

An Investigation of Effective Teaching of Life Skill Education in Primary School Curriculum in Kenya-A Case of Kericho Central Sub-County

Koech Joel Kiplangat^{1*}, Onsare Paul², Tabot Benedicta³

University of Kabianga, Kenya

DOI: [0.21276/sjahss.2019.7.7.5](https://doi.org/10.21276/sjahss.2019.7.7.5)

| Received: 10.07.2019 | Accepted: 18.07.2019 | Published: 30.07.2019

*Corresponding author: Joel Kiplangat Koech

Abstract

Review Article

Life Skills Education (LSE) is expected to equip the learners with psycho-social competences and interpersonal skills to enable individual make informed decisions, solve problems, think, critically and creatively, communicate effectively and relate with other people. The main objective of this study was to investigate teacher preparedness in teaching of LSE. Purposive sampling, simple random sampling technique and stratified sampling techniques were used to select the study sample of 30 head teachers and 68 LSE teachers. Questionnaires, interview schedules, checklist and observation schedule were used to collect data. Descriptive statistics with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) package was used to analyze data from questionnaires while qualitative data from interview schedule and classroom observation schedule were analyzed by thematic analysis. The main findings were that most teachers had not been trained on LSE hence indicating low level of preparedness. The study recommends that teachers need to be trained on the LSE through workshops, seminars and in-service training.

Key Words: Preparedness, Holistic, Life skills, Psycho-social Competences.

Copyright © 2019: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use (NonCommercial, or CC-BY-NC) provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Life skills are capacities for versatile and positive conduct that enables people to manage or deal effectively with the day to day difficulties of life. The teaching of Life Skills Education enables the acquisition of these abilities which equips one with psycho-social capabilities and relational aptitudes to empower an individual settle on informed choices, take care of issues, think critically and innovatively, communicate adequately and relate with other people Wachira, Obai, Pare, Moracha, Mbaabu and Ng'ang'a, [21].

Customarily, parents, grandparents and other relatives were actively involved in Life Skills Education through shaping boys and girls on their respective gender roles in the society, Kenya Institute of Education [1] 2008, (pg. 9). Guidance on growing up, what to be, what to do, what to know and how to consolidate gender specific respective virtues was stressed in traditional societies, adds International Centre for Alcohol Policies [19]. This shows that traditionally teaching of Life Skills Education was a very important core function of parenting. This was done by parents within the family as well as by extended family members. The teaching of life skills was also

considered a societal parental obligation in which Life Skills Education was imparted communally in an informal way [2].

Statement of the Problem

LSE was introduced as a subject in Kenyan primary school curriculum in the year 2008 as a stand-alone subject with an objective to equip learners to address psycho-social challenges which the children and youth are facing. Hence the LSE subject primary syllabus focuses on three main areas; knowing and living with oneself, knowing and living with others and making effective decisions [20].

Although the focus of teaching of LSE has been based on the three areas mentioned above, behaviours of learners exiting primary level education, [3] seem to suggest inadequate acquisition of psycho-social competences, hence the need to investigate the teaching of LSE. Though a number of studies on implementation of LSE have been done for example Abobo [4] in Trans Nzoia West District of Trans-Nzoia County, Riungu [22] in Langata Division in Nairobi County and Kimbui [5] in Ruiru District in Kiambu County, these studies focused on strategies used in the teaching of LSE in Kenyan schools. However, there is lack of focus on level of preparedness of the teachers,

their attitude towards the subject, the availability of relevant resource materials and challenges affecting the effective teaching of LSE in public primary schools in Kenya. Therefore, there is need for an investigation of effective teaching of LSE in primary schools in Kenya.

The above mentioned studies and perhaps many others have not given reasons why there is apparent discrepancy between the teaching of LSE subject and inadequate acquisition of LSE psycho-social competencies among the learners exiting primary level education. This study therefore seeks to investigate effective teaching of LSE in primary schools in Kenya. The purpose of the study investigated teacher preparedness to teach LSE in public primary schools in Kenya.

Related Literature

Tripathi and Shukla [6] observed that in the 21st century, life globally is undergoing significant 'transition and change'. Today's children and youths are exposed to more information and cultural diverse choices than earlier times. These changing social, moral, cultural, ethical and religious values have exposed 'lifestyles' in the society which affected the youth and the children. This calls for the need to provide today's children with new set of ways and systems to deal with demands of life. In the 21st century 'individual' rather than 'the systems' is considered as the basic unit of the society hence it is important that children and the youth are equipped with life skills and other skills to deal with variety of choices, changes and stressors.

Hendren, Birel, Weisen and [23] states that "nearly one in five children had emotional problems over time during their youth regardless of where they live or how well off they are" such a group scenario can only be mitigated by ensuring Life Skills Education is taught effectively. Emotionally disturbed children exhibit their impairment in a variety of ways such as failing academically, having poor self-image, having poor peer relations, show little respect to their followers and also do not respect their parents. Hendren *et al*, [24] emphasis that teaching of Life Skills Education enables children and adolescents to be equipped with abilities which enable them to develop socially, emotionally, mentally and spiritually. Hence life skills are considered as crucial for promotion of healthy children and adolescent development for primary prevention of some key causes of children and adolescent diseases, disabilities and deaths. Teaching of Life Skills Education is further considered as a tool for socialization and preparing young people to cope with the effects globalization causing significant transition and change, [7] Teaching of Life Skills Education has come about as a result of the fact that individuals must be equipped with learning opportunities which empowers an individual with psycho-social competences. [8] So as to cope with the effects of

globalization such as demands of modern life, poor parenting, changing family structure, dysfunctional relationships, new understanding of young people's needs, decline of religion, and rapid socio cultural change [7].

Preparedness of Teachers towards Teaching of LSE

Kimbugi [5] noted that preparedness of teachers teaching LSE refers to teacher academic, professional managerial abilities in ensuring that LSE is well planned, managed and evaluated. Preparedness includes also the availability of teaching/ learning resources at the disposal of learners and teachers to facilitate the teaching and learning of LSE. [4] pointed out that successful implementation of curriculum depends on the vital role of teachers. This calls for the need to give teachers proper and important preparing to have the option to deal with another program including LSE. They further noted that the teacher who is the instructor translate the wide broad objectives of the educational modules into instructional destinations.

Therefore teacher training is aimed at developing relational abilities, proficient mentalities and qualities that furnish educators with learning and capacity to distinguish and build up the instructive needs of the youngster, Republic of Kenya, [9]. Hence teacher preparedness is a very vital element in LSE implementation in that the saying that "No education is better than its teachers" still holds. Teaching of LSE requires instructional method of dynamic learning through participative showing techniques, for example, pretend, discusses, circumstance examiners and one-on-one critical thinking.

Life skills programmers can effectively draw in youngsters in their very own improvement procedure, [10]. Active learning of LSE requires teaching using participatory learning mode which requires engaging the learner in an experiential environment, thus enabling children to acquire attitudinal and behavior change [11]. In order for teachers to teach LSE using participatory learning mode, teachers need to be trained so as to be conversant with participatory mode of teaching. In a study by Shikuku [12], it is noted that teaching LSE is done by teachers who have not been adequately trained while some have never been trained. What has been happening since LSE was introduced in 2008, is that the ministry of education has provided resource materials, mostly in form of text books only, without any special training to teachers [9].

As often as possible educators have been accused of average quality in applying teaching method and ineptitude in homeroom execution [25] also, this has influenced students' results adversely. Educators' powerlessness to successfully convey in the homeroom and the utilization of improper procedure is brought about by ineptitude among instructors [26]. Such incompetency among professional teachers impact

negatively on the outcomes of the curriculum designers' expectations on LSE in which apart from being recently introduced in primary and secondary curriculum, requires participatory mode of teaching of which most professional teachers have not been in-serviced.

The significance of in-service training and proceeding with expert improvement for the training calling when all is said in done is progressively recognized in nations all through the world [27]. Hence LSE instructors ought to be satisfactorily prepared through in-service training to deal with ably LSE. Thus improving acquisition of psycho-social competencies among learners exiting primary level of education. Studies in Sub-Saharan African reveal that many LSE teachers are under-qualified due to the fact that they are not adequately trained [28], hence there is need to train teachers through in-service training in order to not only teach LSE [29,30], but to do so effectively.

Research Design

A research design is the course of action of conditions for gathering and dissecting information in a way that joins importance to the examination reason with economy in strategy and to provide the required information. The study adopted a mixed method approach and as such, it was an intensive descriptive analysis of effective teaching of LSE.

The study was conducted in Kericho Central Sub-County which is located in the South-Western side of the Kenyan Rift Valley Province. It lies between 35⁰-40⁰ and latitude of 023⁰ South East between the Equator The study population consisted of 227 LSE teachers and 102 head teachers of the public primary schools. The sample size for the study was arrived at after taking 30 percent of 102 head teachers and 30 percent of 227 LSE teachers as argued by [31]. The researcher collected data using five instruments namely: questionnaires for teachers, questionnaires for the head teachers, interview schedules for head teachers, observation of the lesson for LSE teachers and check list for LSE resources.

RESULTS

The study sought to find out teachers preparedness towards teaching of LSE in primary school. Teachers were to indicate if they are prepared or not to teach LSE subject by responding to the question based on their knowledge. To achieve this, head teachers' and teachers' questionnaire had a section on preparedness where the respondent gave their response by indicating Yes or No to the questions on preparedness.

Teachers' Preparedness to Teach LSE

The responses from the head teacher's questionnaire on teacher's preparedness towards teaching LSE as a subject are as per Table 1

Table-1: Head Teacher's Response on Teacher-Preparedness

Statement	Yes	No	Total
Teachers have attended LSE training course.	10 (33.33%)	20 (66.67%)	30 (100%)
Teachers have knowledge in teaching of LSE.	9 (30%)	21 (70%)	30 (100%)
Teachers have attended LSE workshops	9 (30%)	21 (70%)	30 (100%)
I have conducted in-service training of LSE for teachers in school.	6 (20%)	24 (80%)	30 (100%)
There are teachers who have done private training in teaching of LSE	4 (13.33%)	26 (86.67%)	30 (100%)

Source: Researcher (2018)

Based on Table 1, 20 (66.67%) of head teachers responding to item 1 on whether teachers in their schools have attended LSE training, indicated that the teachers had not attended training course on teaching LSE subject; those who agreed that indeed teachers were trained were only 10 (33.33%). This revealed that majority of teachers according to the head teachers were not prepared to teach LSE hence this poses difficulty in delivering LSE to the learners. This is contrary to the study of (Republic of Kenya, UNCEF, [32] which stated that teacher training and developing of communication skills, professional attitudes and values equip teachers with knowledge and ability to identify and develop the educational needs of the learners. This is also in line with a study by Shikuku

[12] who noted that teachers teaching LSE have not been sufficiently trained while some have never been trained.

Responding to item 3 in Table 1, nine (30%) head teachers reported that teachers have attended LSE course and had knowledge in teaching of LSE while 21 (70%) agreed that teachers had not attended any LSE training course and had no knowledge in teaching LSE. This implies that teachers may not be able to effectively teach LSE subject in primary schools therefore there is need to train in the area of LSE to build their capacity.

Responding to item 4, 6 (20%) of the head teachers agreed that teachers have participated in in-

service training of LSE, while 24 (80%) of them reported that teachers had not participated in any in-service training on LSE. On whether there are teachers who had done private training in the teaching of LSE, four (13.33%) of the head teachers said that there were teachers in their schools who had done private training on LSE, but the other 26 (86.67%) of the head teachers said that there were teachers in their schools who had not gone for private training on life skills. This implies that the teachers handling LSE subject in public primary schools in Kenya are not capacitated to handle LSE as a subject.

These responses point out that teachers in public primary schools in Kenya experienced challenges in the teaching of LSE subject. This is in line with Orodho [13] and Birimana and Orodho [14], who are in agreement regarding the need for a continuous staff training and capacity building in order to enhance quality of teaching. The quality of LSE teaching was therefore not adequate in the primary schools within the study area, thus the learners did not meet the desired outcomes in as far as the objectives of the curriculum is concerned. Learners therefore are not able to empirically conceptualize essential concepts relating to life skills issues.

In essence, according to Table 1 indicates an existing gap that needs to be addressed in terms of training teachers in a bid to building their skill capacity to teach LSE in schools in Kenya. Therefore, it can be deduced from these facts that teacher training is very key but lacking in the implementation of the curriculum. The teacher training curriculum in teachers' training colleges and institutions does not include the pedagogy of LSE. This renders teachers inept and incapacitated to effectively teach LSE and so teachers have to rely on their general knowledge and expertise in implementing the curriculum, while others have little or no experience at all and are incompetent in teaching LSE. Teachers will teach issues that may not have been included into the new curriculum and therefore learners may not essentially gain from what was planned for in the curriculum.

Teachers' Responses on Preparedness to Teach LSE

Teachers' preparedness towards teaching of LSE as a subject was investigated through the use of teachers' questionnaires and the findings are recorded as per Table 2.

Table- 2: Teachers' Responses on Preparedness to Teach LSE

Statement	Response		Total
	Yes	No	
I was trained to teach LSE subject in college	12 (20.0%)	48 (80.0%)	60 (100%)
I have undergone training course in LSE subject	10 (16.7%)	50 (83.3%)	60 (100%)
I am conversant with strategies/ methods used to teach LSE e.g. (use of participatory mode of teaching)	15 (25.0%)	45 (75.0%)	60 (100%)
I have the right concept of what LSE subject entails	8 (13.3%)	52 (86.7%)	60 (100%)
I have expertise in teaching LSE subject which enables acquisition psycho-social skills among learners with ease.	5 (8.3%)	55 (91.7%)	60 (100%)

Source: Researcher (2018)

The results in Table 2 on teachers preparedness to teach LSE subject showed that, 12 (20.0%) out of 60 (100%) teachers who participated in the study had been trained to teach LSE in college, while 48 (80.0%) were not. This indicates that majority of teachers who had not undergone LSE training are facing challenges in terms of teacher preparedness to teach the subject. Responding to item 2 on Table 2 about those who had undergone some training course relating to LSE, 10 (16.7%) teachers indicated that they had undergone some training, while 50 (83.3%) indicated that they had not undergone any training implying that those teachers teaching life skill were not adequately equipped with the methodology and skills to teach LSE.

Teacher's responding to item 3, 15 (25.0%) indicate that teachers were conversant with the

strategies or methods to teach LSE that one needed to be conversant with, for example (use of participatory mode of teaching), while 45 (75.0%) of the teachers were not conversant with LSE methodology. This shows that teachers were unable to engage the learners actively in LSE lessons. Responding to item 4, only eight (13.3%) of the teachers indicated that they had the right concepts of what LSE subjects entails and those who lacked the right concepts about LSE subject were 52 (86.7%), implying that teachers have a misconception of what LSE subject entails. Five (8.3%) of the teachers had the expertise to enable learners acquire psycho-social skills easily while 55 (91.7) had no expertise.

It can therefore be noted that the subject of LSE suffers insufficient and inadequate manpower in

the implementation of its curriculum. It can be reliably deduced from Table 2 that teachers who are teaching LSE have not been trained to teach LSE either back in Teachers' Training Colleges or through in-service training since they graduated from college before the introduction of LSE Curriculum into the system in 2008. The findings therefore revealed that a higher number of teachers had no pre-service training, contrary to a study by Orodho [15] who concur that, one of the factors in curriculum implementation is the pre-service and in-service training of teachers; pre-service is the training of teachers on a certain curriculum before they start teaching while in-service is the training of teachers on how to implement a certain curriculum while they are already in the field. This therefore implied that many teachers were not prepared to teach LSE. Thus teachers teaching LSE are not conversant with the teaching strategies and methodologies which becomes a challenge to the effective teaching of LSE. This renders teachers inept and incapable of teaching LSE effectively as they have to rely on their general knowledge and expertise to teach LSE which ostensibly leads to teaching out of inconsequence where the content and guidelines are not adequately available. This also is in contrary to Mangrulkar Whiteman and

Posner, [10] who assert that active learning of LSE requires to be taught using participatory learning mode which requires engaging the learner in an pragmatic environment.

The study reveals that teachers have little experience and expertise rendering them incompetent in teaching LSE. This therefore means that learners end up not being well-equipped with the appropriate knowledge and skill to deal with psycho-social life issues, contrary to Hanushek *et al* [16] who compared well-trained teachers with less trained teachers and noted that achievement was related to teachers' knowledge of the subject matter. The results of this study showed that teachers who are teaching LSE subject in public primary schools are not well prepared to teach LSE thereby pointing out to the idea that learners are not attaining the requirements of the curriculum.

Effectiveness of Training Life Skills Teachers

The responses obtained from the head teacher's questionnaires inquiring if indeed teachers' training to teach LSE was effective or not, are as per Table 3.

Table-3: Effectiveness of Life Skills Teachers' Training

Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD
Teachers who are trained in LSE can effectively teach the subject.	12 (40.0%)	14 (46.7%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)
Training teachers on LSE in college enhance effective teaching of LSE subject	15 (50.0%)	9 (30.0%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.0%)	2 (6.7%)
Teacher's mastery of LSE content enhances effective teaching of the subject.	10 (33.3%)	12 (40.0%)	2 (6.7%)	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)
Effective teaching of LSE depends mainly on teacher preparedness.	14 (46.8%)	13 (43.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)
There is need to in-service teachers to effectively teach LSE.	15 (50.0%)	10 (33.3%)	2 (6.7%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)
LSE lesson subject is allocated in the school master time table	3 (10.0%)	4 (13.3%)	0 (0.00%)	18 (60.0%)	5 (16.7%)

Source: Researcher (2018)

According to Table 3, a total of 26 (86.7%) head teachers agreed that teachers who are trained in LSE can effectively teach the subject, three (10.0%) of the head teachers disagreed whereas one (3.3%) of the head teachers was undecided. This implies that to effectively teach LSE, teachers needed to undergo the relevant training in LSE. If that is not done then there will be incapacitated handling of the subject by teachers and therefore learners will not attain the achievement as spelled out in the curriculum. The desirable characteristics in the behaviours of learners will not be realized; hence the learners may exit primary level of education without acquiring the necessary psycho-social competencies and may exhibit undesirable behaviours and undesirable vices.

On item 2, 24 (80.0%) of the head teachers agreed that training teachers on LSE in college enhance

effective teaching of LSE subject. Five (16.7%) head teachers disagreed while one (3.3%) head teacher was undecided. This implies therefore that training of teachers on LSE in college enhances effective teaching of LSE subject. This is in agreement with Kimbui [5] who pointed out that qualified trained teachers contribute more positively to effective teaching of LSE than untrained teachers. Responding to item number 3, on the mastery of LSE, 22 (73.3%) of the head teachers agreed that mastery of LSE content enhanced effective teaching of the subject. However, six (20.0%) of the head teachers disagreed while two (6.7%) of the head teachers were undecided. This implies that, teacher's mastery of LSE content enhance effective teaching of the subject.

The head teachers who agreed that effective teaching of LSE depends mainly on teacher

preparedness were 27 (90.1%), those who disagreed were 2(6.6%), and one (3.3%) of the head teachers was undecided as shown on Table 3, item four. The findings of this study therefore means that a teacher of LSE should be well-prepare well in order to effectively deliver on teaching LSE. 25 (83.3%) of the head teachers agreed to the need for in-service teachers training so as to effectively teach LSE was by two (6.7%) of the head teachers were undecided due to lack of knowledge on the contents of the curriculum for teaching LSE. Three (10.0%) of the head teachers

disagreed to the fact that there is need for in-service training of teachers who are teaching LSE. This therefore means that there is much need for the in-service training of the teachers in all the primary schools for the effective teaching of the LSE. If this is not done, then teachers who are teaching LSE in public primary schools are not capacitated to handle the subject meaning that learners will end up exiting primary school level of education without acquiring the necessary life skills.

Table -4: Allocation of LSE Subject on the Master Timetable and Lesson Planning

Question	Yes	No
Is life skills subject allocated in the school master timetable?	7 (23.30%)	23 (76.70%)
Do teachers prepare for the lessons of LSE in your school?	6 (20.00%)	24 (80.00%)
Does teaching of LSE enhance the learners' cognitive abilities?	7 (23.30%)	23 (76.70%)

Source: Researcher (2018)

Effective teaching of LSE lesson in primary schools curriculum requires the subject to be allocated in the school master time table, teachers needed to prepare for the LSE lessons and that they need to know that the subject enhances psycho-social abilities of the child. 23 (76.70%) of the head teachers said that life skills lessons is not allocated in the school master timetable while seven (23.30%) said that LSE subject is allocated in the school master timetable as indicated in Table 4. This implies that LSE subject is not given a serious attention as other formal subjects since it did not exist in the school time table and also that its being non-examinable at the national level in standard eight, negatively influences the affects the effective teaching of LSE subject.

According to the head teachers' responses, teachers of LSE do not prepare for life skills lesson as indicated by 24 (80.00%) of the head teachers while six (20.00%) of them said that teachers prepared to teach life skills lessons. This means that teachers do not effectively teach LSE. 23 (76.70%) of the head teachers

agreed that LSE enhanced children's abilities while seven (23.30%) head teachers feel that LSE did not, implying that teaching of LSE is key in having learners acquire the life skills while in primary school. These findings agree with the findings of Kawira, [17] who indicated that inadequate time allocated to the teaching of LSE has compromised on the content coverage, so as a result, it is difficult for learners to develop psycho-social competencies.

Effective Teaching of LSE

Whereas head teachers were asked to respond on the on the allocation of LSE on the master timetable, teachers need to prepare well by preparing for LSE subject as allocated on the master timetable. Teachers therefore should prepare, scheme of work, lesson plans and lesson notes so as to effectively teach LSE. To be able to achieve this, teachers in the 30 schools where the study was conducted, through the teacher's questionnaires, were asked on the best way of effectively teaching LSE and their response were as recorded in Table 5.

Table -5:Effective Teaching of LSE

Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD
Adequate coverage of content at each level facilitates effective teaching of LSE subject	24 (40.0%)	20 (33.3%)	3 (5.0%)	8 (13.3%)	5 (8.3%)
Proper utilization of schemes of work and lesson plans facilitate effective teaching of LSE subject	29 (48.3%)	21 (35.0%)	2 (3.3%)	8 (13.3%)	1 (1.7%)
Proper utilization of relevant resource materials enhances the teaching of life skills.	30 (50.0%)	26 (43.3%)	2 (3.3%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (1.7%)
Strengthening of school based curriculum supervision by head teachers improves the quality of teaching of LSE.	22 (36.7%)	23 (38.3%)	1 (1.7%)	10 (16.7%)	4 (6.7%)
Maintaining up-to-date record of individual pupil psycho-social competencies skills ensure effective teaching of LSE.	26 (43.3%)	25 (41.7%)	2 (3.3%)	3 (5.0%)	4 (6.7%)

Source: Researcher (2018)

From Table 5, item number 1, a total of 24 (40.00%) and 20 (33.30%) of the teachers from the selected schools in Kericho Central Sub-County strongly agreed and agreed respectively that adequate content coverage at each level facilitates effective teaching of LSE subject, eight (13.40%) of the teachers disagreed while five (8.30%) strongly disagreed. Only three (5.00%) were undecided implying that content coverage is needed to facilitate teaching of LSE in schools. 50 (83.3%) of the teachers agreed that proper utilization of schemes of work and lesson plans facilitate effective teaching of LSE subject as deduced from item no. 2 on Table 5, nine (15%) disagreed, while two (3.3%) were undecided. This points out that well prepared schemes of work, lesson plans and lesson notes enhance effective teaching of LSE, which according to the teachers' responses, were not prepared.

According to the data collected from the teachers' questionnaires as tabulated in Table 5 item 3, proper utilization of relevant resource materials enhanced the teaching of life skills, 56 (93.3%) of the teachers agreed to it while two (3.30%) disagreed and two (3.30%) were undecided. This indicated that proper utilization of teaching resource materials was critical to enhancing the teaching of LSE in primary schools, which according to the study was not the case. 45 (75%) of the teachers agreed that strengthening of school based curriculum supervision by head teachers improves the quality of teaching of LSE in schools, while 14 (23.4%) felt that it does not.

It is therefore seen that strengthening of the school-based curriculum supervision improves the quality of teaching of LSE in the schools. 51 (85%) of the teachers responding to item 5 agreed that maintaining an up-to-date record of individual pupil's psycho-social competency skills ensures effective teaching of LSE while 7 (11.7%) of teachers disagreed as shown in Table 5. This affirms that an up-to-date individual record of learners' psycho-social competences enhances effective teaching of LSE, thus enhancing the acquisition of psycho-social competencies.

According to table 4, teachers did not adequately cover LSE content, prepare schemes of work, lesson plans, and did not properly utilize relevant LSE learning resource materials. There was no continuous supervision of life skills curriculum delivery in primary schools; hence, there was lack of effectiveness of the teaching of LSE. This is contrary to Onganga [18] and Human Rights Watch (2003), who both asserts that for there to be effective implementation of the LSE program, there should be a clear supportive policy from the government.

Teachers' Preparedness to Teach LSE Subject

The responses compiled from head teachers' interviews pointed out that lack of training for teachers was one of the major hindrances which affected teacher's basic preparedness in teaching of LSE in primary schools.

Head teachers in all the schools affirmed that as implementers of LSE in their schools, teaching of LSE play an important role in shaping the behaviour outcomes of learners.

Head teacher I in school 2 was interviewed on the effectiveness of LSE, and said:

"Teachers in my school have not gotten training in LSE. The major challenge faced by my teachers is lack of knowledge on participatory methods recommended for teaching LSE subject. Teachers do not have the skills on how to teach LSE subject since they did not get any training on LSE in teachers training colleges neither has the ministry of education done in-service training of teachers through seminars and workshops on the teaching and learning of LSE. I am convinced that if teachers get trained on life skills they would be in a position to prepare well to effectively teaching LSE it with confidence."

Head teachers in schools 4, 5, 7 and 8 shared a similar view. Moreover, a head teacher of one of the sampled schools, school 1, who had similar views as above also observed that lack of life skill training contribute to teacher's non-preparedness to teach LSE curriculum in the teaching and learning process.

"...teachers have not received any training or seminar to keep them up-to-date with the new curriculum..." (Head Teacher X, School 1).

"... when the government introduced the new curriculum in 2008, on LSE curriculum, it did not organize seminars and workshops for teachers already in the field to build their capacity to teach the new subject." (Head Teacher III, School 3).

Head Teacher V in School 7 responding to item 13 of the interview schedule on the challenges teachers face in the teaching LSE said:

"The government has not reconsidered providing frequent training of teachers, who are already in the field and were not trained in colleges, through seminars or workshops for the sake of building their capacity and knowledge on LSE."

Head teachers in other schools, 1, 5, 9, 11, 19 and 26 had similar opinions as head teacher V in school 7.

The statements of the interviewees relates to the responses from the head teachers' and teachers' questionnaires in that lack of training for teachers makes them un-prepared to teach LSE in primary schools. As a result, the teachers faced a dilemma when it came to the teaching of LSE. This affects the learners as they are not adequately facilitated through the participatory approach method by the teachers as they lacked the current knowledge and skills, resulting in learners exiting primary level of education without empirical life skills attributes.

Discussion on Teachers' Preparedness to Teach LSE

From the responses of head teachers and teachers, a high number of teachers have not been trained in LSE subject either during the training in college or through workshops or in-service training so as to be able to implement life skills curriculum effectively.

According to the head teachers' and teachers' responses, teacher preparedness to teach LSE is in agreement with the findings of Birimana and Orodho [14] and Orodho [13], who emphasized the need for continuous staff development in order to enhance quality of curriculum implementation. Given that most of the teachers have not attended any workshops or seminars so as to enhance the teaching of life skills, most of the teachers teaching life skills in the selected schools have not been adequately trained in LSE either through seminars or workshops or in college. This implies that teachers who are teaching LSE in public primary schools in Kenya do not have the requisite capacity to handle the subject.

Summary of the Findings

Findings revealed that teachers were not adequately prepared for effective teaching of LSE in public primary schools in Kericho Sub-County, since most of them did not have the knowledge and skills on teaching LSE. A majority of the teachers had not undergone any training on LSE either through teachers training college, workshops or seminars yet the role of the teachers in the teaching of LSE and learners acquisition of psycho-social skills cannot be underestimated.

CONCLUSIONS

The LSE in the primary curriculum is a very important component whose presence cannot be over-emphasized. The teachers' role in effective teaching of the subject is important for the teaching and learning of life skills subject to be successful. LSE in essence is critical to acquisition of psycho-social competencies which learners must exhibit in their behaviors, throughout their life in school and/or during their future endeavors.

In establishing teacher preparedness towards teaching of LSE, teachers who had had not been trained

on LSE during pre-service training need to attend seminars and workshops or undergo in-service training in a bid to build their capacity to handle the subject. Those teachers are not conversant with LSE teaching strategies and methodologies and are faced with the challenge of not being able to effective teaching of LSE and thus are not adequately prepared to teach LSE in primary schools.

The findings of this study are very significant to teachers, parents, curriculum planners, school administrators and other government organs who are involved in education. In line with the findings and conclusions, the researcher recommends that the teachers need to be trained on the LSE during pre-service period and through workshops, seminars or in-service training.

The researcher suggests that a replication of the study in other counties be done so as to compare and contrast the findings and on the effects of cultural beliefs on LSE.

REFERENCES

1. KIE, (2008). Life Skills Syllabus, KIE Nairobi
2. Kimbui, S. K. (2011). Implementation of LSE Curriculum in Public Primary Schools in Ruiru District
3. Katola M. *Morality among the Akamba: A case study of youth in Central Division of Kitui District* (Doctoral dissertation, PhD Thesis, Kenyatta University).1996
4. Adami-Bunyard E, Gummow M, Milazzo-Licklider N. Improving Primary Student Motivation and Achievement in Mathematics.1998
5. Abobo F, Orodho JA. Life skills education in Kenya: An assessment of the level of preparedness of teachers and school managers in implementing life skills education in Trans-Nzoia district, Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 2014;19(9):32-44.
6. Kimbui, S. K. (2011). Implementation of LSE Curriculum in Public Primary Schools in Ruiru District
7. Tripathi Alka and Shukla Grisham (2013). A Study on Life skills on Adolescent Behaviour Transition Study, *IJBAR* January, February Issue 2013, 8-10
8. WHO (1999). Partners in Life Skills Training: Conclusions from a United Nations Inter-Agency Meeting, Geneva. WHO/MNH/MHP/99.2
9. KIE, (2006). Primary Education Social Studies Handbook, KIE Nairobi
10. UNESCO, (2012). Republic of Kenya
11. Mangrulkar, L, Whitman E, V, & Posner, M. (2001). Life Skills Approach to Child and Adolescence Healthy Human Development, Health and Human Development Programmes (HHD) Division of Education Development Centre Inc. (EDC)

11. Bwayo, (2014). Primary school pupil's life skills development the case for primary school Pupil's development in Uganda PHD Thesis Mary Immaculate College Limerick Ireland
12. Shikuku I. (2013). The Implementation of LSE Curriculum in Kenya Secondary Schools, Master's Thesis Moi University
13. Orodho, A.J, Waweru, P.N, Ndichu & Nthinguri (2013). Basic Education in Kenya: Focus on Strategies Applied to Cope with School-Based Challenges Inhibiting Effective Implementation Of Curriculum International Journal of Education and Research, Vol. 1 No.11 November, 2013 pp1-10. www.ijern.com
14. Orodho, A.J. (2014). The Equity and Quality of Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) Policy in Kenya: What is the Unfinished Business in the Financial Management? International Journal of Current Research, Vol.8 Issue 03 (March, 2014) 5582-5591 <http://www.journalcra.com>
15. Orodho, A.J., Waweru, P.N., Getange, K. N & Miriti, J.M.(2013). Progress towards Attainment of Education for All (EFA) Among Nomadic Pastoralists: Do Home-Based Variables Make A Difference in Kenya? Research on Humanities and Social Sciences Vol3.No.21, 2013 pp54-67. www.iiste.org
16. Hanushek EA, Kain JF, Rivkin SG. Does special education raise academic achievement for students with disabilities?. National Bureau of Economic Research; 1998 Aug 1.
17. Kawira ML. School factors influencing the implementation of life skills education in public primary schools in Athi River District, Kenya. Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Kenya. 2012.
18. KIE, (Onganga 2). Primary School Syllabus, KIE Nairobi.2007
19. Krassilnikov M. ICAP 2000. Darmstadt, September. 2000.
20. Bosman FT, Carneiro F, Hruban RH, Theise ND. WHO classification of tumours of the digestive system. World Health Organization; 2010.
21. Wakibi SN, W Ng'ang'a Z, Mbugua GG. Factors associated with non-adherence to highly active antiretroviral therapy in Nairobi, Kenya. AIDS Research and Therapy. 2011 Dec;8(1):43.
22. Reche GN, Bundi TK, Riungu JN, Mbugua ZK. Factors contributing to poor performance in KCPE in public day primary schools in Mwimbi division, Maara district, Kenya. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. 2011;2(5).
23. Weisen RB, Orley J, Evans V, Jeff Lee T, Sprunger B, Pellaux D. Life Skills Education in Schools. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization. 1994.
24. Hendren R, Birrell Weisen R, Orley JH, World Health Organization. Mental health programmes in schools. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1994.
25. Sawamura N, Sifuna DN. Universalizing primary education in Kenya: Is it beneficial and sustainable. Journal of international cooperation in Education. 2008;11(3):103-18.
26. Otieno KO. Teaching/learning resources and academic performance in mathematics in secondary schools in Bondo District of Kenya. Asian Social Science. 2010 Dec 1;6(12):126.
27. Fraser C, Kennedy A, Reid L, Mckinney S. Teachers' continuing professional development: Contested concepts, understandings and models. Journal of in-service education. 2007 Jun 1;33(2):153-69.
28. Materese SA, Bach BW, Engleberg IN, editors. Communication in the general education curriculum: A critical necessity for the 21st century. National Communication Association; 2003.
29. Leach F. School-based gender violence in Africa: a risk to adolescent sexual health: HIV/AIDS and education. Perspectives in Education. 2002 Mar 1;20(1):99-112.
30. Rooth E. An investigation of the status and practice of Life Orientation in South African schools in two provinces (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Western Cape).
31. Orodho JA. Education and social sciences research methods. Nairobi: Harlifax Printers. 2005.
32. Unicef. New York: UNICEF; 2012. Opportunity in crisis: preventing HIV from early adolescence to early adulthood. 2012.