**EAST AFRICAN NATURE & SCIENCE ORGANIZATION**

*Original Article*

# An Assessment of Tanzania Institute of Education Guide's Compliance in Implementation of the Form One Orientation Programme in Selected Secondary Schools in Moshi District Council

*Eliatosha Moses Mbwambo[1*]*

[1] The Mwalimu Nyerere Memorial Academy, P. O. Box 307, Zanzibar, Tanzania.
[*] Author for Correspondence ORCID ID; https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4498-3751; Email: eliatoshambwambo88@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT**

The current study's objective was to assess adherence to the 2014 TIE Guide in the implementation of the Orientation Programme (FOP) in secondary schools within the Moshi District Council. A qualitative research approach and case study design were employed. Social cognitive theory guided this study. A total of 40 informants from four secondary schools were purposively selected, including 4 heads of schools (HoS), 1 District Secondary Education Officer (DSEO), 2 Schools Quality Assurers (SQA), and 33 teachers. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, document reviews, and unstructured observation. Triangulation was used to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings. The study found that the schools did not fully adhere to the TIE's guide in implementing the FOP. The findings highlight a gap in the proper execution of the FOP as outlined in the 2014 TIE guide, suggesting areas for improvement in its implementation within the district such as ensuring all students fully participate in the FOP, to ensure quality delivery across secondary schools, HoS strictly comply to the guide, SQA's should regularly monitor the implementation of the FOP in schools, and conducting pre-assessments before starting the FOP to identify students' English language proficiency level and post-assessments at the end to evaluate FOP achievement of its intended outcomes.

## INTRODUCTION

The Orientation Programme is an essential educational initiative implemented in many countries worldwide to support students transitioning from primary to secondary education. This transition is often a significant milestone in a learner's academic life, with challenges arising from adapting to a new academic environment, different social dynamics, and varying expectations. In European countries, such as Germany, Griebel & Berwanger (2006) emphasise the importance of orienting students to ensure a smooth transition. The support from teachers and parents plays a crucial role in how well learners adjust to secondary school life. In the United Kingdom, the orientation programme focuses on helping pupils adjust to new school structures and social interactions rather than addressing language barriers, as English is the mother tongue (Anderson *et al*., 2000).

Similarly, in Canada, the orientation programme is recognised as a highly effective transitional intervention, particularly in bilingual contexts, where children who speak English as a first language are introduced to new educational settings through the French language medium (Romaine, 2000). In some African countries like Nigeria, the orientation programme is also an established practice aimed at introducing new students to school facilities, academic programmes, rules, and social dynamics. This programme, typically held shortly after admission, includes both formal and informal activities to aid students' adjustment (Egbiji, Eyo, & Oko, 2011).

In South Africa, the orientation programme is viewed as a strategy to provide motivational talks, extracurricular activities, and psychological support to students, recognising the need for strong peer and teacher support in boosting students' morale and academic confidence (De Wit, Karioja, & Rue, 2010). In Kenya, the orientation programme serves to familiarise new students with school rules and routines and offers guidance on subjects and career prospects (Sigei, 2013).

But in Tanzania, the Form One Orientation Programme (FOP) was introduced between 1988 and 1994, primarily to support students transitioning from primary education, where Kiswahili is the language of instruction, to secondary education, where English becomes the medium of instruction. The FOP, designed in collaboration with education experts, the Ministry of Education, and the British Council, aimed to enhance students' ability to cope with secondary education, particularly in understanding subjects taught in English. To facilitate this, FOP materials were developed through the efforts of teachers and managers under the Education Quality Improvement Programme for Tanzania–English Language Teaching (TIE, 2014).

Despite these efforts, there is a lack of clarity regarding whether secondary schools in Tanzania fully comply with the 2014 TIE Guide in implementing the FOP. This raises questions about the extent to which the Guide is followed to effectively meet FOP objectives. Moreover, the switch from Kiswahili to English at the onset of secondary school in Tanzania presents a unique challenge, particularly for students who may not be proficient in English, making the FOP's role in improving English language proficiency crucial for students' learning and academic success (Mtana & O-Saki, 2017). Given these global and local

contexts, this study seeks to assess compliance with the 2014 TIE guides in implementing the FOP in secondary schools in Moshi District Council.

## Problem Statement

The TIE guide mandates the FOP implementation framework, including a six-week duration, specific subject coverage (Sciences, Mathematics, Social sciences and English), language of instruction, and roles of each stakeholder involved: school heads, teachers, school quality assurance, and secondary education officer (TIE, 2014). Murasi (2013) indicates variations in the timing of the studied schools. In some schools, the FOP was considered solely in terms of English language and Mathematics improvement, neglecting other subjects (Faustin, 2014).

Despite the emphasis on stakeholders' compliance with the guide in implementing the FOP, there is limited understanding of the actual practices due to limited research in Tanzania exploring its compliance. Lack of such research in other places risks continued contradictions that would hinder students' successful transition to English-medium secondary education. The current study aimed to specifically study Moshi District Council, considering the diverse range of schools.

The study focused on two key questions: First, how did schools adhere to the 2014 TIE-prescribed guide regarding FOP duration, subject inclusion, assessment practices, language of instruction, and other components? Second, how was the FOP with evidence implemented in the Moshi District Council? A study responding to these questions was imperative in Tanzania.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is guided by Social Cognitive Theory (SCT), which emphasises the role of self-efficacy, self-regulation, observational learning, and environmental factors in shaping behaviour (Bandura, 1986). In the context of compliance with the TIE Guide in secondary schools, SCT highlights

these key elements as important factors influencing the implementation process.

The theory expounds that, teachers' and supervision stakeholders' belief in their ability to implement the FOP as required (self-efficacy), their capacity to self-monitor and adjust their practices (self-regulation), and the influence of observing and collaborating with successful peers (observational learning) all play a crucial role in how the TIE guidelines are internalized and applied. Additionally, environmental factors such as school resources and administrative support can either facilitate or hinder adherence to these guidelines. Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) offers a comprehensive framework for understanding how teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders implement the FOP, considering both external guidelines and the cognitive and social processes involved.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Tanzania's education system is unique in that students from Swahili-medium primary schools need a bridging curriculum due to the transition to English-medium secondary schooling, where they face challenges. The FOP is a crucial educational initiative designed to enhance students' ability to use English effectively in learning other subjects at the secondary level. It addresses the language transition gaps, ensuring equal access to secondary education (TIE, 2014).

The Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE) have a comprehensive guide for implementing the FOP for secondary schools in the Tanzania Mainland. This guide serves as a standard for the effective implementation of the FOP and provides detailed instructions on how to structure, monitor, and evaluate the programme. It is intended to assist teachers in delivering the programme while also guiding school leaders, supervisors, and other stakeholders in overseeing its successful execution (TIE, 2014). The TIE's guide mandates a six-week programme that covers eight subjects: Mathematics,

Civics, History, Geography, Biology, Physics, Chemistry, and English, divided into four learning areas: Basic Mathematics, Science, Social Science, and Language that consists of topics building on prior primary school learning (TIE, 2014).

Findings reveal a significant variation in FOP implementation across schools in Tanzania. Late admissions and student reallocation cause delays in starting the FOP. Also, some schools limit the programme to English subject teachers. To evaluate students' language proficiency during the FOP, assessment practices varied across schools. Some schools administer assessments at the end, while others use pre- and post-tests, and some assess only the English language subject (Murasi, 2013). However, the lack of standardised assessments across schools raises concerns about the effectiveness of the FOP.

Some schools in Dodoma implemented a year-long FOP focused on subjects like English language and Mathematics skills (Faustin, 2014), while in the same region, other schools follow the recommended six-week duration. Schools implement the FOP differently with varying subject focus, durations and content. This variation raises concerns about trustworthiness and emphasises the importance of ensuring that schools adhere to the guide to improve the quality of the FOP.

Given the limited research on how schools adhere to the guide, particularly the diversity of schools in Moshi, Tanzania, it was necessary to undertake the current study. Similarly, the guide emphasises the involvement of stakeholders, such as school quality assurance officers, secondary education officers, school heads, and teachers. So far, there is insufficient research on their roles in ensuring compliance with the guide. Therefore, addressing these gaps was essential.

## METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a qualitative approach and case study design for an in-depth assessment of adherence to the 2014 Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE) guide for implementing the FOP. The study area was Moshi District Council (Moshi DC) because of limited studies on the topic. The methods employed to gather data were semi-structured interviews, unstructured observations, and document reviews. A purposive sampling technique was employed due to the fact that it permitted the selection of participants who could provide rich and relevant data about the topic under study (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000; Patton, 1990). Thus, the researcher was specifically interested in the perspectives of individuals directly involved in the FOP implementation (teachers of the relevant subjects) and monitoring (HOS, DSEO, and SQAs). The sample consisted of 40 informants, including 4 Head of Schools (HoS) from four schools, 1 District Secondary Education Officer (DSEO), 2 Schools Quality Assurers (SQA), and 33 teachers. Data were thematically analysed through coding and categorising identified themes. Ethical issues, namely requesting research permission from responsible authorities, informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity, were adhered to (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to assess whether secondary schools adhered to the 2014 guide in the implementation of the FOP. Heads of schools are responsible for ensuring the FOP supervision as per the TIE's guide. The study revealed that in the studied schools, some heads of schools did not know if there was a Guide for implementing the FOP and did not have the main guiding document. Most of them considered the baseline books as guidelines. Also, FOP coordination, time of running and medium of instruction were not as per the guide. The sub-categories below describe;

### The FOP Supervision and Monitoring

The guide specifies that the head of school should appoint a teacher from the English department to coordinate and monitor the FOP in collaboration with the academic office, under the HOS's

supervision at the school level. Additionally, the FOP should be monitored and supervised by school inspectors at the national level and by the HOS at the school level, according to the guidelines (TIE, 2014).

The study revealed a lack of uniformity in the supervision of the FOP. For example, in School Y, the FOP is coordinated by the dean of studies, while in School X, it is coordinated by the second mistress and the discipline office. Responding to the interview, HoSY said:

> *"... FOP is coordinated, supervised and monitored by the Second Mistress in collaboration with discipline offices..."* HoS Y).

Therefore, in schools X and Y, the FOP was monitored by the dean of studies and discipline offices, respectively. On the other hand, in both schools A and B, FOP is coordinated by academic offices. Academic officers were in charge of the coordination, supervision and monitoring of activities related to FOP. Explaining the supervision of FOP in response to the interview, the HoS A Said:

> *"... he academic office is responsible for coordination and monitoring of the FOP activities with the help of the head of the English department... (HoS A).*

Furthermore, the findings from document reviews showed that all four schools performed moderately in adhering to the FOP guidelines, with none scoring high or low in this area. The findings from the document review indicate how the studied secondary schools performed in monitoring and supervising the FOP. None of the schools scored highly in adhering to the guidelines for monitoring and supervision. Instead, all four schools demonstrated a moderate level of adherence to the FOP monitoring and supervision requirements.

## Duration for Implementing the FOP

The study found that the duration for running the FOP varied among schools. Some schools would normally conduct the FOP for two weeks, whereas other secondary schools would conduct the same for six weeks or more. Through observation, the researcher found that the FOP in Schools X and Y was in progress for six weeks after the official opening of the school calendar. In contrast, the FOP had ended up in schools A and B. Asked the head of school B, how long has the FOP been implemented in your school? The reply of the HoS B was:

> *"... two weeks is enough to conduct the FOP to all students; after that, we begin teaching the syllabus contents..."* (HoS B).

It was found that School B conducted the FOP differently from School A. This is because the latter conducted the course for four weeks. Probed with a question, why did you conduct a four-week FOP against the guide, the HoS A had this to say:

> *"... we conduct the four-week FOP because students do not report at once, and sometimes we fail to cover the official syllabus on time..."* (HoS A).

Further, it was found that schools X and Y ran the FOP for more than six weeks. Being asked the same question, HoS Y had this to explain:

> *"We've been conducting the FOP for several weeks since December, following interviews with students who are due to start secondary school in January. This allows us to begin the Programme before the official school opening..."* (HoS Y).

Not only was the baseline material arranged in a way that directed the FOP to be conducted for six weeks. Nonetheless, the quality assurance officer's expression supported the above findings. Responding to the interview, *how long should the FOP be conducted?* The SQA 1, in reply, said:

*"Form One Students should train for six weeks in full, according to the government directives and guidelines before beginning the syllabus..." (SQA 1).*

The differences observed suggest that some schools did not fully adhere to the guide for implementing the FOP. Among the four schools (A, B, X, and Y), two schools (50%) followed the FOP guide by implementing the FOP for six weeks. However, the remaining schools (50%) did not comply with the guide, as they did not conduct the FOP as specified.

Irrespective of the findings, the FOP guideline for implementing FOP instruct all schools to conduct the FOP for six weeks. However, heads of some schools opined that the six weeks dedicated to the FOP were not enough since many students reported to school late and, hence, did not attend the FOP fully. They held that the duration for conducting the FOP needed a discussion among stakeholders.

Support from the previous studies on the above findings revealed that schools differed in the duration for implementing BOC in Dodoma. For example, Faustin (2014) reported that some schools conducted the FOP for one year. Whereas other schools conducted the same for four to six weeks (Murasi, 2013). This variation in implementing the FOP calls for investigations.

Hence, the school's quality assurance officer had this to say when interviewed, How long is FOP to be conducted? This was the reply:

*"... FOP must be conducted for six weeks since day one of the first school term..." (SQA 2).*

Also, the above comment was supported by one SQA that FOP was to be conducted for six full weeks without missing a day for any reason. He further stated that some of the secondary schools start the FOP late. Explaining this situation, SQA 2 said:

*"... some schools, especially that we visited, conducted the FOP for a short time because of late reporting or other reasons..." (SQA 2).*

The findings further suggest that schools did not fully adhere to the prescribed duration of the FOP. According to Bandura (1986), individual capacity, such as teachers' and supervisory stakeholders' ability to self-monitor, and environmental factors, including school location and administrative support, can either facilitate or impede adherence to established guidelines. Importantly, teachers and school leaders must recognise that noncompliance with the FOP framework undermines students' ability to experience a successful transition into secondary education. Ensuring full implementation of the FOP is therefore critical for fostering student adjustment and academic readiness.

Thus, secondary schools must start teaching the FOP without delay for any reason. This is because late teaching of the course will either lead the teacher to rush or overlook some of the planned experiences as a result of failure to attain the desired FOP learning outcomes. In the very end students learn retards due to their inability in the English language.

**Language of Instruction During the FOP**

Classroom observations revealed that teachers employed both Kiswahili and English during the FOP, frequently using code-switching and code-mixing to present FOP content. Teachers were observed translating English text into Kiswahili and communicating with students in Kiswahili. For example, during morning assembly announcements, a teacher at School B explained:

*"...let me announce in Kiswahili to make myself clear to the Form One…"*

These findings are in line with Johanes' (2017), whose study suggests that teachers code-switch to aid student comprehension. However, Johanes adds notes that code-switching and code-mixing can hinder English language acquisition. Similarly,

Mtesigwa (2001) observed that the language policy, which mandates English instruction, is often not enforced, with Kiswahili dominating classroom interactions and English terms being mixed in.

The observed practices suggest that teachers believe Form One students would struggle with English-only in their communication. While all four schools (100%) used the English language moderately during the FOP, none used it extensively. This is noncompliance with the TIE's guide in teaching the FOP. Although the FOP implementation guide mandates English instruction to promote student English language proficiency, enabling them to effectively use the language across subjects. This is crucial for their education, given that English is the medium of instruction for many subjects in Tanzanian secondary schools (URT, 2014; TIE, 2014).

The above finding could be supported by Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory, which insists that teacher self-efficacy and observational learning influence behaviour. In this case, compliance with the TIE guide mandates using English. Non-compliance may result from low confidence in English, weak self-monitoring, or limited access to effective role models. Practical barriers like lack of understanding, resistance to change, and environmental factors also contribute to non-compliance despite the given importance of English proficiency for students.

In addition to that, the interviews with the School Quality Assurance (SQA) revealed that their primary method for ensuring adherence to FOP guidelines is through school visits, where they observe and evaluate implementation. As one SQA representative stated:

> "...during our school visit, we observe and evaluate each aspect, especially the implementation of FOP, if it is done as required..."

This suggests a reliance on observation as the sole feedback mechanism. The SQA should explore additional methods for assessing FOP implementation beyond school visits. Regular evaluation of FOP practices is crucial, as the programme's effectiveness significantly impacts student learning, awareness, and adaptation to the school environment. The discrepancy between the observed language practices and the mandated use of English highlights the need for more robust monitoring and enforcement of the FOP guide.

**Teachers Involved in the FOP.**

The study revealed that the FOP would be implemented similarly in both Schools A and B, as well as Schools X and Y. Teachers assigned to teach different subjects in Form One were responsible for implementing the FOP. However, in some schools, the discipline teacher, second master, academic officer, and environment master were tasked with orienting new students in their respective departments. There was a small difference in the participants involved in the FOP between Schools X and Y. Being interviewed, who facilitates the FOP in your school? Head of School X replied:

> ''...except Kiswahili teacher, all are responsible for facilitating the FOP... second master and discipline master orient students on the school regulations, history, culture, and routine... academic officer orient students on academic issues...'' (HoS X).

In schools X and Y, subject teachers and heads of different departments would orient students in their areas of leadership. In schools A and B, subject teachers and teachers on duty would orient Form One about the school routine and culture. When interviewed, who teaches the FOP in your school? Head of School A replied:

> "All subject teachers allocated lessons in Form One Class participate in facilitating FOP... while teachers on duty during the FOP are

*responsible for orienting students on safety measures...'' (HoS A).*

In this case, the studied schools adhered to the 2014 TIE guidelines for implementing the FOP. According to the guide, the FOP should be taught by all teachers allocated to teach the curriculum subjects in Form One (TIE, 2014). The above findings do not coincide with a study conducted in Dodoma by Murasi (2013), who discovered that only teachers who teach English taught the FOP in one of the schools.

**Subjects Involved in the FOP**

Subjects involved in the FOP differed from one school to another. Some schools involved only a few subjects, whereas other schools involved more subjects. The observation revealed that the number of subjects involved depended on the school's preferences and ownership. Religious schools would involve religious subjects, unlike other schools. HoS X was asked in the interview what subjects are taught in your school during the FOP. His reply was:

*''... in our school, we teach civics, history, geography, English language, physics, chemistry, biology, basic mathematics, bookkeeping, commerce, and Bible knowledge'' (HoS X).*

School Y included ten subjects in the FOP, some of which were religious studies. Asked a question, the same question in the interview, the HoS Y replied:

*"We conduct FOP on civics, history, geography, English language, physics, chemistry, biology, basic mathematics, Bible knowledge, and Latin'' (HoS Y).*

In Schools X and Y, several academic subjects were taught during the FOP, with the number of periods per week indicated for each subject. In school X, subjects such as Book-keeping, Commerce, and Bible Knowledge were included in the FOP, while in school Y, Bible Knowledge and Latin were part

of the FOP. These subjects are not part of the baseline curriculum, indicating differences in the subjects selected for the FOP. When asked about the subjects taught during the FOP, HoS A had the following to say:

*"In this school, eight subjects out of nine taught in English are involved in the FOP. The subjects are civics, history, geography, English language, physics, chemistry, biology, and basic mathematics… except for agriculture, which is not included in the baseline'' (HoS A).*

In response to the same interview question, the head of School B said:

*"…During the FOP, we teach eight subjects. Subjects involved are civics, history, geography, English language, physics, chemistry, biology, and basic mathematics, as introduced by the baseline...'' (HoS B).*

The study examined the academic subjects offered during the FOP in Schools A and B. It was observed that both schools consistently implemented weekly instructional periods for subjects such as Civics, History, Geography, English, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, and Basic Mathematics. Notably, School A did not offer Agriculture, as it is not included in the baseline FOP curriculum. This omission was interpreted as a missed opportunity to support students' adjustment and facilitate a smoother transition into secondary education.

These findings suggest revising the FOP curriculum to incorporate additional subjects, such as Agriculture, which are part of the broader secondary school syllabus. Including a wider range of subjects during the orientation period may help address potential transitional challenges students face when encountering unfamiliar content. Moreover, a more inclusive and supportive FOP structure would better prepare students for the academic and social demands of secondary school, thereby promoting a more effective and seamless transition.

**The Involved FOP Teaching-learning Materials**

The study found that the presence and use of the teaching-learning materials depended on the school's ownership and mission. In schools A and B, the baseline material was the main teaching resource. In contrast, school Y used the baseline, the Holy Bible, and the missionary Institute of Apostles of Jesus guide due to their mission for the priesthood. In school X, the baseline materials and the Holy Bible were used as a guide for implementing the FOP. Asked in the interview, what materials are used during the FOP in your school? HoS Y said:

> *''...we use the baseline books, the Holy Bible, and the Missionary Apostles of Jesus guide since our students are prepared to be future God's servants...'' (HoS Y).*

Schools A and B did not use materials other than the baseline book in the FOP. In an interview, the head of School A had this to say:

> *''... we use baseline materials brought by the government for teaching FOP...'' (HoS A).*

Therefore, the school determined which materials were the focus of their teachings. For religious-based schools, the Bible was an important resource in shaping learners. The above findings are supported by a study by Faustin (2014), who found that teachers taught FOP using the baseline and other supplementary materials. It was noticed that schools A and B did not use any other supplementary materials to teach FOP. Only schools X and Y used extra references in the FOP. Teachers must not rely only on the baseline materials in teaching the FOP. This study is of the view that teachers should utilise different materials to guide their students. They should also encourage learners to read cards, class readers, and other simple storybooks to acquire proficiency in the English language.

**Student Assessment During the FOP**

The study revealed that the assessment of students would be done in schools A, B, X, and Y to determine learners' achievements in the FOP. The study revealed that each school had its unique way of assessing the achievement of the FOP. Assessment methods involved oral tests, written tests, summative tests at the end of the FOP, and formative tests (weekly continuous tests). The test items would be composed by the teachers. Explaining in the interview, HoS X said:

> *''...we assess students' learning by providing them with a test at the end of the course. Similarly, we assess them through in-class oral tests, written tests, quizzes, and exercises to determine their achievements in the FOP. Items are constructed by the individual teachers.'' (HoS X).*

This shows that school X conducted a formative and summative assessment to assess learners' progress and the achievement of the FOP. Assessment in school Y was different. In the interview, the HoS said:

> *''We provide exercises, weekly and monthly tests to assess students' progress... the assessment items are constructed by each subject teacher'' (HoS Y).*

This showed that School Y only conducted a formative assessment to assess learners' progress. Explaining the assessment of the FOP in school A, the HoS said in the interview:

> *''... we normally administer a test at the end of the FOP. Test items are constructed by subject teachers...'' (HoS A).*

The assessment of students in School B differed from that of School A. In a sense, subject teachers in school B would construct test items and submit them to the academic office for compilation to get a single examination to be administered. A team of teachers marks the examination as the test

comprises all the taught subjects. Explaining how the assessment is conducted in school B, in the interview, the HoS said:

> *''... we construct and administer a single examination at the end of the FOP, which teachers mark as a team. Each subject teacher constructs items and submits them to the academic master to compile into a single examination comprising all subjects...'' (HoS B).*

Consequently, observations found that each school had its own assessment approach. Only schools X and Y conducted an entrance interview to select students based on high pass marks, unlike schools A and B. The quality assurance officer explained how the assessment during the FOP should be carried out.

> *''...there should be two assessments: one before students start the FOP to determine their needs and strengths. Another at the end of the FOP to assess the learning progress...'' (SQA 2).*

Assessment is key to learning, determining progress, and monitoring learning throughout the FOP period. Methods include teacher, self, and peer assessments, using tools like observation, assignments, tasks, quizzes, and portfolios. The guide directs teachers to use these as continuous assessments, also intended to contribute to individual student scores in a particular subject (TIE, 2014).

Research suggests that assessment tools should align with communicative teaching methods (Lyimo & Mapunda, 2016). Through these assessments, the FOP's value would be enhanced, student outcomes improved, and the success of the FOP would be better evaluated. This is because assessment might be a feedback source to determine the FOP's effectiveness.

## The Use of the TIE Implementation Guide

The study revealed that three heads of schools out of four were not aware of the guide for the implementation of the FOP. In this regard, only one head of school was found with the FOP guiding document. Asked the question in an interview, "What guide does your school adhere to in the implementation of the FOP"? If any. HoS X said:

> *''We use the baseline books and a guideline of the Apostles of Jesus as our main guideline for orienting our students since this is a church school...'' (HoS X).*

This showed that school X above used a guideline provided by the Missionary Institute of the Apostles of Jesus to orient their learners to secondary education and develop their priesthood call, but did not use the TIE's guideline in implementing the FOP. The HoS Y had this to say in response to the same interview question:

> *''... we use the baseline book and the Holy Bible as our guide in the FOP practice...'' (HoS Y).*

This shows that both Schools X and Y did not use the official guide provided by TIE. Instead, they referred to the Holy Bible, basic books, and religious guidelines as their primary sources. In School B, the study found that the head of the school was neither aware of nor using a guide for the implementation of the FOP. When asked in an interview about the guide the school adhered to in the implementation of the FOP, the school head responded:

> *''... we use the baseline books as the guide that helps teachers to teach FOP...'' (HoS B).*

In the study, only one school (25%) out of the four had access to the FOP guide provided by the TIE, while three schools (75%) lacked the guide altogether, highlighting a gap in the resources necessary for effective FOP implementation. The findings are supported by document review data, which revealed that the availability of the TIE

implementation guide did not necessarily translate into adherence to its directives for implementing the FOP. Odhiambo & Shinali (2015) emphasised the need for strict curriculum supervision, monitoring, and teachers' training to improve learning.

**The FOP Implementation Records Keeping**

The study found only one student's attendance record in school X, in which 140 admitted students attended the FOP. The relevant baseline materials were available the FOP timetable was available. Although written implementation reports for the past three years were found, records of test items and results were not found for one year. The study, thus, established that school X would conduct the FOP but did not keep a good record. In school Y, the study found attendance records over three consecutive years, with 90, 98, and 64 students attending the FOP as they were admitted. The relevant baseline materials were available, the FOP timetable was followed, and implementation reports, test items, and results indicating the FOP execution were kept.

In School A, the study found inconsistent attendance records over three years. In one year, 166 students were registered, but only 155 attended. The next year, 185 students were registered, but no attendance records were available. In the third year, 140 students were registered, but no attendance records existed. Despite this, the school had baseline teaching materials and followed the official Programme (FOP) timetable. The study also revealed that implementation reports from previous years were unavailable, and there were no records of test items or results for the three years. This indicates that the school lacked proper record-keeping.

Similarly, in school B, attendance records showed 162 students registered, but only 142 attended the FOP in one year. In the next two years, no attendance records were kept. The study revealed that the relevant baseline and the timetable for implementing the FOP were available in School B.

The FOP implementation reports for the past three years were not found. The records of test items and results were not found except for one year. The school's B FOP record-keeping was bad. Expressing how records of the FOP implementation should be kept, SQA 2 said:

> *''... School heads need to write the FOP implementation report at the end of the FOP and document the FOP test items and results. The results are also used in the students' continuous assessment...'' (SQA 2).*

The current study found that none of the schools had a culture of comprehensively recording the implementation of the FOP. This is not a good way to run the FOP.

**CONCLUSION**

This study concludes that the FOP implementation in the selected secondary schools in Moshi District had not fully adhered to the 2014 TIE Guide, particularly duration, language of teaching and assessment during the FOP. Furthermore, the absence of standardised and uniform assessment practices prevents the collection of official evidence to determine the FOP's effectiveness. This lack of documentation hinders the evaluation of both implementation and assessment practices. The study also concludes that variations in FOP implementation duration are unhealthy as they would compromise the FOP quality and standards. Therefore, measures are needed to ensure all students have equal opportunities for full participation in the FOP.

**Recommendations**

- Schools should strictly follow the 2014 TIE Guide for the FOP to ensure quality delivery and consistency across secondary schools. The guidelines provide essential direction on how the FOP should be conducted. School Quality Assurance need to regularly monitor FOP implementation to advise heads of schools and teachers on better practices.

- Schools should conduct student assessments to evaluate student learning and the success of the FOP. The pre-assessments before starting the FOP to identify students' strengths and weaknesses, while summative assessments at the end to determine students' progress.

- Given the findings of this study, future studies should consider using quantitative or mixed-method approaches for generalizable findings examining the relevance and practicability of the present FOP duration.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, L., Jacobs, J., Schramm, S., Splittgerber, F. (2000). School transitions: Beginning of the end or a new beginning? *International Journal of Educational Research 33, pp. 325-339.*

*Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.*

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). Research Methods in Education (5th Ed.). Routledge, Falmer.

Creswell, J. W & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

De Wit, D., Karioja, K. & Rue, B. (2010). Student Perceptions of Diminishing Teacher and Classmate Support Following the Transition to High School*: Are they related to declining attendance? School Effectiveness and School Improvement,21,* (4), 451- 472.

Egbiji, J., Eyo, M. & Oko, P. (2011). The Extent of Implementation of the Orientation Program Among Public and Private Secondary Schools in Cross River State of Nigeria. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia, Vol. 5 (2), Serial No. 19,*215-224.

Faustin M. (2014). *Impact of Pre–Form One Orientation Course in enhancing students' Learning in ordinary secondary schools:* A case of selected faith-based secondary Schools in Dodoma. Published Master's dissertation. The University of Dodoma.

Griebel, W and Berwanger, D. (2006). The transition from Primary School to Secondary School in Germany. *International Journal of Transitions in Childhood, (2), 32-39.*

Joyce-Gibbons, A., Galloway, D., Mollel, A., Mgoma, S., Pima, M., & Deogratias, E. (2017). Successful Transition to Secondary School in Tanzania: What Are the Barriers? *Journal of International Development, Vol. 30, Issue Number 10.*

Johanes, J. (2017). The Influence of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing on Learning English Language in Secondary Schools: The Case of Rombo District. Unpublished Master's Thesis: The FOPen University of Tanzania.

Lyimo, D & Mapunda, G. (2016). Do Tanzanian Secondary School Teachers of English Use The Communicative Approach as Required? Lessons from Kilimanjaro Region. *Journal of Linguistics and Language in Education Vol. 10, Number 2, 73-91.*

Murasi, G. (2013). *The role of baseline orientation course in enhancing learners' Transition from primary to secondary education in Tanzania:* The case of Dodoma Municipality. Published Master's Thesis (MAED). The University of Dodoma.

Mtana, N. J and O-Saki, K.M. (2017). *Empowering the Marginalised through Language Supportive Pedagogy in Tanzanian Secondary Education.* Multilingualism and Development. British Council.

Mtesigwa, P. C. K (2001). Tanzania's educational language policy: The medium of Instruction at

the Secondary Level. A Doctoral Dissertation: Columbia University.

Odhiambo, F., & Shinali, M. C. (2015). Towards Improved Access to Secondary Education in Kenya: A Focus on In-School Factors that Hinder Effective Transition from Primary Schools. *International Journal of Education and Research, Vol. 3. No. 12.*

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods. Sage Publications.

Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Sigei, K. W. (2013). Analysis of transition of new students in secondary schools in Bomet District, Bomet County, Kenya. Master Research Project. Kenyatta University.

Tanzania Institute of Education. (2014). A Guide for the Implementation of Baseline Program For Secondary Schools in Tanzania Mainland. Tanzania Institute of Education.

URT (2014). Education and Training Policy. Ministry of Education and Vocational Training.