and interact actively, so as to develop their communicative competence. They suggest that a conducive class should be of medium size of 45 students. They further suggested that students’ active interaction is also facilitated by the way the teachers organized the students’ seating arrangement. In this study, schools which had over 45 students per class were: school B2 with 68 students, D2 with 71 students, E2 with 46 students, E4 with 55 students and G1 with 46
students. School E2, with a population of 46 students was not affected by lack of any of the physical conditions mentioned in Table 3 and as a result it had a pretest mean score of 10.32 unlike schools B2, D2, E4 and G1 with lower pretest mean scores of 8.36, 6.73, 8.33 and 8.36 respectively. Though, an appropriate students’ seating arrangement is determined by the teacher’s pedagogical competencies in classroom management, in such large classes like D2, E4 and G1 it was difficult for the teachers in this study to use appropriate pedagogical competencies of classroom management to arrange their students appropriately for learning writing skills. However schools like C2 and D1 did not have very large numbers and yet the teachers reported that they were not well arranged. These results show that, it is possible that the physical conditions of some classrooms may have challenged the Teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom arrangement, especially classes which had large numbers and lacked facilities. That means the physical conditions of the classroom influenced how the teachers arranged their classrooms and this in turn influenced the pre-test performance of students in their Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. Since research findings have established that classroom arrangement determines how students write, this study tried to compare students’ post-test performance of the control and experimental groups in relation to classroom arrangement. The observation carried out for the control group and experimental groups during the teaching for post-test Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, indicated that the two groups did not arrange their classrooms in the same way.
The results of the observation carried out on the physical conditions of the form four classrooms for the 7 schools in the control group, indicated that all the schools except schools D2 and E4 had classrooms which were spacious, had sufficient chairs and desks, had sufficient light and were well ventilated. It was however observed that, in schools; D2 (71 students) and E4 (55 students), which had large numbers of students, the classrooms were not spacious, they did not have sufficient chairs and desks, for example in school D2, 4 students, each, shared a desk with another student. In all the schools of the control group it was observed that all the teachers a whole class seating arrangement during the teaching of the post-test Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic. That means, there was no difference in classroom seating arrangement, between the schools which had the conducive physical conditions and those which did not have. These teachers, therefore, demonstrated that was the conventional way of arranging the students for a Kiswahili composition (Insha) lesson which only allowed for product oriented approach despite the schools providing the necessary physical conditions. As a result the Kiswahili composition (Insha) post-test performance of the students in the control group had little improvement. Lack of conducive physical conditions, however, still had a significant impact as noted in school E4 which had the least improvement of 2.85%.

The observation of the schools in the experimental group showed that the teachers had followed the guidelines given in the intervention module. Most of the schools in the experimental group had been indicated in table 30, as having conducive physical conditions except B2 and GI. The problems of the physical conditions for these 2 schools were rectified as guided by the intervention module, such that for school B2 the
teaching for the posttest was done in the school hall where, enough chairs and desks were provided. The hall provided sufficient space for the organization of groups. This school had the highest improvement of the posttest mean score of 9.9%. For school G1 the students were moved to a more spacious classroom where the appropriate physical conditions were also provided. The observation results of the experimental group indicated that all the classrooms in the experimental group had the appropriate physical conditions. The teachers also arranged their students in groups of 5 instead of whole class teaching as it was the case with control group.

When the post-test results of the experimental and control groups were compared the experimental group had a better posttest performance of an overall posttest mean score of 10.52 (52.6%) while the control group had an overall post-test mean score of 9.18 (45.92%). Since this study has also indicated that students who were arranged in groups of 3-5 performed better, it is most likely that the class arrangement of the experimental group contributed to the better results for the experimental group in the posttest scores.

4.5.4.3 Class Control

Class control is an important aspect of classroom management because it ensures that disruptive behavior does not arise and interfere with learning. Teacher pedagogical competencies in this aspect are the ability of the teachers to identify students’ class control problems among their students and apply their pedagogical competencies in managing them. This study therefore sought to determine whether the teachers experienced any class control problems among the form four students when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The results of the teacher responses are as presented on Table 32.
Table 32: Class Control Problems Encountered by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class control problems</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative in group work.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not finish writing assignment on time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make unnecessary noise in class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 shows the class control problems encountered by teachers in this study. The results from the table show that, 13 (81.25 %) teachers indicated that their students did not finish writing assignment on time. These teachers were 6 from the experimental group and 7 from the control group. The second class control problem was inattentive students, which were indicated by 7 (43.70%) teachers who were made up of 2 teachers from the experimental group and 5 from the control group. The teachers who indicated that their students were uncooperative in group work were 6 (37.50%) teachers. These were 3 from experimental group and 3 from the control group. Those who indicated that their students were not interested in learning were 6 (37.50%) teachers with 2 being from experimental group and 4 from the control group. The least class control problem was one concerning students making unnecessary noise in class which was indicated by 2 (12.50%) teachers consisting of one from experimental group and one from control group.
The results of this study, as shown in table 31, indicate that schools in both the experimental group and from control group had some kind of class control problems but the most serious one which was encountered by teachers from both groups, when teaching form four Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing, was students not finishing writing their Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) on time. This problem could have been caused by the students not having the interest and motivation to write because of not having been equipped with adequate skills for writing. According to Graham and Perin (2007b), students who are not motivated are also likely not to have any interest in writing. They are also of the view that students enjoy writing and are motivated to write if the classroom environment is supportive and a pleasant place. It is only teachers with adequate pedagogical competencies who can create such a supportive and a pleasant classroom environment. One way of addressing this problem is suggested by Conley (2011) that, effective teaching of writing is to help students to develop the ability to write and promote positive attitude about writing. He also suggests that, this could be done by the teachers making sure that, whenever they gave the students a writing assignment, they needed to talk to them on how they were expected to respond to the assignment. The fact that, the students in this study had problems of finishing their writing assignments and handing them on time was an indication that they were struggling to write due to teacher inadequate pedagogical competencies which resulted to not creating conducive learning environments. That also explains why the students in this study had low pretest scores in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing.
After the teachers had identified the class control problems they encountered, the study sought to establish the kind of control measures they used so as to ensure that effective teaching and learning took place when teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. The results of the teacher responses are shown on table 33.

**Table 33: Teacher Class Control Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class control measures</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage students in interactive activities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise group work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish any undisciplined behaviour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher to be in class on time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33, shows the results of the class control measures which the teachers in the study had reported to have been using. The results from Table 33 show that 14 (87.50%) teachers indicated that they engaged their students in interactive activities. These teachers were from 7 schools in the experimental group and 7 from control group. Those who indicated that they would punish any undisciplined behavior were 9 (56.25%) teachers who were made up of 3 from experimental group and 6 from control group. Those who indicated that they would be in class on time were 8 (50%) teachers; who consisted of 4 from experimental group and 4 from control group. Those who indicated they would supervise group work were 7 (43.75%) teachers who were made up of 1 from experimental group and 6 from control group. From the results of this study on Table 33, the most popular class control measure which the teachers in the
study had reported to have been using was engaging students in interactive activities and then followed by punish any undisciplined behavior. Supervising group work was not popular among these teachers because, as reported earlier very few teachers in this study used effective groups for arranging their classes. The choice of interactive activities, as a class control measure by most of the teachers in this study, is an indication that these teachers demonstrated an appropriate pedagogical skill of dealing with students’ problems constructively.

In carrying out the observation on class control aspects during the teaching of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing lesson, for the posttest, the study focused on class control problems and how the teachers addressed any class control problems which arose. From the observation, the study established that all the teachers, both in the experimental and control groups did not experience any class control problems. That means the students were attentive, they showed interest in learning by responding to their teacher’s questions, they did not make any unnecessary noise and those who were in the experimental group, were cooperative in their group work. In both groups there was adequate discipline control among the students.

The only differences which were observed between the experimental and control groups in relation to class control measures were that, since the teachers in the experimental group had arranged their students in group discussions, their students engaged in student to student interactive activities than the ones in the control group who were in whole class arrangement. Furthermore the students in the experimental group showed more interest in their learning due to being engaged in more interactive activities in their groups, unlike the students in the control group, who, because of being in a whole
class arrangement, they were more passive listeners. The teachers in the experimental group were also able to supervise group work, which also, provided a better way of the teachers interacting with the students than when it was in the control group because of whole class arrangement. The teachers in the experimental group demonstrated better pedagogical competencies for classroom management in class control, by engaging their students in interactive activities. This made the students acquire better writing skills, which resulted to a better performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) posttest scores.

The results of this study have indicated that Teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom management influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. When the teachers in this study were asked to indicate their opinion on whether competent class management skills were necessary for improving students’ performance in Kiswahili composition writing skills, the results showed that; 6 (37.5%) agreed and 10 (62.5%) strongly agreed, which means all the 16 (100%) teachers agreed with the statement. This study therefore, concurred with the views of Suciu and Mata (2011) that the teachers were aware of the importance of classroom management in improving students’ performance. Classroom management is considered by Suciu and Matta (2011) as an important component in teaching, which involves a teacher’s ability to manage the teaching and learning process, organize the learning space, and manage time and learners. Classroom management is therefore an important aspect of a teacher’s pedagogical competence for improving students’ performance.
4.5.5 Influence of Teacher Pedagogical Competencies in Design and Use of Assessment Techniques

The study sought to determine the influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies in designing and using assessment techniques on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. In trying to determine this the study focused on frequency of assessment, aspects considered in designing assessment techniques methods of assessment, use of feedback in correcting students’ errors, criteria for assessment and keeping students’ assessment records.

4.5.5.1 Frequency of Assessment

In trying to determine how the teachers in this study designed assessment techniques, the study sought to establish from the teachers in this study how frequently they assessed their form four students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The study sought to determine this because according to Graham and Perin (2007b) frequency of assessment is important in determining the students’ performance. However, since Graham et al. assert that assessment of writing is an integral part of writing instruction; teachers should assess students’ writing as frequently as they teach it. The results of the teacher responses on how frequently they assessed their form four students are shown on Table 34.
Table 33: Frequency of Assessment of Form Four Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Contr.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once every week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every two weeks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results on Table 34, it shows that, the teachers who indicated that they assessed once every week were 7 (43.75%) teachers, who were 4 from the experimental group, in schools B2, D1, F1 and G1 and 3 from the control group in schools A1, E3 and G2. Those who indicated that they assessed once every two weeks were 7 (43.75%) teachers who were 3 from schools A2, C1 and E2 of the experimental group and the following 4 schools, C2, D2, E1 and F2 in the control group. Those who indicated that they assessed once per month were 2 (12.50%) teachers who were in school B1 from experimental group and school E4 from control group. This means that the total number of the teachers who reported that they assessed their form four students Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills once every week and once every two weeks was 14 (87.50%) which was quite high.

In order to confirm what the teachers had reported a captured on table 33 about the frequency of assessment of their form four students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing, the study carried out documentary analysis of the students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing exercise books to check on the marked Kiswahili composition (Insha). The study sampled 10% or a minimum of 3 students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing exercise books from each of the 14 schools leaving out
school C1 and E1 which had already dropped out of the study. The study focused on the number of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) which the students had written and had been marked by their teachers in the whole of the previous term. The pretest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing were also used so as to determine whether there was any relationship between the frequency of the Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) assessment and students’ pretest performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing. The results of the frequency of assessment from documentary analysis are indicated in table 35.

**Table 35: Marked Students’ Kiswahili Compositions (*Insha*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>School Codes</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Sampled <em>Insha</em> exercise books</th>
<th>Frequency of <em>Insha</em> given per term</th>
<th>Pre Test Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35 shows the results of the frequency of assessment of students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) as obtained from documentary analysis of students’ sampled exercise books. Table 34 shows the numbers of sampled exercise books from every school, the number of marked Kiswahili compositions (Insha) which were identified from the sampled exercise books for every school and the pretest mean score of each school. The results on Table 34 show that the schools which had three assessments per term, which translated to once per month, were 6 (42.90%) schools and they were three schools from experimental group and three from control group. Those which had two assessments per term were 4 (28.57%) schools and they were three schools from experimental group and one school from control group, while those which had one assessment per term were 4 (28.57%) schools which were one school from experimental group and three schools from control group. The results on Table 34 also show that the schools which had given their students one Kiswahili composition (Insha) per term were those which had high numbers of students, like B2 with 68 students, D2 with 71 students and E4 with 55 students except A1 which had 40 students.

Though more teachers had indicated more frequent assessment on Table 33, this had covered the formative evaluation during the teaching of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing and the actually marked ones which are indicated on Table 35. In analyzing the frequency of assessment of students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) the study considered using the results obtained from documentary analysis for the marked students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) since they were regarded to be more authentic, having been obtained from tangible documents. These results were used to find out whether by designing frequent assessment teachers were able to influence students’
performance in their pretest Kiswahili compositions (Insha). The influence of the frequency of assessment was determined by comparing the overall mean scores of the schools with the frequencies of assessment.

Table 35, shows that the teachers who had given 3 assessments in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing per term were from schools B1, E2 and F1 in the experimental group and schools C2, F2 and G2 in the control group. The pretest mean scores of these schools were: 9.28, 10.52, 8.90, 9.10, 9.29 and 9.55 respectively and resulting to an overall pretest mean score of 9.44. The teachers who had given two assessments in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing per term were from schools A2, D1 and G1 in the experimental group and school E3 in the control group. The pretest mean scores of these schools were: 8.16, 8.37, 8.36 and 7.47 respectively, which resulted to an overall pretest mean score of 8.09. The teachers who had given one assessment in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing per term were from school B2 in the experimental group and schools A1, D2, and E4 in the control group. The pretest mean scores of these schools were: 8.36, 8.13, 6.72, and 8.33 respectively and their overall pretest mean score was 7.89. From these results it is evident that the schools which had more frequent assessment had higher scores than those which did not have frequent assessment. This is an indication that frequency of assessment influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The teachers who gave frequent assessment demonstrated the recommended Teacher pedagogical competencies in designing and using assessment techniques in teaching writing. These results, therefore, concur with the assertion by Graham and Perin (2007b) that frequency of assessment is important in determining the students’ performance in writing skills.
The study also sought the teacher views on whether the frequency of assessment in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills was related to improvement in students’ performance. The teacher views are indicated in table 36.

**Table 36: Frequency of Assessment in Insha Writing Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Insha writing skills improves students’ performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36, shows the responses of the teacher views on whether frequent assessment of students in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills was likely to improve their performance. The results on Table 35 shows that 9 (56.3%) teachers strongly agreed and 7 (43.7%) teachers agreed, which means all the 16 (100%) teachers agreed with the statement that frequent assessment. Although the teachers in this study were aware of the importance of the frequent assessment in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, the results of this study have shown that, 10 (62.50%) teachers, gave less than 3 assessments per term, in terms of the actual marked students’ Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*). It is possible that the teachers who had large numbers of students found it challenging to give frequent assessments, because of the marking involved, and that could have been the reason why they gave one assessment per term. However, there were schools which had fewer students, like school A1 with 40 students, yet the teacher
gave only one assessment per term and school A2 with only 15 students the teacher gave only 2 assessments per term. These results, therefore, show that in giving frequent assessment it requires teachers who are committed to it, and these are the teachers who have and practice pedagogical competencies in designing and using assessment techniques for Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing.

### 4.5.5.2 Factors to Consider in Designing Assessment Techniques for Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*)

In analyzing the factors which the teachers in this study considered for designing assessment techniques, this study focused on what Brown (2007) advocates, that the teachers need to consider what he refers to, as principles that serve as guidelines for the design of a good test or assessment. This study therefore sought to determine the Teacher pedagogical competencies in considering the relevant factors when designing an assessment technique for Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills for their form four students. The results of the factors considered by the teachers in designing an assessment technique are shown on Table 37.

**Table 37: Factors Considered by Teachers in Designing an Assessment Technique**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class control measures</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The usefulness of the feedback</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the study on Table 37 show that 15 (93.80%) teachers considered the usefulness of feedback, 11 (68.30%) teachers considered appropriate time for the students to do the test, 10 (62.50%) teachers considered that the test should be reliable, while those who considered validity of the test were 6 (37.50%) teachers. From these results the most important factor considered by the teachers was feedback and the least considered was validity. Although validity is an important factor in designing assessment techniques, because it ensures that the assessment tool is based on the content the learners have covered, the majority of the teachers in this study did not consider it to be important. However, all the factors indicated on Table 37, were important in designing assessment techniques. For further analysis of how factors for assessment technique could have influenced students’ performance in their pretest and posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing this study focused on the feedback factor. The reason for focusing more on the feedback factor was because it was possible to observe the use of feedback in the teaching of a Kiswahili composition (Insha) lesson for the posttest.

The effect of feedback, which is referred to by Brown (2007) as “wash back” is important for informing students about their strengths and weaknesses when the teachers assess their writing. The type of feedback the teachers give to their students, however, depends on the scoring scale the teacher uses. According to Coombe (2010), an important part of assessing writing has to do with choosing an appropriate scoring scale. This study therefore, sought to find out the methods used by the teachers to assess students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha). The teachers in this study, were therefore, asked to indicate the methods they used to assess their form four students’ competence.
in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. The results of the scoring scales which the teachers used are shown in table 38.

**Table 38: The Scoring Scales Teachers used to Assess Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring scales used</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic scoring scale or impression scale (<em>kukadiria</em>)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic scoring scale or detailed grade for each element (<em>uchanganuzi</em>)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary trait scoring scale; focus on one aspect of writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 shows that 8 (50.00%) teachers indicated that they used holistic scoring scale or impression scale. These teachers were from schools A2, B2, D1 and G1 in the experimental group and from schools D2, E1, E3, and E4 in the control group. The overall pretest mean score of these schools was 7.97. The teachers who used analytic scoring scale or detailed grade for each element were 5 (31.25%) and these teachers were from schools B1 and E2 in the experimental group and schools A1 C2 and G2 in the control group. The overall pretest mean score of these schools was 9.28. The teachers who used primary trait scoring scale, which focuses on one aspect of writing, were 3 (18.75%) and these teachers were from schools C1 and F1 in the experimental group and school F2 in the control group. The overall pretest mean score of these schools was 8.90. These results of the study depict that all the three scoring scales were used by the teachers in this study but the majority of them used holistic scoring scale or
impression scoring scale, followed by analytic scoring scale while the least preferred scoring scale was primary trait. When the students’ performance was analyzed in relation to the scoring scales used, the study results show that, the overall pretest means score of (7.97) for the schools which used holistic scoring scale was the lowest as compared to the higher overall pretest mean score of (9.28) for the schools which used analytic scoring scale.

Though holistic scoring scale was the one preferred by most teachers in this study, several disadvantages of this scale have been identified by some scholars. According to Heaton (1988), it can be unreliable if marking is done under short time constraints while Cohen (1994) states that, longer essays tend to be given higher marks and there is no diagnostic information on how those marks were awarded. Though the teachers in this study considered feedback as an important aspect, holistic scoring scale does not provide for that. This is because according to Hamp-Lyons (1991) the marking does not indicate the students’ ability and the marker tends to overlook the various sub-skills which make up writing and therefore not being able to provide the students’ strengths and weaknesses. The results of this study, therefore, confirm the shortcomings of the holistic scoring scale, since the pretest overall mean score of the schools which used this scale was lowest. It is therefore most likely that the use of this type of scoring scale influenced the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) during the pretest because it did not give them an appropriate feedback which could have helped them to detect their errors and correct them. The fact that the students were not able to identify their strengths and weaknesses it was not possible for them to make corrections and improve in their writing skills.
Further to the results from the teachers, on the scales they used for assessing students Kiswahili (Insha) writing skills, the study sought from the students whether their teachers indicated each and every mistake they made as they marked their Kiswahili (Insha) which could have implied use of analytic scale. The responses of the students indicated that 474 (89.30%) students reported that their teachers indicated each and every mistake as marked their Kiswahili compositions (Insha). Those who said no were 57 (10.7%) students who were 30 students from school D1 and 27 students from school B2. These results of the study show that, those who did not indicate each and every mistake were from schools B2 and D2 which had large numbers of students. The teachers in these two schools also indicated that they used holistic scoring scale. The students’ pretest performance in Kiswahili compositions (Insha) from these two schools was also low, that is B2 had a pretest mean score of 8.36 (41.85%) and D1 had a pretest mean score of 6.73 (33.65%) which could be an indication of the influence of teacher method of assessment.

Since according to most students, mistakes in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) were indicated by their teachers, it may imply that most of their teachers used analytic scoring scale, though from the teacher responses only 5 (31.25%) teachers indicated that they used it. In such a situation where the teachers and the students’ responses differed, it is most likely that, the teachers may have used holistic scoring scale when marking students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha), and then also indicated some mistakes even if they did not indicate all of them. The documentary analysis of the students’ marked Kiswahili compositions (Insha) actually confirmed that the teachers had only indicated a few mistakes; which was an indication that they used holistic and analytic.
4.5.5.3 Use of Feedback

From the feedback the teachers gave their students after assessing their Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*), this study sought to examine the way the teachers were using it prior to the students doing the pretest and during the teaching for posttest in order to establish its influence on the students’ performance in Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) writing. This study therefore sought to find out from the teachers the kind of feedback they gave to their students who did well and to those who did poorly after they had marked their Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*).

The results of the study revealed that; the teachers reported that, for the students who did well; they told them to reduce the common mistakes and continue writing as many Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) as possible because through writing they would enhance their speed and creativity. They also encouraged the students who did well, by material rewards and by positive comments such as: excellent, well done, marvelous, good and very good, keep it up or continue like that. For the students who did poorly, the teachers indicated that they gave the students comments such as; repeat the assignment can do better, put more effort, correct the mistakes, improve, pull up your socks, aim higher, keep on practicing, work hard, and you have the potential. In their feedback to both the students who did well and those who did poorly in their Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*), all the teachers from experimental and control groups also urged their students to correct their mistakes which the teachers indicated. Though this kind of feedback can be regarded as positive feedback, it was given after assessing students’ final product of writing. Graham and Perin (2007b) recommend that teachers are required to consider assessment as part of an on-going instructional programme so that
the students continuously get feedback during the process of learning writing in order to improve in their final writing product. This kind of assessment which is referred to as formative evaluation was not used by the teachers in this study and as a result, students’ pretest performance in Kiswahili compositions (Insha) writing was low.

Another way, by which the students could have benefited from the Teacher feedback, could have been; the teachers indicating the students’ mistakes which they had identified when marking their Kiswahili compositions (Insha) and then, devising ways of helping them to correct their mistakes. The study therefore sought to find out from the students how their teachers helped them to correct the mistakes in their Kiswahili compositions (Insha). The results of the students’ responses are on Table 39.

**Table 39: Correction of Students’ Mistakes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How teachers helped students correct their mistakes</th>
<th>Frequent percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Overall pre-test mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The teacher first punished the students and gave out another Insha.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The teacher discussed with the students their mistakes in class</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The teacher called the students individually and explained the areas to correct.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The teacher insisted that the students speak standard Kiswahili all the time and use the dictionary.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) The teacher encouraged the students to read Kiswahili books and practice writing Insha on their own.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) The teacher did not help the students to correct their Insha mistakes.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39 shows that 154 (29%) students from schools A1, D1, E4 and G1 indicated that, their teacher first punished them and then gave them another Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) to write. The overall pretest mean score of these schools was 8.30. The students who indicated that their teacher did not help them to correct their Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) mistakes were 134 (25.2%) from schools A2, B2 and D2. The overall pretest mean score of these schools was 7.75 and two of these schools; B2 and D2 were the same schools in which the teachers used holistic scoring scale and did not indicated each and every mistake in the students’ marked Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*). Those who indicated that their teacher came to class with their marked Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) and discussed their mistakes with them were 112 (21.1%) students from school B1, C2 and F2. The overall pretest mean score of these schools was 9.22. The students who indicated that their teacher called them individually, and explained to them the areas to correct were 58 (10.9%) and they were from schools E2 and G2. The overall pretest mean score for these schools was 9.94. Those students who indicated that their teacher insisted that they speak standard Kiswahili all the time and use the dictionary were 37 (7.00%) and they were from schools E3 and E1. The overall pretest mean score for these schools was 7.74. The students who indicated that their teacher encouraged them to read Kiswahili books and write Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) on their own were 36 (6.8%) students, who were from schools C1 and D1. The overall pretest mean score for these 2 schools was 8.45.
From the results of the students’ pretest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing, in relation to the use of feedback it was evident that teachers who called their students individually, and explained to them the areas to correct had the best pretest overall mean score of 9.94 followed by those teachers who came to class with the students marked Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) and discussed their mistakes with them who had a pretest overall mean score of 9.22. The study therefore established that these were better ways the teachers could use to help their students to correct their mistakes and thereby benefit from the teacher feedback so as to improve in their Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) writing skills.

The students’ responses on how their teachers helped them to correct their mistakes can be referred to as corrective feedback because the teachers aimed at helping their students to improve in their Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) writing skills. Research has also shown that corrective feedback is important, though; Mollestam and Hu (2016) suggest that it should be used cautiously. In a study they carried out in Lund, Sweden, the results revealed that the teachers believed that corrective feedback was an important part of language learning, but it should be adapted to each individual’s needs. The results of the current study concur with these research findings since the teachers in this study who called their students individually and explained to them the areas to correct, attended to their individual needs as per the research findings and they had the best overall pretest mean score of 9.94. This was followed by the teachers who came to class with the students’ marked Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*) and discussed their mistakes with them, who had an overall pretest mean score of 9.22. By discussing the students’ errors in class, it provided an opportunity for the students to correct each other’s errors.
and their own as they interacted with each other. The results of this study concur with findings of studies which have established that peer correction has a positive impact on the quality of students’ writing (Villamil and de Guerrero 1998, Berg 1999).

Some methods used by some teachers in this study to help students to correct their marked Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were appropriate and resulted to better performance during the pretest. Other methods however were not effective like the method of; teacher first punished the students and gave out another Kiswahili compositions (Insha) were unlikely to motivate the students to write. The study by Mollestam and Hu (2016) also indicated that corrective feedback had a negative effect on learners’ motivation to write if it was not used well.

Other methods used by teachers in this study for corrective feedback which were also not very effective, since they also resulted to low performance, were such as: the one whereby the teacher insisted that the students speak standard Kiswahili all the time and use the dictionary, and the one where the teacher encouraged the students to read Kiswahili books and to write Kiswahili compositions (Insha) on their own. In this study these methods of assessment were not effective as indicated by the low pretest performance. This is because these corrective feedback methods were too general and they did not address specific students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) writing problems nor did they lead the students through the process of learning writing skills in a way that they could have developed their interests in writing. Furthermore, when the teachers first punished their students and then gave them another Kiswahili composition (Insha) to write, they made their students to perceive writing as a boring and an unpleasant activity in which the students were not motivated to take part. These results of the study
therefore show that Teacher corrective feedback is necessary and it influences students’
performance in writing skills but it has to be used appropriately otherwise if not,
students will not be motivated to write. In this study most of the teachers did not use
corrective feedback appropriately, and that is why the students in this study performed
poorly during the pretest.

In trying to establish further, the influence of assessment techniques on students’
performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, the study analyzed the
results of the observation schedule on teacher assessment techniques during the
教学 of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing lesson for posttest, in both control
group and experimental group. For the control group, the results of the observation
indicated that all the 7 teachers, did not correct any errors of students during the lesson
because the students were not involved in any interactive activities but rather the
teacher dominated the communication. The only assessment which the teachers in the
control group focused on was summative evaluation of the students’ written Kiswahili
composition (Insha), which were handed in, at the end of the lesson for marking.
Though this kind of assessment technique is necessary for feedback, of the end product
of writing, it did not provide the students with an opportunity to identify and correct
their errors before the final product of writing.

The 7 teachers in the experimental group were required to follow the guidelines
provided in the intervention module on how to design the assessment of Kiswahili
composition writing during the teaching of the posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha)
topic. The assessment techniques which the teachers in the experimental group used
indicated that the teachers considered assessment as part of an on-going instructional process and involved students in the assessment process in the following ways:

In a whole class discussion, the teachers in the experimental group were able to guide the students in identifying and correcting each other’s errors as they answered questions orally. Some of the errors identified during whole class interaction included errors in pronunciation, for example in school B2 a student said “Sule etu” instead of “Shule yetu” (Our school) and grammatical errors such as: “Shule hiki ni chetu” instead of “Shule hii ni yetu.” (This is our school) as observed in school G2, were corrected instantly. The teacher, at first, asked the students to identify these errors from each other and provide the correction immediately. These teachers also explained to the students the assessment criteria for assessing each other’s’ first draft of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing, in which the teachers emphasized aspects such as content, vocabulary, grammar and spelling. The students were required to focus on these aspects in their group activities and as they assessed each other’s drafts in the process of preparing to write their final Kiswahili composition (Insha).

The students, in the experimental group were organized into groups of 5 students, where they discussed and outlined the main content points together, identified and corrected each other’s errors as they interacted orally and read each other’s first drafts of the posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha) which they had exchanged among themselves. The teacher also monitored group activities and provided corrections of the students’ work where they needed it. These activities of assessing students, as they engaged in the learning process of writing concurs with the suggestion by Gathumbi and Masebe (2005) who state that, during the writing tasks, the teacher should monitor the learners’
interactive activities, and where necessary correct and advise on the spot. This type of correction is referred to as formative evaluation or feedback.

Graham and Perin (2007b) also suggest that, assessing students’ writing should not be limited to teachers but it is also useful to have students assess their own writing progress. Studies which were carried out by Villamil & de Guerrero (1998), on students assessing their own work or by peers, have indicated that, it provides an opportunity for students to improve in their writing skills. This study results concur with these findings since the students in the experimental group whose teachers had used assessment as an instructional process and involved the students in peer assessment had a better posttest overall mean score of 10.52 (52.6%) as compared to the overall posttest mean score of 9.18 (45.92%) for the control group. The students in the experimental group performed better in the posttest because they performed better in the content and had fewer grammatical and spelling errors which could be attributed to peer formative evaluation done during the process of learning writing Kiswahili composition writing skills.

In terms of seeking to involve the students more in the assessment, the study sought to find out from both the teachers and students whether sharing the assessment criteria with students was likely to improve students’ performance. The responses of the teachers are presented in table 39 and those of the students in table 40.
Table 40: Teachers’ Views on Sharing with the Students the Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sharing the assessment criteria with students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40 which shows teacher responses on the statement that; “sharing the assessment criteria with students is likely to improve students’ performance”; indicates that 8 (50%) teachers agreed, 7 (43.8%) teachers strongly agreed and only 1 (6.3%) teacher was uncertain. That means almost all the teachers except one accepted that sharing the assessment criteria was one way of improving students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. In addition to the teacher responses on their views about sharing the assessment criteria with the students the study sought the students’ views on the same and they are presented on table 41.

Table 41: Students’ Views on Teachers Sharing the Assessment Criteria with Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will improve in Kiswahili Insha writing if teachers share the assessment criteria with students.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the results on Table 40 on, whether students would improve in Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) writing skills if before writing the teacher explained to the students how their Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) would be marked and marks allocated, 246 \((46.3\%)\) students strongly agreed, 159 \((29.9\%)\) agreed, 60 \((11.3\%)\) students disagreed, 44 \((8.3\%)\) strongly disagreed while 22 \((4.1\%)\) were uncertain. The results show that most of the students agreed with the statement which in total were 405 \((76.2\%)\) students as compared to 93.8\% teachers, and that means the students concurred with the teachers on the statement that: Students will improve in Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) writing if teachers share the assessment criteria with students. The results of this study therefore concur with similar research views reported in the Module of Centre for Open Education, Resources and Language Learning (COERLL) which established that, when giving feedback, it is more effective and leads to better performance in writing if it is based on previously shared evaluation criteria. (COERLL) further states that the grading criteria should be handed out when handing out the assignment.

**4.5.5.4 Keeping Assessment Records of Students’**

In investigating how the teachers kept assessment records of students’ performance in Kiswahili composition \((Insha)\) writing skills, the study results indicated that the teachers had recorded the students’ marks in a common subject progress mark book for the Department of Kiswahili, and only in very few schools, had the teachers saved the marks in the computer (E2 and B1). The marks were recorded as one combined Kiswahili mark which did not show separate marks for the three Kiswahili papers that is; Paper 1 \((Insha)\), Paper 2 Language \((Lugha)\) and Paper 3 Literature \((Fasihi)\). The
marks for every Kiswahili examination which the students had done, whether mid-term or end-term examinations, were all recorded in the common departmental mark book.

In analyzing students’ marked Kiswahili compositions (Insha) from a sample of 10% of the students’ exercise books, the results indicated that there were very few Kiswahili compositions (Insha) which the students had written; at most they were three in a term. In some schools’ students had separate Kiswahili compositions (Insha) writing exercise books from the one for language (lugha) and another one for Kiswahili literature (Fasihi) but in some schools there was no separate exercise book. This could have been an indication of either the book was not available or not used often. The students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha) had been marked by the teachers using the holistic scoring scale with a few mistakes highlighted and the marks indicated out of 20. These marks were however not recorded anywhere separately. The Kiswahili teachers in this study did not have their own personal records which indicated specific marks for Kiswahili composition (Insha). It was therefore not possible for the Kiswahili teachers to authentically track students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing alone and devise ways of assisting those who had problems in it.

As much as the Kiswahili teachers in this study had some assessment records, they did not consider keeping their own separate Kiswahili composition (Insha) assessment records which would have enabled them to monitor their students’ strengths and weaknesses in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. Maxim and Lee (1997) assert that effective and continuous assessment record keeping is the core of best teaching and learning practices. They further suggest that teachers need to create their own systems of keeping assessment records to fit the environment they teach which
may be different in every classroom. The results from this study do not concur with this suggestion and that means the Kiswahili teachers were not able to plan and organize their teaching so as to create a conducive learning environment for each student during the teaching of Kiswahili composition (Insha) lessons and thereby improve their students’ Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills was unlikely to improve without having any records of Kiswahili composition (Insha) scores and that means teacher pedagogical competencies in design of assessment techniques had an influence on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills by contributing to the students’ low mean scores.

Records of past KCSE examination results were however well kept in all schools as received from the Kenya National Examination Council. The students’ Kiswahili marks were provided as a whole one mark which combined the three Kiswahili papers, and that means it was not possible to tell how a student performed in each paper; more so in Kiswahili composition (Insha) paper. The teachers can, however, benefit from the KNEC Reports prepared and released for every KCSE examination results, because these reports provide an analysis of how the students performed in each Kiswahili paper.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research. The summary of the study highlights the findings of the study on the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). From the summary of the research findings conclusions are drawn and from the conclusions the recommendations emerge.

5.2 Summary

The purpose of the study was to investigate how teacher pedagogical competencies influenced students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili in Kenya’s public secondary schools. The writing skills the study focused on were Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills among the form four candidates. The specific objectives of the study, which were derived from the pedagogical competencies in this study were, to:- establish the influence of teachers’ pedagogical competencies in: planning for teaching, teaching methods, use of learning resources, classroom management and design and use of assessment techniques. In order to establish how the teachers’ pedagogical competencies, influenced the students’ performance in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills the study used the following instruments to collect data; students pretest and posttest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (Insha), teachers’
questionnaire, students’ questionnaire, observational schedule documentary analysis and an intervention module which was used by the teachers in the experimental group.

The results of the study on the students’ performance in their Kiswahili compositions (Insha) indicated that the overall pretest mean scores for the schools in both the experimental group and control group were generally low and there was no significant difference between the two groups. The low overall pretest mean scores for the two groups was an indication that, these students had not mastered writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The marking of the students’ pretest Kiswahili compositions (Insha), which was done by using analytical scoring scale, indicated that, students had various errors in all elements of writing in their Kiswahili compositions (Insha) such as:- insufficient content which resulted to inadequate length, lack of cohesion and organizational skills, insufficient vocabulary, errors in grammar and spelling and some had not even mastered the basic skill of handwriting, such that there were some Kiswahili compositions (Insha) which were illegible from some students. All these writing errors were found among these students despite these students having been taught by teachers who were academically and professionally qualified, and who, also had sufficient experience in teaching Kiswahili. It was therefore expected that these teachers had knowledge and skills in all the pedagogical competencies from their training. The study therefore, sought to find out whether the teachers’ pedagogical competencies had influenced the students’ pretest performance in their writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).
The posttest results of the students in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing showed that, the overall posttest mean score for the experimental group was also higher than that of the control group. These results showed that, there was a significant difference between the overall posttest mean score and the overall pretest mean score and between the overall posttest mean scores of the experimental group and control group.

These results showed that, there was an improvement of the students’ posttest means scores in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The improvement of students’ performance in their posttest mean scores, for both experimental and the control groups was due to the teaching of the posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic before the students wrote on it. The students in the experimental group however, had a higher overall posttest mean score than the control group because they taught using the process-oriented approach unlike the teachers in the control group who used the conventional method which was like the product-oriented-approach.

Due to these significant differences these results therefore reject the main hypothesis of this study which was: Ho There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili compositions (Insha), when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in teaching them and accept the alternative hypothesis that: There is a significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili compositions (Insha) when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in teaching them.
In analyzing the results of the study on the influence of the teacher pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills, the focus of the study was to test the main hypothesis of the study which was: *There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in teaching them.*

In the first objective, the study was to establish how the teachers’ pedagogical competencies in planning for teaching influenced students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). In analyzing the results of this first objective the focus was on how the teachers used the following documents for planning to teach which were; syllabus, schemes of work and a lesson for planning to teach.

The results of the study indicated that most of the teachers in the study had used the two Kiswahili syllabuses; one prepared by KIE (2002) and a few teachers had used the one by KNEC (2016) and most of them had prepared their schemes of work for teaching Kiswahili. The teachers who had indicated that they did not use the syllabus were the same ones who had not prepared schemes of work and the performance of their students in pretest was lower than those who had used the syllabus and had prepared the schemes of work. The study results also established that the teachers who had prepared schemes of work, had planned indicated very few lessons for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills which did not provide sufficient frequency of learning writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The study results further established that the schools where the teachers had prepared more lessons in their schemes of work for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) had better overall pretest mean
scores than the schools where the teachers had not prepared any schemes of work. The study results, therefore, showed that preparation of more frequent Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing lessons in the schemes of work was likely to improve the students’ performance.

The study results on the teachers’ preparation of the lesson plan indicated that the number of teachers who reported that they did not prepare the lesson plans for teaching writing skills Kiswahili composition Insha was higher than the one which had been indicated for the syllabus and schemes of work. The results from documentary analysis also indicated that all the teachers in the study had not been preparing lesson plans for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). These results show that the lesson plan preparation for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills was the most neglected aspect of planning and yet it is the most important.

The importance of the lesson plan was indicated by the study results which showed that, the overall pretest mean score of the schools where the teachers reported that they had used the lesson plan to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills was higher than where the teachers reported that they did not use the lesson plan. Furthermore the posttest mean scores were higher when all the teachers in both experimental and control groups had prepared lesson plans to teach the posttest Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic.
The results of the study also indicated that the schools in the experimental group had better posttest scores than the control group, which can also be attributed to the way the teachers in this group prepared their lesson plans. The lesson plans for the teachers in the experimental group had been prepared from similar well prepared schemes of work to teach writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) in a double lesson of eighty minutes. The lesson plan which was prepared to teach writing as a process, outlined the content in logical steps and had indicated all the requirements for all the sections. A well prepared lesson plan was very significant in planning to teach since it provided for all the other pedagogical competencies of this study which are part of the components of the instructional model of Gerlach and Ely (1980). The lesson plans which had been prepared by the teachers in the control group had sketchy content, and was even lacking in some of them. They also indicated about 20 minutes of teaching and the remaining time to be used for writing the composition.

The results of this study indicated that though the teachers in this study were well trained and, therefore, had been equipped with the pedagogical knowledge for planning to teach, they did not all show the commitment to demonstrate their pedagogical competencies in using the documents for planning to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills and therefore they contributed to the low performance in the pretest. However, when planning was improved the students’ performance also improved.
The results of this study indicate that, teachers’ pedagogical competencies in planning to teach influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. These results therefore reject the hypothesis of this study which was: Ho- There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in planning to teach them, and accept the alternative hypothesis that: There is a significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili compositions (Insha) writing when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in planning to teach them.

In the second objective, the study was to determine the influence of teachers’ pedagogical competencies in teaching methods on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The study focused on the pretest and posttest mean scores, of both experimental and control groups in relation to the methods the teachers used to teach Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

The results of the study on the methods used by the teachers in this study indicated that teachers used various methods for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The most popular methods were: “Give students a topic and the students write on it”, followed by “Teacher gives a brief explanation about the topic before the students write on it” while the least popular was group discussion method. The methods which the teachers in this study reported to have been using for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills were not methods of teaching but rather methods of assigning students to write their Kiswahili compositions (Insha) without teaching them. This means that the teachers in this study used product oriented approach which focused only on the product of writing rather than on the process of teaching writing. Since use
of product oriented approach in teaching is not capable of helping learners to develop writing skills, this explains why the overall pretest mean scores were low.

The least preferred method by teachers in this study, which was group, discussion method has been demonstrated by studies to be an effective method of teaching writing skills and therefore was an appropriate method for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. The results of the study showed that the schools in which the teachers indicated that they had used group discussion method for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills had higher overall pretest mean score as compared to those schools which had used the other methods which were popular among the teachers in this study. The effectiveness of the group discussion method was also demonstrated by having better overall posttest mean score for experimental group which had used group discussion method, than the lower overall posttest mean score for the control group which had not used group discussion method.

During the teaching of Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic for the posttest, the experimental group which was guided by the intervention module used the process-oriented approach, which involved the use of group work. The control group used product oriented approach. In using process oriented approach the teachers in the experimental group involved the students in group activities of learning writing as a process which consisted of; generating ideas for the content of their Kiswahili compositions (Insha), preparing their first drafts, and correcting each other’s’ errors of the first draft of their Kiswahili compositions (Insha). This made learning of writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) learner-centered and thereby created more interest for students to learn. In using process oriented approach to teach writing skills
in Kiswahili composition (Insha) the teachers interacted with the students as they monitored their group activities. The results of the study indicated that, use of process oriented approach which involved group discussion, resulted to better performance in posttest mean score for the experimental group because the teachers were committed to leading the students in the process of learning writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) rather than focusing only on them producing writing works.

The results of this study showed that teachers’ pedagogical competencies in teaching methods influenced the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. These results also reject the hypothesis of this study which was: $\text{Ho- There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in teaching methods.}$ and accept the alternative hypothesis that: $\text{There is a significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in teaching methods.}$

In the third objective, the study was to examine the influence of the teachers’ pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The study focused on the availability of the resources and textbooks and their influence on the pretest and posttest mean scores of the experimental and control groups. The results of the study indicated the following:-

The results of this study established that all the schools in this study did not have any other teaching and learning resources except the chalkboard. The textbooks were also very few especially for the students. This situation was clear evidence that, the teachers
In this study, teachers could not exercise their pedagogical competencies adequately in the use of learning resources since they were not available, and the textbooks were available but not enough thereby resulting in low students’ performance in their pretest Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.

In trying to establish how teachers’ pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources influenced the posttest results, the study results from observation indicated that all the teachers in the experimental group followed the guidelines provided in the intervention module. Thus, these teachers used the chalkboard in a well-organized way while noting the main content of the lesson right from the introduction. These teachers also used the relevant textbooks written by Wamitila (2004), Wahiga and Kagwa (2005; 2010) or the extracts of these textbooks by giving their students to read during the lesson. In the second lesson, the students reported the features they had identified in the school environment which were part of describing their school. The teachers in the experimental group, therefore, used the school environment as a learning resource and involved the students in the use of learning resources. The results of the study established that the teachers in the experimental group demonstrated adequate pedagogical competencies in being committed to using the teaching and learning resources which were available, as instructed in the intervention module. Due to their pedagogical competencies in the use of teaching and learning resources, the teachers’ in the experimental group were able to influence the posttest results of their students so as to improve to a higher overall posttest mean score than the overall post-test mean score for the control group.
The results of the study from the observation of the teachers in the control group indicated that some teachers did not use the chalkboard to note down the content, but a few teachers used it. The teachers in these schools had a teacher’s copy of the relevant textbook, by Wahiga and Kagwa (2010) which they used to derive the content which was explained by the teacher only for about 10 minutes, without involving the students. These teachers also noted on the chalkboard the summary of the main points of the content of the Kiswahili composition (Insha) topic. The overall posttest mean score for the schools in the control group improved from the pretest but the improvement was higher for the experimental group. The higher overall posttest mean score improvement in the experimental group was an indication that teachers’ pedagogical competencies in the use of teaching and learning resources which was better than for the control group had an influence on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

The study results indicated that teachers’ pedagogical competencies in the use of teaching and learning resources influenced students’ performance in their posttest mean scores and therefore rejected the main hypothesis of this study which was: Ho- There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources, and accepted the alternative hypothesis that: There is a significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when their teachers use different pedagogical competencies in the use of learning resources.
In the fourth objective the study was to establish how the teachers’ pedagogical competencies in classroom management influenced the students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills in their pretest and posttest scores for the control and experimental groups. The study focused on how arrangement of the classroom in classroom management influenced students’ learning and performance.

The results of the study indicated that, students’ performance in their pretest mean scores varied as per the way the teachers had arranged their classrooms. Most of the teachers in this study preferred whole class arrangement in which the students did not perform well in their pretest as compared to those who had been arranged in groups of 3-5, though this was the least preferred classroom arrangement by teachers in this study. The results of this study showed that classroom arrangement influenced students’ pretest performance and was therefore one of the causes of the low pretest mean scores.

The study results showed that three schools which had classes that had large numbers of students were not spacious and therefore were not well arranged. These schools had low pretest mean scores which was an indication that lack of spacious classrooms could have also influenced teachers’ pedagogical competencies in arranging the classroom and in turn influenced students’ low performance in their pretest mean scores.

The results of the study on class control indicated that most of the students did not hand in their Kiswahili writing assignments on time, and a considerable number were not interested in learning writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). These problems were a reflection of teachers who did not have adequate pedagogical competencies for motivating their students so as to create interest in them to learn writing skills in
Kiswahili composition (*Insha*), thereby resulting to students’ low pretest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing.

In trying to find out how the teachers’ pedagogical competencies in classroom management influenced students’ performance in their posttest results, the study focused on how the teachers in the control group and experimental group managed their classrooms during the teaching of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing lesson, for the posttest. From the observation, the study results established that all the teachers, both in the experimental group and in the control group did not have any class control problems, among their students. These two groups however, arranged their classrooms differently. The teachers in the control group had arranged their students in whole class arrangement and as a result the students were only passive listeners since the teachers dominated the class activities as they explained to the students on how they were to write their Kiswahili compositions (*Insha*). In the experimental group the teachers had arranged their students in discussion groups of 5 students per group, as directed by the intervention module. The students in the experimental group were active as they engaged in group activities during the lesson which motivated them to show interest in what they were learning unlike the students in the control group. The teachers in the experimental group also had an opportunity to interact with their students as they monitored them in their groups, thereby motivating them more.

The results of this study established that, arranging students in groups for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills, was a more effective way of classroom management since it resulted in better students’ overall posttest mean scores in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing for the experimental group than for the control
group which had used whole class arrangement. These results of the study therefore rejected the hypothesis of this study which was: Ho - There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when taught by teachers of different pedagogical competencies in classroom management, and accepted the alternative hypothesis that; There is a significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when taught by teachers of different pedagogical competencies in classroom management.

In the fifth objective the study was to determine the influence of the teachers’ pedagogical competencies in design and use of assessment techniques on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The results of the study indicated that, most of the teachers in the study had reported that they assessed once per week and once every two weeks. However documentary analysis of students’ marked exercise books indicated that there were few marked students’ Kiswahili compositions (Insha), which was an indication that they did not give frequent assessments to their students in terms of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing. The study results also indicated that the schools which had only one students’ marked Kiswahili composition (Insha) per term were mainly those which had large numbers of students, though there was also one school which did not have a large number of students. The results of the study also indicated that, the schools which had fewer assessment also had lower overall pretest mean scores than those which assessed three times per term. These results explain why the pretest mean scores were low since most of the teachers were not assessing their students frequently. From these results which show that frequency of assessment was related to performance, it means that frequency of assessment in
Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing could have enabled the students to do better in their pretest performance. Since this was not done, it means that the teachers’ pedagogical competencies in design and assessment techniques influenced their students’ performance in their pretest mean scores of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.

The results of the study, on the factors which the teachers indicated to be important in designing assessment techniques, it was indicated that, most of the teachers considered the usefulness of the feedback. On the choice of a scoring scale more teachers chose holistic scoring scale than analytic scoring scale which could have given better feedback than holistic scoring scale. However since most students reported that their teachers indicate every mistake in their marked Kiswahili compositions (Insha) it could mean that, the teacher may have indicated a few mistakes even if they had used holistic scoring scale.

On the use of the teacher’s feedback, the results of the study indicated that, teachers’ feedback was important and the students benefited from it when the teachers used it appropriately. The results of the study indicated that the schools which had better pretest mean scores, were those where the teachers used the feedback to help the students to correct their mistakes. The importance of feedback in helping students to improve in their Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills was evident in the experimental group when teaching the posttest topic.
The teachers in the experimental group, who followed the guidelines of the intervention module on how to design and use assessment techniques, considered assessment as part of an on-going instructional process and therefore designed their assessment techniques to be used as formative evaluation, during the process of teaching and learning Kiswahili composition (Insha writing skills). The teachers explained to the students the assessment criteria which they were to use to assess each other’s first draft of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing in their groups. The teachers involved the students in identifying each other’s errors and emphasized to the students that, as they assessed each other’s writings they were to check the following aspects of writing: such as, content, vocabulary, grammar and spelling. This type of assessment, which was formative evaluation, provided an opportunity for students in the experimental group to improve in their writing skills before writing the final product and therefore performed better in their overall posttest mean score. These results are an indication that students acquired better writing skills by using this assessment technique and the end product of writing was better. The teachers in this group therefore, applied these pedagogical competencies in designing assessment techniques which they used for assessing students’ Kiswahili composition writing in the process of learning writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

The results of the study for the control group indicated that the only assessment which the teachers in the control group focused on was summative evaluation of the students’ written Kiswahili compositions (Insha), which they handed in, at the end of the lesson to be marked by the teacher. Though this kind of assessment technique is necessary for providing the students with feedback from the teacher for the end product of writing, it
did not provide the students with an opportunity to identify and correct their errors during the process of teaching and learning of writing skills in Kiswahili compositions (Insha). This was the reason why the overall posttest mean score for the control group did not improve as much as for the experimental group.

In keeping assessment records of students, the study established that the teachers had recorded students’ total Kiswahili marks in a common Kiswahili Departmental mark book without having a separate record of Kiswahili composition (Insha) marks or even a teacher’s record of those marks. Without any record of such marks it was difficult for the Kiswahili teachers to identify students who were weak in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing by referring to specific marks of a Kiswahili composition (Insha). It is possible that, this situation could have contributed to the low performance in pretest.

These results of the study indicated that teacher pedagogical competencies in design and assessment techniques had an influence on students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. These results of the study therefore rejected the hypothesis of this study which was: Ho - There is no significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when taught by teachers of different pedagogical competencies in design and use of assessment technics and accepted the alternative hypothesis that; There is a significant difference in the mean scores of students in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing when taught by teachers of different pedagogical competencies in design and use of assessment technics.
5.3 Conclusion

From the findings of the research, the following conclusions were drawn.

Teacher pedagogical competencies of planning to teach, methods of teaching, using resources for teaching and learning, classroom management and design and use of assessment techniques, which the study focused on, influenced students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) in secondary schools in Kenya. The effectiveness of these pedagogical competencies is however determined by teachers who do not only have the pedagogical knowledge, but also have the pedagogical skills and the commitment and motivation to apply these pedagogical competencies holistically. These pedagogical competencies complement each other and that means their effectiveness in determining performance is only realized when the teacher applies all the pedagogical competencies in teaching any one lesson. The influence of the teacher pedagogical competencies in this study was indicated in the following ways.

The study established that, though the majority of the teachers had used the Kiswahili syllabuses of KIE and KNEC to prepare their schemes of work for teaching Kiswahili planning for teaching writings skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) was not given much attention. This was indicated by having very few lessons in the schemes of work for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing and also teachers in this study not showing any evidence of prepared lesson plans for teaching writings skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). The study showed that teacher pedagogical competencies in planning to teach influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing because students’ pretest scores were low where teachers did not use the syllabus to scheme, did not prepare schemes of work or had prepared very few lessons
and did not prepare lesson plans. Students’ posttest performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing improved even more when teachers prepared lesson plans which focused on teaching writing as a process. The study was able to show that, though the lesson plan is the most neglected document for planning to teach it is the most effective in influencing students’ performance.

On the methods of teaching the study showed that students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing was low because of the teachers using the conventional method which was teacher-centered and typically of product–oriented approach. Students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing improved when the students were taught writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha), using group work in a process-oriented approach which was learner-centered. Using this approach resulted to students being more intrinsically motivated to learn writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha). The use of this approach however requires teachers who are committed and are intrinsically motivated, because it is more involving and requires the teacher to put in more time in planning and the actual teaching and learning process.

In using learning resources for teaching writings skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha), the study showed that students’ performance was low where teachers did not have the teacher pedagogical competencies to identify, acquire, make, improvise and use the appropriate resource materials and textbooks. The learning resources and textbooks were also not sufficient in most schools, making it difficult for teachers to practice their pedagogical competencies effectively in the use of resources. Students’ performance improved where the teachers had the initiative and commitment to identify, acquire and use the available learning resources and textbooks effectively.
during the process of teaching and learning writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*).

In the teacher pedagogical competencies in classroom management, the study showed that the teachers influenced students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills by the way they arranged their classrooms when teaching. Whole class arrangement was not effective for teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) especially where it was teacher centered, resulting to low scores because the students were not actively engaged in the learning process and were not motivated to finish their writing assignments. The arrangement of students in groups of 5 for the process-oriented approach was more effective and resulted to an improvement of students’ performance. This is because in this classroom arrangement the students were actively engaged in the learning process and were, therefore, motivated to learn writing skills in Kiswahili composition writing.

On the influence of teacher pedagogical competencies in design and use of assessment techniques this study indicated that students’ low performance in their Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) was due to teachers using holistic scoring scale, focusing on summative evaluation, and not using teacher’ feedback appropriately. The study was able to show that students’ performance improved when teachers used assessment as a learning process, involved the teacher and learners in peer assessment, used analytical scoring scale and used teacher feedback to correct students’ errors.
The study finally concludes that the pedagogical competencies which this study focused on influenced students’ performance because they were important for teaching and learning of writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*). These pedagogical competencies are derived from the Instructional Systems Model of Gerlach and Ely (1980) which illustrates fundamental principles of teaching and learning. This study was able to show that where teachers did not apply the pedagogical competencies adequately the students’ performance was low. The positive influence of the pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*), was determined by teachers who did not only have the pedagogical knowledge, but also had the pedagogical skills and the commitment and motivation to apply the pedagogical competencies holistically in a process-oriented approach. These pedagogical competencies complement each other and that means their effectiveness in performance is only realized when the teacher applies all the pedagogical competencies holistically in teaching any one lesson.

**5.4 Recommendations**

From the findings of this study it was recommended that:

i) There was need for the Ministry of education to organize for an in-service for the Kiswahili teachers so as to equip them with the modern methods, of teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) using the process oriented approach. This would motivate the teachers to refine their pedagogical skills and apply them. This would also motivate the students.
ii) There was need for the head teachers of the schools, to work with the heads of department of Kiswahili to ensure that teachers were facilitated and monitored in applying the pedagogical competencies, when teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha) by providing them with the necessary facilities they require and time.

iii) There was need for the government, through the Kenya Library Services, to consider setting up more libraries in many parts of Kenya, with well stocked Kiswahili books which could be borrowed by the Kiswahili teachers for teaching and by their students for reading in order to improve in learning writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

iv) There was need for the Ministry of Education to consider increasing the number of lessons for Kiswahili to be eight like what has been allocated to English, instead of the current six for form three and four, since in the two languages there are three examination papers for the KCSE examination. This would provide time for the Kiswahili teachers to plan for more lessons of teaching writing skills in Kiswahili composition (Insha).

v) The Ministry of Education needed to ensure that schools followed the regulation of the maximum number of students in a class to be 45 so that a situation of congested classrooms which makes it difficult for teachers to practice their pedagogical competencies do not arise.
5.4.1 Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings of this study it was recommended that:

i. This study was carried out in Kenya, but other researchers can carry out a similar study in other regions where a second language is taught at any level.

ii. Researchers could carry out research on how teachers’ pedagogical competencies influence other aspects of language learning like grammar, comprehension and vocabulary acquisition.

iii. Research could also be conducted on the influence of teachers’ pedagogical competencies on students’ performance in other subjects in all secondary schools in Kenya including private schools.
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APPENDICIES

APPENDIX 1: A LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR, COUNTY EDUCATION.

.................................................................COUNTY

RE: CARRYING OUT RESEARCH IN YOUR COUNTY

I am a PhD student at the University of Nairobi conducting a research on the “Influence of Teacher Pedagogical competencies on Students’ Performance in Kiswahili Composition Writing Skills in Kenya’s Public Secondary Schools. The findings of this study are expected to help the Kiswahili Teachers come up with better methods of teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing and consequently improve the overall performance of Kiswahili. Your county has been randomly selected in the republic of Kenya to take part in this study.

The purpose of this letter is to kindly request you, as the head of county Education sector, to assist the researcher with a list of all the public secondary schools in this county and the analysis of the KCSE results of these schools for the last two years. This information will enable the researcher to purposively and randomly select two schools which will participate in this study. The information which will be received from you and that which will be collected from the selected schools in this county will be used purely for purposes of this study only and the respondents will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Attached please, find a copy of my Research Permit No: NACOSTI/P/15/30166/8199 Dated 15th October, 2015 .........................

Yours Faithfully,

Theresia Wakesho Kazungu

University of Nairobi
APPENDIX II A LETTER TO THE HEADTEACHER

THE PRINCIPAL,

SECONDARY SCHOOL

Dear Sir /Madam

RE: CARRYING OUT RESEARCH IN YOUR SCHOOL

I am a PhD student at the University of Nairobi conducting a research on the “Influence of Teacher pedagogical competencies on Students’ Performance in Kiswahili Composition Writing Skills in Kenya’s Public Secondary Schools.” The findings of this study are expected to help the Kiswahili Teachers come up with better methods of teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing and consequently improve the overall performance of Kiswahili. Your school has been randomly selected in this county to take part in this study.

The purpose of this letter is to kindly request you, as the head of your school, to assist the researcher and the research assistants by linking them to the Kiswahili teacher of the 2016 form four class so as to collect the required data. The information which will be collected for this study will be through the Kiswahili teacher’s and students’ questionnaire, students doing a pretest and a posttest of writing a Kiswahili composition (Insha), an analysis of the documents used for planning to teach Kiswahili and an observation of Kiswahili lessons. All the information which be collected during the study will be used purely for purposes of this study only, and the respondents will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Attached please, find a copy of my Research Permit No: NACOSTI/P/15/30166/8199 Dated15th October, 2015 ………………………………………

Yours Faithfully,

Theresia Wakesho Kazungu
APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KISWAHILI TEACHERS

Kindly respond to the following items which are for data collection in the teaching of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills. Your responses will be highly appreciated and will be used for this study only. They will also be treated with utmost confidentiality.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND DATA OF THE RESPONDENT AND STUDY.

1. Name of school…………………………………………………………………………..

3. Name of county………………………………………………………………………….

4. Your gender:  Male  Female

5. Your age  
   21 – 25
   26 – 30
   31– 35
   36 – 40
   Above 40

6. Indicate by a tick in the box your highest academic level:-

   i) Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education
   ii) Diploma in Education
   iii) Bachelor of Arts
   iv) Bachelor of Education (Arts)
   v) Any other…………………………………………………………………………

7. What is your highest professional qualification?
i) Untrained Teacher

ii) P1 Teacher

iii) Diploma in Education

iv) Bachelor of Education (Arts)

Any other………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8 State the last College or University you attended.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9) State the teaching subjects you specialized in.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Indicate your experience of teaching Kiswahili in years.

   i) 1-3 years

   ii) 4-6 years

   iii) 7-9 years

   iv) Above 10 years

11.a) Total number of students in the current form 4 Kiswahili class by gender

   Male _______________ Female _____________________

12. How many periods of Kiswahili do you teach per week in form IV? ……………

13. What other classes do you teach Kiswahili? …………………………………………

14 What is the total number of periods of Kiswahili do you teach per week? …………

15. What is the mean score of your form IV class in Kiswahili composition (Insha)?……..
16. What has been the cause of the above performance for your form four class in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION B:

Part I: Planning to Teach Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*) Writing Skills?

17. Which of the following documents have you been using when planning to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills? (Tick in the box)

i) KICD Kiswahili Syllabus  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

ii) KNEC Kiswahili Syllabus  
    Yes ☐  No ☐

iii) Schemes of Work  
     Yes ☐  No ☐

iv) Lesson Plan  
    Yes ☐  No ☐

Any other …………………………………………………………………………………

18. What aspects do you consider to be important when planning to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

19. Indicate (by ticking one) how often you plan to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

   Once per week ☐
   Once per 2 weeks ☐
   Once per month ☐
   Once per term ☐
20) Comment on your choice above

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

21) How much time do you plan to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

i) A single lesson of 40 minutes  

ii) A double lesson of 80 minutes

22) What problems do you encounter as you plan to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills to the form four class?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

23) How do you deal with the problems you face in planning to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills to the form four class?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Part II: Methods of Teaching Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*) Writing Skills.

24) Indicate (by a tick) whether you use the following language skills to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

i) Listening (*Kusikiliza*)  

ii) Speaking (*Kuzungumza*)  

iii) Reading (*Kusoma*)  
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25) Indicate (by a tick) whether you use the following methods when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

i) Group discussion
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

ii) Give students a topic and they write on it.
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

iii) The teacher gives a brief explanation about the topic before the students write on it.
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

iv) Students choose their own topic and write a Kiswahili composition (Insha) on it.
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

v) Any other …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

26) What steps do you follow when teaching your students Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

27) What problems do you encounter when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills to form four students?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

28) How do you deal with such problems?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Part III: Resources and Textbooks for Teaching Kiswahili Composition (Insha) Writing Skills.

29) What resources does your school have for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills?

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

30) List the Kiswahili textbooks you use for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

31) How do you identify the most relevant resources and textbooks for teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills?

a) Resources

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

b) Textbooks

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
31) Choose one item that indicates the situation in your form four class regarding textbooks and teaching/learning resources for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

a) Textbook

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Available but not enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Every student has a textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Resources

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Not available except chalkboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Available but not enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The school provides enough whenever required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32) How do you address the problems of insufficient or lack of textbooks and resources in your form four Kiswahili class?

a) Textbooks

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Ask the school to buy at least a teacher’s copy.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Borrow from a public library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Borrow from another school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Produce photocopies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Buy my personal copy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other........................................................................................................................................
b) Resources

i) Make use of what is in and within the school environment.  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

ii) The teacher to make resources  
    Yes ☐  No ☐

iii) Request the school to buy  
     Yes ☐  No ☐

iv) Ask the students to bring from home  
    Yes ☐  No ☐

v) Any other ..................................................

Part IV: Classroom Management in Teaching Kiswahili Writing Composition (Insha) Skills.

33) Indicate by a tick which one of the following ways you arrange your classroom when teaching your form four Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills?

i) Whole class teaching ☐

ii) Individualized learning ☐

iii) Groups of 9-11 ☐

iv) Groups of 6-8 ☐

v) Groups of 2 ☐

vi) Groups of 3-5 ☐

Any other  .................................................................................................

34) Tick the following to indicate the physical conditions of your form four classroom.

i) Spacious  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

ii) Has sufficient chairs and desks  
    Yes ☐  No ☐

iii) Has sufficient light  
     Yes ☐  No ☐

iv) Well-arranged  
    Yes ☐  No ☐
v) Well ventilated         Yes ☐  No ☐

vi) Any other

35) Do you experience the following class control problems among your form four students when teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

i) Inattentive students         Yes ☐  No ☐

ii) Uncooperative in group work.  Yes ☐  No ☐

iii) Make unnecessary noise in class  Yes ☐  No ☐

iv) Do not finish writing assignment on time  Yes ☐  No ☐

v) Not interested in learning  Yes ☐  No ☐

Any other discipline problem

36) What kind of control measures do you use to ensure that effective learning takes place when teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

i) Engage students in interactive activities.  Yes ☐  No ☐

ii) Supervise group work.  Yes ☐  No ☐

iii) Punish any undisciplined behavior.  Yes ☐  No ☐

iv) The teacher to be in class on time.  Yes ☐  No ☐

Any other
Part V: Designing Assessment Techniques in Teaching Kiswahili Composition (*Insha*) Writing Skills.

37) Indicate (tick one) how often do you assess your form four students in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

i) Once every week

ii) Once every two weeks

iii) Once per month

iv) Once per term

Any…………………………………………………………………………………………

38) Indicate by a tick whether you consider the following factors when designing an assessment for Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills for your form four class?

i) Appropriate time. Yes ☐ No ☐

ii) Validity. Yes ☐ No ☐

iii) Reliability Yes ☐ No ☐

v) The usefulness of the feedback. Yes ☐ No ☐

39) What kind of feedback do you give to the students who:-

i) Do well.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

ii) Do poorly.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………
40) Indicate by choosing one of the following methods which you use to assess your form four students’ competence in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

i) Holistic scoring scale or impression scale (*Mtindo wa kukadiria Insha nzima*)

ii) Analytic scoring scale or detailed grades for each element (*Mtindo wa uchanganuzi*)

iii) Primary trait scoring:-focusing on one aspect of writing.

41) How do you keep assessment records of students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills?

………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION C: KISWAHILI TEACHER’S OPINIONS

Kindly indicate your opinion on the following statements by putting a tick in the appropriate box of your choice. S.A stands for Strongly Agree, A for Agree, U for Uncertain D for Disagree and S.D for Strongly Disagree.

1. The Secondary Education Syllabus for Kiswahili provides the necessary guidelines for teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills.

   S.A   A   U   D   S.D

2. Teaching of Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills requires adequate planning in order to improve students’ performance.

   S.A   A   U   D   S.D

3. Group discussion is an effective method of teaching form four students Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing skills.

   S.A   A   U   D   S.D
4. Students have to be taught the four language skills as a prerequisite for their good performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

S.A □ A □ U □ D □ S.D □

5. Lack of teaching and learning resources has been a significant factor in contributing to the poor performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills in my school.

S.A □ A □ U □ D □ S.D □

6. Teacher’s competent class management skills are necessary for improving students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

S.A □ A □ U □ D □ S.D □

7. Frequent assessment of students Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills improves their performance in the same.

S.A □ A □ U □ D □ S.D □

8. When a teacher shares with students the assessment criteria for Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing before they write, it improves students’ performance.

S.A □ A □ U □ D □ S.D □

19. Teacher’s competence in teaching Kiswahili is a major factor that determines students’ performance in Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills.

S.A □ A □ U □ D □ S.D □

Thank you for your cooperation and willingness to respond to this questionnaire
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APPENDIX IV: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FORM FOUR STUDENTS

Kindly respond to the following items by filling the spaces, ticking in the box or by indicating your opinion in choosing S.A Strongly Agree, A Agree, Uncertain Disagree or Strongly Disagree. This data collection is for learning of Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills. Your responses will be highly appreciated and will be used for this study only. They will also be treated with utmost confidentiality.

1. Name of school…………………………………………………………………………………

2. Name of county…………………………………………………………………………………

3. Your gender: Male □ Female □

4. In a form four class we are taught Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing skills:
   i) Every week □
   ii) Once per two weeks □
   iii) Once per month. □
   iv) Once per term. □

5. The Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing lesson is taught in:
   i) A single lesson of 40 minutes. □
   ii) A double lesson of 80 minutes. □

6. Does your teacher use the following methods when teaching Kiswahili composition (Insha) writing.
   i) Group discussion Yes □ No □
   ii) Whole class discussion Yes □ No □
   ii) Read a passage about the topic Yes □ No □
   iv) The teacher gives a short explanation on the topic and then the students write the Kiswahili composition (Insha) Yes □ No □
v) Gives the topic for Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing and tells the students to write. Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Does your teacher always use standard Kiswahili (Kiswahili sanifu):
   i) In class while teaching Kiswahili Yes [ ] No [ ]
   ii) Out of Class while speaking Kiswahili Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. There are enough textbooks to teach Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing in form four.
   i) Strongly Agree [ ]
   ii) Agree [ ]
   iii) Uncertain [ ]
   iv) Disagree [ ]
   v) Strongly Disagree [ ]

9. When teaching Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing the teacher uses:-
   i) Chalkboard to write main points (*hoja muhimu*) of the Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) topic. Yes [ ] No [ ]
   ii) Other materials like pictures, charts and real objects. Yes [ ] No [ ]
10. Students will improve in their Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) writing if before writing the teacher explains the way it will be marked and marks allocated.

i) Strongly Agree □

ii) Agree □

iii) Uncertain □

iv) Disagree □

v) Strongly Disagree □

11. a) When the teacher marks your Kiswahili composition (*Insha*) does he/she indicate each and every mistake you make?

Yes □  No □

b) Choose one of the following methods your teacher uses in helping you to correct these mistakes.

i) The teacher firstpunishes the students and then gives out another *Insha* □

ii) The teacher discusses our mistakes with us together in class □

iii) The teacher calls us individually, and explains the areas to correct. □

iv) The teacher insists that we speak standard Kiswahili all the time and use the dictionary. □

v) The teacher encourages us to read Kiswahili books and practice writing (*Insha*) on our own. □

vi) The teacher did not help us to correct our *Insha* mistakes □

*Thank you for your cooperation and willingness to respond to this questionnaire*
APPENDIX V: OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

OBSERVING TEACHING OF A KISWAHILI COMPOSITION (INSHA) WRITING LESSON

NAME OF SCHOOL........................................................................................................

COUNTY ....................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

DATE........................... TIME.................................................................

TOPIC..............................................................................................................

SUB-TOPIC...........................................................................................................

OBJECTIVES:

.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
I Planning for Teaching
   a) The teacher has a planned lesson using
      i) Kiswahili KICD Syllabus,
      ii) Kiswahili KNEC Syllabus
      iii) Schemes of Work,
      iv) Lesson plan
      v) Lesson notes.
   b) The lesson planned has the following:-
      i) Sequence of objectives concurs with content outline
      ii) Learning activities for every step
      iii) Instructional resources are indicated.
      iv) Time is properly estimated for every step

II Methods of teaching/learning
   a) Introduction was:-
      i) Motivating
      ii) Reviewed a previous related lesson by questions
      iii) Related to learners experiences.
      iv) A preview of the topic by the teacher
   b) Lesson presentation was:-
      i) In a logical sequence
      ii) Appropriate methods e.g.
      -Teacher’s explanation were adequate.
      -Learners’ participated actively in:
      -appropriate learning activities
      -group discussions
      -whole class question and answer
      -individual activities of writing their compositions (Insha)
   c) Conclusion
      i) Teacher reviewed the lesson covered by:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspects to be observed</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Planning for Teaching</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) The teacher has a planned lesson using</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Kiswahili KICD Syllabus,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Kiswahili KNEC Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Schemes of Work,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) Lesson notes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) The lesson planned has the following:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Sequence of objectives concurs with content outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Learning activities for every step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Instructional resources are indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Time is properly estimated for every step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Methods of teaching/learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Introduction was:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Motivating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Reviewed a previous related lesson by questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Related to learners experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) A preview of the topic by the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Lesson presentation was:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) In a logical sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Appropriate methods e.g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher’s explanation were adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learners’ participated actively in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- appropriate learning activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- group discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- whole class question and answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- individual activities of writing their compositions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Insha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Teacher reviewed the lesson covered by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- questions
- summarizing the main points
ii) Gave appropriate assignment
iii) The objectives were achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>Use of Instructional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional resources used included:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Relevant text books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Well organized chalkboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Other resources such as:--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IV  | Classroom Management.          |
|     | i) The class is well organized |
|     | ii) There is adequate discipline control. |
|     | iii) Students are attentive.    |
|     | iv) Students’ responses are acknowledged |
|     | v) Teacher calls students by names |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>Designing Assessment Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Is the teacher able to identify the following learners’ verbal errors during verbal interaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Cohesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>How does the teacher correct learners' errors during oral discussion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>The teacher points out the errors and corrects them promptly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>The teacher asks students to identify each other’s’ errors and correct them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### iii) Other ways of correcting students’ errors:

| ……………………………………………………………… |
| ……………………………………………………………… |
| ……………………………………………………………… |

### c) What kind of feedback does the teacher give the students after marking their compositions (*Insha*)

- **i)** For the students who do well the teacher positively reinforces them in class
- **ii)** For the students who do not do well, the teacher guides them to correct their errors.

Any other

| ………………………………………………………………… |
| ………………………………………………………………… |

### d) The teacher has marked students’ compositions (*Insha*) and kept a record of marks.
# APPENDIX VI: DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS GUIDE

Name of School………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

County…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of document</th>
<th>Contents of the Document</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Kiswahili Syllabus (K.I.E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Kiswahili Syllabus (KNEC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Schemes of Work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Lesson Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Lesson Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Record of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Students’ Assessment Records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Students’ marked compositions</td>
<td>(Use a sample of 10% )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Records of past KCSE Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII: SCHEME OF WORK FORMAT (RATIBA YA MAFUNZO)

SOMO .................................. SHULE.................................

DARASA ................................. MUHULA.............................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIKI</th>
<th>SOMO</th>
<th>MADA KUU/NDOGO</th>
<th>SHABAHA</th>
<th>MAZOEZI YA/KUJIFUNZA</th>
<th>ASILIA/VIFA A (NYENZO)</th>
<th>MAONI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funzo la Insha ya maelezo lichukue vipindi viwili vya dakika 80 kwa kila wiki na lifunzwe kwa wiki mbili.

3.3 Tayarisha mpangilio wa funzo kutokana na ratiba utakaozingatia jedwali lifuatalo.
APPENDIX VIII: LESSON PLAN FORMAT (MPANGILIO WA FUNZO)

DARASA………………………… TAREHE…………………………
WAKATI………………………… IDADI YA WANAFUNZI ………………

SOMO…………………………………… MADAKUU…………………………
MADA NDOGO ……………………………

MUHULA ................................... WIKI .................................
FUNZO…………………………………………

SHABAHA………………………………………………………………………………
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUDA</th>
<th>MAFUNZO</th>
<th>MAZOEZI YA KUJIFUNZA</th>
<th>VIFAA/ASILIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX IX: PRE-TEST MARKING SCHEME

(MWONGOZO WA KUSAHIHISHA)

Topic: My life in secondary school. (Maisha Yangu Katika Shule ya Sekondari)

CONTENT (MAUDHUI)

Mwanafunzi ni lazima atambue Insha hii ni ya maelezo. Kwa hivyo mtindo wake uwe wa maelezo.
Mwanafunzilazima ajihusishe.Kwa hivyo lazima atumie nafsi ya kwanza “Maisha yangu.”
Mwanafunzi lazima atoe hoja zisizopungua 5 kuhusu maisha yake katika shule ya sekondari k.m:
Elimu
Maendeleo yake yalikuaje? Alikuwa anafanya bidii na kupata matokeo mazuri?
Shida za kupata matokeo mabaya ni zipi?
Mambo gani yalikuwa yanamfanya apate matokeo mazuri.
Chakula – Je lishe ilikuwa bora katika shule ya sekondari?
Mazingira yalimfaa kwa afya yake?
Uhusiano wake na walimu pamoja na wanafunzi n.k.
Vifaa katika shule viko vya kutosha na alivitumia vilivyo?
Msimamo wa mwanafunzi katika masomo yake.

Allocation of Marks for the Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Marks allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content (Maudhui)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (sarufi)</td>
<td>5 (-½ a mark for every mistake up to 10 mistakes = 5 marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>3 (-½ marks for every mistake up to 6 mistakes = 3 marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X: POSTTEST MARKING SCHEME (CONTENT)
(MWONGOZO WA KUSAHIHISHA (MAUDHUI)

Topic: My secondary school “Shule yangu ya sekondari”

CONTENT (MAUDHUI)

Hii ni Insha ya maelezo.

Mwanafunzi lazima aeleze shule yake kinagaubaga.

Mambo yafuatayo lazima yazingatiwe.

- Mahali ilipo na mipaka yake, k.m kaunti n.k.
- Jina la shule
- Ilianzwa lini na nani?
- Majengo yake yako vipi? K.m madarasa, afisi, maabara, na maktaba?
- Kuna wanafunzi wangapi katika shule hiyo?
- Kuna walimu na wafanyikazi wangapi?
- Sare yao iko vipi?
- Sheria za shule zinasemaje kwa kifupi?
- Wanafunzi wana nidhamu?
- Katika michezo shule yako ikoje?
- Katika mitihani ya kitaifa inafanyaje?
- Mnafanya kilimo chochote? Mna shamba la kulima?
- Mna magari ya shule n.k

TANBIHI – Yule ambaye ameandika juu yake mwenyewe basi amepotoka kimaudhui. Hivyo hatapita D+ (05).

Allocation of Marks for the Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Marks allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content (Maudhui)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (sarufi)</td>
<td>5 (-½ a mark for every mistake up to 10 mistakes = 5 marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>3 (-½ marks for every mistake up to 6 mistakes = 3 marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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