Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Civic Education on Acquisition of Social Cohesion Competency among Secondary School Students in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya

Esther Omundi*and Evans Ogoti Okendo (PhD) **
*PhD Candidate Catholic University of Eastern Africa –Gaba Campus
**Mwenge Catholic University (Tanzania), Faculty of Education

Abstract
The purpose of the evaluation was to establish the effect of civic education on social cohesion in secondary schools in Uasin Gishu county Kenya. The evaluation was guided by the Constructivist theory and (CIPP) model. Causal comparative design was used. Target population included 142 secondary schools, 142 teachers and 8520 students. Stratified and simple random sampling techniques were used to select 256 History and Government students from 43 schools. The study used Questionnaire for data collection. Data collected was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics was in form of frequencies, percentage, means and standard deviation. Independent t-test, multiple regression and chi-square were adopted to test the hypotheses. The study established that majority of the students have been taught all the topics in civic education. The assessment methods commonly used to evaluate the teaching of civic education were use of objective tests and oral questions. The findings indicated that majority of the students scored below average on the items that measured the knowledge of the students on the core tenets of civic education. Majority of the students were generally likely to treat others well. The overall mean for the aggression scale was 2.46 in a scale of 0-6 times which implies that majority of the students were likely to do wrong to their colleagues two times. On ethnocentric scale, majority of the students believed that their culture is superior to others. Further, majority of the students were somewhat likely to forgive. Majority of the students feel nervous when they speak in front of a group and they were concerned about what other people think of them. To some extent, the students are self-conscious. The study established that there was a significant relationship between students' level of knowledge on civic education and the internalization of the core tenets of civic education.

Key words. Ethnocentric, forgiveness, aggression, civic education and citizenship

Introduction

The education given to members of the society during the pre-colonial period prepared them to take certain roles in society and to become useful members of that society (Omolewa, 2007). Therefore, the main objective of this education was to train youths for adulthood (Marlow-Ferguson & Lopez, 2001). Learning by doing or apprenticeship was the method that Africans had always used (Omolewa, 2007). Apart from skills development, African education emphasized social responsibility, political participation, spirituality and moral values (Marlow-Ferguson & Lopez, 2001). This was passed on from one generation to the next by word of mouth through song, dance, proverbs, folktales and myths (Elabor-demudia, 2000). This resulted in cultural estrangement, which in turn served to reinforce Africans' self-devaluation and self-hatred (Nyamnjoh, 2004).

Formal education was introduced in Kenya in the 1800s by Christian missionaries. The goal of introducing formal education to Africans was purely for the spread of Christianity in Africa (Alwy & Schech, 2004). The British government's decision to educate the Africans was solely to serve the interests of the British government. The colonial education was designed to produce workers who would remain submissive and serve in subordinate positions and at the same time play the role of "civilizing" their fellow natives (Mwiria, 1991). In Kenya, for the few who managed to get admission to high school, they were bombarded with

Western cultural values through the teaching of European literature and history. Christian religion which was an integral part of the curriculum denounced African customs as heathen (Whitehead, 2005).

Despite the cultural violence inherent in this type of education, many Africans who only received practice-oriented education viewed academic-oriented education as a means through which their social standing would be elevated. They wanted the high quality of education that Europeans and Asians received, but at the same time they wanted an education that would not destroy their cultures. This led to the rejection of the education offered by the British government and Africans started their own independent schools (Omolewa, 2007).

Since independence, there have been successive committees formed to address educational issues. For instance, in 1976 a committee was formed to redefine Kenya's educational policies and objectives. The report produced by this committee emphasized the need to strengthen national unity and to promote economic, social and cultural aspirations of the people of Kenya (MOEST, 2005). These objectives were echoed in a report written in 2000 by a commission of inquiry, which had been mandated to inquire into the Kenyan education system and make recommendations on how the Kenyan education system can promote national unity, social responsibility, rapid industrial and technological development, life-long learning and adaptation in response to changing circumstances (MOEST, p.3).

Although there were many other education committees, the 1981committee is very important in the education history of Kenya because it led to the abolition of "A" levels and the establishment of 8-4-4 system of education (MOEST, 2005). The promulgation of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 ushered in changes in how the state and citizen relate. The constitution places the sovereign power in the people of Kenya, which they can exercise directly or through their democratically elected representatives. The sovereignty is exercised at national and county level. Further, participation of people is one of the national values and principles of governance as provided in Article 10 of the constitution and all state organs and officers are bound to apply it. Every person has right to freedom of expression including freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas. These constitutional provisions put the citizens at the centre of government programmes and governance.

The County Government Act provides that there shall be established a national design and framework for civic education including determining the content of civic education curriculum. All these provisions demand for structured, continuous and sustainable way of engaging with the citizens. In the past, civic education has been provided by civil society organizations and faith-based organizations with little coordination and varied messages as well as delivery mechanisms. Over the years, this scenario has improved with the government initiating the Kenya National Integrated Civic Education (KNICE) Programme. The programme developed coordination mechanism, curriculum to standardize messaging and delivered civic education at national and county level.

Civic education (which is taught as part of history and government in the Kenyan education system at the high school level) was purposely chosen because the subject's central goal is to address issues that promote social cohesion and sound democratic citizenship. Civic education, therefore, offers a platform for the explicit discussion of issues that would promote peace, not only in the confinement of the classroom, but social cohesion as a whole.

Civic education is defined "as educating children, from early childhood, to become clear-thinking and enlightened citizens who participate in decisions concerning society" (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 2005). The Programme's long term goal is to create sustained public awareness on, adherence to and engagement with the Constitution. The Vision of the Strategy is an informed citizenry that actively participates in the affairs of the society. This vision is based on the desire to have citizens that are fully aware of their relationship with society and to mobilize them to play their role in shaping the society's future. The constitution provides the lens with which to contextualize that participation.

The County Government Act 2012, Section 99 provides the objectives of civic education as follows: Sustained citizens' engagement in the implementation of the constitution; Improved understanding, appreciation and engagement of in the operationalization of the county system of government; Institutionalizing culture of constitutionalism; knowledge of Kenya's transformed political system, context and implications; Enhanced knowledge and understanding of electoral system and procedures; Enhanced awareness and mainstreaming of the bills of rights and national values; Heightened demand by citizens for

service delivery by institutions of governance at the county level; Ownership and knowledge on principal economic, social and political issues facing county administrators and their form, structures and procedures; and appreciating for the diversity of Kenya's communities as building blocks for national cohesion and integration.

The project is designed for secondary schools. This is because they are been trained on civic education from primary schools and they are expected to practice social cohesion within and outside their schools and at their homes. They are also expected to share the knowledge, skills and attitudes with the community. Group activities to be evaluated will include; election of the leaders in schools; group discussions in class; streaming in schools which should not portray any discrimination in relation to gender, tribe, ability or social backgrounds.

Students outcome to be evaluated will include; minimized strikes in schools, maximum discipline, participation in community development activities, avoid participants in electoral violence; changes in community attitude- sensitizing the community on the need to practice peace, democracy and human rights by respecting each individual and their properties. Students' achievement will also be evaluated through a test

Statement of the problem

Despite lot of emphasis on the role of civic education as tool of promoting social cohesion, Kenya has been experiencing ethnic tensions some of which generated to violence. These ethnic tensions characteristically occur at every election period since the initiation of multiparty democracy in 1991/1992. For instance, Kenya experienced ethnic violence in 1992, 1997, 2002 and 2007/2008. The most infamous and wide spread post-election violence that involved people from various ethnic backgrounds was that of 2007/2008. The violence led to lose of life of innocent children, men and women not to mention displacement of many families and destruction of property. Among the hardest hit areas was Uasin Gishu County.

Since the 2007/2008 post-election violence, there has been considerable efforts by both governmental and Non-Governmental organizations that aim at improving social cohesion. One of the main approaches is integration and streamlining of civic education in the Kenyan education curricula. In this approach elements of social cohesion have been incorporated in most subjects at both primary and secondary levels of education and even institutions of higher learning. The main subjects that carry civic education include: social studies, History and Government in primary and secondary levels respectively. While in tertiary levels (colleges and universities), civic education is part of History of education. Ideally integration of civic education in the curricula is meant to make Kenyan schools centers of imparting the ideals of responsible citizenship among learners. These ideals include but not limited to: honesty, patriotism, loyalty, modesty and obedience, respect for cultural heritage and pluralism in today's contemporary society etc.

Despite the integration of civic education in the curricula the country continues to witness ethnic tensions every other election period. As indicated there above, these tensions more often than not generate to localized ethnic tensions and sometimes violence. This occurrence casts doubt about the effectiveness of civic education in imparting the ideals of responsible citizenship among learners. There is scanty evaluative literature (Ajere, 2006; Oluniyi, 2011) that exists on civic education, thus the impact that civic education has had on imparting the ideals of responsible citizenship is not well understood. From this literature, it is clear that little emphasis is put on civic education in our schools. This lack of prominence, arguably, may have contributed to the dismal display of responsible citizenship among the Kenyan youths. Paucity of socially responsible citizens poses a major threat to social cohesion not only to the current but also future generations. Thus the effectiveness of civic education in meeting the ideals of responsible citizenship among Kenyan youths must be understood. Therefore, the current evaluation study sought to establish the extent to which the ideals of responsible citizenship have permeated among secondary school students in Uasin Gishu County.

Evaluation Questions
   i.   To what extent is civic education taught in secondary schools in Uasin Gishu County?
   ii. To what extent does curriculum implementation focus enough attention on social cohesion values?
   iii. What is the level of students' knowledge of the core tenets of civic education

Hypotheses

i)   Ho: There is no significant gender difference in knowledge of core tenets of civic education (forgiveness, ethnocentrism and aggression).
ii) H0: There is no significant gender difference in level of internalization of the core tenets of civic education

Theoretical Framework
The evaluation was guided by constructivism theory. The constructivism theory was propounded by Jean Piaget. The theory postulated that through the process of accommodation and assimilation individuals construct knowledge out of their experiences. He also argued that cognitive constructivism theory proposes that humans cannot be given information which they immediately understand and use, but they must construct their own knowledge through experience. It explains how learning occurs regardless of whether learners are using their experiences to understand a lecture following the instructions for building a model airplane. Von Clasersfield (1999) emphasized that in constructivism the learners construct their own understanding and that learners do not just mirror and reflect what they read but instead they find meaning and tend to find regularity and order in the events of the world.
The constructivist theory stresses the need to actively involve the learners in the learning process other than playing the passive/receipt role. Therefore, learning process is both objective and subjective (Willard Holt, 2000). Constructivism theory focuses on the role played by the instructor's culture values and background as interplay between learners and tasks in shaping of meaning and yet other factors like inadequacy of learning resources may interfere with the whole process. More importantly not all concepts can be learned through doing (Mayor, 2004). Learners have to be cognitively active during the teaching learning process hence the instructor just guides them. The evaluator will use the constructivism theory to assess the extent to which civic education has impacted on social cohesion. The evaluator will also find out the extent to which the learners are involved to find meaning out of the knowledge, skills and values learnt (Wertsch, 1999).

Context Input Process Product Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam's Model)
Since evaluative information is meant to serve the decision makers with essential information for decision making. The evaluator only serves education best by providing relevant information to administrators, policy makers, school boards and teachers by highlighting various les of decision making. The evaluator will use the CIPP evaluation model that clarifies the person to use the evaluation results and how they are to use them and what aspects to make decisions on (Northers Sanders, 1987). The contexts, input, process, product (CIPP) model was developed by Stufflebeam and so it is at times referred to as Stufflebeam's model (Glathom et al., 2009; Orustein & Hunkins, 2009). The model deals with both formative (contexts and input) and summative (Process and product) aspects of a programme.
The study was guided by Context Input Process Product model (CIPP) by Stufflebeam moreover the component of the model that was utilized was that of product evaluation. The component was preferred for this study because it enabled the evaluator to determine the extent to which the students had internalized the core tenets of civic education. The evaluator was able to assess the level of students' knowledge on the core tenets of civic education as determinants of social cohesion.
The evaluation basically concentrated on the component aspects of product evaluation since it enabled her to assess the extent to which the students were able to internalize and practice the core tenets of civic education. Among the core tenets that were focused on include knowledge, forgiveness, and ethno centralism regression among others as the determinants of social cohesion. The evaluator aimed at establishing the contribution of civic education to the level of existing social cohesion in students as a product.

Evaluation design and methodology
 The evaluation adopted causal comparative evaluation design. The design involved collecting data for the purpose of determining whether and to what extent a relationship exists between two or more variables. Therefore, the design is applicable to the current evaluation whose aim was to determine the relationship between the internalization of core tenets of civic education and adoption or practice of the core tenets of civic education that may lead into social cohesion in secondary schools in Uasin Gishu County. The target population of the included all History and Government secondary school teachers and students in Uasin Gishu County. Probability sampling procedure, proportionate stratified random sampling technique was used to select 43 secondary schools to take part in the study, 256 form three history and government

students, 43 heads of department and 43 subject teachers. Questionnaire and interview schedule were used for data collection.

Discussion of findings

Topics Taught in Civic Education

The first evaluation question was: To what extent is civic education taught in secondary schools in Uasin Gishu County? Data regarding the question was summarized and presented in Table 1 and 2.

Table 1 student's response on Topic Taught in Civic Education

Statement	YES		NO		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
National Integration	117	88.6	15	11.4	**132**	**100.0**
Good Citizenship	103	78.0	29	22.0	**132**	**100.0**
Constitutionalization	74	56.1	57	43.2	**132**	**100.0**
Democracy	102	77.3	30	22.7	**132**	**100.0**
Human Rights	111	84.1	21	15.9	**132**	**100.0**
Nationalism	102	77.3	30	22.7	**132**	**100.0**
Government	110	83.3	22	16.7	**132**	**100.0**
Electoral Process	69	52.3	63	47.7	**132**	**100.0**
National Unity	111	84.1	21	15.9	**132**	**100.0**
Peace Education	74	56.1	58	43.9	**132**	**100.0**
Rule Law And Justice	67	50.8	65	49.2	**132**	**100.0**
Conflict Resolution	102	77.3	30	22.7	**132**	**100.0**
Leadership	85	64.4	45	34.1	**132**	**100.0**

As shown in Table 1, 88.6% (117) of the students stated that they were taught national integration, 78.0% (103) were taught good citizenship, 56.1% (74) were taught constitutionalisation, 77.3 %(102) stated that they were taught democracy and 84.1%(111) were taught human rights. Further nationalism (77.3%) government (83.3%) electoral process (52.3%) and national unity (84.1%) were taught to the students who participated in this study. It should also be noted that 56.1% (74), 50.8% (67), 77.3 %(102) and 64.4 % (85) of the respondents were taught peace education, rule of law and justice, conflict resolution and leadership respectively. This shows that the students have been taught majority of the topics on civic education.

Table 2 Teachers' Responses on Civic Education Topics They Teach

Statement	YES		NO		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
National Integration	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Good Citizenship	31	79.5	8	20.5	**39**	**100.0**
Constitutionalization	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Democracy	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Human Rights	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Nationalism	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Government	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Electoral Process	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
National Unity	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Peace Education	23	59.0	16	41.0	**39**	**100.0**
Rule of Law and Justice	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**
Conflict Resolution	31	79.5	8	20.5	**39**	**100.0**
Leadership	39	100.0	0	0.0	**39**	**100.0**

As shown in Table 2, majority of the teachers stated that they taught national integration, good citizenship, constitutionalisation, democracy, human rights, nationalism, government, electoral process, and national unity. Further, the teachers who participated in this study also state that they taught peace education, rule of

law and justice, conflict resolution and leadership. This shows that the teachers had taught most of the topics on civic education.

Extent to Which Curriculum Focuses on Social Cohesion

The second evaluation question was: To what extent does the curriculum focus enough attention on social cohesion values? Data that responded to this question was collected from teachers, curriculum support officers and document analysis. The teachers were asked to state whether the topics they taught in civic education appropriately addressed the issues of social cohesion. The results are presented in Table 3

Table 3 Whether Topics in Civic Education Address Issues of Social Cohesion

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	31	79.5	79.5
No	8	20.5	20.5
Total	**39**	**100.0**	**100.0**

As shown in Table 3, majority (79.5%) of teachers were of the opinion that topics in civic education address social cohesion appropriately whereas 20.5 %(8) were of a contrary opinion. Responses to open-ended question indicated that teachers experienced problem of lack of adequate resources and limited time to complete the content in the topics covered in civic education. They suggested that with appropriate and adequate resources, the topics in civic education can be covered adequately.It was important for this study to determine the methods that the teachers considered effective in teaching civic education. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Effective Methods in Teaching Civic Education

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Discussion methods	15	38.5	38.5
Question and answer method	16	41.0	41.0
Lecture	8	20.5	20.5
Total	**39**	**100.0**	**100.0**

The findings in Table 4 show that 41 % (16) of the teachers stated that question and answer methods were effective in teaching civic education while 38.5 % (15) stated that discussion methods were effective in teaching civic education. Another, 20.5 % (8) stated that lecture method was effective method in teaching civic education. Teachers also stated that the schools and the community assisted them to teach civic education by providing learning resources and cordial relationship with the educational stakeholders. The common co-curricular actives that provide forum for practicing social cohesion values include debate activities and music festivals as stated by majority of the teachers who participated in this study

Internalization of the Core Tenets of Civic Education

This evaluation sought to establish the extent to which the students have internalized the core tenets of civic education. The core tenets investigated in this study are: - forgiveness, ethnocentrism, self-consciousness and aggression. All the four tenets lead to social cohesion. Findings on each of the mentioned tenets are presented in the following sub-sections.

Social Cohesion Scale

The social cohesion scale was adopted by Van der Maesen (2003) who stated that social cohesion depends on the strength of social relations and is a function of the integration between norms and values (including trust) in society. This scale consisted of 20 items designed to measure social cohesion values amongst secondary school students. Responses range from one (1) times to five (5) times. The student's responses on social cohesion scale items are shown in Table 5

Table 5 Social Cohesion Scale

Statement	VL		ML		L		MU		VU		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
I seek for assistance from other communities.	44	33.3	31	23.5	27	20.5	14	10.6	16	12.1	**132**	**100.0**
I feel closer to people from my community than people from other communities	29	22.0	37	28.0	34	25.8	17	12.9	15	11.4	**132**	**100.0**
I feel very comfortable with	25	18.9	29	22.0	32	24.2	25	18.9	21	15.9	**132**	**100.0**

my schoolmates from other communities											
I treat people from other communities equally	17	12.9	20	15.2	22	16.7	36	27.3	37	28.0	**132**	**100.0**
I tell my friends that our president can come from my community	29	22.0	26	19.7	40	30.3	18	13.6	19	14.4	**132**	**100.0**
I Encourage Members from different communities to support each other	18	13.6	19	14.4	36	27.3	30	22.7	29	22.0	**132**	**100.0**
I encourage different religious communities to cherish each other's faith	26	19.7	19	14.4	30	22.7	30	22.7	27	20.5	**132**	**100.0**
I don't enjoy working with people from other communities in outside my county	32	24.2	37	28.0	16	12.1	25	18.9	22	16.7	**132**	**100.0**
I feel happy when People from other communities are send back to their counties of origin	35	26.5	37	28.0	19	14.4	17	12.9	24	18.2	**132**	**100.0**
I feel bad when people from other communities take up our employment opportunities	29	22.0	26	19.7	35	26.5	28	21.2	14	10.6	**132**	**100.0**
I advocate that different communities should live happily together	9	6.8	26	19.7	32	24.2	26	19.7	39	29.5	**132**	**100.0**
I would be willing to participate in activities to benefit people in the community	17	12.9	18	13.6	41	31.1	32	24.2	24	18.2	**132**	**100.0**
I respect other peoples' customs and cultures	24	18.2	31	23.5	36	27.3	19	14.4	22	16.7	**132**	**100.0**
I respect my seniors within and out school	17	12.9	17	12.9	33	25.0	33	25.0	32	24.2	**132**	**100.0**
I love participating in activities that benefit the community/society	27	20.5	24	18.2	22	16.7	18	13.6	41	31.1	**132**	**100.0**
I encourage. Citizens to take part in activities that promote human rights	20	15.2	26	19.7	21	15.9	29	22.0	36	27.3	**132**	**100.0**
I support that. Citizens should be willing to ignore(disregard) any law that violates human rights	23	17.4	23	17.4	32	24.2	19	14.4	35	26.5	**132**	**100.0**
I encourage People to demand their political and social rights	27	20.5	21	15.9	30	22.7	26	19.7	28	21.2	**132**	**100.0**
I witness. Political leaders allocating jobs in the government(public sector) to members of their community	26	19.7	30	22.7	31	23.5	27	20.5	18	13.6	**132**	**100.0**
I don't agree that Local immigrants should give up the language and customs of their former counties	33	25.0	29	22.0	21	15.9	21	15.9	28	21.2	**132**	**100.0**

The study sought to determine the internalization of the core tents of civic education. As presented in Table 5, over half (56.8%) of the students who participated in this study were unlikely to seek assistance from other communities whereas only 20.5% (27) were likely to seek for assistance from other communities. It is also shown that half (50%) of the students were unlikely to feel closer to people from other communities.

This implies than an equal proportion (50%) of the students were likely to feel closer to people from their community than people from other communities.

The findings shows that majority (72%) of the students were likely to treat people from other communities equally whereas 28% (37) were unlikely to treat people from other communities equally. Similarly, 41.7% (55) of the students were unlikely to tell their friends that our president can come from their community, however, 58.3% were of different opinion. This group of respondents was likely to tell their friends that their presidents can come from their community. Further, 28% (27) of the students were unlikely to encourage members from different communities to support each other, whereas majorities (72%) were likely to encourage members from different communities to support each other. There were 65.9% (87) of the respondents who were likely to encourage different religious communities to cherish each other's faith while 34.1% (45) were unlikely to encourage different religious communities to cherish each other's faith.

The study also established that slightly above half (52%) of the students who participated in this study were likely to enjoy working with people from other communities outside their county. However 47.7% (63) were unlikely to enjoy working with people from other communities outside their county. There were 54.5 % (72) of the students who were unlikely to feel happy when people from other communities are sent back to their counties of origin. Only 45.5 %of the students were likely to feel happy when people from other communities are sent back to their communities are sent back to their counties of origin.
The studies that 41.7% (55) of the students were unlikely to feel bad when people from other communities take up their employment opportunities. However, 58.3 % were likely to feel bad when people from other communities take up their employment opportunities. Another 26.5% (35) of the students were unlikely to advocate that different communities should live happy together. There were 73.5 % were likely to advocate that different communities should have happily together. Similar proportion (26.5%) of the students stated that they were unlikely to participate in activities to benefit people in the community. But majority 73.5 % stated that they were likely to participate in activities to benefit people in the community.

The finding also shows that majority 58.3% of the students were likely to respect other people's customers and cultures whereas 41.7% (55) were unlikely to respect other people customers and cultures. It should also be noted that 74.2 % of the students' school, however, 25.8% (34) were unlikely to respect their senior within and out of school. It is shown that 65.2% of the students were likely to encourage citizens to take part in activities that promote human rights, while 34.8% (46) of the students were unlikely to encourage citizens to take part in activities that promote human right. Same number of respondents (34.8%) were unlikely to support citizens to ignore (disregard) any law that violets human rights. However, majority (65.2%) were likely to support citizens to ignore (disregard) any law that violate human rights.

The study also shows that 36.4% (48) of the students were unlikely to encourage people to demand their political and social rights whereas 63.4% were likely to encourage people to demand their political and social rights. Another 42.4 % (56) were unlikely to witness political leaders allocating jobs in the government (public sector) to members of their community. Majority (57.6%) were likely to witness political leaders allocating jobs in the embers of their community. There were 47%(62) of the respondents who were likely to agree that local immigrants should give up the language and customs of their former counties 53% were not likely to agree that local immigrants should give up the language and customers of their counties

Aggression Scale
The aggression scale consisted of 15 items that was designed to measure self-reported aggressive behaviors among secondary school students. The scale measured behaviors that might have resulted into psychological or physical injury to other students. Items were limited to overt aggressive behaviors and did not include relational aggression, that is, behaviors that harm others through peer relationships (Crick, 1995). Responses to each item ranged from 0 times through 6 or more times. Students' responses on this scale are presented in Table 6.
Table 6 Aggression Scale

Statement	0		1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
I teased other students to make them angry.	69	52.3	15	11.4	12	9.1	11	8.3	12	9.1	13	9.8	132	100.0
I got angry very easily with someone.	53	40.2	29	22.0	8	6.1	9	6.8	12	9.1	21	15.9	132	100.0
I fought back when someone hit me first.	60	45.5	28	21.2	17	12.9	5	3.8	7	5.3	15	11.4	132	100.0
I said things about other students to make other students laugh.	50	37.9	24	18.2	21	15.9	14	10.6	9	6.8	14	10.6	132	100.0
I encouraged other students to fight.	52	39.4	24	18.2	17	12.9	22	16.7	6	4.5	11	8.3	132	100.0
I pushed or shoved other students	54	40.9	18	13.6	13	9.8	18	13.6	17	12.9	12	9.1	132	100.0
I was angry most of the time.	60	45.5	27	20.5	5	3.8	11	8.3	13	9.8	16	12.1	132	100.0
I got into a physical fight because I was angry.	57	43.2	22	16.7	23	17.4	6	4.5	12	9.1	12	9.1	132	100.0
I slapped or kicked someone.	63	47.7	17	12.9	17	12.9	16	12.1	9	6.8	10	7.6	132	100.0
I called other students bad names	60	45.5	18	13.6	21	15.9	10	7.6	9	6.8	14	10.6	132	100.0
I threatened to hurt or to hit someone.	49	37.1	31	23.5	16	12.1	12	9.1	16	12.1	8	6.1	132	100.0
I sustained injuries due to fights	60	45.5	22	16.7	19	14.4	16	12.1	10	7.6	5	3.8	132	100.0
I carried a weapon	69	52.3	18	13.6	13	9.8	10	7.6	17	12.9	5	3.8	132	100.0
I used alcohol	66	50.0	17	12.9	16	12.1	16	12.1	10	7.6	7	5.3	132	100.0
I used marijuana/bang	72	54.5	11	8.3	16	12.1	14	10.6	11	8.3	8	6.1	132	100.0

As shown in Table 6, 52.3 % (69) of the students have never seen a friend teaching other students to make them angry whereas 11.4% (15) have seen them ones. Another 40.2 % (53) have got angry very easily with someone. However, 22% (29) have seen once a student getting angry very easily with someone 5 times, 9.1 % (12) have seen this behaviour three times. It is also revealed that 45.5% (60) of the students have never fought back when someone hit them first. Further 21.2% (28) have fought back once, 12.9% (17) have fought back twice, and 11.4% (15) have fought back five times whereas 5.3% (7) have fought back four times.

This shows that over half (54.5%) of the students have at least fought back once when someone hit them first. The study also shows that 37.9% (50) of the students have never said things about other students to make them laugh whereas 18.2 % (24) have said things about other students once 15.9%(21) have said twice, 10.6% (14) have said three times, 10.6%(14) have said five times while 6,8%(9) have said things about other students to make other students laugh four times. It is also evident that majority (62.1%) of the students have at least said things about other to make them laugh at least once. As reveled in the table, 39.4% (52) of the students never encouraged other students to fight. However, 18.2 % (24) encouraged to fight. However, 18.2 % (24) encouraged other students to fight once 16.7% (22) encouraged other students to fight three times, 12.9 %(17) have encouraged other students to fight twice whereas 8.3 %(11) had encouraged other students to fight five times. Only 4.5 % (6) stated that they encouraged other students to fight four times. The study indicated that 40.9 % (54) have never pushed or shoved other students while 13.6% (18) have pushed ones and three times respectively.

Another 12.9% (17) have pushed other students 4 times 9.8% (13) twice times while 9.1% (120 five times. Less than half (45.5%) of the students were never angry while 20.5% (27) were angry ones 12.1% (16) were angry five times, 9.8 % (13) were angry 4 times and 8.3 %(1) were angry 3 times. This implies that majority of the students became angry at a given time. As a result of being angry 17.4%(23) of the students got into physical fight twice, 16.7%(22) once 9.1%(12) four and five times respectively and 4.5 %(6) got physical fight because of being angry 3 times. However 43.2 % (57) never got into physical fight because of angry.

There was an equal proportion (12.9%) of students who slapped or kicked someone ones and twice respectively whereas 12.1(16) slapped or kicked someone three times, 6.8% (9) slapped or kicked someone 4 times and 7.6 % (10), slapped, slapped or kicked someone 5 times. Majority (47.7% of the students never slapped or kicked someone. The findings shows that 23.5% (31) of the respondents once threatened to hurt or hit someone, 12.1% (16) threatened to hurt twice and four times respectively whereas 9.1% (12) threatened to hurt three times and 6.1% (8) five times. However, 37.1% (49) have never threatened to hurt someone. it is evident that 16.7%(22) to the respondents had sustained injuries due to fights once, 14.4% (19) had stained injuries twice, 12.1% (16) three times, 7.6% (10) four times and 3.8% (5) had stained injuries due to fights five times. The remaining 45.5% (60) have never sustained injuries due to fights.

As for carrying a weapon, 13.6% (18) of the student had carried a weapon once, 12.9% (17) had carried 4 times 9.8% (13) had carried two times, 7.6% (10) had carried 3 times while 3.8% (5) had carried a weapon 5 times. Majority 52.3%) have never carried a weapon. Further, had (50%) of the students had never used alcohol whereas 12.9% (17) had used alcohol once, 12.1 (16) had used alcohol twice and three times. Only 7.6% (10) had used alcohol four times and 5.3% (7) has used alcohol five times. The table shows that 12.1% (16) of the students used bang twice, 10.6% (14) used bang three times, 8.3% (11) used bang 4 times and once respectively whereas 6.1% (8) used bang 5 times. The remaining 54.5% (72) do not use bang.

Ethnocentric Scale

The study sought to establish the feelings of the students about their culture and other cultures. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7 Ethnocentric Scale

Statement	SA		A		U		D		SD		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
People from other cultures act strange and unrealistic when they come into my culture.	81	61.4	18	13.6	9	6.8	15	11.4	9	6.8	**132**	**100.0**
Most other cultures are backward compared with my culture	29	22.0	51	38.6	20	15.2	11	8.3	21	15.9	**132**	**100.0**
Most people would be happier if they didn't. Live like people do in my culture.	38	28.8	26	19.7	28	21.2	23	17.4	17	12.9	**132**	**100.0**
My culture should be the role model for other cultures.	32	24.2	25	18.9	33	25.0	25	18.9	17	12.9	**132**	**100.0**
Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in my culture.	35	26.5	27	20.5	23	17.4	20	15.2	27	20.5	**132**	**100.0**
Other cultures should try to be more like my culture.	31	23.5	32	24.2	26	19.7	23	17.4	19	14.4	**132**	**100.0**
I'm not interested in the values and customs of other cultures	30	22.7	35	26.5	32	24.2	16	12.1	19	14.4	**132**	**100.0**
It is not wise for other cultures to look	20	15.2	32	24.2	19	14.4	31	23.5	30	22.7	**132**	**100.0**

up to my culture.											
People in my culture could learn a lot from people in other cultures.	40	30.3	25	18.9	25	18.9	23	17.4	19	14.4	**132**	**100.0**
Most people from other cultures just don't know what is good for them.	26	19.7	32	24.2	29	22.0	20	15.2	24	18.2	**132**	**100.0**
People from my culture act strange and unusual when they go into other cultures.	36	27.3	21	15.9	31	23.5	19	14.4	25	18.9	**132**	**100.0**
I have little respect for the values and customs of other cultures.	26	19.7	31	23.5	32	24.2	20	15.2	23	17.4	**132**	**100.0**
Most people would be happier if they lived like people in my culture.	33	25.0	22	16.7	32	24.2	21	15.9	24	18.2	**132**	**100.0**
People in my culture have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere	32	24.2	22	16.7	26	19.7	33	25.0	19	14.4	**132**	**100.0**
My culture is backward compared to most of the other cultures	24	18.2	33	25.0	26	19.7	25	18.9	24	18.2	**132**	**100.0**
My culture is a poor role model for other cultures.	26	19.7	23	17.4	33	25.0	22	16.7	28	21.2	**132**	**100.0**
Lifestyles in other cultures are not as valid as those in my culture.	23	17.4	25	18.9	25	18.9	34	25.8	25	18.9	**132**	**100.0**
My culture should try to be more like other cultures.	32	24.2	28	21.2	34	25.8	18	13.6	20	15.2	**132**	**100.0**
Most people in my culture just don't know what is good for them	35	26.5	30	22.7	28	21.2	22	16.7	17	12.9	**132**	**100.0**
I'm more interested in the values and customs of other cultures	26	19.7	24	18.2	26	19.7	32	24.2	24	18.2	**132**	**100.0**
People in other cultures could learn a lot from people in other cultures	39	29.5	26	19.7	31	23.5	16	12.1	20	15.2	**132**	**100.0**
Other cultures are smart to look at than my culture.	16	12.1	26	19.7	31	23.5	28	21.2	31	23.5	**132**	**100.0**
I respect the values and customs of other cultures.	35	26.5	19	14.4	25	18.9	23	17.4	30	22.7	**132**	**100.0**

As revealed in Table 7, 75 % (99) of the students agreed that people from other cultures act strange and unrealistic when they come into their culture. Another 60.6 % (80) agreed that most other cultures are backward compared with their. Only 24.2 % (32) agreed. Further, 48.5% (64) of the students asserted that most people would be happier if their culture while 30.3 % (40) disagreed. The study establish that 43.2 % (57) of the students agreed that their culture should be the role model for other cultures whereas 31.8 %(62) disagreed. There were 47% (63) agreed that other cultures should try to be more like culture. But 31.8% (42) disagreed, as 19.7% (26) were neutral.

Slightly below half (49.2%) of the students stated that they were not interested in the values and customers of other cultures while 26.5 % (35) disagreed. There were 39.4 % (52) of students who felt that it was not wise for other cultures to look up to their culture. However, 46.2% (61) disagreed and 14.4 % (19) were neutral on this item. As indicated in Table 5.22, 49.2% (65) of their culture can learn a lot from people in other culture as 31.8% (42) disagreed. There were 44.3% (58) of the respondents who stated that most people from other cultures don't know what is good from them while 33.6 % disagreed. Another 43.2% (57) agreed that people from their culture act strange and unusual when they go into their cultures. However, 33.3% (44) disagreed. The findings also show that 43.2 % (57) of the students stated that they have little respect for the values and customers of other cultures whereas 32.6% (43) disagreed.
Most (41.7%) students who participated in this study believed that most people would be happier if they lived like people in their culture. The other 34.1 % (45) disagreed. Further, 40.9% (54) stated that people in their culture have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere as 39.4 % (52) disagreed. As stated by 43.2 % (57) of the students their culture was backward compared to most of the other culture, 37.1(49) disagreed and 19.7% (26) remained neutral. It was stated by 37.9% (50) of the respondents that their culture was not poor role model for other cultures whereas 37.1% (49) agreed and 25.0% (33) were undecided. This implies that the respondents believe that their culture is not poor role model for other cultures.

Only 36.4% (48) of the student stated that lifestyles in other cultures are not as valid as those in their culture, but 44.7% (59) disagreed and 18.9% (25) were neutral. This indicates that majority of the students believes that their culture is superior to others. The respondents (45.5%) also stated that their culture should try to be more like cultures. However, 28.8% (38) disagreed and 25.8% (34) were neutral. It is also evident that 49.2% (65) of the students agreed that most people in their cultures don't know that is good for them

whereas 29.6% (39) disagreed and 21.2% (28) were neutral. Another 37.9% (50) stated that they were more interested in the values and customers of other cultures, while 42.4% (56) disagreed.

It was also stated by 49.2% (65) of the respondents that people in other cultures could learn a lot from people in their cultures. However, 27.3% (37) disagreed less than half (31.8%) of the respondents agreed that other cultures are smart to look at whereas 45.7% (59) disagreed, and 23.5% (31) were neutral. This shows that majority (45.7%) of the respondents did not consider other cultures to be smart to look at as compared to their cultures. There were 40.9% (54) of the respondents who sated that they respect the values and customers of other cultures while 40.1 % (53) disagreed. There were 18.9% (25) who were undecided.

Gender and Knowledge of Core Tenets of Civic Education

The study sought to find out whether there was a significant gender difference in knowledge of core tenets of civic education among students. To achieve this, the null hypothesis *"there is no significant gender difference in knowledge of core tenets of civic education (forgiveness, ethnocentrism, self-consciousness and aggression)"* was tested via independent samples t-test statistic. The test assessed diverse civic education domains namely citizenship, Human rights, conflict resolutions and peace education. The summated score was used the measure of students' level of knowledge on civic education. Independent samples t-test was appropriate since the process required comparison of knowledge of core tenets of civic education students' gender. Independent samples t-test results are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8: Gender and Knowledge of Core Tenets of Civic Education

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	4.141	.044	-3.880	130	.000	-2.25708	.58173	-3.40797	-1.10619
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.743	94.007	.000	-2.25708	.60309	-3.45453	-1.05964

The output in Table 8 shows that knowledge of core tenets of civic education was normally distributed for both groups and that there was homogeneity of variance as assessed by Levene's Test for Equality of Variances. After running the independent t-test on the data with a 95% confidence interval for the mean difference, it was found that there was a significant gender difference in knowledge of core tenets of civic education ($t_{(130)}$ = -3.743, $p > 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that there is a significant gender difference in the level of knowledge on core tenets of civic education among secondary school students in Uasin Gishu County.

Gender and internalization of the core tenets of civic education

The study also sought to establish whether there was a significant gender difference in the level of internalization of the core tenets of civic education among students. To achieve this, the following null hypothesis was tested, *"there is no significant gender difference in level of internalization of the core tenets of civic education"*. Gender responses were coded for ease of analysis as Male-1 and Female-2. The core tenets of civic education considered in this study were knowledge, forgiveness, ethnocentrism, aggression and self-consciousness. Aggression was measured via a 15 item aggression scale. The scale assessed self-reported aggressive behaviors among secondary school students. The scale measured behaviors that might result in psychological or physical injury to other students thus most of the items referred to aggressive behaviors against other students. The scale requested information regarding the frequency of the most common overt aggressive behaviors, including verbal aggression (teasing, name-calling, encouraging students to fight, threatening to hurt or hit) and physical aggression (pushing, slapping, kicking, hitting), as well as information about anger (getting angry easily, being angry most of the day). To minimize recall bias, the scale requested information about behaviors during the past 7 days. Responses to each item ranged from

0 times through 6 or more times. Responses are additive; thus, the aggression score ranged between 0 and 90 points. The summated score on the aggression scale constituted a student's aggression score.

Ethnocentrism measurement scale was composed of 24 items concerning the students' feelings about their culture and other cultures. The scale required students to indicate the degree to which the statement applies to him/her by marking whether he/she (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) are neutral, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree with the statement. To determine a student's ethnocentrism, scoring for negatively stated items (2, 3, 5, 8 9, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 23) was reversed. The summated score for all the 24 items constituted a student's generalized ethnocentrism score. Forgiveness likelihood scale measured tendency to forgive. It consisted of 15 items concerning hypothetical wrongdoing and one item concerning a wrongdoing experienced by the respondent. The scale required student to indicate the degree to which the statement applies to him/her by marking whether he/she [5] Extremely Likely; [4] fairly Likely; [3] somewhat Likely; [2] slightly Likely; [1] Not at all likely to agree with the statement. The summated score for all the 15 items constituted a student's generalized willingness to forgive score. ^^ Self-consciousness measurement scale comprised of 22 item questionnaire. The Self-consciousness measurement scale was meant to measure individual differences in private and public self-consciousness as well as social anxiety. The scale required the respondents to indicate the extent to which each of the 22 statements was like him or her, using the following response format: 3 = a lot like me, 2= somewhat like me, 1= a little like me 0= not like me at all. The summed score for all the 22 items constituted the student's individual differences in self-consciousness We already know the site

Conclusions
Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that majority of the students have been taught all the topics in civic education. The topics covered were: national integration, good citizenship, constitutionalisation, democracy, human rights, nationalism, government, electoral process, national unity, peace education, rule of law and justice, conflict resolution and leadership.
It was established that all the teachers were in agreement that the civic education areas were adequately addressed in the course and the issues of social cohesion were addressed appropriately. The methods considered effective in teaching civic education were question and answer methods, discussion methods and lecture method. Wall charts and projectors were commonly used as the teaching and learning resources when teaching civic education. The common co-curricular actives that provide forum for practicing social cohesion values include debate activities and music festivals. The assessment methods commonly used to evaluate the teaching of civic education in their school were use of objective tests, essay questions and oral questions.

Further, it was established that both the curriculum support officers, principals, teachers and students had positive attitude towards civic education in schools and therefore they were supportive. In all the schools where the study was conducted, the syllabus was available and it had all the topics of civic education. Further, schemes of work, students' notebooks and past examination papers were available and they had majority of the topics covered in civic education.

The findings indicated that the lowest student scored five items out of 30 correctly while the best student scored 23 items out of the possible 30. This yielded to a mean score of 11.58 points out of 30 points. This implies that majority of the students scored below average on the items that measured the knowledge of the students on the core tenets of civic education. Majority of the students were unlikely to seek assistance from other communities and they were likely to treat people from other communities equally. Similarly, majority of the students who participated in this study were unlikely to feel happy when people from other communities are sent back to their counties of origin. The finding also shows that majority of the students were likely to respect other people's customs and cultures and were likely to encourage citizens to take part in activities that promote human rights. This implies that majority of the students were generally likely to treat others well.

Concerning the extent to which the students have internalized the core tenets of civic education, the study established that majority of the students have never seen a friend teasing other students to make them angry.

However, over half of the students have at least fought back once when someone hit them first. The overall mean for the aggression scale was 2.46 in a scale of 0-6 times which implies that majority of the students were likely to do wrong to their colleagues two times. On ethnocentric scale, majority of the students asserted that people from other cultures act strange and unrealistic when they come into their culture while others stated that most other cultures are backward compared with theirs. This indicates that majority of the students believes that their culture is superior to others.

Recommendations

i. Persistent and organized attention should be rendered to civic education in learning institutions. Whereas History, Christian religious education and other subjects augment students' understanding of government and politics, they can hardly replace sustained, systematic attention to civic education. Civics should be seen as a central concern from early childhood (ECD) through primary, even if it could be taught as a part of other curricula or in separate subjects.

ii. Attention should be given to the assessment of civic education which currently is insufficient in terms of both content and frequency. Assessments in civic education that occur, are primarily in secondary schools and generally take the form of short response test items. Such tests are useful for determining students' knowledge and understanding of basic facts and concepts. However, they are not able to assess students' acquisition of a variety of civic skills such as evaluating, taking, and defending positions on political and civic issues, speak and writing on these issues, and monitoring and influencing public policy.

iii. Civic education should help students develop a reasoned commitment to those fundamental values and principles necessary for the preservation and improvement of Kenyan constitutional democracy. Civic education should enable students and even citizens to make wise choices in full awareness of alternatives and provide the kind of experiences and understanding that cultivate the growth of a reasoned commitment to those values and principles that enable a cohesive society to exist.

iv. Teachers should use a variety of instructional methods and approaches to enable students internalize the core tenets of civic education. The use of a wide variety of age-appropriate historical narratives, biographies, autobiographies, and current accounts in the media should be encouraged. Students, particularly in an age of anti-heroes, should have many opportunities to learn about people who have defended human rights and political freedoms, fulfilled civic responsibilities, or had the courage to make ethical and moral decisions when they were in the minority.

References

[1] Akpan, J. (2001). The role of Social Studies in nation building. *Nigeria Journal of Curriculum & Instruction (NJC1) 10 (5),* 41 – 45.

[2] Akpan, C and Ukpong, E. F. (2001). Civic education for effective citizenship and development in Nigeria. *Journal of education research and evaluation, 3(2), 1-10.*

[3] Azebamwan,C. (2010). Integrating Civic education in schools and strategy for Implementation. *Nigerian Observe*r Online, October, 6

[4] Brock-Utne, B. (2000). Peace education in an era of globalization. *Peace Review, 12(*1), 131-138.

[5] Brock-Utne, B. (2001). Education for all—in whose language? *Oxford Review of Education, 27(1),* 115-134.

[6] Christensen, L. (1994). Building community from chaos. In B. Bigelow, L. Christensen, S. Karp, B. Miner, & B. Peterson (Eds.), rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice (pp. 50-55). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

[7] Chomsky, N. (1971). *Problems of knowledge and freedom*. New York: Pantheon

[8] Clinton D (2010) Impacts of Education on democracy in *Education Journal of Educational Research, 2,* 201-212.

[9] *Cohen*, L., *Manion*, L., & Morrison, K. (*2007*). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge/ Falmer. Concept Cartoons: Examples Science.

[10] Dei, G. J. S. (2000). Towards an anti-racist discursive framework. In G.J. S. Dei & A. Calliste (Eds.), Power, knowledge and anti-racism education: A critical reader (pp. 23-39). Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fern wood.

[11]   Dei, G. J. S. (2004). Social difference and the politics of schooling in Africa: A Ghanaian case study. *International Journal of Educational Development, 24(4)*, 343-359.

[12]   Dei, G. J. S. (2010). *Teaching Africa: Towards a transformative pedagogy* (1st ed.). London: Springer.

[13]   Dei, G. J. S., Hall, H. L., & Rosenberg, D. G. (2000). Introduction. In G. J. S. Dei, H. L. Hall, & D. G. Rosenberg (Eds.), Indigenous knowledges in global contexts: Multiple readings of our world (pp. 4-17). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

[14]   Dei, G. J. S., & Asgharzadeh, A. (2000). The power of social theory: The anti- colonial discursive framework. *Journal of Educational Thought, 35(3),* 297-323.

[15]   Dei, G. J. S., & Asgharzadeh, A. (2005). Narratives from Ghana: Exploring issues of difference and diversity in education. In A. A. Abdi & A. Cleghorn (Eds.), Issues in African education: Sociological perspectives (pp. 219-238). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

[16]   Dei, G. J. S., & Asgharzadeh, A. (2006). Indigenous knowledges and globalization: An African perspective. In A. Abdi, K. P. Puplampu, & G. J. S. Dei (Eds.), African education and globalization: Critical perspectives (pp. 53-79). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

[17]   Dei, G. S., Asgharzadeh, A., Bahador, S., & Shahjahan, R. A. (2006). *Schooling and difference in Africa: Democratic challenges in a contemporary context.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

[18]   Dull, L. J. (2004). Democracy and discipline in Ghanaian education. International *Journal of Educational Development, 24(3),* 303-314.

[19]   Dunne, M. (2007). Gender, sexuality and schooling: Everyday life in junior schools in Botswana and Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27(5),* 299-511.

[20]   Evans G and Rose P (2007) *Education and support for democracy in sub Saharan Africa, testing mechanism rules,* Nairobi. Longhorn publishers.

[21]   Falade, D. A. and Adeyemi, B. A. (2015), civic education in Nigeria. One hundred years of existence problems and prospects. *Journal of emerging trends in educational research and policy studies, 6(1), 113-118.*

[22]   Falade, D.A. Akinola, B.A and Adejubee, O.O. (2009) "culture, values, Peace Education and Adult Education; Issues and perspectives". A paper delivered at the 1st Annual NNACE conference.

[23]   Fiske, E., & Ladd, H. (2004). Racial Equity in Education: How Far Has South Africa Come? Terry Stanford Institute of Public Policy. *Working Paper* SAN05-03.

[24]   Finkel, Steven E. (2003). The impact of the Kenya national civic education programme On democratic attitudes, knowledge, Values, and behavior. U.S. Agency for International Development, Nairobi, Kenya

[25]   Fuller, B., & Snyder, J. C. W. (1991).Vocal teachers: Silent pupils: Life in Botswana classrooms. *Comparative Education Review, 35(2),* 274-294.

[26]   *Gutmann*, A. (*1987*). Democratic Education. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

[27]   Jekayifa, A. A., Mofoluwawo, E. O. and Oladiram, M. A. (2015) implementation of civic education in Nigeria, challenges for social sciences studies teachers. *Journal of current research, 3(2), 102-110.*

[28]   Johnson, D., & Stewart, F. (2007). Education, ethnicity and conflict. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27(3),* 247-251.

[29]   Kerr, D. (2004). Changing the political culture: reviewing the progress of the citizenship education initiative in England. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference. San Diego, USA,

[30]   Kidwell, F.L.ll. (2005). The relationship between civic education and state policy: An evaluative study. . An unpublished dissertation. CA: University of Southern California.

[31]   Keer, D. (1999). *Re-examining Citizenship Education in England*. In Torney-Purta, J., Schwille,J. and Amadeo, J. Civic Education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA Civic Education project, Amsterdam, IEA.

[32]   Kothari, C. R. (2004) , Research Methodology –Methods and Techniques, 2nd ed., New Age International (P) Ltd., New Delhi.

[33]   Kubow, P. (2007). Teachers' constructions of democracy: Intersections of Western and indigenous knowledge in South Africa and Kenya. *Comparative Education Review, 51(3),* 307-328.

[34] Hirschi, T. (1999). "Social Bond Theory". In Francis T. Cullen and Robert Agnew(eds). *Criminology theory: Past to Present.* Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing, pp 167-174

[35] Akers, R. (1998). *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

[36] Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.

[37] Shoemaker, D.J. (1996). Theories of delinquency: An examination of explanations of delinquent behavior (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

[38] Kohlberg, L. (1963). The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: I. Sequence in the development of moral thought. *Vita Humana*, *6*(1–2), 11–33.

[39] *Alwy, Alwiya; Susanne Schech (2004). "Ethnic Inequalities in Education in Kenya" (PDF). International Education. 5 (2): 266–277. Retrieved March 19, 2014.*

[40] *Eshiwani*, G. (*1993*) Education in Kenya since Independence. East African Educational Publishers, Nairobi.

[41] Mwiria K. (1991). Education for Subordination: African Education in Colonial Kenya. BER, KU, Nairobi, Kenya.

[42] *Lithuania, V. (2009). The impact of cultural and citizenship education on social cohesion,* Leibniz institute for social sciences, Germany.

[43] Levine, D. H. and Bishali, L.S. (2015) *Civic Education and Peacebuilding*. United States of Institute, Washington.

[44] Marlow-Ferguson, R., and Lopez, C., (2002) World Education Encyclopedia: A Survey of Educational Systems Worldwide, Volume 2. Gale Group: University of California

[45] cohesion, Leibniz institute for social sciences, Germany. Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance By Ronald L. Akers

[46] Magstadt, T. M. (2009). *Understanding politics; ideas, institutions and issues*. USA

[47] Mattes, R., Denemark, D., & Niemi, R. (2012). Learning Democracy? Civic Education in South Africa's First Post-Apartheid Generation. Unpublished paper presented at the 7th General Conference of the European Consortium for Political Research, Bordeaux, France.

[48] Motaboli, Teboho (2009). *Curriculum 2005 (C2005/NCS), Outcomes Based Education (OBE) in South Africa*. Lesotho: Morija Printing Works.

[49] Mathews, S.A. & Dilworth, P.P. (2008). Case studies of pre-service teachers' ideas about the role of multicultural citizenship education in social studies. *Theory and Research in Education, 36(4),* 356-390.

[50] Mhlauli, M. (2012a). The paradox of teaching citizenship education in Botswana primary schools. European. *Journal of Educational Research 1 (2), 85-105*

[51] Mofoluwawo, O. E., Jarimi, M. and Oyelade, T (2012) the instruction mentality of civic education in molding the youths. A case study of college of educational students in Oyo town, Nigeria. *International journal of humanities and social sciences 2(3) 269-276.*

[52] MOEST (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology). (2005). A policy framework for education, training and research: Meeting the challenges of education, training and research in Kenya in the 21st century. Nairobi, Kenya: Government Printer.

[53] *Mugenda*, O.M. and *Mugenda*, A.G. (*2003*). *Research Methods, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. ACT, Nairobi

[54] Mwangi K. (2012). Education for subordination: African education in colonial Kenya. *History of Education, 20(3), 261-273.*

[55] Omirin, D and Funke, F. (2015), Perception of Teachers on the Influence of Peace Education in the south west Nigeria secondary schools. *Global Journal of Human Social Sciences and Linguistics and Education, 15 (2),* 30-38.

[56] Olibie, D. and Akudoli, L.R. (2013), towards a functional citizenship education curriculum in Nigeria colleges of education for sustainable development in 21st century. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 3(8),* 95-101.

[57] Oluniyi, O. (2011). Country report: citizenship education and curriculum development in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science Education 10 (4),* 61–67

[58]   Osler, A and Starkley, H. (2004). Study of advances in civic education in education systems; good practices in industrialized countries. International Bureau of Education. London.

[59]   O-saki, K. M., & Agu, A. O. (2002). A study of classroom interaction in primary schools in the United Republic of Tanzania. *Prospects, 32(1),* 103-116. Pirsi, E., *Civic Education and Human Rights,* University Of Toronto. India

[60]   Oso WY, Onen D (2005). *A General Guide to Writing Research Proposal and Report: A Handbook for Beginning Researchers*. Kisumu, Kenya: Option Press and Publishers.

[61]   Omolewa, M. (2007). Traditional African modes of education: Their relevance in the modern world. International Review of Education 53, 5-6, 593-612

[62]   Stimac, M. O. and Obzuri, C. (2007). *The Attitude of Students and Teachers towards*

[63]   Smith, A. (2010), *the Influence of Education on Conflict and Peace Building, Education for All Global Monitoring Report.* University of Cluster, Paris.

[64]   Smith, A. A., Fountain, S. A and Mclean, H. (2002) *an Evaluation Civic Education in secondary schools in the Republic Of Serbia*. Open society institute. Hungary.

[65]   Sofadekan, A. O. (2012), *Social Studies Education in Nigeria. The Challenges of Building a Nation*. Brunel University. London

[66]   Tabulawa, R. T. (1997). Pedagogical classroom practice and the social context: The case of Botswana. *International Journal of Educational Development, 17(2),* 189-204.

[67]   Vasiljevic, B. (2009). *Civic education as a potential for developing civic society and democracy. The case of Serbia*. Serbia. University of Tromso.

[68]   Weinstein, M. (2009), *the Power of Civic Education in Democratic Socialization. An Investigation of Cape Town High Schools. University Of Cape* Town, South Africa.