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ABSTRACT

Stakeholders’ concern about the dwindling quality of teachers’ instructional tasks and students’ academic performance in Nigeria secondary schools could be attributed to the perceive inadequacies in instructional planning. This study therefore investigated teachers’ instructional planning and productivity in public secondary schools in Ondo North Senatorial District of Ondo State, Nigeria. Descriptive survey research design was adopted, and 600 teachers and 30 principals were sampled using multi-stage and simple randomly sampling techniques. Data were collected using Instructional Planning Questionnaire (IPQ), and Teachers’ Productivity Questionnaire (TPQ). Three research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. The research questions were answered using descriptive statistics while the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC). Results indicated a moderate level of teachers’ instructional planning (Mean = 2.97);
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teachers demonstrated high performance in the preparation of lesson notes, content knowledge, classroom management and record-keeping while the least performed tasks included the use of instructional materials, learners’ assessment, performance feedback and review of academic activities. Teachers’ instructional planning has significant relationship with instructional task performance \(r = 0.896 \ p<0.05\), and students' academic performance \(r = 0.851 \ p<0.05\). The study concluded that teachers performed instructional planning at a moderate level while concerted efforts are needed to boost productivity. It was recommended that the State Ministry of Education and relevant professional bodies should organize capacity training seminars/workshops to improve teachers’ instructional tasks performance in secondary schools.
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**RESUMEN**

La preocupación de los grupos de interés sobre la disminución de la calidad de las tareas de enseñanza de los docentes y el rendimiento académico de los estudiantes en las escuelas secundarias de Nigeria podría atribuirse a las insuficiencias percibidas en la planificación de la enseñanza. Por lo tanto, este estudio investigó la planificación de la formación y la productividad de los docentes en las escuelas secundarias públicas del distrito senatorial del norte de Ondo, en el estado de Ondo, Nigeria. Se adoptó un diseño de investigación de encuesta descriptiva y se muestrearon 600 docentes y 30 directores, utilizando técnicas de muestreo aleatorio simple y multietapa. Los datos se recopilaron utilizando el Cuestionario de Planificación Instruccional (IPQ) y el Cuestionario de Productividad de los Maestros (TPQ). Tres preguntas de investigación y dos hipótesis guiaron el estudio. Las preguntas de investigación se respondieron utilizando estadísticas descriptivas, mientras que las hipótesis se probaron a un nivel de significancia de 0.05 utilizando Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC). Los resultados indicaron un nivel moderado de planificación de la enseñanza de los maestros (Media = 2.97); los maestros demostraron un alto desempeño en la preparación de notas de lecciones, conocimiento del contenido, gestión del aula y mantenimiento de registros, mientras que las tareas menos realizadas incluyeron el uso de materiales didácticos, la evaluación de los alumnos, la retroalimentación del desempeño y la revisión de las actividades académicas. La planificación de la enseñanza de los docentes tiene una relación significativa con el desempeño de tareas instruccionales \(r = 0.896 \ p<0.05\) y el desempeño académico de los estudiantes \(r = 0.851 \ p<0.05\). El estudio concluyó que los maestros realizaron la planificación de la enseñanza a un nivel moderado, mientras que se necesitan esfuerzos concertados para aumentar la productividad. Se recomendó que el Ministerio de Educación del Estado y los organismos profesionales pertinentes organicen seminarios/talleres de formación de capacidades para mejorar el desempeño de las tareas de enseñanza de los docentes en las escuelas secundarias.
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INTRODUCTION

The secondary school education system occupies a centre stage in human capital and national development. This is because the secondary school absorbs the products of primary schools and prepares students for further studies in higher educational institutions. The Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014) stipulated in the national policy on education that the main goals of post-basic secondary school education shall be the preparation of the individuals for higher education, trained manpower at sub-professional grades for self-reliance and useful living within the society. The attainment of the goals of secondary school education depends to a large extent on teachers’ instructional planning and effective teaching-learning process.

Planning in educational management entails the process of setting objectives, determining the strategies and mapping out programmes for achieving the educational objectives (Nwankwo, 2014; Onwuka, 1996). Instructional planning involves the ability of the teacher to decide in advance what is to be taught, how to be taught, when to be taught, who is to be taught, and the evaluation of the learners to ascertain the level of achievement of the educational objectives (Ayeni & Afolabi, 2012; Koleoso, 2002).

Instructional planning can also be described as the systematic process of selecting the subject topics, formulating measurable instructional objectives, developing content-knowledge, determining the best teaching methods, choosing appropriate instructional materials, identifying suitable techniques for class control, deciding measures for evaluating students’ performance and giving feedback for the purpose of achieving educational goals (Longe, 2003; Olibie, 2013).

Instructional planning enables the teacher to consciously prepare learning activities, make effective use of the appropriate instructional techniques and materials in the teaching-learning process, minimize wastages and guide against deviation from predetermined goals. However, in a study by Rabiul, Rashed, and Mehbuba (2018) on hindrances to use and prepare the lesson plan of secondary school teachers in Bangladesh found that teachers placed little emphasis on instructional planning because of the stress associated with large class size and the desire to cover the syllabus; the lack of standardized lesson plans invariably hamper the quality of curriculum instruction as reflected in the ineffective teaching and limited capacity of students to learn and inability to cope with advancement of knowledge. The study recommended the use of lesson plan to enhance class interaction and greater participation of students in the teaching-learning process.

Productivity in education is the rate at which educational objectives are achieved. It is a continuous process, taking into consideration, the instructional resource input, process and output phases of education (Yusuf, 2017). The extent to which the teachers apply instructional planning process will determine the level of productivity in terms of the quality of instructional tasks and students’ academic performance. It is therefore imperative for the teachers to put in place effective planning, so that the educational goals can be achieved.

The stakeholders’ concern on quality education and the fulfilment of secondary education goals for students made teachers to be accountable for the quality of
teaching-learning process. However, the perceive low capacity of teachers’ instructional resource input which possibly manifest through inadequacies in lesson preparation, instructional materials, instructional techniques, content presentation, learners’ engagement, classroom management, learners’ evaluation among others seems to hamper the quality of instructional planning and productivity in secondary schools. This study therefore investigated the perceived gaps in teachers’ instructional planning and productivity in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria using Ondo North Senatorial District of Ondo State as a case study.

The findings of this study would provide additional information on how instructional planning process could be used in improving teaching and learning activities and achieve better learning outcome in secondary schools. The education policymakers, curriculum developers and professional bodies would find the outcome of the study useful in identifying the strengths and weaknesses in teachers’ instructional planning process and consider the need to organize seminars/workshops to strengthen teachers’ capacities in instructional planning in order to improve the level of productivity in secondary schools. It is also envisaged that the findings of this study would acquaint teachers with the procedure and positive impact of instructional planning process, and the areas that need to be improved upon in their instructional task performance and boost students’ academic performance in secondary schools.

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING PROCESS AND PRODUCTIVITY

Instructional planning process is the making of appropriate decisions to identify the learning concepts/topics within the frame of the curriculum, formulating measurable learning objectives, selecting relevant learning contents/experiences, providing suitable instructional materials, and identifying appropriate instructional techniques that are used in the teaching-learning process for the purpose of achieving educational objectives and improving students’ academic performance. The teachers being the driving force in the implementation of the school curriculum are involved in instructional tasks planning, engagement of students in learning activities and evaluation of students’ knowledge and skills for the purpose of achieving the educational objectives and desired productivity.

Productivity is the output in an organization. In the school setting, productivity is the degree of efficiency and effectiveness with which the school management and teachers utilise the available resources to achieve the set educational goals in terms of students’ learning outcome (Akinloye, 2013; Ayeni, 2018). This implied that an efficient teacher utilizes the available resources optimally to accomplish the tasks set out in the job description/schedule within the stipulated time.

Productivity also means the relationship/ratio between the result achieved (output) and the quantum of resources used in production (input); consequently, the level of productivity in secondary schools could be facilitated by school administrators and teachers in their sound knowledge and appropriate application of instructional planning process. Ijaiya (2013) in her study on education and teachers’ productivity found that teachers’ work performance and productivity are determined by effective teaching measured by students’ academic performance.
Teachers’ instructional tasks entail adequate planning of lesson notes, improvisation of instructional materials, effective delivery of curriculum-contents, child-friendly classroom management, effective time management, evaluation and reinforcement of students’ performance and adequate keeping of records (Ayeni & Afolabi, 2012). In the performance of these tasks, teachers are expected to demonstrate sound knowledge of the subject matter and pedagogical skills through adequate research, critical thinking and problem-solving to facilitate effective teaching-learning process and regular feedback on students’ performance in order to achieve the educational objectives.

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING PROCESS AND STUDENTS’ ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Instructional planning process is a very important aspect in the school setting, which involves teacher’s ability to critically study the syllabus and curriculum-contents, assess the quality of resource inputs, systematically articulate learning experiences, select appropriate instructional methods, functional learning equipment and materials, and comfortable educational space to facilitate effective teaching-learning process, evaluate learners’ performance and review feedback in line with the set standards in order to achieve the educational objectives. Teachers are also expected to communicate and collaborate effectively with colleagues in the manner that will boost their professional knowledge, skills and experience in instructional planning in order to enhance teaching-learning process and improve students' academic performance.

Students’ academic performance could be defined as learning outcomes which include knowledge, skills and values acquired by students throughout their period of study which produced observable and measurable behaviour of students in terms of scores obtained from a teacher-made test, terminal examinations and external examinations such as the West African Senior School Certificate Examinations (WASSCE), the Senior School Certificate Examinations conducted by National Examinations Council (NECO-SSCE) and so on (Ayeni & Amanekwe, 2018).

In Nigeria, the percentage of students who obtained five credits and above in subjects including English Language and Mathematics in the West African Senior School Certificate Examinations (WASSCE) were relatively low and fluctuating between 2016 and 2018, and reflected the following percentages in 2016 (52.97%), 2017 (59.22%) and 49.98% in 2018 (Adenipekun, 2018). Similarly, in Ondo State, the performance levels of students’ who obtained five credits and above in WASSCE reflected the following percentages in 2014 (24.36%), 2015 (30.29%), 2016 (61.64%), 2017 (46.17%) and 47.20 % recorded in 2018 (Ministry of Education, 2018). The dwindling performance seems to have been caused by the perceived inadequacies in teachers’ instructional planning and delivery.

The low level of students’ academic performance is a matter of concern and could be attributed to the perceived inadequacies in teachers’ instructional delivery. This potential gap underscores the need to expand research knowledge on teachers’ instructional planning process, and considering the fact that education is a dynamic process and the need for continuous improvement in the quality of teaching-learning process cannot be under-estimated; It is based on
this premise that the researcher has considered it imperative to enhance instructional delivery through innovative and result-oriented instructional planning process that is being introduced to boost teachers’ professional competence in instructional tasks performance and improve students’ academic performance. Based on the researcher’s working experience as a Lead Evaluator in Ondo State Quality Education Assurance Agency; and Chairman, Teaching Practice at Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, and organization’s best practices, the application of the instructional planning process is professionally explained as follows.

1. **Identify the problem/unit of instruction that will be covered:** Teachers are expected to demonstrate professional ability in identifying the learning concepts/topics to be taught from the subject curriculum, syllabus and scheme of work which contains the logical and sequential arrangement of contents and learning experiences to be covered within a specified period of instruction.

2. **Diagnosing the learning problem:** Teachers are expected to be painstaking and critically examine the topic(s) to be taught in relation to what makes the topic important, the learning resources, age, and interest of learners. The teacher should also have in-depth understanding of the psychological and social factors affecting students' disposition to learning; this would enable the teacher to give due attention to those factors that may affect effective teaching-learning process and respond professionally to students’ interest and educational needs.

3. **Setting of learning objectives:** It is expected of teachers to formulate educational objectives that are specific, measurable and achievable in terms of content-knowledge and experiences acquired by the learners within the stipulated time of instruction. This enables the teacher to develop suitable strategies and focus attention on relevant educational activities that foster learners' participation to achieve the set objectives.

4. **Data generation and analysis:** Teachers should be skillful in the classification of content components, organization and integration of the content elements/learning experiences (subject matter). Content knowledge generally refers to the body of knowledge, facts, concepts, theories and principles and information that the teachers teach, and students are expected to learn in a given subject. The content-knowledge should be comprehensive and well specified to facilitate orderly presentation of instructional activities and learners’ engagement.

5. **Identify and develop possible alternatives:** This step involves recognition of suitable instructional methods and activities that foster effective teaching-learning process. Teachers need to be conversant with numerous teaching methods that take recognition of the magnitude of complexity of the concepts to be taught and promote students’ interest and engagement in learning for the purpose of achieving the educational objectives.

6. **Evaluation and selection of the best alternative:** This is the process by which the teacher considers/examines the relevance, complexity and flexibility of the various methods of teaching in relation to the learning experiences, learning facilities and classroom setting, and choose the most suitable method(s) for imparting knowledge and facilitate active learners engagement in the teaching-learning process.
7. **Budgeting**: This is the numerical outline for allocating resources to specific objectives and activities. The teacher is expected to be goal-oriented and demonstrate professional ability in the mapping out of instructional tasks and allocation of appropriate learning resources and time to the teaching and learning activities. Besides, this will enable the teacher to organize the class for optimal capacity utilization of educational facilities, learning space, equipment and materials for the purpose of achieving the educational objectives.

8. **Action/implementation stage**: This stage involves ability of the teacher to create sequence of learning activities and utilize appropriate instructional resources to stimulate adequate participation of learners in the teaching-learning process. The teacher will do well by creating child-friendly atmosphere that promote equitable access to learning resources, positive class interaction, effective communication, reflective thinking and creativity in the teaching-learning process.

9. **Control, monitor and review of teaching and learning activities**: This involves the teacher’s ability in effective time management, class management to foster active learners’ engagement, preventing disruptive behaviour, providing performance feedback to students, and giving feedback to the school management and parents. This would enable the teacher to compare actual results with the intended learning objectives for the purpose of re-examining learning activities and procedures in order to make necessary adjustment/take corrective action that will improve curriculum implementation and learners’ academic performance.

Instructional planning process is very important in the school setting since teachers’ competence in instructional planning will enable them to identify the key issues that need to be reviewed and improved upon in the course of implementing the curriculum so as to ensure that significant achievement is recorded when compare the original goals and what is actually achieved. This will no doubt bring about continuous improvement in the quality of instructional tasks performance and students’ academic performance. Teachers are therefore expected to apply the planning process to improve the different aspect of teaching such as: subject mastery, lesson preparation, effective communication in the presentation of content-knowledge with varied methods that can make teaching and learning effective, interactive and meaningful for the students. This will enable learners to acquire relevant knowledge and skills for the purpose of achieving the desired learning objective which is measured by students’ academic performance.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The most prominent task of teachers is to improve teaching-learning process through effective instructional planning processes that are input-factor to instructional tasks performance and more generally determined students’ learning outcomes in secondary schools. However, there is a growing public outcry and stakeholders’ concern about the realization of the secondary school education objectives probably due to the perceive inadequacies in teachers’ instructional tasks which possibly accounted for the dwindling level of students’ academic performance as reflected in the percentage of those who obtained
credit level passes and above in five subjects including English Language and Mathematics in the West African Senior School Certificate Examinations between year 2016 and 2018 which had often been below 50 percent and depicts low standard of education in Nigeria secondary schools.

The dwindling level of students' academic performance could be perceived as the resultant effect of the inadequacies in curriculum delivery by the teachers. It is not uncommon that many teachers seem to undermine the need for effective instructional planning partly due to myriad of challenges that are associated with the classroom instruction which among others include excessive allocation of teaching workload, congested class size, excessive marking of students’ exercises, and shortage of instructional materials. This calls to question the level of teachers’ competence in their instructional planning process, which could have its negative implications on teachers’ instructional tasks performance and students’ learning outcomes. The dwindling level of students’ academic achievement tends to increase the stakeholders’ concern on the realisation of the national policy on education which stipulates that “Education system cannot rise above the quality of teachers in the system (FGN, 2014). This thought provoking statement underscores the need for this study, which seeks to investigate the level of teachers’ instructional planning and productivity in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. The study is however delimited to public secondary schools in Ondo North Senatorial District of Ondo State, Nigeria.

Research Questions
The following research questions were raised to guide the study.
1. What is the level of teachers’ instructional planning process in secondary schools?
2. What is the level of teachers’ instructional task performance in secondary schools?
3. What is the level of students’ academic performance in secondary schools?

Research Hypotheses
The following research hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:
HO1: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning process and instructional task performance in secondary schools.
HO2: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning process and students’ academic performance in secondary schools.

RESEARCH METHOD

The study adopted the descriptive research design of the survey type. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used for the study. Three (3) Local Government Areas were randomly selected out of the existing six (6) LGAs in Ondo North Senatorial District. Ten (10) secondary schools were randomly selected from each of the three (3) LGAs sampled for the study. Respondents comprised 600 teachers and 30 principals selected from 30 sampled schools out of the existing 91 public secondary schools. Twenty (20) teachers were randomly selected from each of the 30 sampled secondary schools. All the 30 principals of the sampled schools were included in the study.
Three (3) research questions and two (2) hypotheses guided the study. Data were collected using self-structured questionnaires titled “Instructional Planning Questionnaire” (IPQ) and “Teachers’ Productivity Questionnaire” (TPQ). The research instruments were subjected to face and content validity; the research instruments were pilot tested using a test-retest technique in two secondary schools that were not included in the study sample. The reliability coefficient was determined using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 level of significance which yielded reliability coefficients of 0.85 and 0.97 for the IPQ completed by teachers and TPQ completed by principals respectively. Therefore, the instruments were generally regarded as reliable. The questionnaire was structured on a 4-point Likert rating scale and classified as: Always (A), Often (O), Seldomly (S), and Never (N) with the values of 4, 3, 2 and 1, respectively. The research questions were answered using Frequency counts, Percentage and Mean Scores values which were rated as Low (< 2.5), Moderate (≥ 2.5 <3.5) and (High ≥3.5) while the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC).

The TPQ was administered to the principals personally by the researcher and two trained research assistants were engaged to help in the administration of the IPQ to teachers in the sampled schools. A total of 30 principals’ questionnaires and 600 teachers’ questionnaires were distributed and administered on the respondents in the three (3) LGAs sampled in Ondo North Senatorial District. The researcher clearly explained procedures for completing the questionnaire to the respondents. Respondents were requested to complete the questionnaires and return them to the researcher on the same day. The few respondents who could not fill the questionnaire on the spot were given opportunity till the next day when the researcher visited their schools to collect completed questionnaire. The administration of the instrument took five (5) working days. This method ensured 100 percent rate of return.

RESULTS

The research questions were answered using descriptive statistics: frequency counts, percentage and mean score while the research hypotheses were tested using inferential statistics: Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) at 0.05 level of significance. The results were presented in tables 1 – 5, and figures 1 – 2.

Research Question 1: What is the level of teachers’ instructional planning in secondary school?
### Table 1. Level of Instructional Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x̅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in the setting of the educational goals.</td>
<td>Fre</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in the formulation of strategies to achieve the</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational goals.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in the setting of criteria for performance</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in generating alternatives to the identified</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational problems.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in performance evaluation and review of</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational activities/programmes.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Frequency/Grand Mean</strong></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key: A (Always), O (Often), S (Seldomly), N (Never)*

The data presented in table 1 above revealed the level of teachers’ effectiveness in instructional planning as reflected in the following percentage average points: Always (26.1%), Often (49.0%), Seldomly (22.2%), and Never (2.7%). The grand mean value of 2.97 implied that the level of teachers’ instructional planning process is moderate. However, the teachers are least effective in the evaluation and review of curriculum instruction and educational programmes in secondary schools. The pictorial representation is shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Bar Chart of the Level of Instructional Planning**
Research Question 2: What is the level of teachers’ instructional task performance in secondary schools?

Table 2. Level of Teachers’ Instructional Tasks Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Teachers’ Tasks</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Prepare lesson notes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Appropriate teaching methods</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sound knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Good use of instructional materials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Conduct continuous assessment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Performance feedback</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Effective classroom management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Instructional review</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Record – keeping</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Coverage of syllabus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage/Mean</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key: A (Always), O (Often), S (Seldomly), N (Never)

The data presented in Table 2 indicated the level of teachers’ instructional tasks performance as reflected in the following percentage average points: Always (37.0%), Often (38.7%), Seldomly (15.0%), and Never (9.3%). Items 1, 2, 3, 7 and 9 showed tasks that are highly performed while items 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10 showed tasks that are least performed. The grand mean of 3.03 implied that majority of the teachers moderately performed instructional tasks in secondary schools in Ondo North Senatorial District. The pictorial representation is shown in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Bar Chart of the Level of Teachers’ Instructional Tasks Performance

Research Questions 3: What is the level of students’ academic performance in secondary schools?

Table 3. Students’ Academic Performance in the Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (WASSCE) Results in Ondo North Senatorial District from 2015/2016 to 2017/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Session</th>
<th>No. of Candidates Registered</th>
<th>Candidates with 5 Credits and above Including English and Mathematics</th>
<th>Candidates with 5 Credits and above Including either English or Mathematics</th>
<th>Candidates with 5 Credits and above without English and Mathematics</th>
<th>Candidates with Less Than 5 Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>2096</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6124</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in table 3 indicated that out of 6,124 students registered for WASSCE from 2015/2016 to 2017/2018, a total of 2,868 students representing 46.8% made credits and above in a minimum of five subjects, including English Language and Mathematics. 28.6% of the students had 5 credits pass including either English Language or Mathematics. However, 16.2%
of the total registered students obtained 5 credits but without a credit pass in English Language and Mathematics while only 8.4% of the students had less than five (5) credits. The result indicated that the level of academic performance of students’ in Ondo North Senatorial District was below the average level.

**HO1:** There is no significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning and instructional task performance in secondary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.</th>
<th>Relationship between instructional planning and instructional task performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Planning</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Task</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result on table 9 indicated that r-cal (0.896) is higher than r-tab (0.195). This implies a significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning and instructional task performance at 0.05 level of significance and 628 degree of freedom. Therefore the null hypothesis of no relationship is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is not rejected.

**HO2:** There is no significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning and students’ academic performance in secondary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.</th>
<th>Relationship between instructional planning and students’ academic performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Planning</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Academic</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result on table 5 indicated that r-cal (0.851) is higher than r-tab (0.195). This implies a significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning and students’ academic performance at 0.05 level of significance and 628 degree of freedom. Therefore the null hypothesis of no significant relationship is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is not rejected.

**DISCUSSION**

The analysis of data on the level of instructional planning in table 1, revealed a grand mean value of 2.97 which indicated that a majority of the respondents affirmed that teachers maintained a moderate level in instructional planning in the key areas of setting educational goals, formulating operational strategies, developing evaluation criteria, generating alternative solutions, and performance review, which have positive influence on teachers’ productivity in secondary schools in Ondo North Senatorial District. The findings corroborate Ameen (2007)
who indicated that teachers played major roles in formulating the goals of educational programme, curriculum implementation, use of modern teaching aids and assessment methods to achieve quality education. However, the finding of this study indicated that teachers are least effective in the evaluation and review of curriculum instruction and other educational programmes in secondary schools.

The data presented in table 2 on the level of teachers’ instructional tasks performance revealed a grand mean value of 3.03, which implied that majority of the teachers performed instructional tasks moderately in the preparation of lesson notes, knowledge of subject matter, classroom management and record keeping. However, the tasks performed below the grand mean included the use of instructional materials, conduct of continuous assessment, performance feedback, review of curriculum instruction, and coverage of the syllabus. These could be partly responsible for the result presented in table 3 which revealed that 46.8% of students obtained credit level passes and above in five subjects including English Language and Mathematics. This indicated that the teachers still need to step up effort in the performance of instructional tasks in order to improve students’ academic performance in secondary schools in Ondo North Senatorial District of Ondo State.

The data presented in table 4 revealed that there is a significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning and instructional tasks performance. This implied that a majority of teachers were effective in instructional planning and efficiently utilise the available resources to accomplish instructional tasks within the stipulated time. This finding further corroborates Yusuf (2017) who emphasized the importance of instructional planning, taking into consideration, the instructional resource input, process and output phases of education.

The finding also revealed that there is a significant relationship between teachers’ instructional planning and students’ academic performance. This implied that teachers’ effectiveness in instructional planning enhanced the teaching-learning process particularly the setting of educational goals, preparation of lesson notes, knowledge of subject matter, learners’ engagement and classroom management have positive influence on teachers’ productivity in secondary schools. This finding corroborates Ijaiya (2013) who found that teachers’ work performance and productivity are determined by effective teaching measured by students’ academic performance.

**Conclusion**

It was concluded that a majority of the teachers maintained a moderate level in instructional planning and instructional tasks performance with the best performed tasks recorded in the preparation of lesson notes, knowledge of subject matter, classroom management and record-keeping which have positive impact on teachers’ productivity. However, the observed inadequacies in the use of instructional materials, conduct of continuous assessment, performance feedback, review of curriculum instruction, and coverage of the syllabus are potential issues of concern which have to be addressed by the school administrators, and could be explored for future research studies in order to provide additional information and foster best practices that would improve teachers’ instructional delivery and students’ academic performance in secondary schools.
Recommendations
Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Principal should give adequate attention to instructional planning and encourage collaborative work among teachers in order to improve teachers’ instructional tasks performance and foster students’ learning capacity, class interaction and academic performance in secondary schools.

2. The State Ministry of Education should organise periodic capacity development seminar/workshop for principals and teachers in order to improve their competence in instructional planning and boost instructional tasks delivery and improve students’ academic performance in secondary schools.
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