

**REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF COBET MATERIALS  
AND LEARNERS ACHIEVEMENT IN MASASI AND  
KISARAWA COBET CENTRES**

**Prepared by:  
John Massawe  
Beniel Seka  
Catherine Baynit  
Jeanmina Mtitu**

**TANZANIA INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION IN COLLABORATION WITH THE  
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND UNICEF  
JUNE, 2000**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The writers of the report would like to thank the following for helping to accomplish this work.

1. The Tanzania Institute of Education for supporting the work in various ways and encouraging the writers to complete their task inspite of constraints which sometime slowed down the pace of the work.
2. The Inspectorate Department of the Ministry of Education and Culture for co-ordinating the work
3. District Executive Directors and all the district personnel for Masasi and Kisarawe for their co-operation during the data collection exercise.
4. The Ward Education officers and facilitators in the COBET centres for providing an enabling environment to carry out the data collection exercise.
5. UNICEF for providing funds to do the task.

We hope that this spirit will continue in future.

## CONTENTS

	Ukurasa
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Meaning of the COBET Programme.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.2 Rationale for COBET.....	2
1.3 Aim and Objectives of COBET.....	3
1.4 Objectives of Evaluating the COBET Materials and Achievement of the Learners.....	4
1.5 Significance of the study.....	5
<b>2.0 METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 The Population.....	6
2.2 Sampling and Procedure.....	7
2.3 Instrumentation.....	7
2.4 Administration of Instruments.....	9
<b>3.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.1 Effectiveness of the Modules.....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1.1. Curriculum content.....	10
3.1.2. Illustrations.....	12
3.1.3. Learners' Activities.....	13
3.1.4. The level of Language Complexity.....	15
3.1.5. Questions for Exercises.....	16
<b>3.2 Effectiveness of the Teaching- Learning Materials. 16</b>	
3.2.1 The COBET Syllabuses.....	16
3.2.2 The Learners' and Facilitators' Modules.....	17
3.2.3 Charts Posters and Cards.....	17
<b>3.3 Effectiveness of Classroom Instruction..... 18</b>	
3.3.1 Strategies Used by Facilitators.....	18

3.3.2	Learners' Activities.....	19
3.3.3	Facilitators' Activities.....	20
3.3.4	Methods Used by Facilitators to Motivate Learners.....	21
3.3.5	Methods Used to Facilitate Communication.....	21
3.3.6	Methods of Evaluation Used in Class.....	21
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Learners Achievement Per subject.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.4.1	Cohort One Achievement in Hisabati.....	22
3.4.2	Cohort Two Achievement in Hisabati.....	23
3.4.3	Cohort One Achievement in Ujenzi wa Haiba.....	23
3.4.4	Cohort Two Achievement in Ujenzi wa Haiba.....	24
3.4.5	Cohort One Achievement in Kiswahili.....	25
3.4.6	Cohort Two Achievement in English.....	26
3.4.7	Cohort One Achievement in Maarifa.....	27
3.4.8	Cohort Two Achievement in Maarifa.....	28
3.4.9	Cohort One Achievement in Stadi za Kazi.....	29
3.4.10	Cohort Two Achievement in Stadi za Kazi.....	30
3.4.11	General Performance in the Achievement Tests.....	31
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Teaching – Learning Environment in COBET.....</b>	<b>33</b>
3.5.1	COBET Building Facilities in Masasi.....	33
3.5.2	COBET Building Facilities in Kisarawe.....	33
3.5.3	COBET Furniture in Masasi.....	34
3.5.4	COBET Furniture in Kisarawe.....	34
3.5.5	Care of COBET Materials.....	34

<b>3.6</b>	<b>Community Involvement in COBET.....</b>	<b>35</b>
3.6.1	Rationale for Community Involvement in COBET.....	35
3.6.2	Community Involvement in COBET in Masasi District.....	36
3.6.3	Community Involvement in COBET in Kisarawe District.....	36
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Motivation in the COBET programme.....</b>	<b>37</b>
3.7.1	Absence of Corporal Punishment and Uniforms.....	37
3.7.2	Sports and Games Gear as Motivators.....	37
3.7.3	Provision of Mid-day Meals.....	38
3.7.4	Motivating the Facilitators.....	38
3.7.5	Expanding Work Skills Training in COBET.....	40
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Conclusion and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>40</b>
4.1.1	Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Modules	40
4.1.2	Appropriateness of Teaching-Learning Strategies.	43
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>45</b>
	References .....	47

## **PARTICIPANTS**

This work has involved a total of six evaluators namely

- John E. Massawe (Tanzania Institute of Education).
- Beniel Seka (Tanzania Institute of Education).
- Jeanmina Mtitu (Inspectorate Headquarter MOEC).
- I.W. Mlaponi (Masasi District Chief Inspector of School).
- S.J. Massawe (District Adult Education Officer).
- Catherine Baynit (Inspectorate Headquarters MOEC)

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Meaning of the COBET Programme**

COBET is the short form of Complementary Basic Education for Tanzania. It is a programme intended to benefit children who have missed the opportunity to enroll in formal schools or have dropped out of school for various reasons. It is a second chance for school dropouts but the only chance for those who, for one reason or another, never got any opportunity for schooling.

Uganda carries out a similar programme called COPE (Complementary Opportunity for Primary Education). It is from this programme that the COBET planners and organizers have learned a great deal. This is because both COPE and COBET initiatives are basic education programmes developed jointly by the Ministries of Education and UNICEF in the respective countries.

However, COPE and COBET have fundamental differences. While COPE caters for children aged 8 – 14 years, COBET extends its services up to 18 year olds. Furthermore, COBET operates in two cohorts, cohort one (8-13) and cohort two (14-18) years. Unlike COPE which benefits those children who never enrolled in school and those who dropped out of school for various reasons.

The organizational differences between COPE and COBET determines the complexity of the problems of implementation they face. While COPE learners are expected to be "homogeneous" in their academic ability because they all never went to school, the situation in COBET is different. COBET learners are "heterogeneous" in their academic ability. While the best COBET learners can read and write both in Kiswahili and English, a minority of them can't read or write. Heterogeneous classes are usually difficult to teach. A learner who can't read or write can hardly follow what is written on the chalkboard, text books, cards or posters. While some pupils in normal primary schools learn to read and write in pre-

school education, it sounds as if COBET learners who can't read or write would be given some kind of pre-school treatment before they join their respective cohorts.

## **1.2 Rationale for COBET**

Enrolment into primary education has been declining with time. The rapid expansion in primary education in the seventies as a result of UPE (Universal Primary Education) raised enrolment to primary schooling to very high rates. Due to resource constraints and a number of other reasons, the high enrolment rates have not been sustained. There has been a consequent decline in gross enrolment rate (GER) from a high 98% (1981 figure) to an indicative 77% (1995 figure). It is estimated that the current net enrolment is around 55%. This shows that a substantially large number of school – age children are not enrolled in school. More than 2.25 million children are out of school and some 2.7 million are living in abject poverty, therefore increasing the chances of non-enrolment and further dropout (MOEC, 1999). If enrolment is declining and dropout rate is on the increase, it goes without saying that illiteracy, which we had fought against for so long, shall again be on the increase. To clear the backlog of illiterate children and arrest illiteracy from increasing, some intervention through a non-formal approach is essential. This consideration makes the COBET programme imperative.

The COBET programme becomes even more important in our society because it attempts to empower out of school girls by providing them with an educational opportunity to acquire basic education. Girls usually face more challenges and social misfortunes than boys. For example, on becoming pregnant, they face rustication from school permanently. Some irresponsible parents force their daughters into unplanned marriages to obtain bride price. An educated girl leads to a future

educated mother. COBET therefore increases educational opportunities for the unfortunate girls who missed it.

The COBET programme is very important to the youth because it teaches them productive as well as life skills. The curriculum for "STADI ZA KAZI" is designed such that it opens up opportunities for the learners to learn and train in different apprentices and entrepreneurial skills.

### **1.3 Aim and Objectives of COBET**

According to Katunzi and Manda (1999), the overall objectives of COBET is to provide alternative learning opportunities for out-of-school children, particularly girls. They delineated the specific objectives as to:

- (a) develop a complementary basic education curriculum by strengthening basic competencies, life and survival skills and to introduce flexible time - tabling;
- (b) establish a system for regular, periodic collection of information on out-of-school children and those desegregated by gender, for planning and implementation of COBET;
- (c) identify and improve capacities of key partners such as NGO's, religions groups, Community Based Organizations. (NGOs) and employers involved in providing basic education;
- (d) Plan and implement education for out-of – school children;
- (e) Improve the capacity at the community level to initiate, plan, monitor, evaluate and report on COBET;
- (f) Conscientize communities and parents towards education and other basic rights of unschooled and schooled children in order to increase their support of, and participation in, Complementary Basic Education.

The ultimate aim of COBET in Tanzania is to provide appropriate, equitable and skillful primary education to all children currently not in school, regardless of their gender, economic or geographical status.



It is intended that the COBET programme should be affordable for both the family, the learner and the government. The COBET curriculum is designed to be learner – centred, appropriate and problem oriented. To make the COBET curriculum implementation meaningful and interesting, the teaching – learning methodologies and strategies have been designed to be interactive and participatory.

A successfully COBET programme would have the majority of its learners mainstreamed into the normal primary and secondary education system. This ultimate aim can be achieved because the COBET and primary school curricular have been designed to be as far as possible parallel, but slightly different.

It is the central aim that the COBET programme should produce people who are well versed in the knowledge intended for primary education. Furthermore, the COBET graduates should possess productive skills to the level of making them self reliant as far as economic production is concerned. They should have also developed life skills such as interpersonal communication, self actualization etc.

#### **1.4 Objectives of Evaluating the COBET Materials and Achievement of the Learners**

By the time this evaluation was effected, COBET programme had gone through the first two phases, phases one and phase two, each lasting for three months of actual teaching. Curriculum materials such as syllabi, modules for facilitators and learners for both phases for all the six COBET subjects were in place and were subjected to the present evaluation exercise.

It was therefore imperative to Evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum materials in the field so that year one COBET materials can be published for expansion of the programme and adaptation by other institutions particularly NGO's who offer education for out-of-school children.

The COBET learners had stayed in school for six months and had gone through phase one and phase two of the COBET materials. It was therefore necessary to evaluate learners' achievement after the first two phases of learning.

This exercise evaluated the materials for the first two phases only. The tests for the measuring achievement were also based on the content covered within the first six months. The third phase materials were not evaluated although they had already reached in the COBET centres visited.

### **1.5 Significance of the study**

It is quite clear that the COBET programme has been implemented in the respective centres for only six months, but all the same evaluation had to be effected. Although six months is a relatively short period for the implementation of an educational programme, information was urgently needed to shade light on how to improve the facilitators modules as well as the learners modules , so that they can be published for a wider scale distribution in line with the planned COBET expansion.

It was also important to know how the facilitators were using the learners' and facilitators' modules in class for effective teaching. The modules were scrutinized to identify any shortcomings in them. COBET advocates the use of modern interactive and participatory teaching methods and strategies. It was necessary to find out the extent to which the facilitators put these effective teaching strategies into practice.

Academic achievement is one of the most important aspects of an educational programme. This study was aimed at finding out objectively the extent to which the learners had achieved within the period of six months of COBET teaching. The information about academic achievement may be essential in decision making as to whether after the three phases in both cohorts, the learners should or should not be allowed to continue to second year, or any other decision along that line.

COBET is a community based programme. It was therefore necessary to find out the extent to which the community had accepted and internalized the programme. In this study, the term "community" shall refer to several groups of people related in one way or another to the COBET programme, such as the COBET centre Committee, Village Committees in which the COBET centre is situated, parents, and all the Ward and District administration in general.

Some COBET learners are former school dropouts. It was also important to find out if the reasons which made these learners drop out of school in the past exist in the COBET centres today. COBET future shall depend on whether such reasons are non-existent in the centres or are eradicated as soon as they crop up.

## **2.0 METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 The Population**

The target population in this evaluation exercise include all COBET learners in the twenty centres, ten of the centres located in Kisarawe district in the Maneromango Ward, and the ten centres located in the Lisekese Ward of Masasi district. The population has covered all the sixty (60) facilitators, three per centre.

## **2.2 Sampling and Procedure**

The evaluation covered all the 20 COBET centres in the two districts, Kisarawe and Masasi. All the 60 facilitators were involved in the evaluation by filling a questionnaire specifically designed for them. The community members selected to represent parents' ideas were the COBET centre committee members. It happened that these committee members had some of their children in the respective COBET centres.

Each test paper was administered to a randomly selected group of the learners. In each centre the learners were split into five groups chosen randomly, and each group attempted one of the five tests namely; vocational Skills (Stadi za Kazi); Kiswahili; Mathematics (Hisabati) ; Personality Moulding (Ujenzi wa Haiba) and General knowledge (Maarifa) for cohort one. For cohort two the tests were on the subjects; English; Mathematics, Personality Moulding, General Knowledge and Vocational Skills.

Every facilitator was served with a questionnaire to fill. The facilitators in charge of the COBET centres were asked to respond to an interview. Members of COBET committees were also interviewed to represent the views of parents and the community. Lessons were observed using an observation schedule. COBET materials in each centre were verified using the COBET materials checklist.

## **2.3 Instrumentation**

The present evaluation exercise employed six separate instruments:

- Questionnaire for the community, QC;
- Lesson observation schedule, LOS;
- Facilitators' interview schedule, FIS;
- COBET Materials checklist, CMC;
- Five test papers, one paper per subject.

The questionnaire for the community, QC, was used to seek information from the parents and other community members.

The lesson Observation Schedule, LOS, was used to evaluate the appropriateness of teaching/learning strategies for each subject. It was filled by the evaluation.

The facilitators' Questionnaire, FQ, was used to seek information about the whole process of teaching at the COBET centre. It also sought information about the quality of the facilitators' module, the learners' modules, learners motivation and their activities, the teaching-learning strategies, teaching aids, communication and lesson evaluation.

The Facilitators Interview Schedule, FIS, was used to seek information about the general organization and administration of the COBET centres. It focused mainly on the problems faced during COBET implementation at the respective centres. It also touched on the quality of COBET materials and the related curriculum in general. Enrolment and dropouts along gender lines were also considered.

The COBET Materials Checklist, CMC, was used to verify the presence of all the COBET materials supplied to the centre and their conditions at the material time of evaluation.

The tests were meant to assess the level of academic achievement of the learners after the two phases of teaching within the COBET system. Each cohort had a different test for each of the five subjects. This is because the cohorts have been established age – wise, and this has some implications on their cognitive abilities. No attempt was made to compare the two cohorts due to their age differences.

## **2.4 Administration of Instruments**

It was unfortunate that time and urgency of the work did not give room for the pre-testing of the instruments. The instruments were prepared by four experts, two Curriculum developer from the Tanzania Institute of Education and two school Inspectors from the Inspectorate Headquarters of the Ministry of Education and Culture.

After developing the evaluation instruments the evaluators travelled to their assigned districts. One inspector and one curriculum developer went to Kisarawe district, and the other similar pair went to Masasi district. The host evaluator in Kisarawe was the District Adult Education coordinator, and his counterpart in Masasi was the District Chief Inspector of schools. Therefore the data collection in this evaluation exercise was done by six people, The COBET centres in Likekese ward of Masasi district which were evaluated are Temeke, Nangose, Mkarakate, Nankungwi, Mbonde; Mpekeso, Mkomaindo, Migongo, Mkuti and Mwenge – Mtapika.

Those of Maneromango ward of Kisarawe district are; Chang'ombe, Mengwa, Mfuru Kivukoni, Marumbo, Maneromango Sokoni, Boga, Msanga sokoni, Mianzi, Bembeza and Ngongele.

## **3.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

### **3.1 Effectiveness of the Modules**

The terms of reference (TOR) required the evaluators to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the facilitators' and learners, modules. The following were the attributes used to assess the quality of the facilitators' and learners Modules.

- The depth, width and arrangement of the curriculum content therein;
- The quality and size of the illustrations;
- The quality and complexity of the learners' activities;
- The level of difficulty of the language used in the modules;

- The quantity and quality of the learners' exercises.

These attributes shall be discussed one after another, coupled with quantitative data.

### 3.1.1 Curriculum Content

It was found that content arrangement in the modules was quite satisfactory. The percentage of consensus by the facilitators in favour of the good content arrangement in the modules shows that the modules were expertly designed and developed. Table 3.1 shows that 100% of the facilitators were of the opinion that the content arrangement in the learners module was satisfactory.

**Table 3.1 ARRANGEMENT OF CONTENT IN THE MODULES**

QUESTION	LEARNER'S MODULE				FACILITATORS MODULE			
	YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
Is the content arrangement satisfactory?	59	100	0	0	58	98.3	1	1.7

It was also important to find out the extent to which there was correlation between the syllabuses and the related learners' and facilitators' modules.

**Table 3.2 Correction of the Syllabus and modules**

QUESTION	LEARNER'S MODULE				FACILITATORS MODULE			
	YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
Is there correlation between the syllabuses and related modules?	51	86.4	08	13.6	51	86.4	06	10.2

If the correction is low the module may be branded irrelevant in content. There was a very high percentage of facilitators (86.4) who were of the opinion that both the module types had good correlation with their respective syllabi. This shows that the modules were written based on the already prepared syllabi.

The relationship between the content in the Learners' and facilitators' modules and their related syllabus objectives was evaluated. The high percentages of responses, 100% for the learners modules and 94.9% for facilitators modules show that the facilitators were convinced that the syllabuses' objectives were well represented in the respective modules. These responses are represented in table 3.3.

**Table 3.3 RELATION BETWEEN CONTENT AND SYLLABUSES OBJECTIVES**

QUESTION	LEARNER'S MODULE				FACILITATORS MODULE			
	YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
Is there a relationship between content and syllabus objectives	59	100	0	0	56	94.9	0	0

There was a substantive difference in responses about the time allocated to cover the content present in the syllabuses and modules.

**Table 3.4 TIME ALLOCATION TO COVER SYLLABUS CONTENT**

QUESTION	LEARNER'S MODULE				FACILITATORS MODULE			
	YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
Is the time allocated enough to cover the selected content?	43	72.9	26	44.1	30	50.9	26	44.1



There were some reservations as to the time allocated to cover the syllabus. About the content in the learners' modules, more than half of the facilitators (72.9%) were in favour of the time allocation. The case for facilitators guide was such that almost half of the facilitators had objected that time is not enough, see table 3.4.

### **3.1.2 Illustrations**

The illustrations in the modules were evaluated to find out their quality and quantity. According to the data as seen in table 3.5, there were enough illustrations in the modules. The data also show that the illustrations were of the right size as far as the facilitators were concerned.

The illustrations were chosen so as to related closely with the content. In none of the modules was there an irrelevant illustration.

The illustrations were found to be gender responsive by most of the facilitators (91.5%). This shows that both women and men, boys and girls were represented in different aspects without serious stereotyping.

There were suggestions that drawings and pictures in the modules should be colored so as to be more attractive and stimulate learners interest.

Some respondents suggested that the style of dressing of the people who appear in the pictures should be updated.

**Table. 3.5 Quality of Illustration in the Modules**

QUESTION	LEARNER'S MODULE				FACILITATORS MODULE			
	YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
1. Is the number of illustrations in the modules satisfactory?	55	93.1	1	1.7	55	93.2	1	1.7
2. Are you satisfied with the size of illustrations in the modules?	49	83.1	6	10.1	42	71.2	5	8.5
3. Is there enough relationship between the illustrations and the content in the modules?	53	89.8	4	6.8	46	78	5	8.5
4. Are the illustrations in the modules gender responsive enough?	54	91.5	2	3.4	50	84.7	0	0

There were some drawings in the modules which could also be drawn as posters so that they can be enlarged for more clarification. Drawings on posters are better than the small ones in the modules because the labeling becomes clearer.

### **3.1.3 Learners' Activities**

The COBET curriculum is to a very large extent activity oriented. By thorough inspection of the modules, it was seen that there were many activities in the learners' as well as the facilitator's modules. This can also be evidenced by table 3.6 where 93.2 % of the facilitators indicated that there were enough activities in the modules.

According to the data in table 3.6 the facilitators indicated that the activities in the modules were understandable to them and to the learners. Lesson observations have revealed that most of the activities in the modules are up to the level of the learners because they were actually seen doing them.

Most of the teaching-learning activities which were observed in the evaluation process employed materials obtained from their immediate environment. The facilitators involved the learners when the class was confronted with the tasks of preparing or collecting teaching-learning materials.

**Table. 3.6 Learners' Activities in the Modules**

QUESTION	LEARNER'S MODULE				FACILTATORS MODULE			
	YES	%	NO	%	YE S	%	NO	%
1. Are there enough learners activities in the module?	55	93.2	1	1.7	55	93.2	0	0
2. are the learners activities up to the level of the learners ability?	29	49.2	5	8.5	45	76.3	5	8.5
3. Are the materials needed for the activities in the modules available in the immediate environments?	43	72.9	12	20.3	38	64.4	13	22
4. are the explanations of the activities understandable to the learners and facilitators?	54	91.5	0	0	42	71.2	0	0

### 3.1.4 The kevel of language complexity

The learners and facilitators modules were evaluated to find out the level of complexity of complexity of the language used. Although the language was of moderate difficulty inmost of the modules, those who couldn't read or write could not grasp anything from the modules.

An example was given for staid za kazi where the music language uses was very difficult. The following are some examples of Kiswahili wards which were termed as difficult:

“Bango kitati”; “Matini; “Kufagagua”, “Bungua”, :Bunga bongo n.k. These terms were found to be difficult both for facilitators and the learners.

### 3.1.5 Questions for Exercises

**Table 3.7 Questions at the End of Lessons**

QUESTION	LEARNER'S MODULE				FACILITATORS MODULE			
	YES	%	NO	%	YES	%	NO	%
a) Are there enough questions for learners exercises at the end of lessons in the modules?	48	81.4	11	18.6	34	57.6	25	39
b) Are the end of chapter questions up to the cognitive ability of the learners?	53	89.8	06	10.2	51	86.4	06	10.2

There was a satisfactory agreement (81.4%) that the learners' modules contain enough questions for exercises at the end of each lesson, see table 3.7. The facilitators use these questions in the homework's they assign to the learners. Some of the questions are used in periodic tests.

According to the facilitators interviewed, the end of the chapter questions had been carefully designed in most of the modules to be up to the cognitive ability of the learners. This was verified by looking at the learners' exercise books and seeing the scores they get from the end of lesson questions. Generally the scores were satisfactory.

### 3.2 Effectiveness of Teaching-learning Materials

In this evaluation exercise, teaching materials included the COBET syllabi, the learners' modules, the facilitators' modules, and all other posters, charts, cards etc.

#### 3.2.1 The COBET Syllabuses

The COBET programme has five (5) syllabuses namely:

- Mbinu za Mawasiliano (Communication skills which deals with both English and Kiswahili in one volume;
- Maarifa (General Knowledge);
- Hisabati (Mathematics);

- Stadi za Kazi (Work Skills);
- Ujenzi wa Haiba (Personality Development)

The syllabuses have all been designed meticulously in six columns. The first column is about the skills the learners shall have to master. The skills were well selected, and were always in consonance with the content.

### **3.2.2 The Learners' and Facilitators' Modules**

The effectiveness and appropriateness of the learners' and facilitators' modules have been discussed in detail in section 3.1 of this report. There was enough correlation between the content and its arrangement in the learners' modules versus the content arrangement in the facilitators' modules.

The facilitators' modules are so precise that the facilitators find them easy to follow in their lessons. Everything is well spelt out; the aims and objectives, the teaching-learning aids, the lesson development steps as well as the series of learners' activities. End of lesson questions stimulate more activities on the part of learners.

However, more substantive editing of the modules is required before final publishing of the modules is effected.

### **3.2.3 Charts, Posters and Cards**

In most centres visited, charts were available, but for the subjects which were inspected, they were not used during the lesson observation. Maybe the facilitators did not know what to do with the Charts and posters, or they were simply lazy or didn't bother to use them.

Cards were available in the centres but were not used in the lesson observed.

By observing the classroom walls, it could be seen that some teaching learning materials had been improvised such as mathematics charts, English charts, Kiswahili cards, English cards and pictures. However, no effort was used by facilitators to use these teaching aids in their lessons. In almost all the lessons observed, teaching aids were not used except the modules for the facilitators. It is questionable whether learners textbooks and the teachers guides are teaching aids in actual sense.

### **3.3 Effectiveness of Classroom Instruction**

One lesson was observed in each of the twenty COBET centres, using a Lesson Observation Schedule . The main attributes observed using the schedule are:

- Strategies used by facilitators;
- Activities done by learners during the lesson;
- Activities done by the facilitator;
- Teaching aids and how they were used;
- How the learners were motivated during the lesson;
- Communication and feedback during the lesson;
- Evaluation and follow-up of the lesson.

Each of these attributes has been further discussed and elaborated.

#### **3.3.1 Strategies Used by Facilitators**

During lesson delivery facilitators were observed on the strategies they employed. Observers used a ten strategy checklist to see the extent to which the strategies were used. The strategies are Question – answer, Demonstration, Lecture, Experiment, skill training Discussion, Role play, simulation, Project and Guest Speaker. Most of the facilitators used more than one strategy as can be seen in table. 3.8

**Table 3.8 Strategies Used by Facilitators**

Strategy	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
Question – answer	100%	100%	100%
Demonstration	40%	60%	50%
Lecture	10%	70%	40%
Experiment	0%	10%	5%
Skill training	30%	60%	45%
Discussion	40%	40%	40%
Role play	30%	20%	25%
Simulation	70%	0%	35%
Project	0%	0%	0%
Guest Speaker	0%	0%	0%

The results show that there is a good mix of strategies which could result into effective teaching-learning. Moreover, the Project and Guest Speaker strategies could not have been employed given the short period in which the observation was done.

### 3.3.2 Learners Activities

As teaching went on, learners were observed as they participated in various activities. Eight types of activities were observed, that is Question – answer, Experimentation, Group discussion, Skills training. Use of COBET Books in class, Preparing collecting Learning aids correctly. Table 3.9 gives the results for the two groups (Masasi and Kisarawe) combined.



**Table 3.9 Activities Done by Learners in Class**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Frequency (5)</b>
Question – answer	100
Experimentation	5
Group Discussion	35
Skills Training	85
Use of COBET Books in the Class	85
Preparing/Collecting Learning Aids	30
Responds to Assignments	100
Using Learning Aids Correctly	35

The results appear to be quite positive on learners activities and could lead into effective learning.

### **3.3.3 Facilitators Activities**

Facilitators were observed to perform a number of activities when presenting their lesson. Table 3.10 shows the activities they performed and their frequencies in percentages.

**Table 3.10 Activities Done by Facilitators in Class**

<b>Activities Observed</b>	<b>Frequency (5)</b>
Explanation	90
Answered Learners questions	95
Encouraged and motivated learners	100
Offered fair punishment to offenders	100
Gave demonstrations	65
Corrected mistakes in class	90
Prepared and used teaching aids	45
Prepared a lesson and used it	100
Maintained satisfactory class management	100
Guided group activities	55
Gave and marked assignments	95
Investigated learners' difficulties	85
Summarised group observations	05
Helped individual learners	90
Corrected learners misconceptions	95
Used COBET books in the classroom	85

### **3.3.4 Methods Used by Facilitators to Motivate Learners**

About 85% of the facilitators motivated their learners by praising them for any reasonable attempt they made towards the correct answer. They were observed to use phrases such as “good”, “well done” and “try again”. Almost all the facilitators (95%) gave relevant examples drawn from the learners’ environment and this encouraged them to learn.

### **3.3.5 Method Used to Facilitate Communication**

The use of correct language level for each cohort made communication in class possible. About 95% of the facilitators used the appropriate language level for their cohort. Soliciting learners feedback by probing questions was also very effective in ensuring communication. About 90% of the facilitators applied this technique. Success in communication was also done through meaningful introduction of the lesson. Nearly 75% of the facilitators were successful in this.

### **3.3.6 Methods of Evaluation used in Class**

The majority of facilitators (about 95%) used oral questions to evaluate their lessons. In addition they gave assignments which they marked in class. About 90% of the facilitators did this. Some of them (75%) made corrections and explained any misconception that arose from the lesson.

## **3.4 Learners Achievement Per Subject**

One of the ways to find out whether the COBET programme is succeeding or failing is by looking at learners achievement. This has been presented in the present report through tables of achievement given in table 3.11 through 3.21.

The summary of achievement data given in table 3.21 and the subsequent comments show that some progress is being made in COBET as far as academic achievement is concerned, but a lot remains to be done.

### 1 Cohort One Achievement in Hisabati

A total of 77 learners did the mathematics Achievement test. The mean score was 72.3%. The Masasi group had a mean score of 75.8%. Their counterparts in Kisarawe District had a relatively lower score. Their mean score was 72.3%. The actual scores have been shown in table 3.11.

**Table 2.11: Achievement in Hisabati for Cohort One**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
	2.6		1.4
	2.6	3.0	2.8
5	2.6	-	1.4
10	2.6	3.0	2.8
15	0.0	-	0.0
20	5.3	-	2.8
25	5.3	-	2.8
30	5.3	-	2.8
35	0.0	6.1	2.8
40	2.6	6.1	4.2
45	2.6	-	1.4
50	7.9	3.0	5.6
55	0.0	9.1	4.2
60	5.3	6.1	5.6
65	5.3	3.0	4.2
70	5.3	9.1	7.1
75	0.0	12.1	12.8
80	7.9	6.1	7.1
85	13.2	9.1	11.3
90	10.4	24.2	16.9
	n = 44	n = 33	n = 77

### 3.4.2 Cohort Two Achievement in Hisabati

A total of 48 learners did the Hisabati Test. The mean score was 47.8%. The Masasi group had a mean score of 57.8% whereas the Kisarawe group had a lower mean score of 35.7%. The actual performance for grouped data has been shown in table 3.12.

**Table 3.12 Achievement in Hisabati for Cohort Two.**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
0-5	14.3	0.0	10.4
6-10	3.6	0.0	2.0
11-15	3.5	5.0	4.2
16-20	7.1	0.0	4.2
21-25	3.6	5.0	4.2
26-30	3.6	5.0	4.2
31-35	7.1	0.0	8.3
36-40	10.7	0.0	4.0
41-45	14.3	10.0	10.4
46-50	10.7	15.0	8.3
51-55	3.6	15.0	4.2
56-60	3.6	5.0	4.2
61-65	3.6	5.0	8.3
66-70	7.1	10.0	6.3
71-75	0.0	10.0	6.5
76-80	3.6	5.0	6.3
81-85	0.0	0.0	2.0
86-90	0.0	5.0	0.0
91-95	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	0.0	5.0	2.0
	n = 26	n = 22	n = 48

### 3.4.3 Cohort One Achievement in Ujenzi wa Haiba

A total of 56 learners in cohort One attempted the Ujenzi wa Haiba test. The mean score was 34.8%. The mean score for the Masasi group was 35.6% while that of Kisarawe was 28.7%. The scores have been displayed in table 3.13.

**Table 3.13 Achievement in Ujenzi wa Haiba for Cohort One**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
0-15	35.3	9.5	18.4
6-10	0.0	3.1	2.0
11-15	17.7	6.2	8.2
16-20	0.0	18.8	12.5
21-25	0.0	9.5	6.1
26-30	5.9	0.0	2.0
31-35	0.0	0.0	0.0
36-40	11.7	15.6	14.3
41-45	5.9	0.0	2.0
46-50	5.9	6.2	6.1
51-55	0.0	3.1	2.0
56-60	0.0	6.1	4.1
61-65	5.9	0.0	2.0
66-70	0.0	9.5	6.1
71-75	5.9	0.0	2.0
76-80	0.0	3.1	2.0
81-85	0.0	0.0	0.0
86-90	5.9	0.0	2.0
91-95	0.0	6.2	4.1
95-100	5.9	3.1	4.1
	n = 25	n = 31	n = 56

#### **3.4.4 Cohort Two Achievement in Ujenzi wa Haiba**

A total of 36 learners did the Ujenzi wa Haiba test. The mean score was 45.4 %. The Masasi learners had a mean score of 40.5% whereas their counterparts in Kisarawe had a relatively higher mean score of 51.0%. The actual performance has been displayed in table 3.14

**Table 3.14 Achievement in Ujenzi wa Haiba for Cohort Two**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
0-15	15.8	20.0	18.4
6-10	0.0	0.0	0.0
11-15	0.0	0.0	0.0
16-20	0.0	0.0	0.0
21-25	10.5	0.0	5.3
26-30	0.0	5.0	2.6
31-35	0.0	15.0	7.9
36-40	15.8	5.0	10.5
41-45	0.0	15.0	7.9
46-50	10.5	5.0	7.9
51-55	0.0	0.0	0.0
56-60	5.3	15.0	10.5
61-65	0.0	0.0	0.0
66-70	0.0	0.0	0.0
71-75	5.9	5.0	2.6
76-80	36.8	5.0	21.2
81—85	5.3	0.0	2.6
86-90	0.0	5.0	2.6
91 -95	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0
	n = 17	n = 19	n = 36

### 3.4.5 Cohort One Achievement in Kiswahili

A total of 59 learners attempted the Kiswahili Achievement Test.. The means score was 47.4% . The Masasi learners had a reasonably high mean score of 60.6% compared with the Kisarawe learners who had a much lower mean score of 33.8%. The scores in grouped data have been displayed in table 3.15.

**Table 3.15 Achievement in Kiswahili for Cohort One**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
0-15	20.0	6.7	13.4
6-10	6.7	13.4	10.0
11-15	0.0	6.7	3.3
16-20	6.7	3.3	5.0
21-25	13.4	6.7	10.0
26-30	0.0	0.0	0.0
31-35	6.7	0.0	3.3
36-40	6.7	3.3	5.0
41-45	3.3	3.3	3.3
46-50	10.0	0.0	5.0
51-55	3.3	6.7	5.0
56-60	6.7	3.3	5.0
61-65	3.3	3.3	3.3
66-70	0.0	0.0	0.0
71-75	0.0	3.0	1.7
76-80	3.3	10.0	6.7
81-85	0.0	20.0	10.0
86-90	3.3	6.7	5.0
91-95	3.3	0.0	1.7
95-100	3.3	3.3	3.3
	n=29	n=30	n=59

**3.4.6 Cohort Two Achievement in English**

A total of 28 learners did the English language test. The mean score was 53.0%. The Masasi group had a mean score of 67.2% whereas the Kisarawe group mean score went as low as 17.5%. The actual performance is shown in table 3.16.

**Table 3.16 Achievement in English for Cohort Two**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
0-15	62.5	0.0	19.0
6-10	0.0	0.0	0.0
11-15	0.0	0.0	0.0
16-20	0.	5.3	3.9
21-25	12.5	5.3	6.7
26-30	0.0	0.0	0.0
31-35	0.0	5.3	3.9
36-40	0.0	0.0	0.0
41-45	0.0	0.0	0.0
46-50	12.5	5.2	6.7
51-55	0.0	5.2	3.9
56-60	0.0	15.8	11.5
61-65	0.0	10.5	6.7
66-70	12.5	5.5	6.7
71-75	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-80	0.0	5.3	3.9
81-85	0.0	10.5	7.7
86-90	0.0	15.8	11.5
91-95	0.0	5.3	3.9
95-100	0.0	10.5	4.0
	n= 8	n=20	n=28

### 3.4.7 Cohort One Achievement in Maarifa

The cohort had a total of 50 learners who attempted the Maarifa Achievements test. The mean score was 26.3%. The Kisarawe group had a mean score of 27.8% whereas their counterparts in Masasi had a relatively lower mean score of 24.1%. The grouped data scores have been shown in table 3.17.



**Table 3.18 Achievement in Maarifa for Cohort Two**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
0-15	33.4	4.8	17.7
6-10	0.0	0.0	0.0
11-15	0.10	0.0	0.0
16-20	98.3	19.0	14.7
21-25	16.7	9.5	11.8
26-30	0.0	9.5	5.9
31-35	16.7	0.0	5.9
36-40	0.0	14.3	8.8
41-45	0.0	0.0	0.0
46-50	0.0	0.0	0.0
51-55	0.0	0.0	0.0
56-60	0.0	19.0	11.8
61-65	8.3	9.5	8.8
66-70	0.0	0.0	0.0
71-75	8.3	4.8	5.9
76-80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81-85	0.0	0.0	0.0
86-90	8.3	4.8	5.9
91-95	0.0	4.8	2.8
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0
	n = 16	n = 22	n = 28

#### 3.4.9 Cohort One Achievement in Stadi za Kazi

A total of 54 learners attempted the Stadi za Kazi Achievement Test. The mean score was 19.3%. Both groups' scores were quite low. The Masasi group had a mean score of 20.1% whereas their counterparts in Kisarawe had a slightly lower mean score of 18.2%. The grouped scores have been shown in table 3.19

**Table 3.19 Achievement in Stadi za Kazi for Cohort One**

Scores (%)	FREQUENCIES IN %		
	Kisarawe	Masasi	All
0-15	29.1	38.7	34.5
16-20	16.6	16.2	16.4
21-25	12.5	9.7	10.9
26-30	8.3	3.2	5.5
31-35	0.0	0.0	0.0
36-40	12.5	3.2	7.3
41-45	4.2	9.7	7.3
46-50	4.2	6.5	5.5
51-55	0.0	0.0	0.0
56-60	0.0	0.0	0.0
61-65	0.0	3.2	1.8
66-70	4.2	0.0	1.8
71-75	4.2	3.2	3.6
76-80	0.0	0.0	0.0
81-85	0.0	0.0	0.0
86-90	0.0	3.2	1.8
91-95	4.2	3.2	3.6
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0
	n = 23	n = 31	n = 56

#### 3.4.10 Cohort Two Achievement in Stadi za Kazi

A total of 29 learners did the Stadi za Kazi test. The mean score was 34.7%. The Kisarawe group had a mean score of 22.4% while their counterparts in Masasi had a relatively higher mean score of 42.3%. The actual performance has been displayed in table 3.20

**Table 3.21 General Academic Performance**

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>COHORT ONE</b>	<b>COHORT TWO</b>
Hisabati	72.3%	47.3%
Ujenzi wa Haiba	34.8%	45.4%
Kiswahili	47.4%	-
English	-	53.0%
Maarifa	26.3%	42.4%
Stadi za Kazi	19.3%	34.7%

The results show that cohort one had good performance in Hisabati. Cohort two, on the other hand, had fairly good performance in English. Cohort two's relatively low achievement in Hisabati was due to learners inability to follow instructions. For example when they were asked to expand (fafanua) they did it the conventional way and they were penalised. They also lacked operational skills, especially division. However it was learned that most of the learners had not been taught division by the end of the second 3 months.

Cohort one performed poorly in both Maarifa and Stadi za Kazi. The poor performance has been attributed to:

- Poor reading skills. Most of the learners could not read the questions. They were used to answering oral questions only.
- Lack of writing skills. Quite a number of them could not write at all. They could not write words, leave alone forming them.
- They had only practised psychomotor skills in Stadi za Kazi. The achievement test appeared strange to them and only few learners were able to answer the questions.

Cohort two did slightly better in the two subjects compared to cohort one. This is probably due to maturity level of the learners. There were some attempts but most of the answers were quite inadequate. They need more practice and guidance.

### **3.5 Teaching-Learning Environment in COBET**

Learning occurs better in a conducive and attractive environment. A good environment is a motivation to the learner. Poor environment can destruct the learners' attention from lesson. If the environment is polluted, learners may contract diseases.

#### **3.5.1 COBET Building Facilities in Masasi**

Among the ten COBET centres in Masasi district, only three (Namkungwi, Mbonde, Temeke) had developed their permanent buildings (office and classroom). Most centres had temporary pit latrines. The rest of the COBET centres used borrowed buildings. Some of the borrowed buildings did not have windows or doors. The borrowed buildings were owned by the village or the nearby primary schools.

The compounds in most of the COBET centres were well kept, but none of the centres had developed flower gardens or planted trees.

#### **3.5.2 COBET Buildings Facilities in Kisarawe**

COBET buildings in the ten Kisarawe centres have a fair condition, not too bad, not good enough. All the centres use borrowed buildings. For example Maneromango sokoni uses a Mosque building, and others use CCM buildings. However, the borrowed buildings have enough ventilation and light. All the COBET centres in Kisarawe except Maneromango Sokoni have offices, and the classrooms have chalkboards.

In most of the COBET centres in Kisarawe, the toilets are in poor condition. The toilets have no doors. However, plans are underway to build permanent houses for COBET.

### **3.5.3 COBET Furniture in Masasi**

All the centres visited had no furniture of their own. For some centres learners come with their chairs from the homes some borrowed from primary school and other were using the benches owned by the village government. Every centre had good plans to build permanent buildings for COBET centres and make furniture for the classrooms.

### **3.5.4 COBET Furniture in Kisarawe**

Although the conditions of the existing items in all centres are good, the furniture's are not enough in almost all centres. For example, desks are a problem in all centres except for Bembeza and Msanga sokoni. In other centres, learners are more affected thus when they want to write, they must use the floor. This was observed at Mfuru Kivukoni centre. Items like teachers table, chairs, cupboards/shelves are not enough. Other centres don't have such items at all.

### **3.5.5 Care of COBET Materials**

Generally, the system of taking care of COBET materials is poor. This is because many of the COBET centres have no offices, and no storage facilities such as cupboards or shelves. Some of the buildings used as classrooms have no doors or windows.

In the few centres where classrooms had doors, the books and stationery were kept on the floor.

However, the facilitators ask for help and keep the materials in the Headteachers offices of nearby primary schools. In other centres where the centre facilitator resides close to the centre, they keep the materials at their houses of residence.

Worse still, some of the centres do not keep an up-to-date inventory of the materials they receive. In some centres no record of materials was kept at all. In such a situation, losses of materials can hardly be traced. Centre facilitators need a sensitization seminar on materials management.

### **3.6 Community Involvement in COBET**

COBET is essentially a community based programme. Parents and the community in general have shown positive responses towards COBET. In most of the centres, parents had put a lot of effort in trying to provide COBET with permanent shelter. Parents were involved in building COBET offices and classrooms on a self-help basis (without payment)

#### **3.6.1 Rationale for Community Involvement in COBET**

For the COBET programme to become sustainable, it must be owned almost completely by parents in the neighborhood of the COBET centre. The parents in Kisarawe and Masasi were sensitized to realize the importance of COBET to their society. They pointed out that COBET:

- taught their out-of-school children the three R's (reading, writing and arithmetic);
- helped to shape the behaviour of their children who would otherwise become thief's, thugs, drug pushers and so forth;
- taught their children different skills for self employment.

From these reasons, parents have shown a lot of support for COBET. COBET leadership in every centre is under influence of COBET centre committee. This committee bridges the COBET centre with the rest of the community. It is under these committees that arrangements were made to get temporary buildings for COBET infrastructure. The COBET centre committees work closely with their respective village development committees to secure permanent plots for COBET and also solve other problems.

### **3.6.2 Community Involvement in COBET in Masasi District**

The parents and the general community surrounding COBET centres in Masasi have shown a lot of support to the COBET programme. The support that parents give could be seen in the following:

- Parents had made arrangements to acquire temporary buildings for COBET centres;
- Parents had built permanent buildings for COBET e.g. at Temeke Mpekeso and Namkungwi. The rest of the centres were at different stages of building permanent COBET buildings.
- Parents were making arrangements in different COBET centres to provide some kind of afternoon meal. In the Temeke centre, for example, the learners get their lunch daily from parents' contribution of maize and beans. Other centres are making arrangements at least to be able to provide porridge to the learners.
- Parents allow the learners to come to the centres with chairs brought from home.
- Parents are making efforts to prepare permanent furniture for COBET centres

### **3.6.3 Community Involvement in COBET in Kisarawe District**

What has been said for Masasi about community involvement applies also to Kisarawe in most cases. The parents and the general community are involved in building classrooms, offices latrines and the related furniture.

What is common between Masasi and Kisarawe is that the COBET centres are helped by the community at village level, ward and district level. For example, district councils supply COBET centres with construction materials e.g. corrugated iron sheets cement and transport.

### **3.7 Motivation in the COBET Programme**

Motivation involves those inner states and processes that prompt, direct, and sustain activity (Zanden and Pace, 1984). Motivation influences the rate of learning, the retention of information and performance.

Motivation may also influence the efficiency of teachers. While learners achieve better when motivated, teachers also work better when motivated.

#### **3.7.1 Absence of Corporal Punishment and Uniforms**

The fact that in COBET system corporal punishment is not used is some kind of a negative reinforcement. Some learners dropped out of school in the past due to excessive use of corporal punishment. By talking to the learners, it was found that they were very appreciative of the absence of corporal punishment in COBET. However, some learners have shown some amount of rudeness may be because there are no threats of punishments.

Learners in COBET do not dress in uniforms. They are not normally forced to wash their clothes, take bath and keep clean. May be it is because no one would like to offend them. For this reason, the COBET learners keep a poor level of personal hygiene. They must be helped to improve their cleanliness. Some facilitators suggested that it would be a good idea if the learners were given uniforms.

#### **3.7.2 Sports and Game Gear as Motivators**

Facilitators suggested that the learners have always asked for sports and games materials such as footballs, netball, nets, jerseys and other sportware. Games are motivating in themselves, because they can make the learners as well as facilitators joyful and cheerful. If sports gear is



available, the learners can make their own arrangements to have time to play. Playing will make the learners love school life. Competition among the learners from different COBET centres should be encouraged.

Singing and traditional dances should be encouraged. COBET centres should work with parents or other traditional experts to prepare drums and other equipment used in traditional "ngoma". The learners will always find their own time to dance provided the materials are available. The subject of STADI ZA KAZI could be used in the preparation of the required materials.

### **3.7.3 Provision of Mid-day Meals**

Mid-day meal is very important to young learners. It adds life to the learners so that they can participate well in sports, singing, drama, "ngoma" and other activities which need energy.

In most of the centres, parents are making local arrangements so that the learners could get at least a bowl of porridge in the afternoon. One of the centres in Masasi, the TEMEKE centre, has gone as far as providing lunch (beans with stiff porridge). Some of the COBET learners do not have constant meals at home, so a single meal at the centre could make all the difference.

### **3.7.4 Motivating the Facilitators**

For teaching to be as effective as expected, the COBET facilitators must be strongly motivated. A few things can strongly motivate the facilitators, e.g. improved allowances, housing, in-service seminars and short courses for promotion.

The facilitators work under especially difficult conditions. Sometimes they are abused by the learners who are not fearful because of the

absence of punishments. They should be considered for special allowances for working in difficult conditions. The facilitators need the hardship allowances because they deal with learners whose behaviour is not very much under their control.

Some of the facilitators have to travel long distances to the COBET centres. It would be a greatly motivating package if houses for facilitators (especially the centre facilitators) were built near the respective centres.

The types of teaching style required by COBET is that of involving activity oriented, interactive and participatory strategies. Such methods and strategies can only be acquired by the facilitators through a series of in-service seminars and planned short courses. The facilitators need special psychological expertise to deal with out-of-school youth. They should have enough guidance and counselling experience to help learners who face social difficulties. While seminars and short courses are so essential to the facilitators, they are also very strongly motivating.

The form four leavers who have had no previous teacher training should be considered for training in Teachers Colleges, at least for one year. The new subject STADI ZA KAZI must be supported by helping the facilitators through courses and seminars. The facilitators need help also in English and Mathematics (Hisabati).

The facilitators should be supplied with supplementary readers. In the COBET centres, there should be mini libraries or at least some book chambers, which shall contain supplementary reading materials. Since COBET learners have their own modules, they should be supplied with normal primary school textbooks which they will use as supplementary books.

### 3.7.5 Expanding Work Skills Training in COBET

Many of the parents interviewed suggested that the COBET curriculum, especially in the subject of STADI ZA KAZI should be expanded so as to include work skills for future self-employment.

The learners will be greatly motivated if they learn the skills they may use to earn money for a living. The following are some of the apprentices which could be highly motivating if they were to be taught in the COBET centres:

- Cookery and Needlework (home economics);
- Carpentry, masonry and metalwork;
- Horticulture and animal husbandry;
- Shoe making and basket making;
- Watch and radio repair.

Parents further suggested that the learners could be provided with tools for the different apprentices. For examples, those learners taking learning cookery skills could be given cooking pots, plates and spoons. Those learners taking carpentry skills could be given hand saws, machets, planes etc. By so doing the learners will be extremely motivated.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 Conclusion

#### 4.1.1. Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Modules

The evaluation team visited all the twenty COBET centres in Masasi and Kisarawe districts. The following are generally the major findings:

- (a) The COBET syllabuses did not pose major problems. The content therein is within the cognitive level of the learners. The syllabuses are supported by parents and the community in general.

- (b) The modules for learners and facilitators were being used in class as planned. However, facilitators did not make any efforts to use extra or supplementary academic materials. They tried to teach faithfully what was contained in the modules. The facilitators did not make any effort to expand the spectrum of the teaching-learning materials suggested in the facilitators' modules.
- (c) To a large extent the illustrations in the modules are appropriate in the sense that they help to illustrate the relevant content. No illustration in any of the modules was found to be completely irrelevant to the content. The illustrations were also properly captioned.
- (d) The relevancy of a module, unit or lesson depends on their correlation with the related syllabus. By simple inspection, this correlation was found to be satisfactory in each subject. The units and lesson in each module were a clear representation of the content in the related syllabus.
- (e) The organization of lesson as they appear in the facilitators' guides are satisfactory.
- (f) The flow of content in each lesson in each subject was observed to be correct and consistent. It shows clearly that principles of transfer of learning were observed in the planning and development of COBET curriculum materials. Units and lessons are arranged from the less difficult to the rather difficult ones, and they build from each other.

- (g) The language used in the COBET modules is moderate, but the language ability of the learners differ substantially. The small percentage of learners in both cohort One and Cohort Two who can't read or write properly face most problems in communication in class. They can't read what is written in the learners modules. They face difficulties in taking notes and responding to class assignments.
- (h) There were enough activities and exercises for the learners in each lesson of each subject. The activities in the modules are appropriate but from the observations made, they were poorly implemented in some instances. The elderly facilitators did not teach as actively and interactively as the facilitators modules demanded . Most of them used teacher-centred strategies.
- (i) There was no crisis in time allocation for the COBET programme. The content which was planned to be completed in the first six months (phase I and phase II) had been done. Materials for the third phase had just arrived. There was also no crisis about the time table.
- (j) The modules are gender responsive to a satisfactory extent. The content in the modules as well as the illustrations depict boys and girls almost in equal frequencies. The problem of negative stereotyping in the illustrations is also absent. Activities which used to be socially coined to be of girls and women are now seen through illustrations and text to be done also by boys and men.

#### **4.1.2 Appropriateness of Teaching-Learning Strategies**

**(a) Presentation of Introduction**

In most of the lessons observed, introduction was done through a mixture of strategies, mostly lecture and question-answer. Facilitators asked questions based on previous lessons and the learners responded accordingly. Some of the questions posed during introduction were sometimes based on the lesson in session, but picked from the facilitators' module.

**(b) Teaching-Learning Procedures**

To a large extent, the elderly facilitators used the teacher-centred strategies such as lectures and demonstrations. The younger facilitators in most cases observed strictly the procedures outlined in their facilitators' guides. However, the modules are designed such that interactive and participatory procedures are encouraged.

**(c) Learners Involvement**

Learners were involved in class through question – answer sessions and also in classroom exercises. There were few learner – centred activities such as small group discussion, simulations, dramatization, games, role-play, excursions or project work.

**(d) Use of teaching- learning Aids**

Some of the teaching-learning aids suggested in the modules were hard to find in the immediate environment of the COBET centres. In some cases, the learners' modules were indicated in the facilitators module as the only teaching aids, which is not very correct. A teaching-learning aid is a material which helps a learner to understand a certain concept.

**(e) Giving and Correcting Exercises**

At the end of every lesson observed, exercises were given and corrections were made. This observation was further strengthened by finding that learners exercise books had been marked and scored up to the date of observation.

**(f) Teaching-Learning Environment**

A lot has to be done in this field. Many centres do not have permanent classrooms. Efforts must be made to build them. In most of the centres, the learners do not have permanent desks to sit on and write. Sitting and writing on the floor provides a poor learning environment, and it could be a serious disincentive.

Since most of the centres were temporary, there were no attempts to plant trees or flower gardens.

Toilet facilities for the learners are not satisfactory, and in some centres they are absent..

**(g) Development of Intended Skills**

Skills development was most obvious in the subject of STADI ZA KAZI. In this subject, the learners had made tangible things which were displayed in class. By virtue of being able to make different items, it shows the learners must have developed some skills. Since it was only the beginning, it is most likely they will develop more skills in the future.

**(h) Learners Achievement**

The general performance in the achievement tests has not been particularly good. This was attributed to the abruptness in which the tests were taken. For instance, they did not do

any preparation including revision. It was also the first time they did a printed test and quite a number of them looked puzzled. However, good performance was recorded in Hisabati for cohort 1 and in English language for cohort 2.

#### **4.2 Recommendations**

- 1) Both the learners' and facilitators' modules have to be edited by an independent body before they are published for wider circulation. Substantive editing as well as language editing are essential.
- 2) Supply COBET centres with supplementary reading materials. Since COBET programme has its own modules, the books used in mainstream primary schools could be used as supplementary materials for COBET.
- 3) A different strategy should be adopted to deal with the learners who can not read or write. Most of these learners had never been to school at all. They make insignificant progress when they are mixed in the same class with those who can read and write in both Kiswahili and English. This applies to both cohorts one and two. Some kind of pre-COBET treatment should be planned for them so that they join COBET when they can read and write.
- 4) COBET facilitators must be encouraged through seminars to use interactive and participatory teaching strategies. If they are left alone the "old-timers" will continue using their poor non-participatory methods.
- 5) Motivate the facilitators by doing the following:
  - (a) Arrange more inservice seminars for skills training in pedagogy;
  - (b) Increase allowances because they teach in unusual conditions;
  - (c) Build residential houses for COBET facilitators;
  - (d) Provide teacher training opportunity for COBET untrained facilitators



- (e) Provide facilitators with a means of transport e.g. bicycle on credit basis;
  - (f) Provide facilitators with knowledge and skills in guidance and counseling so that they are able to deal with the most **"difficult"** learners.
6. Motivate the Learners by doing the following:
- (a) Building permanent classes equipped with the necessary furniture e.g desks, teachers table and chair, cupboards etc.
  - (b) Provide simple lunch meal for the learners;
  - (c) Provide sports and games equipment e.g. balls and nets.
  - (d) Illustrations in the modules should be coloured and attractive.
7. There should be a gender balance in the registration of learners for COBET. At present there are more boys than girls in the classrooms. Only learners who are **"COBET MATERIAL"** should be registered. In some centres in Masasi there are learners who could have joined normal primary schools but they are in COBET.

## REFERENCE

1. Katunzi, N. (1999) **Complementary Opportunity for Primary Education (COPE) and the Complementary Basic Education in Tanzania (COBET Curriculum**, Dar es Salaam.
2. Katunzi, N. and Manda, S. (1999) **Complementary Basic Education for Tanzania (COBET Papers in Education and Development**, University of Dar es Salaam.
3. Kinunda, M, Mmari, G., Robinson, T. and Sarvi, J (1999) **Tanzania Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP)**, Ministry of Education and Culture, Dar es Salaam.
4. Matulu, J.A.P. Mlekwa, F., Mweta, W.R. (1999) **Report on Training of COBET Centre Facilitators in Kisarawe District**, Tanzania Institute of Education, Dar es Salaam.
5. Mosha, I. (1999) **Report on Phase II Materials Development and Production for COBET Programme**, Tanzania Institute of Education, Dar es Salaam.
6. Mvungi, T.A. (1999) **Report of COBET Facilitators Training Workshop in Masasi**, Tanzania Institute of Education, Dar es Salaam.