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ABSTRACT

History and Government academic performance of secondary schools in Kericho has been declining as from 2016 to 2019 in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education results have been declining. The examination aims to determine the influence of inquiry-based on History and Government performance in high schools in Kericho County. The research utilized a descriptive survey research design. A sample of 361 respondents from a target of 503 History teachers, 2340 History and Government students, as well as 230 heads of departments were selected using a stratified sampling technique. Questionnaires, structured interviews, and observation schedules were employed to obtain primary information. Evaluation of data were performed in the form of frequencies, percentages, mean, and Pearson Correlation. Inquiry-based learning was significant in the achievement of History and Government. This reduced cramming and increased the cognitive development of students. There was a considerable relationship the study concluded between inquiry-based learning and achievement of History and Government. It also recommended the government play a major role in ensuring the provision of teaching resources that would assist in the utilization of innovative learning methods.
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INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, teaching has highly revolutionized into a learning process with the introduction of new curricula and innovative teaching styles. The inquiry teaching technique is one of the innovative teaching strategies asserted by Kumari (2012) in teaching History and Government. Mwale (2017) studied innovative methods of teaching history and gave an account of the strategy as the one that encourages class participation with greater teacher-student interaction. Here, assessment is not based on memorization but application of what one has learnt in class. They also observed that innovative teaching methods have a profound effect on teaching and learning history by it establishing socialization, critical thinking, analysis and decision making among scholars.

Yawman and Appiah-Kubi (2018) carried out a study on innovative teaching strategies and student achievement in the Philippines. They conducted an experiment on two classes. Traditional teaching technique was employed to educate the control group, whereas the experimental group was trained by employing the innovative teaching approach. The research indicated that the group of scholars attained significantly higher grades through using the innovative teaching approaches in the post-test than their counterpart who were educated using the traditional teaching technique. In their conclusion, they recommended the application of innovative pedagogy because these strategies engage the learners actively and hence take into consideration their individual differences.

Martin (2021), in supporting the use of innovative strategy, advised that teachers should incorporate historical reconstruction and historical inquiry. Historical inquiry denotes to the practice of questions asking, collecting and assessing relevant evidence, and concluding on the basis of the given evidence. Historical reconstruction pertains the event of constructing knowledge on history through a critical assessment of historical roots. It entails processes including corroboration (historical documents comparison), sourcing (document source analysis), and contextualization (situating the documents in the context of the historical problem). Both techniques stress the role of the scholar in founding historical knowledge. Therefore, these methodologies are in line with constructivist perspectives of teaching and learning. However, these techniques are more appropriate to university scholars than of the lower levels entailing primary and high schools because they require the use of abstract thinking which may not measure academic performance.

Aside from these models, educators still go about the intricate way of tutoring with arising issues from their subject comprehension, resources availability, and finally, their understanding of their learners. Thus, the means in which they present a topic and pose inquiries to their scholars informs and reflects their make-up and orientations (Genc, 2015). Hence, the latter denotes the basis of teaching techniques or the styles employed by tutors. The style of teaching are mediums utilized to convey skills and knowledge so as to advance and guide learning successfully.

Adunola (2011) performed an examination on the influence of teachers’ teaching methods on the education performance of primary school scholars in Nigeria. He indicated that in order to improve learners’ academic performance, teaching technique utilized by educators should be suited best for the subject matter and enhance the attainment of the set objectives. He therefore recommended that in order to achieve this, teachers ought to incorporate innovative teaching strategies. The research further shows that in most countries in Africa; integration of history is done with other subjects of social science such as geography and civics to form social studies and made compulsory because the discipline is seen as
being significant in transmitting important concepts such as nationalism to the younger generation, the subject is mainly taught using the lecture method. This is because the study of the subject is of great importance as it helps students to comprehend the past for posterity, establish a nationalism sense and nurture skills in reasoning.

Similarly, Du Plessis’s (2020) investigation on the of learner-centred methods implementation of tutoring in Tanzania indicated several challenges in learner-centred pedagogy application entailing teachers’ little comprehension of learner-centred pedagogy, huge classes, that pose difficulties in management of classroom, and educators’ lack of inspiration to pedagogy application. This was supported by Makunja (2015) who established that a substantial figure of high school teachers in Morogoro were employing traditional techniques of teaching, predominantly the method of lecture, which made learners memorize facts to be able to recall during examinations. Exclusive of lecturing, teachers favored to employ question-and-answer techniques to elicit responses from the learners. Hence, scholars and teachers’ interactions and also among scholars themselves are greatly emphasized in the course of teaching and learning process.

In Kenya, Rono (2015) and Agumba (2015) pointed out that there are substantial hindrances to change, including the History and Government teachers’ attitude toward innovative pedagogy. Principal amongst this is the performance in national examinations, which dictates the style of teaching used that ensures the attainment of higher grades. They further reported that most classroom time is spent on teacher talk with only 5% of the classroom time being used to integrate learners through other methods, especially the Question-and-Answer method. Further affected by the rigid examination-oriented and inflexible curricula evident in the history curriculum in Kenyan secondary schools, which has led to most schools registering an average performance in the subject Wafula (2019) noted. Kericho County Education reports indicate that performances in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) History and Government results have performed below the national mean between 2016 and 2019. The examination to determine the influence of inquiry-based learning on History and Government performance in KCSE in Kericho County.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Inquiry-based learning is a technique of employing hands-on activities that enable learners to explore concepts and also instruction that it focus on utilizing the process skills to increase a deeper comprehension of the history connection. Inquiry-based instruction, Marshall and Horton (2011) differentiated inquiry-based tutoring from teacher-directed tutoring by concentrating on the unique role of the learners to found a personal interpretation of knowledge on the root of their past experience and knowledge application in a appropriate context.

Moreover, an inquiry-based approach of education is associated with the practices in the classroom that involves investigation analysis of data. It also inspires both collaboration and communication between the students (Thompson, 2006). He discovered support for the idea that there is the inquiry-based presentations effectiveness for enhancing the learning success of the scholars as well as the instructor’s satisfaction when utilized appropriately. It infers contribution that leads to comprehension and participation in learning entails possessing skills, attitudes and knowledge, that results to seeking resolutions to issues and questions while developing new knowledge.

Njoroge et al. (2014) found that inquiry-based instructors can develop inquiring opportunities for learners that would be a significant contributor to the learning process. His study looked at the changing views of high school teachers’ abilities and necessity towards the application of inquiry-based learning that arise from the professional growth illustrated through a series of summer workshops. In line with these advancement opportunities, the instructors were discovered to
pertain greater assurance in their capability in inquiry-based designing to suit their learning objectives.

Moreover, Dewey (1938) declared that the learned content and skills obtained in this means would be conveyed efficiently from the practice setting to any other environment of learning. Concurring with this logic type, it would incur that tutors would expect learners to perform better on standardized assessments that they are given as Oliver-Hoyo (2011) stated that what function in one setting at a certain institution or within a precise discipline might also function at another so the necessity to establish an alternative in learning diverse content. This circumstance yet seems to show another support level for the utilization of inquiry-based education to increase scholar’s scores success for application besides other tutoring approach since the very principle of inquiry-based learning and teaching is the conveyance of experiences along an order of events of learning.

Additional, as Hattie (2009) validates through extensive meta-analysis of the influence on scholar success brought about by numerous factors of environmental and instructional, a diverse of instructional strategies that involves inquiry-based instruction, may be essential to maximize the academic success of scholars in both external and internal tests. Ortlieb and Lu (2011) suggests additional support for the inquiry-based instruction advantages in their inspection of pre-service tutors. The encouraged teachers on employing inquiry-based teaching model reveal a greater, more sustained commitment to helping scholars’ advancement of strategic critical thinking. The application of well-designed, instructional units based conceptually for examination, tutors’ supervised with a robust foundation in various instructional delivery models is literature supported. This agrees that the frameworks of inquiry-based instructional are formulated to meet the course of learning purposes and raise scholars’ class performance while enabling application of multiple strategies of education.

Scruggs et al. (2012) accentuated the social teamwork significance to the realization of knowledge retention and learning success while using inquiry-based technique. His investigation settled that scholars who were involved in an inquiry-based and team-based learning environment had greater inclinations to engage to the task bestowed of knowledge acquiring and showed increased improvement in tests.

Hernández-Ramos and De La (2009) compiled an evaluation that made comparison between teacher-directed teaching with inquiry-based instruction in an over 700 learners’ group in a certain middle school and an equal figure of scholars in a geographically close middle learning institution with same teachers’ credentials and scholars demographics. Throughout this investigation, they established support for greater efficacy for studying that was scholar-oriented. They validated that scholars who had inquiry-based material presentation attained results that were better as contrasted with scholars in the controlled group in both internal inspiration and general material comprehension. Further, they reported the scholars had improved abilities critical thinking within the field content.

There are various inquiry-based learning forms (Abdi, 2014). In structured inquiry, the educator provides input for the scholars with a challenge to explore, along with the materials and procedures. This method of inquiry learning is employed to educate a specific fact, concept, or skill and shows the means to open inquiry, where the scholar formulates his own challenge to examine. Learning Inquiry Cycle Model is an example of a structured inquiry learning technique, grounded on Piaget’s notion of cognitive learning (Tan, 2017). The learning cycle model is a teaching technique consistent with the history inquiry nature and with the technique children naturally study. The power of an inquiry-based technique to learning and tutoring is potential to improve intellectual engagement and foster deep comprehension through the advancement of a minds-on, hands-on, and “research-based disposition” towards learning and tutoring.
Regardless of the number of stages, each cycle of learning has at its central similar objectives (Sajjad, 2011). After the elaboration phase, the tutors can finalize a formal assessment. This is the phase that tutors administer evaluation to establish understanding level of each student. Inquiry respects the complex, interconnected knowledge construction nature, that strives to facilitate learning opportunities; hence, scholars will pertain more meaning on learning as it becomes a more relevant part of their lives, and they start to comprehend better the world surrounding them. Wong and Li (2010) praise inquiry learning when they state that scholars can grasp better the concepts and can arise from simply knowing the material to comprehend it, by building on past constructed knowledge. There is an overall consensus in the literature in regard to the positive influence of constructivist technique on scholar dispositions.

Herman and Knobloch (2004) discovered that the constructivist technique generated increased cognitive and affective conclusions. They asserted that scholars favored the constructivist approach since they had been actively accountable for their own means of learning. The tutor-researcher reflected that it was exciting to perceive learners developing connections, sharing their personal experiences with other classmates, and together working as a single unit. Consequently, scholars were inspired by inquiry learning not only because learners are actively engaged in the course but since the expectation of discovery the answer and attaining better grades inspired them to search for information.

Constructivism as part of an inquiry is formulated to centre the learning scholar and the teacher serves as the guide on the side instead of being stage sage, which is commonly the case with tutor-centred, direct learning classrooms (Ogweno et al., 2021). This constructivist setting mode promotes scholars’ curiosity and inspires them to inspect information in relation with the learning purposes, which encourages independent studying. Inquiry-based technique further builds independent critical-thinking and problem-solving skills among scholars, which is crucial for both scholars and instructors. Additionally, this learning mode involves scholar ability at their own level. All scholars may not attain the similar knowledge, this is due to the individualistic nature of inquiry learning, but as an alternative, scholars have the ability to discover the information that they require and build upon it.

As conveyed by Baker and Robinson (2018), encouraging scholars’ creative thinking and problem-solving is far better than assessing their memorization ability. This arises from the inquiry learning goal, which is to aid scholars attain skills that empower them to construct important concepts and re-evaluate their ingrained misconceptions as tutors, we should desire to rise our scholars beyond facts regurgitation to be lifelong learners who can independently think. A means to establish this is through inquiry education. Inquiry-based learning additionally emphasizes scholars’ concepts comprehension rather than attaining skills. It inspires educators to move away from the tradition in which knowledge is viewed as hierarchical, sequential, discrete, and fixed towards a setting in which knowledge is regarded as a personal construction developed by the scholars where both tutors and scholars cooperatively construct, assess, and review on the process of learning.

Voet and De Weaver (2016) evaluated History instructors’ conceptions of inquiry-based technique in Belgium. They discovered that tutors with sophisticated beliefs about the history nature had a comparatively greater inquiry-based learning level than tutors with subjectivist and objectivist History beliefs. They also reported a numerous contextual aspect which badly affects inquiry-based approaches in history education; these entails available time for teaching history, student lacking procedural information to make a historical inquiry, difficulty in discovering suitable data sources vital for scholars, teachers’ lack of skills and knowledge to in organizing inquiry-based education practices.

Makunja (2015) institute that tutors in Tanzania associate inquiry teaching with mere question
asking and answering when teaching and learning means. This asserts that instructors lacked the capability to choose and organize meaningful learning practices that cultivated and promoted critical thinking, inquiry, problem-solving, and lifelong education. This is attributed to tutors’ lacking skills and knowledge for applying a learner-centred methodology to educating. Namamba and Rao (2017) examined instructors and scholars’ resources perceptions for the application of learner-centred pedagogy in the Kilimanjaro region in Tanzania. They established that resources for educating and learning including teaching aids, libraries, books and computer facilities, were insufficient in learning institution. They also discovered that private learning institution were far ahead in relation of learning and tutoring resources and use of learner-centred pedagogy, which have enabled them to attain better results.

Even though there are several merits to inquiry-based technique of learning there are also a few drawbacks to this means. When tutors are introduced to this tutoring method, many instructors are troubled with the amount of time taken during preparation and implementation. As discussed by Baker and Robinson (2018), the instructors that they interviewed saw constraints in time and scheduling linked with inquiry learning as serious to moderate challenges. Herman and Knobloch (2004) institute that there was a greater workload in building the constructivist units but suggested that tutors need to contemplate on the payback of their extra time investment when creating and utilizing constructivist units of study. Additional concern of tutors raised by the researchers is associated with time; in many cases, students have to search for information using various resources and report the findings. Hence direct educating can get the job completed much more rapid. Other materials can also be viewed as being more quickly taught through instructing directly, but tutors must also consider scholars’ comprehension and material understanding. Direct instruction may rapidly enable the scholars to regurgitate a process but not comprehend the how or why of the imitated procedure, which would diminish the scholar’s ability to retain and reuse the procedure.

The examination performed by Baker and Robinson (2018) also discovered that the attitudes of teachers and students were moderate to a slight challenge. Instructors must believe in and actively utilize a teaching technique before scholars are encouraged to use it. They further instituted that tutors must feel comfortable with instructional technique and agree to them before they would consistently employ them. The instructor’s attitude directly affects scholars’ attitudes, as do scholars’ feelings and interests of connectedness and materials’ relevance.

Herman and Knobloch (2004) stated that instructors ought to anticipate mixed attitudes from learner who have not practiced constructivist activities in past experiences of learning. Constructivist practices can confuse scholars and instructors due to the dramatic change in roles and scholars’ view of how instructional techniques influence their studying. They also discovered that learners who were not familiarized to constructivist instruction did not know understand means to handle new freedom in the classroom, which pertains challenges in classroom management. However, learners rapidly adapted by the second week to the new condition and engaged actively. Though there is agreement on the influence of constructivist technique to factors including retention of knowledge, learners satisfaction, inspiration, and critical thinking, there is much less agreement on its function in acquisition of knowledge.

Bashith and Amin (2017) reported different findings; they established that scholars who were educated with the more traditional technique tended to score greater on content knowledge examinations than scholars taught with constructivist methodology. While learners taught with constructivist methodology may have a deeper material comprehension, that comprehension is not signified at the level of content knowledge. Conversely, Herman and Knobloch (2004) instituted that learner comprehended more by use of the constructivist
methodology in comparison to the traditionalist technique.

This review has contributed to the analysis and evaluation of inquiry-based learning and concluded that inquiry-based models were efficient learning models in that they involved the learners. Their main focus was on how teachers determine the effectiveness of inquiry-based learning as a feasible solution to classroom learning.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A pragmatic paradigm was adopted that applied a descriptive survey research method. The investigation targeted all the 230 secondary schools in Kericho County. Hence, the target population comprised 3073 respondents, where 2340 were Form Four History and Government students, 503 were History and Government teachers, and 230 were secondary school HODs. A sample of 361 respondents was selected from 69 schools using a stratified sampling technique. Questionnaires, interview guides, and observation schedules were adopted for obtaining data. These were evaluated using percentage, frequency, mean, and correlation analysis for the questionnaire, while content analysis was used for both interview and observation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The objective sought to establish the effect of inquiry-based learning on success in History and Government in secondary schools in Kericho County. Inquiry-based learning was investigated based using teachers' and students' questionnaires as well as interview schedules for the History and Government HODs.

Teachers Perceptions

Tables 1 represent teachers’ questionnaires which were used for inquiry-based learning and achievement of History and Government, where frequencies and percentages were used with mean as a measure of central tendency. The values 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were used to represent strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. Those who support were represented by strongly agree and agree, while those who did not support represented disagree and strongly disagree.

The majority representing (29, 50.9%) respondents claimed that teachers use the inquiry-based method believe that the method enables the learners to independently pursue and develop knowledge and become self-reliant and supportive, 3(5.3%) of the respondents did not, and 25(43.9%) were undecided. It revealed that most teachers made learners independently seek and develop knowledge and become self-reliant and supporting (mean of 3.521).

Table 1: Teachers’ perceptions of inquiry-based learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I always make learners seek and construct knowledge independently and become self-reliant and supportive.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always give students tasks to do independently and act as coaches</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discourage students from cramming facts only to be reproduced for examination purposes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a share cognitive set of information between students.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I motivate students to learn the material.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ensure that students construct their own knowledge</td>
<td>31, 54.4%</td>
<td>17, 29.8%</td>
<td>6, 10.5%</td>
<td>3, 5.3%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide formative feedback based on the content learnt</td>
<td>12, 21.1%</td>
<td>39, 68.4%</td>
<td>6, 10.5%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>4.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I develop social and group skills necessary for success outside the classroom.</td>
<td>9, 15.8%</td>
<td>35, 68.4%</td>
<td>9, 15.8%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>3.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I promote positive interaction between members of different cultural and socio-economic groups</td>
<td>20, 35.1%</td>
<td>17, 29.8%</td>
<td>14, 24.6%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>6, 10.5%</td>
<td>3.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to identify the difference between History and Government concepts</td>
<td>34, 59.6%</td>
<td>17, 29.8%</td>
<td>3, 5.3%</td>
<td>3, 5.3%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>4.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to communicate and express myself in daily life in relation to government processes</td>
<td>11, 19.3%</td>
<td>37, 64.9%</td>
<td>6, 10.5%</td>
<td>3, 5.3%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>3.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to make conclusions through their research using different resources</td>
<td>11, 19.3%</td>
<td>34, 59.6%</td>
<td>9, 15.8%</td>
<td>3, 5.3%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>3.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to integrate research with life experience</td>
<td>17, 29.8%</td>
<td>31, 54.4%</td>
<td>6, 10.5%</td>
<td>3, 5.3%</td>
<td>0, 0.0%</td>
<td>4.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of teachers always gave students tasks to do independently and acted as coaches representing 38(50.9%), which was far more than those who did not give students tasks 3(5.3%) respondents, while 25(43.9%) respondents were undecided. Most teachers made learners seek and construct knowledge independent and self-reliant (mean of 3.930).

Forty-six (80.7%) teachers discouraged students from cramming facts only to be reproduced for examination purposes, 11(19.3%) respondents were undecided, and none disagreed. Therefore, the majority of History teachers discouraged cramming and ensured that they understood the concepts and content of the subject (mean of 4.561).

Data results showed that there was a large number (48, 84.3) of teachers who provided a share cognitive set of information among students, with none who disagreed, and 9(15.8%) remained neutral out of 57 respondents. Hence through inquiry learning, teachers were able to provide a cognitive set of information that assists students in acquiring more knowledge of History and Government (mean of 4.281).

Most teachers representing 48(84.3%) of total respondents, motivated students to learn the content of History, though 6(10.5%) disagreed and 3(5.3%) were neutral. It indicated that students were encouraged to inquire in their History and Government questions (mean of 4.536).

Results indicated that the inquiry method assisted students in constructing their own knowledge, where 48(84.2%) agreed, 6 (10.5%) were neutral, and 3(5.3%) disagreed. It indicated that teachers used this method significantly to assist students in constructing their own knowledge concerning the topics in History and Government subject (mean of 4.105).

The inquiry-based method enabled the students to some extent formative feedback, 51(89.5%) agreed, 6(10.5%) were neutral, and none disagreed with the statement. Hence, inquiry-based learning provided formative feedback to the student (mean of 4.105).

A response of 44(84.2%) agreed and 9(15.8%) were neutral that the inquiry learning method developed social and group skills necessary for
success outside the classroom. The results indicate that social and group skills development was acquired from inquiry-based learning, especially outside the classroom (mean of 3.842).

The results indicated that the inquiry-based method promoted positive interaction between a member of different cultures and socio-economic groups, where 37(65.9%) agreed, 14(24.6%) were neutral, and 6(10.5%) disagreed. It showed that a significant number of History and Government teachers promoted positive interaction between students of different cultural and socio-economic grouping through the inquiry method of learning (mean of 3.790).

Most students were able to identify the difference between History and Government concepts through the use of inquiry-based learning, where 51(89.4%) agreed, 3(5.3%) disagreed, and 3(5.3%) were neutral. Hence the result indicated that teachers had the ability to employ inquiry-based learning to assist students in differentiating between History and Government concepts (mean of 4.439).

The results indicated that a larger proportion of learners were able to communicate and express themselves in daily life through the inquiry learning technique, where 48(84.2%) agreed, 6(10.5%) were neutral, and 3(5.3%) disagreed. It showed that communication and expressing daily life in relation to government process through inquiry learning techniques assist teachers in lesson delivery (mean of 3.983).

In response to the ability of teachers to make conclusions through their research using different resources using the inquiry method indicated that 45(78.9%) agreed, 9(15.8%) were neutral and 3(5.3%) disagreed. Therefore, teachers through utilizing inquiry-based learning, are able to make conclusions through their research using different resources (mean of 3.930).

Finally, responses to teacher ability to integrate research with life experience showed that 48(84.2%) of teachers used, 6(10.5%) were neutral, and 3(5.3%) disagreed. Hence, the study can ascertain that teachers were able to integrate research with life experience (mean of 4.088).

### Students Perceptions

Results from Table 2 revealed that the History teachers engaged students in History oriented questions where 201(83.4%) of the students agreed, 20(8.3%) were neutral, and 20(8.3%) disagreed. The results indicated that teachers engaged students with History questions which encouraged students to use inquiry-based learning (mean of 3.959).

A response of 182(75.5%) agreed, 41(17.0%) neutral, and 18(18.7%) disagreed that teachers give priority to evidence which enables learners to establish and assess explanations that address History-oriented questions. Hence teachers, through inquiry learning techniques are able to develop and evaluate students’ ability to explain History (mean of 3.967).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Students’ perceptions towards inquiry-based learning</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our teachers engage us with History-oriented questions.</td>
<td>61, 25.3%</td>
<td>140, 58.1%</td>
<td>20, 8.3%</td>
<td>9, 3.7%</td>
<td>11, 4.6%</td>
<td>3.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our teachers give priority to evidence, which allows us to develop and evaluate explanations that address History-oriented questions.</td>
<td>63, 26.1%</td>
<td>119, 49.4%</td>
<td>41, 17.0%</td>
<td>14, 17.0%</td>
<td>4, 1.7%</td>
<td>3.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our teachers formulate explanations from evidence to address History-oriented questions.</td>
<td>68, 28.2%</td>
<td>115, 47.7%</td>
<td>44, 18.3%</td>
<td>10, 4.1%</td>
<td>4, 1.7%</td>
<td>3.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our teachers evaluate their explanations in light of alternative explanations.</td>
<td>55, 22.8%</td>
<td>116, 48.1%</td>
<td>34, 14.1%</td>
<td>26, 10.8%</td>
<td>10, 4.1%</td>
<td>3.747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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particularly those reflecting historical understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our teachers communicate and justify their proposed explanations.</td>
<td>58, 24.1%</td>
<td>130, 53.9%</td>
<td>28, 11.6%</td>
<td>12, 5.0%</td>
<td>13, 5.4%</td>
<td>3.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our teachers discourage us from memorizing while revising</td>
<td>69, 28.6%</td>
<td>87, 36.1%</td>
<td>15, 6.2%</td>
<td>12, 5.0%</td>
<td>58, 24.1%</td>
<td>3.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents from the results indicated that 183 representing 75.9% agreed, 44 respondents 17.0% were neutral, and 14 respondents representing 5.8% disagreed that teachers formulate clarifications from evidence to address History-oriented questions. The results reveal that teachers have developed explanations to address History questions (mean of 3.967). Similarly, Leh and Melincavage (2012) supported this by noting that an inquiry-based assisted students in developing critical thinking strategies and therefore being able to explain and conceptualize the subject matter being handled.

From the results, 171 respondents representing 70.9% agreed, 34 respondents representing 14.1% were neutral, and 36 respondents representing 14.9% disagreed that teachers evaluated their clarifications in light of alternative explanations. Results obtained after evaluating teachers’ ability to formulate clarifications from evidence to address History-oriented questions indicated that students understood History (mean of 3.747).

The respondents that agreed were 188 respondents representing 64.7%, 28 respondents were neutral representing 11.6%, and 25 respondents representing 10.4% disagreed that teachers communicate and justify their proposed explanation. This showed that teachers communicated to their children (mean of 3.863). Similarly, Marshall and Horton's (2011) research is contrary to the findings of this research because they found that learners who sit and listen to lectures and contributed in rote studying are likely to be involved in critical thinking practices. This is because tutors believe that there is not enough time in class to employ inquiry-based practices since the method requires more time compared to teacher-centred methods like a lecture. Other instructors assert that some scholars are not able to handle this type of rigour and would not be fruitful. Traditional approach was welcomed by scholars as it is predictable and familiar.

Research data indicated that 156, representing 64.7% agreed, while 15 representing 6.2% were neutral and 70 representing 29.1% disagreed that teachers did discourage students from memorizing in class. It showed that teachers discourage the students from memorizing while revising (mean of 3.403).

**Effect of Inquiry-Based Learning on Achievement in History and Government**

Interview results on the question “Is there any effect of inquiry-based learning on achievement in History and Government in secondary schools in Kericho County?” The response from most of the heads of department indicated that it had a significant effect on the performance of History. This differs from Voet and De Weaver (2016) who indicated that there was a negative influence of inquiry-based methods on history teachers. They cited lack of time, challenges in discovering suitable information sources for students, and lack of knowledge as well as skills in teachers. Observation results were analyzed based on the usage of the innovative teaching method. The results are presented below.
Table 3: Question and Answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Used</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often Used</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently Used</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 revealed that questions and answers were often used with 37.04% responses, 37.04% frequently used, and 14.81% moderately used. The results then indicate that most teachers prefer the use of questions and answers to other methods based on simplicity and ease of use.

Table 4: Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Used</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often Used</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently Used</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 indicates that discussion was also often used by 55.56% of respondents, followed by moderately used by 29.63% and finally, 14.81% frequently used. The results revealed that discussion also allowed inquiry methods to be used mostly between themselves.

Inquiry Learning Methods and Achievement in History and Government

The results further indicated that there was a confident moderate noteworthy association between inquiry-based learning and academic performance in History and Government Achievement as indicated by correlation coefficients of 0.498. From the results, History and Government teachers mainly use lecture method as well as Question and Answer method. In a few cases, teacher demonstration and discussion were used. The former was used by more than half of the teachers; most of the lessons were therefore characterized by too much teacher talk. Poor questioning technique was noted, this attracted chorus response.

Table 5: Correlation Coefficients of Inquiry Learning Methods and Achievement in History and Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry Learning Method</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.498***</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers also allowed some individuals or groups of learners to dominate the teaching and learning tasks during the lessons. This made a few learners answer most of the questions. Questions also came from the teacher and were not evenly spread to the whole class; most of these questions were at the introductory and conclusion stage of the lesson.

Another observation made was on the level of the base of the question on Bloom’s taxonomy. The majority of these questions were in the lower order in the cognitive domain. They mainly covered knowledge and comprehension levels. In addition, some questions asked were vague which made learners unable to answer.
The researcher also observed that among the learners who were actively involved by the teacher, there was some noted performance on the content covered. The learners were able to show mastery of the content that was being taught by the teacher. However, in the case of those learners who were passive during the lesson, there was a lack of evidence of any meaningful learning since learners were not actively involved. Nabutola (2012) affirmed this assertion by stating that the failure of most teachers in Kenya to give learners a chance to participate in the learning process has promoted dependence. That is why after successful training, graduates desperately look for jobs instead of creating some or employing themselves.

Kiio (1999) conducted research on technique and materials employed to tutor History and Government in high schools in Kenya. The research findings revealed that there was over-dependence on expository-oriented technique, which tended to inspire passive learning. Kiio’s findings were in line with this research finding that many teachers did not use innovative teaching strategies in History and Government instruction, yet they make learning more meaningful to the learner.

Ajayi and Ekundayo (2010) strongly condemned this situation and called for the adoption of innovative teaching strategies in schools. Today’s learners require much more practical applications in the learning process, including finding information for themselves and constructing knowledge that demonstrates their own understanding and conceptualization. It is true that one of the ways to make learners get practically involved in History and Government learning is to make them be involved in finding knowledge for themselves. If this is done, it will make the learning of History and Government more meaningful to the learners.

The findings also showed that dictation and provision of notes were used by History and Government teachers, further reducing learners’ involvement during instruction. This provided a suggestion that many teachers associate innovative strategies with time wastage and delay in syllabus coverage because such methods require a lot of time both in preparation and delivery and such strategy may take more time than a straight lecture. But the key principle to using any instructional method is first planning for it. If teachers plan well for the methods they use, then time will not be an issue. A research finding by Latchanna and Dagner (2006) on the use of active learning methods in Ethiopian secondary schools tends to dispute the teachers’ notion that time hinders them from using the role-play method. Latchanna and Dagner (2006) found that many teachers (62%) would attend class without their lesson plans. Thus, the teachers found themselves engaging in minor activities which would not have been part of the lesson; in the end, this consumed some of their lesson time.

Sajjad’s (2010) research on effective tutoring techniques at the higher level of education yielded some findings which were not in line with this research finding. In the study, Sajjad found that most scholars rated the lecture means as the best teaching technique. Asked to give details why they rated the lecture the best; the students said that in the lecture, the instructor provides all knowledge interrelated to the subject, it is time-saving and that scholars take notes and listen to lectures attentively.

Teachers perform a core function in structuring learning activities so that the vital components likely to enable successful learning situations are apparent. The teacher also has a function in promoting collaboration among scholars because research shows that scholars rarely deliver quality clarification or engage in high-level discourse unless they are instructed to do so (King, 2002). However, scholars can be educated to together talk, reason and problem-solve, which, in further, has been indicated to contribute to the advancement of personal learning reasoning, and problem-solving. Besides, tutors can mediate scholars’ learning by collaborating in dialogic education or teaching talk, where they model means to associate in reciprocal dialogues to resolve challenges, ask queries that challenge
current comprehension, and develop on the others ideas, so they are correlated together. When teachers model these strategies, learners would learn to develop skills that would guide their learning.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It was concluded that inquiry learning assists in cognitive development and hence reduce cramming in student leading to mastering content. It enables social and group skills creating positive interaction between students as well as teachers. Inquiry learning assists students in communication, understanding, and explaining History and Government concepts. Hence it has a significant effect on the achievement of History and Government.

The research recommended that History and Government teachers should integrate more than one learning technique to ensure that student’s all-round information, knowledge, skills and social understanding of History and Government. It is important for more than teaching techniques to enhance achievement in History and Government.
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