

An Evaluation of School Instructional Activities on Curriculum Implementation in Selected North Rift Counties Public Secondary Schools

Dr. William K. Chepkuto. & Prof. Julius G. Tanui

School of Education, Moi University, Kenya

Abstract: The quality of education in majority of North Rift secondary schools has been wanting over the last five years depicted by poor academic results in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. The objective of the study was to examine the influence of evaluation activities on curriculum implementation in selected North Rift counties public secondary schools. A pragmatic research paradigm utilising mixed method research methodology guided this study. Stratified random sampling technique was used to sample 10% of 3469 secondary schools in the region. Simple random sampling was used to select teachers from each of the 35 sampled schools making a total of 349 out of 3469 teachers in the selected counties. All the principals of sampled schools (35) were included in the study. Fourteen sub county quality assurance and standards officers were selected through purposive sampling method. Questionnaires and interview schedules were used to collect data from education officers, principals and teachers. Quantitative data was analysed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation, Pearson correlation and multiple regression statistics. Qualitative data was analysed using thematic analysis. The study found out that curriculum implementation was directly influenced by the school evaluation. However, all statistics were significant implying that to a moderate degree, utility of quality assurance and standards practice had significant influence on curriculum implementation in public secondary schools in the three counties. The research concluded that for curriculum to be effectively implemented, internal quality assurance and standards practices played a huge role. The study recommends that principals need to ensure they provide timely feedback on evaluation to teachers.

Key Words: Evaluation, Instructional, Curriculum, Implementation

I. INTRODUCTION

This sections looks at how QAS relates with curriculum implementation. The objectives of secondary schools education curriculum across many countries in the world are: to prepare students for useful living in the society and also for higher education (Ayeni, 2012). The realization of these objectives hinges on quality of teachers in terms of professional competencies, quality of inputs (instructional and infrastructural), teaching process, classroom management and students' academic assessment by the teachers. The utility of quality assurance and standards could have significant impact on curriculum implementation in schools (Eke & Chinweuba,

2012). The quality of teachers' instruction has significant impact on students' academic performance.

A research study conducted in Nigeria by Chidobi and Eze (2016) investigated the extent of utilization of Quality Assurance Handbook in the supervision of instruction in secondary schools. Descriptive survey design was employed. The quantitative data were collected through an 18-item questionnaire. The findings of the study revealed among others that both external and internal supervisors do not make adequate utilization of the Quality Assurance Handbook, in the supervision of instruction of secondary schools in Enugu State. The findings also revealed that some factors such as unawareness of the supervisors about the existence of the Handbook contributed to its non-utilization.

In Kenya, Ndaita (2013) examined the influence of the principals' instructional quality assurance role on students' academic performance in Kitui West District, Kenya. This study employed a mixed research design, which included survey and naturalistic designs. The study observed the following: the major pedagogical skills applied by principals to enhance teaching and learning and overall academic performance of students in public secondary schools in Kitui West District included constant monitoring of teachers and performing formative teacher pedagogical evaluation. The principals' curriculum implementation role that influenced students' academic performance included ensuring that the schools followed the prescribed syllabus; teachers prepared schemes of work and lesson plans, assessed textbooks and involved the members of school community in curriculum shaping. The above findings by Ndaita illustrate how internal quality assurance and standards practices are performed. The following sub-sections reviews theoretical and empirical literature on four quality assurance and standards areas and their influence on curriculum implementation in secondary schools

Statement of the Problem

Secondary school education is critical to the national development as students who transit from this stage of education go for higher education that specialises on different careers critical to national growth (Bardi, 2009). The performance of secondary school system is influenced by how

the quality of all areas - supervision, monitoring, maintenance and improvement and responsiveness to emerging needs are functioning (Wanzare, 2006). This, in turn, is influenced by the types of quality assurance and standards policies, procedures and activities that exist and how these are organized and implemented in practice. A contrasting feature is that emphasis in most Kenyan secondary schools including selected North Rift counties; West Pokot, Baringo and Elgeyo-Marakwet in particular has been on academic performance rather than full curriculum implementation (Muriithi, 2012; Ndaita, 2013; Onzere, 2015). This has seen majority of students joining higher education institutions incapable of competing with the demands of the job market (Wafula, 2010). Due to increased strikes by students in secondary schools, parents have expressed major concerns relating to mismanagement of schools and poor performance in national examinations. This state of affairs is affecting curriculum implementation in secondary schools in the study area. Scholars have been arguing that curriculum is not being implemented as envisaged leading to production of half-baked students who find it difficult to adjust to the demands of higher education (Ngware et al, 2012; Fungulupembe, 2014).

Objectives of the Study

To examine the influence of evaluation of school instructional activities on curriculum implementation in selected North Rift counties public secondary schools.

Research Hypothesis

H₀: There is no significant influence of evaluation of school instructional activities on curriculum implementation in secondary schools

Justification of the Study

It is no longer debatable though a matter of great concern that there is a decline in the quality of education delivery in Kenyan public secondary schools across the country. Consequently, the roots of quality of education emanate from quality of human and material resources available for teaching (inputs), quality of teaching and learning practices (process) and the quality of results (outcomes). Secondary schools have the responsibility of ensuring that they utilise quality assurance reports and procedures to ensure that curriculum is effectively implemented. Improving the quality of education is therefore a key concern for many schools and government and serves as one basis for education reforms in the country. This aspect made the researcher to determine how schools are utilising quality assurance assessment reports to ensure effective curriculum in their institutions.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study determined the utility of quality assurance in curriculum implementation in selected North Rift counties; West Pokot, Baringo and Elgeyo-Marakwet public secondary schools. To achieve the aim, this study used pragmatic lens as the theoretical stance, because of its usefulness in studying pluralistic research problems (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Pragmatists reject the idea of alignment to a single research paradigm. They recommend the use of 'what works best' in order to uncover the research problem and provide answers (Creswell, 2013). Pragmatism was used in this study as the paradigmatic partner for mixed methods approach because, pragmatism as a world view opens the door for multiple methods to be used together, accommodating diverse world views, allowing for differing forms of data collection, different categories and sources of data, and different forms of data analysis (Patton, 2002; Creswell, 2013). This paradigm helped in determining the types of questions to be asked, the selection of participants, how the data was collected, and how implications from the findings of this study would be interpreted.

The study utilised mixed method approach which combined the use of qualitative and quantitative research methods. According to Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2003), mixed methods approach is a methodology for conducting research which involves integration (or mixing) qualitative and quantitative data in a single study, the process which is done for the purpose of developing a better understanding of the research problem under investigation. The preference to use this approach was based on the premises that, the mixed methods approach; increases the construct validity of data as it allows corroboration of different sets of data to explain the research problem under study, addresses the offset of one methodology with the strengths of the other methodology and provides a far more comprehensive account of the research problem than when a single qualitative or quantitative approach is used.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Evaluation is an important part of providing quality education as it is one of the essential functions of effective schools to operate (Watsulu & Simatwa, 2011). To ensure curriculum goals are achieved, regular and constant evaluation of students and teachers is necessary as one of internal quality assurance and standard strategy by head teachers. Therefore, the objective of the study sought to determine the frequency at which school head teachers conducted evaluation and its impact on curriculum implementation. To answer the research question, the teachers were asked to indicate the frequency at which evaluation was done on their schools based on the following scale: never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4) and always (5). The results are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Teachers Responses on Head teachers' Role in School Evaluation

Statement	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD
i. Ensure that students assignments are marked by the teacher	8 (2.4%)	18 (5.4%)	64 (19.1%)	104 (31.0%)	141 (42.1%)	4.0507	1.02094
ii. Check examination files	7 (2.1%)	22 (6.6%)	53 (15.8%)	119 (35.5%)	134 (40.0%)	4.0478	1.00483
iii. Give feedback without discussing individual teachers' performance and is acceptable	14 (4.2%)	43 (12.8%)	97 (29.0%)	82 (24.5%)	99 (29.6%)	3.6239	1.15635
iv. Review the assessment information with teachers after KCSE exams	2 (0.6%)	4 (1.2%)	22 (6.6%)	64 (19.1%)	243 (72.5%)	4.6179	.71572
v. Give constructive and timely feedback after classroom observation	7 (2.1%)	31 (9.3%)	55 (16.4%)	109 (32.5%)	133 (39.7%)	3.9851	1.05950
vi. Check the progress records of students	3 (.9%)	18 (5.4%)	49 (14.6%)	89 (26.6%)	176 (52.5%)	4.2448	.95392
vii. Evaluate class and general school performance	0 (0%)	10 (3.0%)	38 (11.3%)	75 (22.4%)	212 (63.3%)	4.4597	.81013
viii. Conduct performance appraisal	3 (0.9%)	8 (2.4%)	27 (8.1%)	75 (22.4%)	222 (66.3%)	4.5075	.81478
ix. Check record of work covered	2 (0.6%)	5 (1.5%)	45 (13.4%)	90 (26.9%)	193 (57.6%)	4.3940	.81892
x. Ensure that students and teachers attend classes regularly	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.9%)	15 (4.5%)	30 (9.0%)	287 (85.7%)	4.7940	.55475
Composite scores						4.2725	0.89098

Source: Field Data (2017)

The results from Table 3.1 shows that 64 (19.1%) of respondents indicated that their principals sometimes ensured that students' assignments were marked, 104 (31.0%) indicated that they sometimes checked while 141 (42.1%) said that they always checked. The findings therefore show that most head teachers often ($M=4.05$ and $SD=1.02$) ensured that teachers marked student assignments in secondary schools. Nevertheless, the high standard deviation scores suggests that some head teachers did not regularly perform this role of ensuring that teachers mark students assignments. Amwayi and Wanjala (2015) indicated that this procedure was commonly tasked to heads of department.

Secondly, 134 (40.0%) of teachers admitted that their head teachers always checked examination files, 119 (35.5%) said that they often checked, 53 (15.8%) said they sometimes checked, 22 (6.6%) of head teachers rarely checked and 7 (2.1%) did not check. This shows that most head teachers often ($M=4.04$ and $SD=1.00$) looked at examinations files as part of evaluating the performance of students in secondary schools. However, some head teachers based on standard deviation values did not regularly check students examination files. Checking examination files helped to know whether curriculum implemented by teachers was achieving its objectives. In line with the study findings, Gichobi (2012) argued that head teacher should also ensure appropriate monitoring of student progress which entails continuous evaluation and feedback. This would lead to good performance linked to effective curriculum instruction management.

On whether principals gave feedback without discussing individual teachers performance, 14 (4.2%) said that they never, 43 (12.8%) said that they rarely do that, 97 (29.0%) indicated that they sometimes do, 82 (24.5%) often do and 99 (29.6%) always gave feedback. The computed statistics showed that most head teachers often ($M=1.15$ and $SD=1.15$) gave feedback often without discussing personal individual teacher performance. The high standard deviation scores suggested that in some schools, some head teachers discussed individual teachers' performance while others did not. This was in contrast to Musungu and Nasongo (2008) who established that to ensure that curriculum goals were achieved, head teachers conducted internal supervision of the development and implementation of schemes of work and lesson plans, checked assignments, records of work covered and discussed their observations and findings with teachers. The feedback assisted the teachers to identify areas of improvement for the purpose of effectively implementing the secondary school curriculum.

The research findings also showed that majority 243 (72.5%) of teachers said that principals in their schools reviewed assessment information with teachers after examinations. This finding was agreed by majority ($M=4.61$ and $SD=0.7$) of teachers as a common practice in schools. The result shows that head teachers and principals work together to review students' performance after examination to identify areas for improvement in schools. This finding is in agreement with Onzere (2015) who established that assessment reports ensured that quality and standards practices were upheld in the education sector in Kenya. Asked as to whether principals

gave constructive and timely feedback after classroom observation, 7 (2.1%) said that they never, 31 (9.3%) rarely gave, 55 (16.4%) sometimes gave, 109 (32.5%) often gave and 133 (39.7%) always gave.

The statistics showed that most head teachers often ($M=3.98$ and $SD=1.05$) gave feedback to their teachers after conducting classroom evaluation process. However, standard deviation values reveal that not all head teachers gave this feedback timely and this put teachers in a difficult situation not knowing the areas which need further improvement with regard to classroom teaching and learning. In agreement with the study findings, Werunga (2014) research found out that 70% of the head teachers who responded agreed that they had regular discussions with the teachers about job performance, 60 % agreed that they created an enabling environment for feedback, 60 % agreed that the teachers feel comfortable with the comments they give especially when the targets had not been achieved. 70 % agreed that they build consensus on the action plan to be implemented after appraisal and 60 % agreed that comments were made in a respectful manner that was constructive for feedback.

With regard to the degree to which principals checked students' progress records, 3 (0.9%) did not, 18 (5.4%) rarely checked, 49 (14.6%) sometimes checked, 89 (26.6%) often checked while majority 176 (52.5%) always checked progress records. The results therefore showed that majority of head teachers in secondary schools often ($M=4.24$ and $SD=0.95$) scrutinised progress records of students to ensure that they were progressing well in their studies in schools. In line with the study findings, Irungu (2013) established that the head teachers assessed learners' notebooks with 12% of the teachers sampled attesting to the head teachers not assessing the notebooks while 88% confirmed that the head teachers assessed the notebooks. The regular check-up of students' progress helped to know and identify students who have weaknesses so that corrective measures are taken to ensure that they improve and therefore enhancement of effective curriculum implementation in schools.

Results revealed that majority 212 (63.3%) of teachers agreed that their principals always evaluated class and general school performance. This statement was highly supported by majority of respondents ($M=4.45$ and $SD=0.81$). This implies that head teachers are not only concerned with the general school performance but also how classes (form 1 to 4) are performing. This initiative of quality assurance and standards practice helps to improve curriculum implementation in public secondary schools. The study findings are in agreement with Mburu (2016) majority of teachers in public primary schools in Thika West Sub-county always discussing exam results with their head teachers. This means that discussion of exam results is helpful in preparing student to tackle future exams, which in turns influences academic performance of schools.

On the frequency at which performance appraisal was conducted in schools, 3 (0.9%) said their principals did not, 8

(2.4%) said it was rarely done, 27 (8.1%) sometimes their heads conducted performance appraisal, 75 (22.45) often did and most 22 (66.3%) of heads regularly conducted performance appraisal in public secondary schools. This shows that most head teachers ($M=4.50$ and $SD=0.81$) are adhering to TSC requirements to be internal auditors of teacher performance appraisal process in secondary schools which helps to determine whether teachers projected achievements have been met or not. In line with the study results, Werunga (2014) results showed that teachers jointly with the head teacher set targets for achievement and performance appraisal interview is based on observation, assessment of ability, readiness and potential of the teacher. On the perception of teachers on performance appraisal feedback, the study established that majority of the teachers do not like being appraised.

On the extent to which principals checked records of work covered, most 193 (57.6%) said that they always checked and 90 (26.9%) said that they often checked. The descriptive statistics ($M=4.39$ and $SD=0.81$) revealed that most principals regularly checked the records of work covered by teachers to determine whether they were lagging behind in teaching or they were ahead. This is a critical practice of ensuring the curriculum is effectively implemented in secondary schools. In line with the study findings, Musungu and Nasongo (2008) research in Vihiga county found out that head teachers were involved in proper tuition and revision, thorough supervision of teachers' and pupils' work, proper testing policy, syllabus coverage, teacher induction courses and team building.

Lastly, majority 287 (85.7%) of respondents agreed that their school principals always ensured that students and teachers attended classes regularly. The mean statistics supported this view ($M=4.79$ and $SD=0.55$). The result therefore implied that head teachers undertook regular duty of ensuring that all students were in school and that no teachers missed their lessons. This practice was helpful in ensuring that the curriculum was effectively implemented in secondary schools.

Average statistics show that most teachers said that ($M=4.27$ and $SD=0.89$) their principals often conducted evaluation for ensuring the curriculum was implemented effectively in secondary schools. This implied that evaluation was a common practice in secondary schools. Moreover, the teachers were asked to give their perceptions on how they thought evaluation processes influenced curriculum implementation in schools. The results are presented in Table 3. 2.

Table 3.2 Teachers Perceptions on the Influence of Evaluation on Curriculum Implementation

Perceptions	Frequency	Percentage
Well done by both teachers and head teacher	69	20.6
It has led to professionalism among all stakeholders in teaching and learning process.	40	11.9

Led to performance improvement amongst students	49	14.6
Does not work in accordance to the codes and regulations of the commission	7	2.1
School ensures timely syllabus coverage	7	2.1
Fairly done	25	7.5
Good	55	16.4
Need to analyse KCSE and class examination results deeply	18	5.4
Constitute a lot in teacher performance or assessment	3	.9
Emphasis should be placed on understanding of the concept more than examination	3	.9
None response	59	17.6
Total	335	100.0

Source: Field Data (2017)

According to 69 (20.6%) of teachers, the process of evaluation was conducted well by teachers in public secondary schools in selected counties in North Rift region. The teachers also mentioned that the process of evaluation had led to professionalism among all stakeholders to ensure that teaching and learning process went smoothly. The teachers also indicated that as a result of effective evaluation, performance improvement amongst students had also been recorded in their schools. In tandem with the study findings, Onzere (2015) found out that systems for monitoring students' progress influenced the academic performance of students in secondary schools. From the study findings, it was clear that effective evaluation being an internal quality assurance and standard practice improved curriculum implementation in schools.

3.1 Principals' Perceptions on Influence of Evaluation on Curriculum Implementation

Through questions posed in the interview session, the principals were asked to indicate how evaluation was conducted in their schools and its influence on curriculum implementation. One principal said:

Departmental audits involving updates of the various professional tools, using more detailed and thorough documentation.

Another principal said they following:

Yes, CATS, rapid assessment tests, midterm exams, end term exams, end year exams and topical quizzes. It makes proper coverage and syllabus completion.

This showed that evaluation was important in ensure that the syllabus was covered according to the policy guidelines. In agreement with the finding, Mburu (2016) established that most head teachers in public primary schools in Thika West Sub-county sometimes ensured the completion of the syllabus. This indicated that these head teachers had realized the

importance of completion of syllabus in improving pupils' academic performance.

3.2 QASOs' Perceptions on the Influence of Evaluation on Curriculum Implementation

After getting head teachers' views, the study also sought Sub County QASOs' perceptions on how evaluation influenced curriculum implementation in schools. SC-QASOs indicated that:

Checking whether students have improved on their internal testing process whether there is value added either compared to their KCSE or previous examination. This influences the outcome of how the students have learnt and this will be an indication that the curriculum has been implemented or not.

The above responses showed that evaluation as a quality assurance and standard practice was normally carried out in secondary schools in the three counties under study. These activities helped to test the relevance of curriculum and also the effectiveness of teachers who implemented it. It also assisted students to know how weak they were in different subjects. On the teachers' side, it helped them to identify those students who needed close assistance in different subjects. It also helped students to know which future careers that they may undertake.

3.4 Hypothesis Testing

The research further examined the relationship that existed between evaluation procedures and curriculum implementation. The results are presented in Table 3. 3.

Table 3.3 Relationship between Evaluation Activities and Curriculum Implementation in Schools

		Evaluation	Curriculum implementation
Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	1	.540**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	335	335
Curriculum implementation	Pearson Correlation	.540**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	335	335
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: Field Data (2017)

The results showed that there existed significant positive relationship ($r=0.540$ and $p=0.001$) between principal's evaluation practices and curriculum implementation in schools. The result suggested that curriculum implementation succeeded in situations where effective evaluation procedures were done by head teachers in secondary schools.

IV. CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

The objective of the research sought to determine how evaluation process inside the school influenced curriculum implementation in the classroom. The evaluation is usually a formal process conducted in school setting to determine whether the planned objectives have been attained or not by those responsible. This research focused on the areas that evaluation was done in schools for the purpose of improving the curriculum implementation process. Bivariate correlation results computed showed that there existed a positive degree of association between evaluation practices and curriculum implementation. This implied that as a result of efforts made by principals to increasing evaluation and assessment activities, there was likelihood for increase in curriculum implementation levels in schools. The evaluation process conducted by the principals provided feedback on continuous curriculum adjustments critical during curriculum implementation process. For effective evaluation process, all stakeholders in the schools have a role to play as it is not an individual function. Evaluation and assessment procedures assist teachers to improve their testing approaches of students. They also enhance effective implementation of curriculum.

V. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

For effective evaluation and assessment procedures, the study recommends that there is need for principals to consider providing timely feedback on teacher evaluation reports so that teachers can make adjustments in areas they feel they required improvement. Moreover, there is need for principals to ensure that they maintain privacy by not discussing evaluation reports of teachers with others persons who may not be interested parties. There is also need for school evaluation not to be pegged on academic performance only but on other curriculum areas in the school.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amwayi, B. L. & Wanjala, P.M (2015). Quality Monitoring in Secondary Education in Kenya: A Comparative Analysis of Public Schools in Kakamega East and Kakamega Central Sub-Counties of Kakamega County. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(1), 411-420.
- [2] Ayeni, A. J. (2012). Assessment of Principals' Supervisory Roles for Quality Assurance in Secondary Schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *World Journal of Education*, 2 (1), 62-69.
- [3] Bardi, M. (2009). *Common Evaluation Frameworks for Language Teachers*. Retrieved November 12, 2016, from <http://www.semlang.eu/Telechargement/Textes/SemLang%20-%20Bardi.pdf>
- [4] Chidobi, R. U. & Eze T.A.Y., (2016). Utilization of the Quality Assurance Handbook in Secondary School Supervision of Instruction in Enugu State, Nigeria. *World Journal of Education*, 6(4), 30 – 7.
- [5] Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- [6] Eke, P. E. & Chinweuba, L. C. (2012). Effective Supervision of Instruction in Nigerian Secondary Schools: Issues in Quality Assurance. *Journal of Qualitative Education*, 8(1), 1-6.
- [7] Fungulupembe, J.K. (2014). *Improving the Quality of Science Education in Tanzanian Junior Secondary Schools: The Stakeholders' Perspectives, Issues, and Promising Practices*. D. Phil Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.
- [8] Gichobi, G. W. (2012). *The Role of Headteachers in Curriculum and Instructional Management: A Case of Secondary Schools, in Gatundu District, Kiambu County, Kenya*. MED Project, Kenyatta University.
- [9] Irungu, P.K. (2013). *Influence of Headteachers' Instructional Supervisory Roles on Pupils' Performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Kahuro District Kenya*. MED Project, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- [10] Johnson, R., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*. 33 (7) 14-26.
- [11] Mburu, P.G. (2016). *Influence of Headteachers' Instructional Supervision Practices On Pupils' Academic Performance in Public Primary Schools in Thika West Sub-County, Kenya*. MED Project, University of Nairobi.
- [12] Muriithi M. M. (2012). *Influence of teachers instructional supervision strategies on curriculum implementation in public primary schools in Imenti South District Kenya*. Unpublished MED project University of Nairobi.
- [13] Musungu, L. L. & Nasongo, J. W. (2008). The head-teacher's instructional role in academic achievement in secondary schools in Vihiga district, Kenya. *Educational Research and Review*, 3 (10), 316-323.
- [14] Ndaita, J.S. (2013). *Influence of Principals' Instructional Quality Assurance Role On Students' Academic Performance In Kitui West District, Kenya*. PhD Dissertation, Catholic University of Eastern Africa.
- [15] Ngware, M.W., Mutisya, M. & Oketch, M. (2012). Patterns of Teaching Styles and Active Teaching: Do they differ across Subjects in Low and High Performance Schools? *London Review of Education*, 10(1), 35-54.
- [16] Nzile, P.N. (2012). *Role of the Head teacher in Instructional Supervision As Perceived By Teachers in Secondary Schools in Kitui District, Kitui County-Kenya*. MED Project, Kenyatta University.
- [17] Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A framework for analysing data in mixed methods research. In A Tashakkori & C Teddlie (Eds) *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research* (pp. 351-383) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [18] Onzere, R.A. (2015). *Influence of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers' Activities on Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Trans-Nzoia East Sub County, Kenya*. MED Project, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- [19] Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [20] Wafula, A. (2010). *Teachers' perceptions on the role of quality assurance and standards officers on quality of education in Nairobi public secondary schools, Kenya*. Unpublished MED Thesis, University of Nairobi.
- [21] Wanzare, Z.O. (2006). *Rethinking school inspection in the third world: The case*. Retrieved on 13-06-2017 from <http://www.ualberta.ca.ck.reberpaperszak.html>.
- [22] Watsulu, J. B. & Simatwa, E.M.W. (2011). Quality education in secondary schools: challenges and opportunities for quality assurance and standards in Kenya: A case study of Kakamega central district. *Educational Research*, 2(7), 1281-1298.
- [23] Werunga, K.S. (2014). *Teachers' Perceptions on Performance Appraisal Feedback in Secondary Schools within Bungoma East Sub-County, Bungoma County, Kenya*. MED Project, Kenyatta University, Kenya.