



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

Journal homepage: <http://www.journalijar.com>

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH

RESEARCH ARTICLE

PREVALENCE AND EFFECT OF USE OF GROUP WORK METHOD IN TEACHING AND LEARNING OF LITERATURE IN KISWAHILI IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KEIYO, KENYA

Mwangi Peter Kamau

Department of Languages, Wareng High School, P.O. Box 910 – 30100, Eldoret, Kenya.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History:

Received: 04 October 2013

Final Accepted: 24 October 2013

Published Online: November 2013

Key words:

Group Work Method, Literature, Kiswahili, Secondary Schools, Keiyo, Kenya.

Abstract

Performance of candidates in Kiswahili in Kenya Certificate of secondary Education has been poor over the past years. The purpose of the study was to look into the role of group work in the teaching of literature in Kiswahili (*Fasihi*) in secondary schools in Keiyo District. This paper focuses specifically on the prevalence of use of group work in the secondary schools and the effect it has had on students' learning. The study employed a descriptive survey research design and was guided by general systems theory. It targeted all teachers of Kiswahili and form four students in Keiyo District Secondary schools. Simple random sampling was used to select 30% of the form four students in each of the selected schools. The study thus had a sample of 10 teachers of Kiswahili and 378 form four students, giving a total of 388 respondents. Data was collected by the use of questionnaires. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques which included frequencies, means, modes and percentages. It was found that many teachers underscore the effectiveness of using group work in teaching literature in Kiswahili as opposed to other teaching methods. In addition, group work provides students with more opportunity to express themselves as compared to other methods. The study thus recommends that teachers should allocate more time of their Kiswahili lesson to discussions in groups. The study is useful to teachers of Kiswahili in understanding the most effective teaching methods and more so where teacher-students ratio is high or where, for certain reasons there is shortage of teachers of Kiswahili.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2013.. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Although educational researchers and policy-makers consider a number of variables in operationalizing school effectiveness, the community holds schools most accountable for students' academic achievement (Bossert, 1988). Thus, the ultimate criterion for assessing the effectiveness of any school reform is the extent to which it improves the actual academic achievement of students. Academic economists and international development agencies claim that an educated population is essential for economic growth and more generally, for a higher quality of life (Lucas, 1988; Barro, 1991; Mankiw, Romer & Weil, 1992; UNDP, 2003; World Bank, 2000). One of the eight Millennium Development Goals is that by 2015 all children in developing countries should complete primary school. Yet developing countries' learners who complete primary school often perform poorly on academic tests (Glenwe & Kremer, 2005).

Many studies have attempted to estimate the impact of school and teacher characteristics on student performance, yet most have serious estimation problems that cast doubt on their results (Glenwe & Kremer, 2005). Almost all existing studies are "retrospective," based on data collected from schools as they currently exist (in contrast to data collected from a randomized trial). Even the best retrospective studies offer only limited guidance due to their estimation problems, the most serious being omitted variable bias (unobserved school, household and child characteristics that are correlated with observed school variables), and measurement error in school data. This has

led to wide variation in the estimated impacts of key variables. For example, of 30 studies from developing countries reviewed by Hanushek (1995), 8 found significantly positive impacts of the teacher-pupil ratio on student learning, 8 found significantly negative impacts, and 14 found no significant impact. In recent years, researchers have turned to natural experiments and randomized trials. Natural experiment studies use “natural” variation in a school characteristic that is unlikely to be correlated with all other factors that determine learning. An (admittedly rare) example is allocating students to different schools based on a lottery. A recent natural experiment suggests that increases in school resources (measured by student-teacher ratios) raise scores on reading (but not math) tests among black South African students (Hanushek, 1995).

The Concept of Group Work and Study Teams

Small group discussions can be traced back to Socrates who led his students in critical inquiry to insight through discussion. The discussion seeks to examine a topic or problem through the flow of argument in which participants learn from each other by pooling ideas. These act as an attempt to better understand knowledge and solve problems rather than acquire new factual information. Learning in interactive groups enhances critical thinking, problem solving, communication skills, innovativeness and both interpersonal and team skills. Students learn best when they are actively involved in the process. Researchers report that regardless of the subject matter, students working in small groups tend to learn more of what is taught and retain it longer than when the same content is presented in other instructional formats. Students who work in collaborative groups also appear more satisfied with their classes (Beckman, 1990; Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Collier, 1980; Cooper & Associates, 1990; Goodsell, Maher, Tinto & Associates, 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991; Kohn, 1986; McKeachie, Pintrich, Lin & Smith, 1986; Slavin, 1980, 1983; Whitman, 1988). Various names have been given to this form of teaching, and there are some distinctions among these: cooperative learning, collaborative learning, collective learning, learning communities, peer teaching, peer learning, reciprocal learning, team learning, study circles, study groups, and work groups. But all in all, there are three general types of group work: informal learning groups, formal learning groups, and study teams (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991).

Organizing Learning Groups

When teachers create classrooms where students work with other students, they should assume that students have something to bring to the knowledge table. They are not blank states upon which knowledge is transcribed or vessels waiting to be filled with knowledge (Aseey & Minyafu, 2009, p. 92). Students need to learn facts and philosophical viewpoints but the purpose of learning facts and philosophical viewpoints is to provide students with tools to think critically. The application of these tools, their use in the exercise of critical thinking, must extend to applications in the world, to the enacting of the results of critical thinking without such applications critical thinking itself, becomes sterile exercise learning, then, is inseparably linked with doing. The following aspects should be considered when organizing learning groups:

Decide how the groups will be formed

According to Farrant (1980), the particular way schools and teachers go about this process of grouping depends on a number of philosophical and practical matters. He asserts that most teachers prefer a situation where students who form a group are of uniform age and ability. These results in a classes being formed which are homogeneous in composition, that is, all of one kind. Such an arrangement when it forms classes of equal age is called horizontal grouping. When it forms classes of equal ability, with most pupils in the top group and the least able in the bottom group, it is called streaming. However, some schools object to this kind of grouping arguing that the very act of labelling a child dull when still at formative stage of development may have undesirable psychological effects. Farrant (ibid.) argues that segregation of people into uniform groups is unnatural, for in normal society association tend to be much more heterogamous or mixed in composition.

Most school accept that a student must remain in the same group of students he joins. Ayot and Patel (1987, p. 155) support the view that students should be grouped according to their abilities. However, they explain the aim of doing this as that of giving the teacher an opportunity to monitor their speed and leaning so that he/she can assist them. There may also be a group which is bound together by common interest. This is referred to as interest group. In this type of group, there are definite learning experiences based on group interests. Therefore, the class can be divided into committees to work on various topics which makeup the theme under study. When the committees report back, the whole body of that theme should be covered adequately thus providing every pupil with an opportunity on the topic that interests him/her most.

Thungu *et al.* (2008, p. 91) states that for group teaching to be effective the teacher should ensure that:

- i. Planning and organization of learning activities are done for each group.
- ii. All the materials required must be ready for each group before the lesson begins.
- iii. There is good class control.
- iv. Groups are flexible enough to accommodate a learner who has been absent for some reason.
- v. The timings for group work must be appropriate.
- vi. Groups have members of mixed abilities as well as representation of gender and racial differences within the class.
- vii. Each group has a well-defined task with a clear testable outcome.
- viii. Immediate feedback is provided followed by further discussion with the teacher.
- ix. Learners who perform very well receive recognition through a reward system.

The teacher should further consider:

- i. Age and Gender
- ii. Ability and experience
- iii. Friendship, interest and willingness to work together
- iv. Learner preferred learning styles
- v. Previous experience
- vi. Nature of task or project
- vii. Optimum size of the group
- viii. Availability of facilities and resources
- ix. Personality traits with reference to compatibility.

Some teachers prefer randomly assigning students to groups to maximize their heterogeneity: a mix of males and females, verbal and quiet students, the cynical and the optimistic (Fiechtner & Davis, 1992; Smith, 1986). Some faculties let students choose with whom they want to work, although this runs the risk that groups will socialize too much and that students will self-segregate (Cooper, 1990). Self-selected groups seem to work best in small classes, for classes of majors who already know one another, or in small residential colleges (Walvoord, 1986). Still other instructors prefer to form the groups themselves, taking into account students' prior achievement, levels of preparation, work habits, ethnicity, and gender (Connery, 1988). They argue for making sure that members of each group are exclusively graded students or exclusively pass/not pass students and that well-prepared students be placed in groups with other well-prepared students. Other faculty, however, try to sprinkle the more able students evenly among the groups (Walvoord, 1986). A middle ground, proposed by Walvoord (1986), is to ask students to express a preference, if they wish, then make the assignments themselves. The teacher could, for example, ask students to write down the names of three students with whom they would most like to work.

Be conscious of group size

In general, groups of four or five members work best. Larger groups decrease each member's opportunity to participate actively. The less skilful the group members, the smaller the groups should be. The shorter amount of time available, the smaller the groups should be (Cooper, 1990; Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991; Smith, 1986).

The cardinal point to remember in determining the size and composition of groups is that the more people in a group, the more complex logistics become; the possibilities for group failure and failure of individuals within the group increases when a group is too large. In using groups, all students should have the opportunity to participate in such groups to gain the educational benefits group learning promises (Assey & Munyafu, 2009, p. 79). This view is supported by Ayot and Patel (1987) who state that if the groups are too big, a lot of time might be wasted in trying to organize them. The problem is worsened by the fact that in a group discussion, sometimes these are students who do not express their views for fear of the classmates. Such students' confidence in themselves can be built through interacting in small groups of about five students where fear is less.

Keep groups together

When a group is not working well, avoid breaking it up, even if the group requests it. The addition of the floundering group's members to ongoing groups may throw off their group process, and the bailed-out troubled group does not learn to cope with its unproductive interactions (Walvoord, 1986). One of the reasons groups should not be broken is that once members get free with each other, they tend to participate and enjoy more. Slow learners are bound to be at home more with their groups than in class with every student glaring at their ignorance. They can benefit from their peers as generation gap is one of the factors that inhibit learning (Ayot & Patel, 1987). Many students fear to ask questions when everybody in class is watching and listening for fear of being perceived as dull.

Sometimes even after the teacher call for questions none is asked, yet a quiz to test their understanding may reveal that many of them never understood the concept at all. The gifted child can improve more in a stable group where he/she knows that the rest of the members are looking up to him/her to assist where and when tasks become difficult to them. This makes such a child to seek to know more to remain in front. At the same time, other members too are challenged to emulate him/her. No student wants to remain a spectator. This therefore helps bring a 'silent' competition with each trying to prove knowledgeable and hence useful to the group.

Help groups plan how to proceed

Organization of group work is very important. The first step is task preparation. In task preparation, one outlines what each group is expected to work on. The teacher should ensure that groups have no more than five members to be effective. Each group should have a secretary to put down key points raised by the group and the chairperson who manages the discussion (Twoli *et al.*, 2007, p. 53). Assey and Minyafu (2009, p. 82) describe the teacher as the chief leader in the classroom. The necessity of the teacher's authoritative role in the group is seen when his/her responsibilities are broken into four stages.

- i. Making preliminary decisions
- ii. Setting the lesson and group tasks
- iii. Monitoring and intervening group activities
- iv. Evaluating and processing the outcome of the groups

The teacher should put into consideration students' individual differences to ensure that they benefit from their groups. The concept of individual difference in education stems from the fact that a classroom is often composed of students of different abilities, interests, intellect, backgrounds (socially, economically, religiously) temperaments, attitudes needs, gender and so on. Every student is seen as unique and the teacher has the responsibility of treating each student with a positive attitude (Nasibi, 2003).

Regularly Check in with the Groups

As the students work on their tasks, the teacher should go round to ensure that the discussion is going on in the right direction, everybody is participating and that the secretaries are recording the main points. It is important that the teacher operates in a low profile not giving away the solution of the task (Twoli *et al.*, 2007). At the end of group discussion, the teacher should organize for a forum for discussion where each group giving a verbal presentation or putting the points on the writing board. With all the main points presented, the teacher has now the duty of highlighting the important points, using proper terminologies and elaborating where possible for students to take notes. It is also important that the teacher provides mechanisms for groups to deal with uncooperative members.

Walvoord (1986) recommends telling the class that after the group task is completed, each student will submit to the instructor an anonymous assessment of the participation of the other group members: who did extra work and who shirked work. If several people indicate that an individual did less than a fair share, that person could receive a lower grade than the rest of the group. According to Walvoord (*ibid.*), this system works if groups have a chance in the middle of the project to discuss whether any members are not doing their share. Members who are perceived as shirkers then have an opportunity to make amends. The best way to ensure comparable effort among all group members is to design activities in which there is a clear division of labour and each student must contribute if the group is to reach its goal (Connery, 1988; Walvoord, 1986).

Why Learn in Groups?

Group discussions have been associated with certain benefits. First, they increase learner participation. The greater the learner participation, the more effective the learning is going on. Second, it allows students to share ideas from each other in a more relaxed way. Some studies show that learning is more effective when peers learn from each other than when they learn from adults (Twoli *et al.*, 2007, p. 53). Thirdly, learners are given an opportunity to pool and share skills. For example; some process, manipulating, organizational and even language skills.

The other benefit of group work is that it creates interest in the subject as they are actively involved. They thus progress at a rate that maintains their interest. Interest promotes study and study promotes learning. Proponents of discussion method therefore, argue that the learning or the gaining of knowledge and understanding is its own reward (Nsubuga, 2000, p. 10).

One of the most desirable aspects of group work is that it helps students develop logic through combination of their own ideas with those of their peers. By expressing their concepts, asking for clarification and engaging in arguments, their understanding becomes sharper and more accurate. According to Gathumbi *et al.* (2005), group work gives learners an opportunity to put language to work which is an ideal situation for language learning as

various language skills are integrated. It is motivating as it allows learners to express themselves freely, thereby developing their verbal skills. These skills are very important as *Fasihi* questions require that a student argue his/her points to get marks. Other advantages of learning in groups include:

- i. The relationship between peers and teacher improves as a result of this cooperation.
- ii. It reduces the stigma of failure particularly for slow learners.
- iii. Learners are able to work at their own place without being too depended on the teacher.
- iv. Learners learn to appreciate each other's strengths and weaknesses and hence respect each other. It also promotes healthy competition.
- v. Learners learn to cooperate as they learn to submerge their personal identity and acquire a social one. This explains why learners talk and identify with the name of their group (Thungu *et al.*, 2008).
- vi. It allows learners access to equipment and materials which may be in short supply.
- vii. It encourages a friendly atmosphere in the group through social talk.
- viii. It encourages joint decision-making.
- ix. It provides opportunities for the development of leadership qualities in learners.
- x. It stimulates the development of leadership qualities in learners.
- xi. It enables learners to explore and handle ideas.
- xii. It promotes personal and social development.
- xiii. It promotes mutual integration of learners in multi-ethnic classes.
- xiv. It encourages a positive attitude to schools.

Statement of the Problem

Performance in literature in Kiswahili has remained poor over the years and this implies that students leave schools without understanding it adequately. A research by Odeo (1998) reveals that most students could barely express themselves through grammatically correct Kiswahili sentences though they obtained impressive grades (B+ and above) at KSCE examinations. According to the Kenya national Examinations Council results, Kiswahili is one of the worst performed subjects (Daily Nation, 2003 August 29). In 2004, there was optimism that finally a solution to perennial poor performance of Kiswahili had come to an end as performance showed a marked improvement (MOEST, 2005).

In order to combat poor performance in Kiswahili, the revised syllabus of 2002 based on Koech Report (RoK, 1999) advocated for the integration of Kiswahili languages and literature. This syllabus also emphasizes the listening and speaking skills in classrooms. It also reduced Kiswahili set books to one play one novel and introduces short stories. Poetry (*ushairi*) as well as oral literature (*fasihi simulizi*) also form part of literature (*fasihi*) paper. As Badiribo (1985) observes that both teachers and student seems to grapple with innumerable difficulties' in the teaching and learning of Kiswahili poetry. He contends that the methods of instruction in use are the source of problems. He also notes that the traditional instructional approach is predominantly practiced in school, despite the fact that the mode of instruction has continued to contribute to poor examination result in Kiswahili poetry. Some teachers make Kiswahili literature lesson appear difficult and unappealing due to methods of teaching. The Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC, 2003) notes that poor performance in Kiswahili paper may be due to poor instructional methods. Kiswahili is a compulsory subject in KCSE and if a student fails in the subject it means that his /her cluster points will go down. This may occasion failure to join university and other middle level colleges. One could fail to attain minimum requirement to pursue a certain course. The above problem facing Kiswahili subject in general and *Fasihi* in particular prompted the researcher to carry out this study.

Limitations of the Study

The study had the following limitations: the teachers of Kiswahili subject were used as research assistants in their respective schools without consideration of their academic qualification and working experience; a literature in Kiswahili class sampled was organized at short notice to enable the researcher collect data from them within one day; the emotional and mental state of students might have influenced the results. These were not taken into account since it was not easy to measure; variables like age, motivation and personality were not controlled.

Material and Methods

The study was conducted in Keiyo District, Rift Valley Province of Kenya. The District is divided into five Divisions, namely Kamaring, Tambach, Metkei, Chepkorio and Soy Division. Keiyo District measures a total area of 1439.3 Km square. The Keiyo and Tugen of Kalenjin community, whose main economic activities are livestock keeping and farming, predominate the District. This study employed descriptive survey research design. Survey

research design was used because the population studied was too large to be observed directly. The survey research therefore was useful because of the economy of taking a sample of the population to generalize results for the whole population.

The study targeted all teachers of Kiswahili and form four students in Secondary schools in Keiyo District. This population was involved in the study because they were directly involved in the teaching and learning of Kiswahili *Fasihi*. In this study, the author stratified the schools into three using students' gender. Therefore, schools were categorized into girls' schools, boys' schools and mixed schools. There were 8 boys' schools, 10 girls' schools and 12 mixed schools, making a total of 30 schools in the District. Stratified simple random sampling was used to select 10 schools that participated in this study. Therefore, 3 boys' schools, 3 girls' schools and 4 mixed schools were proportionately selected for this study. All the 10 Form Four teachers of Kiswahili from the selected schools participated in this study. Simple random sampling was used to select 30% of the form four students in each of the selected schools. The study thus had a sample of 10 teachers of Kiswahili and 378 form four students, giving a total of 388 respondents.

Data was collected mainly by the use of questionnaires which had open-ended and closed-ended questions. In this study, data was analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques which include frequencies, means, modes and percentages. Data was presented in frequency tables. This was done through the use of a computer programme called Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). This therefore formed the basis of interpretation, discussion, conclusion and recommendations of the research.

Results and Discussion

Teachers' Responses on the Prevalence of Use of Group Work in Teaching *Fasihi*

The teachers' responses on prevalence of use of group work in teaching literature in Kiswahili in secondary schools are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Prevalence of Using Group Work in Teaching Literature in Kiswahili

Method	F	%
Most of the time	2	20
Often	2	20
Sometimes	4	40
Never	2	20
Total	10	100

It was noted that 2(20%) of the teachers stated that they used group work method most of the time to teach *Fasihi*. Another 4(40%), 1(10%) and 2(20%) of the teachers asserted that they often, sometimes and never used discussion method respectively to teach *Fasihi* in secondary schools. This, thus implies that majority of the teachers commonly use group work as a method of teaching *Fasihi*. This may be taken to mean that students are able to take their time to exchange ideas and this verbal interaction among themselves would enhance teaching of *Fasihi*.

When the teachers were asked to state how often they used discussion groups to teach *Fasihi*, their responses were as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Frequency of Using Group Work in Teaching Literature in Kiswahili

Response	F	%
Occasionally	7	70
Very rarely	3	30
Total	10	100

As indicated in Table 2, 7(70%) of the teachers stated that they occasionally used group work and the remaining 3(30%) stated that they very rarely used group work in teaching *Fasihi*. These findings are in line with what Goodlad (1984) has established that discussion can be seen only 4-7% of the time in one thousand elementary and secondary classrooms across the United States.

Such findings from secondary schools in Keiyo District imply that methods such as lecture are commonly used in the teaching of *Fasihi* and thus interaction among students is limited. This may have a further implication of overreliance on the teacher and thus poor performance due to limited thinking.

The teachers were asked to state why they used group work in teaching *Fasihi* and Table 3 gives a summary of their responses.

Table 3: Reasons for Using Group Work in Teaching *Fasihi*

Reason	f	%
Discussion is meant for some specific subject matter/topics	2	20
Enables students to participate and teacher gauge student understanding	4	40
Have many lessons and no time to prepare for group discussion	2	20
It is interactive	3	20
Total	10	100

Table 3 reveals that 2(20%) of the teachers occasionally used group work because but only for some specific subject/matter/topic. Therefore, they only used it when teaching given areas in *Fasihi*. Another 2(20%) stated that it enables students to participate and the teacher is able to gauge student's understanding. This means a better understanding of the subject is attained when students are involved through group work. It is also indicated that 2(20%) used group discussion because they had many lessons and therefore they did not have time to prepare for group discussion. However, 3(30%) stated that they use group discussion because it is interactive. A revelation from the table that some of the teachers used group discussion because they had many lessons and had no time to prepare implies lack of focused discussion hence there is no meaningful knowledge attained from such discussions.

Students' Responses on how they Rate Group Discussion as a Method of Learning *Fasihi*

The author sought to establish how students would rate group discussion as a method of learning *Fasihi*. Table 4 shows a summary of their responses.

Table 4: Students' Responses on how they Rate Group Discussion as a Method of Learning *Fasihi*

Response	F	%
Very rarely	45	11.9
Rarely	189	50.0
Often	132	34.9
Hardly never	12	3.2
Total	378	100

As shown in Table 4, 189(50.0%) of the students who participated in the study stated that they rarely study *Fasihi* in groups while 132(34.9%) often studied *Fasihi* in groups. Only 12(3.2%) hardly studied *Fasihi* in groups. This implies that majority of the students in Keiyo District rarely study *Fasihi* in groups. This may mean that the students depend on their teachers' contribution majorly in the learning of *Fasihi* and such a trend may imply poor performance in the subject.

Students' Responses on Effect of Group Discussion

Students were asked to state the extent to which group discussions were helpful to them in improving their ability to understand *Fasihi* as well as tackle *Fasihi* questions. Their responses were as indicated in Table 5.

Table 5: Effects of group Discussion

Response	SA		A		U		D		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
It provides me with more opportunity to express myself	208	55.0	136	36.0	15	4.0	19	5.0	378	100
It exposes me to be a wide range of ideas and information	296	78.3	81	21.4	1	0.3	0	0	378	100
Group discussion are interesting	217	57.4	148	39.2	9	2.4	4	1.1	378	100
Working in groups stimulates	201	53.2	138	36.5	35	9.3	44	1.1	378	100

me to work											
I acquire skills of arguing out my point	230	60.8	130	34.4	0	0	18	4.8	378	100	
It helps me develop a sense of worth	244	64.6	114	30.2	16	4.2	4	1.1	378	100	
It helps me develop the spirit	244	64.6	77	20.4	23	6.1	34	9.0	378	100	
Working in groups makes me learn more within a short time	115	30.4	190	50.3	45	11.9	28	7.4	378	100	

It is indicated in Table 5 that 344(91%) of the students stated that group discussion provides them with more opportunity to express themselves as compared to other methods. The rest (5%) disagreed and only 15(4%) were undecided. Furthermore, 377(99.7%) were of the opinion that discussion groups expose them to a wide range of ideas and information from colleagues whereas 1(0.3%) was undecided. This implies majority of the students agreed that discussion groups expose them to a wide range of ideas.

Table 5 also reveals that 365(96.6%) students agreed that group discussion are interesting and make learning much more enjoyable. Only 4(1.1%) disagreed while 9(2.4%) remained undecided. Further, 339(89.7%) agreed that working in group stimulates them to work even harder and 35(9.3%) were undecided. However, 4(1.1%) disagreed. It was further established that 360(95.2%) of the students stated that they acquire skills of arguing out their points or views convincingly when they work in groups whereas 358(94.7%) stated that working in group helps them to develop a sense of self-worth and confidence. It is further revealed that 321(84.9%) agreed that working in group helps them to develop the spirit of competition and 305(80.7%) agreed that working in groups makes them learn more within a short time. However, it was noted that 28(7.4%) disagreed and 45(11.9%) were undecided. It is therefore worth mentioning that group discussion instills positive traits on the learners and there is need to enhance it in the teaching of *Fasihi* in secondary schools.

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the study findings, it can be concluded that most of the teachers do not use group work method most of the time to teach *Fasihi*. The reasons they use group work in teaching *Fasihi* would be due to the fact that it is meant for some specific subject/matter/topic and that it enables students to participate and the teacher is able to gauge students' understanding. In general, the study established that all the teachers underscore the effectiveness of using group discussion in teaching *Fasihi* as opposed to other teaching methods.

Teachers should use group discussion when teaching Kiswahili *Fasihi*, especially in areas that require analysis and synthesis; for example, when teaching novel and oral literature as it allows for interaction. Similarly, novel is quite wide so it is best taught using group discussions.

References

- Assey, A. A., and Minyafu, R. A. (2009): Principles of teaching and Communication. Nairobi: Kaswanga Press and Consultancy.
- Ayot, H. O., and Patel, M. M. (1987): Instructional Methods (General Methods). Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Badiribo, M. O. (1985): Kielelezo Cha Kufundishia Mashairi Yetu (Unpublished Med. Thesis). Kenyatta University, Nairobi.
- Beckman, M. (1990): Collaborative Learning: Preparation for the Workplace and Democracy. *College Teaching*, 38(4): 128-133.
- Bossert, S. T. (1988): Cooperative Activities in the Classroom. *Review of Research in Education*, 15(1988-1989).
- Barro, R. J. (1991): The Stock Market and Investment. NBER Working Papers 2925, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

- Chickering, A. W., and Gamson, Z. F. (Eds.). (1991): *Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no.47. San Francisco: JosseyBass.
- Collier, K. G. (1980): *Peer-Group Learning in Higher Education: The Development of Higher-order Skills*. *Studies in Higher Education*, 5(1): 55-62.
- Connery, B. A. (1988): *Group Work and Collaborative Writing*. *Teaching at Davis*, 14(1): 2-4. Publication of the Teaching Resources Centre, University of California at Davis.
- Cooper, J. (1990) a: *Cooperative Learning and College Teaching: Tips from the Trenches*. *Teaching Professor*, 4(5): 1-2.
- Cooper, J., and Associates (1990) b: *Cooperative Learning and College Instruction*. Long Beach: Institute for Teaching and Learning, California State University.
- Daily Nation (2003, August 29): *KCSE Results Analysis*. Daily Nation. Nairobi: NMG.
- Farrant, J. S. (1980): *Principles and Practice of Education*. Edinburg: Longman.
- Fiechtner, S. B., and Davis, E. A. (1992): *Why Some Groups Fail: A Survey of Students' Experiences with Learning Groups*. In A. Goodsell, M. Maher, V. Tinto, & Associates (Eds.), *Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education*. University Park: National Centre on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, Pennsylvania State University.
- Gathumbi, P.K. et al. (2005): *Principles and techniques in Language teaching; A Text for teacher educators, teachers and Pre-service teachers*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Glenwe, P. and Kremer, M. (2005): *Schools, Teachers and Education Outcomes in Developing Countries, Handbook on the Economics of Education*.
- Goodsell, A., Maher, M., Tinto, V, and Associates (Eds.), (1992): *Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education*. University Park: National Centre on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, Pennsylvania State University.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984): *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hanblshek, E. K. (1994): *School Quality, Achievement Bias, and Dropout Behaviour in Egypt*. Washington World Bank.
- Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. (1989): *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research*. Edina, Minn.: Interaction Books.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., and Smith, K. (1991): *Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional Productivity*. ASHE-FRIC Higher Education Report No.4. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University.
- KNEC (2002): *Examination Report*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- KNEC (2003): *Examination Report*. Nairobi: Government Printers
- Lucas, R. E. (1988) a: *Money Demand in the United States: A Quantitative Review*. Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy, Elsevier.
- Lucas, R. E. (1988) b: *On the Mechanics of Economic Development*. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22(1), (July): 3-42.

Mankiw, N. G., Romer, D., and Weil, D. M. (1992): A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107: 407-432.

MOEST (2005): Report on Examination results. Nairobi: Government Printers

Nasibi, W. M. (2003): *Instructional Methods*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.

Nsubuga, E. H. K. (2000): *The teacher as a professional*. Kampala: MK Publishers.

Odeo, I. I. (1998): *Oral Questioning in the Pedagogy of Kiswahili Grammar: A case of Teachers Practices in Selected Secondary Schools in Bungoma District, Kenya* (Unpublished Dphil Thesis).

Republic of Kenya (1965): *Report of the Education Commission*. Nairobi: Government Printers.

Republic of Kenya (1976): *Report of the Nation Commission on Educational Objectives and Policies*. Nairobi: Government Printers.

Republic of Kenya (1999): *The Koech Report*. Nairobi: Government Printers.

Slavin, R. E. (1983): When Does Cooperative Learning Increase Student Achievement? *Psychological Bulletin*, 94(3): 429-445.

Slavin, R. F. (1980): Cooperative Learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(2), 315-342.

Smith, K. A. (1986): Cooperative Learning Groups. In S. F. Schmoberg, (Ed.). *Strategies for Active Teaching and Learning in University Classrooms*. Minneapolis: Office of Educational Development Programs, University of Minnesota.

Thungu, J. et al. (2008): *Mastering PTE Education*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Twoli, et al. (2007): *Instructional Methods in Education A Course Book for General Teaching Methods*. Nairobi: KCE.

UNDP (2003): *Human Report 2005*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Walvoord, B. F. (1986): *Helping Students Write Well: A Guide for Teachers in All Disciplines*. (2nd ed.). New York: Modern Language Association.

Whitman, N. A. (1988): *Peer Teaching: To Teach Is to Learn Twice*. Washington, D.C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.4. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

World Bank, (2000): *Education in Sub-Saharan Africa; Policies for Adjustment, Revitalization and Expansion*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.