

**AN INVESTIGATION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL, TEACHERS' COMPETENCIES IN
PLANNING FOR INSTRUCTION
THE CASE OF PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN NANDI SOUTH DISTRICT****Jeruto Fancy, Prof. Chris Mukwa and Dr. Mary Kerich, Moi University****Email: Jeruto.fancy@yahoo.com***¹⁻³Department of Public Health, School of Health Sciences, Moi University, School of Education,
Department of Curriculum Instruction, Technology & Media. P.O Box 3900-30100, Eldoret.**DOI: Under Assignment**Copyright: © 2023 Jeruto Fancy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.**Article Received: 01 July 2023**Article Accepted: 20 July, 2023**Article Published: 26 July, 2023***ABSTRACT.**

The purpose of this study was to investigate teacher's competencies, knowledge, and skills in planning for instruction in primary schools in the Nandi South district. The purpose of this study was to establish primary teachers' competence in planning for instruction with a view or making suggestions for improving teaching and learning in Kenya Primary schools. A survey design taking a descriptive approach (was employed in this study. Stratified and purposive sampling procedures were used to obtain 138 trained primary school teachers used in the study. Survey questionnaires, observation, a checklist, and an interview schedule were developed, validated, and administered in the field to obtain data used in the present study. Data were analyzed by use of the SPSS program using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics included the use of percentages and frequencies were used to answer and analyze research questions. Inferential statistics involving chi-square and ANOVA were used to test live research hypotheses at an alpha level of 0.05. The results indicated that teachers understand and reasonably discuss the instructional planning process. However, it was revealed that they could not use available instructional ideas and materials to make and implement decisions that involve the application of novel conceptual and practical technological ideas. The study also revealed that teachers' attitudes towards planning for instructions are influenced by motivation, availability of teaching and learning facilities, environment, and teacher's personal characteristics. Based on the results it was concluded that teachers are not functionally competent instructional planners. On the strength of the research findings and in light of the conclusion. The study recommends that a well-defined policy be instituted regarding instructional planning in primary schools in Kenya. Such a policy should consider reviewing the current teacher's training programs, and the position or media resources in the school curriculum. It is also recommended that promotion into educational leadership positions and teacher certification be pegged on excellence in instructional planning matters. This study also recommends that teachers need to be motivated through various incentives such as better remuneration, in-service programs, fair administration, and provision of adequate and variety of teaching and learning media. The study provides useful insights which can be used to improve teaching in Kenyan primary schools.

Keywords: Personal characteristics, Planning, Instruction.

Introduction

The major concerns in the 21st Century to all educators, is shifting education from mere learning to effective and efficient management of learning teachers (UNESCO 1995). Teachers can only manage learning effectively if they give importance not only to what is taught, but the way in which it should be prepared and taught (UNESCO 1987)

In Africa (Kafu, 1976:4) notes that these attempts can be ‘traced to the time when tribal priests systematized bodies of knowledge and culture, invented pictographs or sign writing to record, transmit and reproduce information’. Even though the problem still persists because learning has not been fully synthesized in a formula that allows universal compatibility. Perhaps it was in recognizing the need to synthesize management of learning and instructional activities that educational technology emerged as a discipline in the 1960’s. The United Kingdom National Council of Educational Technology (1969) defines Educational Technology as the development of application and evaluation of systems, techniques and aids to improve the process of human being the United States Commission on Instruction

Technology (1972:6) showed a similar concern and used the term instructional technology instead of educational technology. Sifuna and Kaime (2005) observed that most teachers do not prepare adequately before teaching. Taylor (1970) also contends that in as much as learning activities and resources have been integrated in the curriculum: most of them remain loosely co-coordinated with the curriculum. Hence the teacher retains a major role in the selection and organization *of* these learning activities. A review on the state of teaching in Kenya reveals that despite efforts to improve teacher efficiency through training, there are replete complaints from numerous sectors.

Broad and varied attempts have been made to upgrade man's abilities in managing learning. These attempts range from the works of Skinner (1961) on stimulus response. Ciagnes (1996) on categories of learning, Brunner (1966) on the theory of instruction, Hamreus (1967) on systematic instructional product development, to Ausubel (1968), meaningful reception learning.

Planning for instruction plays a pivotal role in connecting curriculum to instruction (Byra and Could, 1994: Clark and Yinger 1987). Even experienced teachers rely on it to ensure the direction of their teaching and bolster the confidence (Mc Cutcheon. 1980). The ability to plan for instruction effectively can affect not only a teacher's success (Arnold, 1988) but also the results of education reform (Hoo Gred, 2002). Effective planning is a basic requirement for success in most professionals such as Architecture, Engineering, Law, Business, Military establishment and even politics. Just as it is unthinkable that an engineer would embark on building a bridge without a plan, no teacher should start teaching without a careful and conscientious plan.

Teachers have been charged with mediocrity in applying pedagogy and incompetence in classroom. Sifuna and Kaime (2005) and David (1983) assert that for teachers to gain the respect they deserve they need to act professionally in their classrooms and this can be realized if they are well prepared. Ingule, et al (1996) contend that teaching calls for more than the love of learners and good knowledge of the material to be taught. It calls for more than the love of learners and good knowledge of the material to be taught.

Primary school teachers from time to time will be called upon to organize the above variables so that measurable changes in the learners' behavior can be effected. The organization of such varied and complex phenomena calls for what Matiru, Mwangi and Schlette (1989) have called a special competence in the field of instructional planning. Moreover, effective instructional planning is absolutely essential if the teacher is to make full use of his knowledge and skills.

Caar 1962 in Kafu (1976:124) asserts that "one of the most troublesome aspects of teacher education is the failure of many teachers to teach as they were taught by colleges at which they were trained. Again, (Sifuna, 2005) contends that poor planning has ruined many classes. In fact, it has been described as the most common cause of students not learning. This scenario therefore, brings out clearly the need to establish primary school teacher's competence in planning for instruction.

Primary school teachers have been equipped with the necessary competencies to teach through training. However, a careful survey of the situation on the ground contradicts this observation. For example, Tirop was quoted recently (Kenya Times, March 23rd, 2006) as saying that schools in Rift Valley, Kenya has dropped drastically in academic performance. He attributes this poor performance to unpreparedness among members of the teaching fraternity, rampant absenteeism, laziness and drunkenness. Definitely, something is wrong as far as teacher competency in instructional matters is concerned in that part of Kenya.

Nacino-Brown, Oke and Brown (1992) maintain that competence in instructional planning requires professional skills which can only be acquired through training and perpetuated through practice. Kali (1990) on the other hand affirms that teachers' attitudes towards planning for instructions are unfavorable. He notes that "most teachers regard such exercises as childish and at worst unnecessary". On the basis of this observation, this study begs the following questions. Does the teachers' professional training in Kenya equip them with knowledge and skills in planning for instruction? Last, but not least. What attitudes do primary school teachers have towards planning for instruction? Despite these views, neither researchers nor policy makers have addressed the issue of instructional planning seriously. Studies such as those of Kalil (1976 and 1980): and Mukwa (1979) support this position. It is against this background that the present study set out to establish primary teacher's knowledge and skills in planning for instruction in Nandi South District, Rift Valley Province, Kenya.

The purpose of this study was to establish primary teachers' competence in planning for instruction with a view of making suggestions for improving teaching and learning in Kenya Primary Schools. The objectives of the study was to establish the extent to which primary school teachers of different professional qualification prepare for instruction, assess the role and length of teachers teaching experience on their knowledge and skills in planning for instructions, investigate the influence of primary teachers' attitude towards planning for instruction and find out the relationship between primary teachers' planning for instruction and personal characteristics.

Theoretical Framework

This study subscribes to what Bower and Flilgard (1981) have termed general theories of instructions. These theories are embodied in what recent psychologist term instructional theories.

Among these theories are Gagne's (later hierarchical task analysis), Brunner's (1966) theory of instruction, Ausubels (1965) meaningful reception learning and Gagne and Brigs (1974) instructional sequencing.

Planning for feedback is the key feature of the approach advocated by Gagne and is characteristics of Neo-behaviorism; according to Gagne planning enables the teacher to organize the content and materials which shall model the learner outcome. However, of particular significance to this study is Bruner's theory of instruction (1966). Brunner's (1966) collection of essays came to be known as theory of instruction where he pointed out that a theory of instruction is prescription of rules for achieving knowledge or skills and providing techniques for measuring or evaluating outcomes. It is also a normative theory that set goals to be achieved and condition for meeting them.

A major theme in the Bruner's theoretical framework is that learning is an active process in which learners construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current or past knowledge. The learner selects and transforms information; construct hypotheses and makes decisions, - relying on a cognitive structure to do so. Cognitive structure provides meaning and organization to experiences and allows the learner to go beyond the information given.

In essence, the present study emphasizes strongly for the dispositions for the learning and the preparation of the learning process. Secondly; it was because of the theory's concern with both learning and the preparation of learning packages that it was adopted as guiding frame work. Finally, Bruner on following empirical steps and by extension, the systems approach model in designing instruction made the theory even more encompassing. The theory gave a clear theoretical specification upon which literature reviewed and data collection was analyzed thus this theory combined easily with some aspects of the system approach theory in weighing the responses to overcome the shortcomings mentioned early.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted through survey design that was deemed appropriate in the study because it is concerned with teacher competence in planning for instructions. Survey design enabled the researcher to get as much as possible details within the limited time and financial resources. The present study was carried out in Nandi South District in the Rift Valley Province of Kenya.

The target populations for this study are primary school teachers, in Nandi South District. Nandi South District has 148 primary schools of which 130 schools are public and 18 are private. A sample of 138 teachers was drawn from 44 primary schools. The study adopted stratified and purposive sampling procedures. Stratified random sampling was used to sample primary teachers from which the sample for the present study was drawn. The study used purposive sampling based on the previous knowledge that teachers had through teaching experience and training on planning for instruction. The researcher used questionnaires were used as the main tools for collecting views, opinions and attitudes of teachers, interviews schedule was designed for the school teachers and document analysis was used to obtain data on whether teachers prepare instructional documents. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to answer research questions. Inferential analysis such as chi-square was used.

RESULTS

Teachers and the acceptability of planning for instruction

It can be observed based on earlier views raised in this text that all professions have unique methodologies for conducting specified activities. Winn (1989) argues that more than any other aspect of education, instructional technology is the field upon which education hinges for delivery purposes. It is also noted that within instructional technology, instructional planning is the hub around which instructional technology hinges. Following that argument, it is therefore posited that instructional planning is the skeleton upon which the entire process of education is built. On the contrary, evidence shows that instructional planning has had very little influence on the classroom teachers and this is not readily acceptable to most of them (Champagne Klopfer and Gus Tone (1982), Collins and Stevens (1982), Divesta and Rieber (1987) and Husen and Postlethwaite.

The above position was posed to respondents in the field to either accept or reject it but with reasons. Item 3. I (iv) of questionnaire was designed for this purpose and those who accepted the statement were asked to rank the statements, which had been advanced by the authors named in the above paragraphs. Those who rejected the statement were asked to give reasons why for thinking otherwise.

A total of 60 (43.0) respondents, disagreed essentially they were implying that instructional planning had had a big influence and it is readily acceptable among school teachers. The reasons advanced are presented in Table 4.4 although it is a requirement that teachers must have instructional documents, this emphasis has often confused outside observers to believe that instructional documents are absent in schools. 16 (27.0) respondents indicated that it is the school administrators and inspectors “who harass teachers and that makes them appear absent. Another important reason 1) 7 (12.0) respondents was that it guides teachers towards the objectives.

Although some scholars (Divesta and Rieber 1987, Husson Postlethwaite 1995) suggest that instructional planning is not acceptable among school teachers. A good proportion 60 (43.0) of the respondent in the present study refuted this claim and gave the reasons why instructional planning cannot be taken for granted, therefore, instructional planning appears by some teachers.

A reasonable large proportion 78 (57.0) of respondents seemed to agree with the statement. They were therefore asked to rate the statements explaining why they agreed with it. The result is summarized in Table I below. The tabulated data allows one to infer that a predetermined curriculum is a demotivator against the preparation of instructional documents: perhaps the only reason why it should be a demotivator is that teachers are not allowed the freedom to make re-organizations in the curriculum as they wish. Even though such a move will be to allow teachers to teach their own views and opinions.

Another important demotivator was that teachers have several preparations to make each day. Unfortunately, the respondents seemed to exclude the preparation of lesson plans from those daily preparations, and yet it is the basic preparation for which they are supposed to undertake. Otherwise, most of the other reasons are partly influenced by external factors for the instant availability of resources.

Table 1 Reason why respondents think instructional planning has had great influence on teachers

N=60

Reason	Proportion
It is the only true way of presenting the lesson effectively	5(8.3)
It is the authorities who have made it appear to be absent by harassing teachers	16(27.0)
A lesson plan is always on teachers head	12 (20.0)
Lesson plan guides teachers to achieve the objectives	7 (12.0)
Learning is planned activity' so it is impossible for one to refuse planning	10 (13.0)
One's professions are determined by the way which he/she plan his instruction.	10 (13.0)

Table 2: Reasons why respondents think instructional planning has not had great influence on teachers

N=78

Statement	Proportion
They get no help or advice in planning instructions	10 (13.0)
The process of planning for instruction in time consuming	10 (13.0)
Typical classroom teachers have several different preparations to make each day	13 (17.0)
Teachers have limited amount of resources for planning instructions	10 (13.0)
Teachers usually work for a pre-determined curriculum hence has little or no influence and choice	20 (26.0)
Content to be planned and taught usually occurs once in a year making the process quite routine and tedious	15 (19.0)

Teacher's professional qualifications and evaluation of pupils

Majority 113(81.9) respondents do not use stated instructional objectives when designing test items for pupils. A total of 25 (18.1) of the respondents consider the stated instructional objectives. The highest proportion was taken by BED degree holders 9 (69.2) while Diploma graduate holders were 6 (14.3), Pl/S1 certificate holders were 7 (8.8). Those with other qualifications had the least figure with 1 (25).01 the 113 (81.1) respondents who do not consider stated instructional objectives, 4 (30.8) were BED degree holders, while Diploma holders were 36 (85.7). The majority of these were Pl/S1 certificate holders 70 (11.4). Those with other qualifications were 3 (75).

Table 3. Proportion of respondents' response on professional qualification and consideration of instructional objectives when designing test items for pupils

Professional	Consider instructional	Do not consider	Total
Qualification	Objectives	instructional objectives	
BED	9(69.23077)	4(30.76923)	13(9.4202)
DIP	6(14.28571)	36(85.71429)	42(30.4348)
P1	9(11.39241)	70(88.60758)	79(57.2464)
OTHER	1(25)	3(75)	4(2.8986)
Total	25	113	100

The results shown below reveals that 54 (39.1) respondents obtained their items for past papers. Those who used textbooks as sources of test items totaled 44(12.3) while 17(31.9) acquired evaluation items from content to be taught. A small proportion of respondents indicated that they use stated objectives to derive evaluation item. It is surprising to note from the data above that only a small portion of respondents used their stated objectives to derive evaluation items. This is surprising because objectives specify the acceptable level of 'performance. If used to derive evaluation items, then one will know if the objectives have been achieved or not. Further investigation should be instituted to establish why teachers in primary schools ignore objectives when designing evaluation tools. It is also shocking. to learn from Table 4, that only 17 (31.9) respondents employed content to be taught in designing their evaluation instruments. One possible reason for the trend observed above can be attributed to the teacher's orientation toward preparing students for examination purposes. Perhaps that is why a large proportion 54 (16.7) used past papers and textbooks to prepare their students for national examinations. However, there is a need to investigate the exact reason why teachers do not employ instructional objectives when designing test items.

Table 4 Respondents' responses on the source of test items

Sources of test items	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %	Cum %
Past papers	54	39.1	39.1	100
State instructional objective	23	16.7	16.7	16.7
Contents to be taught	17	31.9	13.9	48.6
Textbooks	44	12.3	12.3	60.9
Totals	138	100	100	

Teacher's qualification and planning for instructions

Instructional objectives for a long time have been looked at as the cornerstone to the success of any educational system. Scholars such as Tyler (1947), Beeby (1966), Mukwa (1979), and Benaars (1992) have all argued in support of the above view. Their consensus is that without instructional objectives a teacher will fleet from one place to another without gaining anything. It was on the basis of these assertions that the formulation of instructional objectives was chosen as one of the dependent variables within the large variables of instructional planning.

Table 5 below presents data on whether respondents considered instructional objectives as important or not. It is shown that the majority 81 (57.1) respondents considered instructional objectives as important. While 57 (41.3) did not feel that instructional objectives are important at all. Of the 81 (57.1) all 13 (100) BED degree holders considered instructional objectives important. 38(90.1) had Diploma in Education and 30 (37.9) were PUSI qualifications. Out of the 57 (41.3) who indicated that instructional objectives are not important 4(9.5) had Diploma in Education while 49(62) has PI/S1 certificate qualification. Further, 4 (100) had other qualifications like a certificate in Montessori and Early Childhood Education. Thus, respondents with lower professional levels like P1/S1 and those holding other certificates do not consider instructional objectives as important while their counterparts with higher professional level like BED and Diploma in Education highly regarded instructional objectives. The presence study demonstrates and confirms the worldwide reservations people have regarding the adequacy of teacher preparation at P1/S I certificate of level of education. Perhaps the two years duration taken to complete a P I certificate is inadequate to produce a competent teacher in planning for instruction.

Table 5. proportion of respondents' responses by qualification on whether instructional objectives are important

Professional qualification	Instructional objectives important	Instructional objectives not important
BED	13 (100)	0 (0)
DIP	38 (90.1)	4 (9.5)
P1iS1	30 (37.9)	49 (62.0)
OTHER	0 (0)	4 (100)
Total	81 (51.1)	57 (41.3)

Table 6: Chi-square analysis of teacher's qualification and formulation of instructional objectives

Chi-Square	115.2207
Df	
P	.000

Based on the Chi-square test above, there was a significant relationship between professional qualifications and teachers' planning for instructions ($\chi^2 = 115.2207, df = 3, p < 0.01$). Thus, on the aspect of formulation of instructional objectives, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude

that there was a significant difference between the group of professional qualification and their planning for instruction.

4.1.3 Teachers' professional qualification and development of instructional media resources

A large proportion, 79 (57.25) of respondents showed that they did not include media in their lesson plans, while a total of 59 (42.75) included media in their lesson plans. Further analysis revealed that of the 59 (42.75) respondents, a majority 12 (92.3) were BED degree holders while diploma holders had 22 (52.3). A total of 24 (30.38) were those with P1/S1. Those with other qualifications composed the least figure that is 1 (25). It can be observed from the table 4.10 above that out of 79 (57.25) respondents who did not include a media component in their lesson plans. 1 (7.6) had BED degree qualification, 20 (47.6) with diploma in education while 55 (69.6) had either P1/S1 certificate qualification. Those with other qualifications had the least 3 (75) from the above results, it can be said that most teachers 79(57.25) do not include the type of media and quantity of media they will need in their lessons while planning. This was worse with PUS 1 and those with other qualifications because out of 79 (57.25) respondents, only 24 (30.3) said that they included media in their lesson plans. Those with other qualifications indicated that only 1(25) include media; the only group which could be said that they consider media resources in planning for instructions. This implies that there is something wrong with regard to the emphasis in training programs other than their Bachelor of Education counterpart on media as a component of instruction.

Table7. Proportion of respondents' responses on who include/do not include media

Professional Qualification	Include Media	Do not include Media	Total
BED	12 (92.3)	1 (7.7)	9.42029
DIP	22 (52.4)	20 (47.6)	30.43478
P1	24 (30.4)	55 (69.6)	57.25
OTHER	1 (25)	3 (75)	2.90
Total	59 (42.75)	79 (57.25)	100.0)

From the analysis below, it indicated that there is a difference between teachers' professional qualifications and the selection of Media (-56.09208, df = 3, p<0.00). Thus on the aspect of the selection of media, we reject the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences between teachers' professional qualifications and planning for instruction.

Table 8: Chi-square test analysis in regard to teacher qualification and selection of media

Chi-square	56.09208
Df	3
P	000000

Teacher's professional qualifications and selection of instructional methods, techniques, and strategies

Table 9 shows that 28 (24.3) respondents use less than two instructional techniques, 88 (50.1) use three to four techniques, and 22 (25.5) use more than five techniques in a lesson. Further

analysis revealed that among the 79 (57.25) P I/S1 certificate holders, 13 (30.9) used less than two techniques, 63 (79.7) used between three and four while a few 3 (3.7) used over five techniques. Those with other qualifications 2 (50) use less than two, the same number of respondents, 2 (50) use between four and five. The majority of **10 (76.9)** OF Bed degree holders use over five techniques while a few 3 (23.0) use between three and four.

Table 9. Proportion of respondents' responses on professional qualification and selection of instructional methods.

Professional Qualification	2 or less	3 to 4	Over 5	Total
BED	0 (00)	3 (23.1)	10 (76.9)	13 (9.42029)
DIP	13 (30.9)	20(47.6)	9 (21.4)	42 (30.43478)
PI	13 (16.4)	63(79.7)	3 (3.8)	79 (57.25)
Other	2 (50)	2(50)	0 (0)	4 (2.90)
Total	28 (50.1)	88 (50.1)	22 (25.5)	138 (100.00)

The Chi-square analysis below shows that there is a significant difference between teachers' qualifications and selection of instructional methods (-72.02268, df= 3, p<0.01). Thus on the aspect of selection of instructional methods we reject the null hypothesis of the first hypothesis that there is no significant difference between primary school teachers' professional qualification and planning for instruction and conclude that there was a significant between the group of professional qualifications in their planning for instruction and in regard to the selection of instructional methods.

Table 10. Chi-square analysis on teachers' qualification of instructional methods

Chi-square	72.02268
Df	3
P	.000000

- The government should strengthen the management of instructional planning by hiring competent and enough education inspectors in primary schools.
- In-service courses, seminars, workshops, and conferences should be emphasized to enable teachers to widen their knowledge and further their skills.
- In-service programs tailored around the need for specific teaching experience should be provided to teachers.
- The governments should have enough teachers in primary schools. If the trend where one teacher handles a class of more than 30 pupils continues then the quality of education is likely to be compromised.

REFERENCE

- Allan and Louis C (ed) (1998) *Primary Education; A Source Book for Teachers* London: Paul Chapman Publishers.
- Anderson, L. (1990) "*Learners and Learning*", in Reynolds C. May nerd (ed) (1990) *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teachers* published for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Association of Educational Communication and Technology (AECT) (1972). *The Field of Education Technology. A Statement of Definition of Instruction*" Journal of Educational Communication and Technology; Vol. 17 No.8 Pp 36 — 38
- Ausubel, D. P. (1968) *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View*. New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston.
- Avalos, B. and Haddadd, W. (1981). *A Review of Teacher Effectiveness Research in Africa, India, Latin America, Middle East, Malaysia Philippines and Thailand; Synthesis of Results*. Ottawa; International Development Research Center
- Beeby. C. B(1966). *The Quality of Education in Developing Countries*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press.
- Bennaars, G. A(ed) (1993) *Basic Education Forum*. Nairobi: Publication of Basic Education Resource Centre for Eastern and Southern Africa Vol. 3, April, 1993
- Bloom, B. S. (1967) "*Learning for Mastery*", Evaluation Comment 1, No. 2 University of California at Los' Angels. Reprinted in Block 1971 pp 47 — 63
- Bloom B. S., Englehart, M. D., Hill, W. H., Furst, E. J. and Kwohi, D. R. (1956).*Taxonomy of Educational Objective, Handbook 1: The Cognitive Domain*.New York: David McKay Inc.
- Bower, G. H and Hilgard, E. R. (1981). *Theories of Learning*. Cliff New Jearse). Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Brown, J. F. Lewis, R. G. and Harceleroad D. W. (1983). A — V Instruction Technology. Media and Methods (6' ed). New York: McGraw Hill Book.
- Bony, G. W. (1995) "*Course Design*", in B. Matini, A. Mwangi and Schletter R. (1995). *Teach Your Best: A Handbook for University Lectures*. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development DSE Education and Documentation Center
- Caar, A. J. (1952) "*Classroom Paradox*" *Teacher Education* Vol. 13, No. 2 pp 165 — 168
- Carroll, J. B (1983) "*Teaching and Training in Tanzania*". London: Unpublished PHD Thesis submitted to London Univesity.
- Too, J. K. (1986) *A Survey of Availability of Use of Media Resources in Mathematics Instruction: The Case of Secondary School in Nandi North District, Kenya*: Moi University, M. Phil Thesis.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles to Curriculum and Instructional Design*. Chicago: University Press.
- UNESCO, (1995). *World Education Report 1995*. Oxford: UNESCO Publishing.
- Walklin, L. (1987) *Instruction Techniques and practice*. Great Britain: The Part Press Weigerber, R. A. (1968) *Instructional Process and Media Innovation*: Chicago: Rand MC Nall) Publishers.
- World Bank (1980). *Education, Sector policy paper 85*. World Bank, April 1980. New York: The Harworth press.