

# Influence of Instructional Plan Delivery Strategy on Student Learning in Secondary Schools in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya

*<sup>1</sup>Agayo Moraa Elmeldha, <sup>1</sup>John Mugun Boit & <sup>1</sup>Joseph Lelan*

*Moi University, P.O. Box 3900, Eldoret, Kenya*

**Type of the Paper:** Research Paper.

**Type of Review:** Peer Reviewed.

**Indexed in:** worldwide web.

**Google Scholar Citation:** [IJSTER](#)

## How to Cite this Paper:

Agayo, M. E. Boit, J. M. and Lelan, J. (2018). **Influence of Instructional Plan Delivery Strategy on Student Learning in Secondary Schools in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya.** *International Journal of Scientific and Technological Research (IJSTER)*, 1 (1) 109-117.

**International Journal of Scientific and Technological Research (IJSTER)**

A Refereed International Journal of OIRC JOURNALS.

© OIRC JOURNALS.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](#) subject to proper citation to the publication source of the work.

**Disclaimer:** The scholarly papers as reviewed and published by the OIRC JOURNALS, are the views and opinions of their respective authors and are not the views or opinions of the OIRC JOURNALS. The OIRC JOURNALS disclaims of any harm or loss caused due to the published content to any party.

# Influence of Instructional Plan Delivery Strategy on Student Learning in Secondary Schools in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya

<sup>1</sup>Agayo Moraa Elmeldha, <sup>1</sup>John Mugun Boit & <sup>1</sup>Joseph Lelan

Moi University, P.O. Box 3900, Eldoret, Kenya

## ARTICLE INFO

Received 21<sup>st</sup> September, 2018

Received in Revised Form 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2018

Accepted 1<sup>st</sup> November, 2018

Published online 4<sup>th</sup> November, 2018

**Key words:** Instructional Plan Delivery, strategy, Student learning, Secondary Schools.

purposively included in the study. Simple random sampling was used to select 30 % (117) of the teachers in the schools where the study was done. Simple random sampling was used to select 205 students in the selected county secondary schools. The researcher used questionnaires and interview schedules to gather the relevant information under the area of the study. Data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative techniques. The findings indicated that teachers try to prepare lesson plans that cater for all the different needs of the students and that time distribution in lesson plan was done such that all the planned activities were delivered in class as planned. Further, the study established that less than half of the teachers were familiar with dramatization, schemes of work and demonstrations. The study established that, with the p value of 0.004, F-ratio of 4.084 and degrees of freedom of 3 and 146, there was a significant relationship between instructional plan delivery strategy and student learning in county secondary schools in Uasin Gishu County. It is expected that the findings of this study will provide a guide to educational stakeholders on the best classroom management strategy that influences student learning in Uasin Gishu county secondary schools. It is also hoped that the government through the ministry of Education (MOE) will gain insights on classroom management strategies. Further; this study will also benefit future scholars who would wish to conduct similar or related studies as a source of documented literature.

## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of instructional plan delivery strategy on student learning in county secondary schools in Uasin Gishu County. This study utilized the teacher behavior continuum theory as espoused by Wolfgang and Glickman. The study was done in 21 county secondary schools. The study targeted 21 principals, 390 teachers and 8400 students in all the County Secondary schools in Uasin Gishu. All the 21 principals of the county schools were

## Introduction

Waithanji (2013) contends that teachers have the chance to set up and make learning environments kind and respectful through the utilization of acceptable resources to satisfy the nurturing desires of learners each academically and socially. Instruction is a plan of teaching and learning activities in which learning is organized. Instructional planning is the systematic process of deciding what and how students should learn. Planning is mostly the responsibility of teachers (Fabry, 2009). Teachers decide about the form and content of their instruction, such as how much presenting, questioning, and discussing to do; how

much material to cover in the allotted time; and how in-depth to make their instruction (Borich, 2007). In planning process, defining goals and objectives is important. The other factors in planning process are knowledge of the learner, knowledge of subject matter, and knowledge of teaching methods.

Good lesson planning is essential to the process of teaching and learning. A teacher who is prepared is well on his/her way to a successful instructional experience. The development of interesting lessons takes a great deal of time and effort. As a new teacher you must be committed to spending the necessary time in this endeavor. It is also important to realize that the

best planned lesson is worthless if interesting delivery procedures, along with good classroom management techniques, are not in evidence. There is a large body of research available pertaining to lesson development and delivery and the significance of classroom management. They are skills that must be researched, structured to your individual style, implemented in a teacher/learning situation, and constantly evaluated and revamped when necessary. Consistency is of the utmost importance in the implementation of a classroom management plan.

Lesson plans affects not only teachers instruction but classroom management as well. Lesson plans should be practical and usable, be economical in terms of teacher time, and strengthen the educational program. Borich (2007) states that as a combination of lesson objective designing, teaching, modeling, checking for understanding, re-teaching and teacher's self-reflection, lesson plan is a crucial element in the process of meeting national content standards and optimizing the outcome of classroom teaching and learning. This instructional plan motivates students to learn. The aim of instruction is to make the learning process take place. According to Buzzetto–More and Alade (2006), instructional design is: 1. analyzing what is to be taught/learned; 2. determining how it is to be taught/learned; 3. Conducting tryout and revision; 4. assessing whether learners do learn. Instruction is a systematic process in which every component (that is teachers, students, materials, and learning environment) is crucial to successfully learning (Fabry, 2009). Instruction deals with teaching and learning activities. These activities should assist students to learn knowledge and move this knowledge from short term memory to long term memory. To do that, students need to learn how to rehearse, encode, process and feedback new knowledge to be able to remember when they need (Fabry, 2009).

While preparing their lesson/daily plans, teachers should also think about the teaching materials they will use in their lessons in order to decide where and how to use these materials in a proper way, and to make their arrangements accordingly (Wulf, 2007). Planning seems to play a fundamental role in linking curriculum to instruction and, in turn, in influencing what goes on in the interactive teaching environment. Fabry (2009) suggested that teacher planning is the major tool by which teachers manipulate the environments that later shape and control their own behavior. The research of Wulf (2007) on teacher planning in the classroom setting shows that teachers are more apt to consider the context of the teaching

situation and the activities that would be of interest to the learners than the objectives and process for evaluating learners in the lesson.

Learning occurs in activities, and it is logical to suggest that the major task of the teacher is to gain and maintain cooperation during instructional tasks (Fabry, 2009).

Mattern *et al.*, (2006) reports that teachers are concerned with student learning, but in order to meet learning outcomes, the students must be interested and involved in the instructional activities. Thus, learning activities rather than learning outcomes become the focus of teachers' pre-active decision making. Cicek (2013) suggested that what teachers do in the classroom is influenced by what they think prior to entering the interactive environment. This link between teacher planning and action has been examined in three studies. Burns (2010) found that teachers who were given structured lesson plans in advance of teaching used learner ideas during the lessons less frequently than teachers who were unable to plan in advance. Burns (2010) concluded that, given lesson plans that followed the linear planning model, the teachers were less sensitive to the learners' thoughts and actions. A competing explanation for this finding may be that the teachers who were unable to plan were forced by the complexity of the task to employ ideas from their students, whereas the teachers who were able to plan were influenced to focus more on the lesson content than on the behaviors' of the students (Burns, 2010). The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of instructional plan delivery strategy on student learning in Secondary Schools in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya.

### **Methodology**

This study was guided by the teacher behavior continuum of Wolfgang and Glickman. The study employed a survey research design to select schools in Uasin Gishu County. This study employed combination of the quantitative and the qualitative, approaches. The study targeted principals, class teachers, students and heads of departments in all the County secondary schools in Uasin Gishu. The study was done in all the 21 county schools in Uasin Gishu. Simple random sampling was used to select 30% of the teachers in the schools where the study was done. This implied that 117 teachers were involved in this study. For the purpose of this study, the students' sample size was obtained using coefficient of variation. The study therefore had a total sample of 343 respondents. Data was collected using

questionnaires and interview schedule. The data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques.

### Findings

#### Gender of the Students and Teachers

The students and teachers were asked to state their gender and the responses are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1 Gender of the Students**

| Gender of Respondents | Students   |              | Teachers   |              |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
|                       | Frequency  | %            | Frequency  | %            |
| Male                  | 55         | 36.7         | 52         | 50.0         |
| Female                | 95         | 63.3         | 52         | 50.0         |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>150</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

As shown in Table 1, 63.3 % (95) of the students were female whereas 36.7 % (95) were male. It should also be noted that an equal proportion (50%) of male and female teachers participated in this study.

#### Current position of the teaching staff

The responses on the current position held by respondents in the school are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2 current position**

| Position in the school | Frequency  | %            |
|------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Teacher                | 74         | 71.2         |
| HoDs.                  | 12         | 11.5         |
| Class teacher          | 18         | 17.3         |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

As revealed in Table 2, 71.2 % (74) of the respondents were teachers, 17.3 % (18) were class teachers and only 11.5 % (12) were HODS.

#### Level of Education

There was need to establish the level of education of teachers who participated in this study. The responses are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3 Teachers' Level of Education**

| Level of education | Frequency  | %            |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|
| Diploma            | 8          | 7.7          |
| Degree             | 84         | 80.8         |
| Post graduate      | 5          | 4.8          |
| Masters            | 7          | 6.7          |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

Majority (80.8%) of the teachers were degree holders whereas 7.7% (8) were diploma holders and 6.7 % (7) were masters' holders. There were 4.8 % (5) who were post graduate holders.

#### Effects of Instructional Plan Delivery Strategy on Study Learning

The first objective of this study was to determine the effect of instructional plan delivery on students learning. The student's responses are presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

**Table: 4 incorporating teaching and learning aids**

| Response               | Frequency  | %            |
|------------------------|------------|--------------|
| By giving out examples | 41         | 27.3         |
| By asking questions    | 44         | 29.3         |
| Poorly                 | 44         | 29.3         |
| Good                   | 21         | 14.0         |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>150</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

It should be noted that an equal proportion of 29.3 % (44) of the students stated that teachers incorporated teaching and learning aids by asking questions. However 27.3 % (41) stated that teachers incorporated teaching and learning aids by giving out examples. Further 14% (21) of the respondents stated that the

teacher incorporation of teaching and learning aids was good.

The students were further asked to give their opinion on the statements concerning the influence of instructional plan delivery strategy on students learning. Their responses are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5 Influence of Instructional Plan on Student Learning**

| Statement  | SA |      | A  |      | U  |      | D  |      | SD |      | Total |       |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|-------|-------|
|  | f  | %    | f  | %    | f  | %    | f  | %    | f  | %    | f     | %     |
| Lesson plan is designed to ensure that it caters for all the different needs of the students   | 54 | 36.0 | 83 | 55.3 | 0  | 0    | 10 | 6.7  | 3  | 2.0  | 150   | 100.0 |
| The content of scheme of work is in line with the subject and topic objectives   | 52 | 34.7 | 78 | 52.0 | 6  | 4.0  | 13 | 8.7  | 1  | .7   | 150   | 100.0 |
| The content of lesson plan is line with the object and the topic objectives of the lesson, hence reflects how the students will be examine | 58 | 38.7 | 57 | 38.0 | 11 | 7.3  | 19 | 12.7 | 5  | 3.3  | 150   | 100.0 |
| Time distribution in lesson plan is done such that all the planned activities are deliver in class as planned                              | 73 | 48.7 | 52 | 34.7 | 10 | 6.7  | 8  | 5.3  | 7  | 4.7  | 150   | 100.0 |
| Incorporated teaching /learning materials are relevant to what is taught   | 55 | 36.7 | 58 | 38.7 | 8  | 5.3  | 21 | 14.0 | 8  | 5.3  | 150   | 100.0 |
| Lesson clearly shows achievements and goals that should be achieved in a particular lass lesson  | 59 | 39.3 | 56 | 37.3 | 20 | 13.3 | 12 | 8.0  | 3  | 2.0  | 150   | 100.0 |
| The lesson plan is always students- centered and based on ASEI-PDSI approaches   | 33 | 22.0 | 56 | 37.3 | 32 | 21.3 | 23 | 15.3 | 6  | 4.0  | 150   | 100.0 |
| Lesson build upon prior student knowledge i.e from known to unknown  | 49 | 32.7 | 58 | 38.7 | 14 | 9.3  | 21 | 14.0 | 8  | 5.3  | 150   | 100.0 |
| Lesson is started with a highly motivating activity  | 52 | 34.7 | 54 | 36.0 | 9  | 6.0  | 17 | 11.3 | 18 | 12.0 | 150   | 100.0 |
| At the end of the lesson the lesson, summarize the lesson and focus on positive gains made by students                                     | 77 | 51.3 | 45 | 30.0 | 7  | 4.7  | 8  | 5.3  | 13 | 8.7  | 150   | 100.0 |

As shown in Table 5, 91.3 % (137) of the students stated that lesson plan was designed to ensure that it caters for all the different needs of the students whereas 8.7 % (13) disagreed. There were 86.7 % (130) who asserted that content of scheme of work was in line with the subject and topic objectives whereas 9.4% (14) disagreed. Further, 76.7% (115) of the students stated that the content of lesson plan was in line with the objectives of the lesson hence it reflects how the student was examined, while 16.0 % ( 24) disagreed. Another 83.3 % (125) of the students stated

that time distribution in lesson plan was done such that all the planned activities were delivered in class as planned. Only 10% (15) disagreed. Table 4.9 also show that 75.3% (113) of the students stated that the incorporated teaching and learning materials were relevant to what is taught whereas 19.3 % (29) disagreed.

It is also revealed that 76.7 % (115) of the students stated that the lessons clearly indicated achievements and goals that should be achieved in a particular class

lesson. However, 10% (15) disagreed and 13.3% (20) were undecided. It should be noted that 59.3% (87) of the students asserted that the lesson plan was always students centered and based on ASEI-PDSI approach as 19.3% (29) disagreed and 21.3% (32) were undecided. Majority (71.3%) of the students also stated that lesson was built upon prior student knowledge while 19.3 % (29) disagreed. The table also shows that 70.7% (106) of the students who

participated in this study agreed that their teachers usually start lessons with highly motivating activities while 23.3% (25) disagreed. Lastly, 81.3 % (122) of the students sated that their teachers usually summarize the lesson and focus on positive gains made by the end of the student’s lesson.

The teachers were asked to state the instructional plan methods they were familiar with. Their responses are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6 Instructional Plan Methods**

| Instructional plan methods | Frequency  | %            |
|----------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Demonstrations             | 17         | 16.3         |
| Dramatization              | 45         | 43.3         |
| Schemes of work            | 37         | 35.6         |
| Lesson plan                | 5          | 4.8          |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

The responses on table shows that 43.3 % (45) of the teachers were familiar with dramatization 35.6% (37) were familiar with schemes of work while 16.3% (17) were familiar with demonstrations only 4.8 % (5) were familiar with lesson plan.

They were further required to state the directives the school head had given the teachers to ensure that lesson plans and schemes of work were designed based on the standard curriculum. The results are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7 directives given by head teachers**

| Directives            | Frequency  | %            |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|
| Provide KNEC syllabus | 38         | 36.5         |
| Provide KICD syllabus | 35         | 33.7         |
| Lesson plan books     | 31         | 29.8         |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

As stated by 36.5 % ( 38) of the teachers, the head teachers have provide KNEC syllabus while 33.7% (35) stated that the head teachers had provided teachers with KICD syllabus. There were 29.8 % ( 31) who stated that the head teachers had provided the teachers with lesson plan books.

The teachers were also asked to state how the schools facilitate teaching and learning aids in lesson presentation. The responses are shown in Table 8.

**Table 8: How the school facilitates teachers**

| Statement   | Frequency  | %            |
|---|------------|--------------|
| Provide material for preparation of teaching aids           | 39         | 37.5         |
| By providing the aid projectors                             | 37         | 35.6         |
| All the required to be used in demonstrations and practical | 20         | 19.2         |
| Provide essential facilities                                | 8          | 7.7          |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

There were 37.5 % (39) of the teachers who stated that the school provides materials for preparation of teaching aids whereas 35.6 % (37) stated that the school provides projectors. Further, 19.2% (20) stated that the school provides all that is required to be used in demonstrations and practical and 7.7% stated that only the school provides essential facilities required.

Opinion of the teachers concerning the influence of instructional plan delivery strategy on student learning is shown in Table 9.

**Table 9 Influence of instructional plan delivery on students learning**

| Statement  | SA |      | A  |      | U |     | D |     | SD |     | Total      |              |
|--|----|------|----|------|---|-----|---|-----|----|-----|------------|--------------|
|  | f  | %    | f  | %    | f | %   | f | %   | f  | %   | f          | %            |
| The lesson plan is designed to ensure that it caters for all the different needs of student                              | 48 | 46.2 | 45 | 43.3 | 4 | 3.8 | 0 | 0   | 7  | 6.7 | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| The content of scheme of work is in line with the subject and topic objectives   | 51 | 49.0 | 49 | 47.1 | 1 | 1.0 | 3 | 2.9 | 0  | 0   | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| The content of lesson plan is in line with the objectives of the lesson, hence reflects how the student will be examined | 49 | 47.1 | 54 | 51.9 | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 1  | 1.0 | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| Time distribution in lesson plan is done such that all the planned activities are delivered in class planned             | 50 | 48.1 | 51 | 49.0 | 0 | 0   | 3 | 2.9 | 0  | 0   | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| Incorporated teaching/ learning materials are relevant to what is taught   | 36 | 34.6 | 62 | 59.6 | 5 | 4.8 | 1 | 1.0 | 0  | 0   | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| Lesson clearly shows achievement and goals that should be achieved in a particular class lesson                          | 38 | 36.5 | 60 | 57.7 | 4 | 3.8 | 2 | 1.9 | 0  | 0   | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| The lesson plan is always students- centered and based on ASEI -PDSI approaches  | 37 | 35.6 | 58 | 55.8 | 6 | 5.8 | 3 | 2.9 | 0  | 0   | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| Lesson is build upon prior student knowledge i.e from known to unknown   | 45 | 43.3 | 56 | 53.8 | 3 | 2.9 | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0   | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| Lesson is started with a highly motivating activity  | 49 | 47.1 | 45 | 43.3 | 1 | 1.0 | 5 | 4.8 | 4  | 3.8 | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| At the end of the lesson the lesson, summarize the lesson and focus on positive gains made by students                   | 42 | 40.4 | 57 | 54.8 | 3 | 2.9 | 2 | 1.9 | 0  | 0   | <b>104</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

As shown in Table 9, 89.4 % (93) of the teachers stated that lesson plan was designed to ensure that it caters for all the different needs of the student whereas 6.7% (7) disagreed and 3.8 % (4) were undecided. It is also revealed that 96.2 % (100) of the teachers stated that the content of schemes of work is in line with the subject and topic objectives, while 2.9 % (3) disagreed. Another 99 % (103) of the teachers asserted that the content of lesson plan was in line with the objectives of lesson and thus reflects how the students will be examined. Further 97.1 % (101) agreed that time distribution in lesson plan is done such that all the planned activities were delivered in class as planned while 2.9 % (3) disagreed.

Majority (94.2%) of the teachers were also of the view that the incorporated teaching and learning materials were relevant to what was taught whereas 1.0% % (1) disagreed and 4.8 % (5) were undecided. The table shows that 94.2 % (98) of the teachers stated that the lessons clearly showed achievements and goals that were to be achieved in a particular class lesson, as 1.9 % (2) disagreed. There were 9.13 % (95) of the teachers who stated that lesson plan was always students-centered and based on ASEI-PDSI approaches. However 2.9 % (3) disagreed. Another 97.1 % (101) stated that lessons were built upon prior student knowledge and 90.4 % (94) stated that lessons were started with a highly motivating activity. Further,

95.2% (99) stated that at the end of the lesson, they provide a summary and focus on positive gain made by students.

Further statistical analysis was done to establish the relationship between instructional plan delivery strategies and student learning. There were 10 items measuring instructional plan delivery strategies. Using the criterion of Eigen values equal or greater than 1.00, four factors were extracted which accounted for 65.702% of the variance.

The four factors that were labeled: “interesting”, “effectiveness”, “Design” and “student-centred”. The

factors were abbreviated as P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>3</sub> and P<sub>4</sub> respectively. The dependent variable is student learning that is abbreviated by Y. Therefore, the regression equation will be:

$$Y = \alpha + a_1P_1 + a_2P_2 + a_3P_3 + a_4P_4 + e$$

e = a random error term

a<sub>1</sub>, a<sub>2</sub>, a<sub>3</sub> and a<sub>4</sub> = coefficients of proportionality for the factors “interesting”, “effectiveness”, “Design” and “student-centred” respectively.

The output from multiple regression analysis is presented in Table 10.

**Table 10: Coefficients Used in the Multiple Regression Equation**

| Variable       | Coefficient | t-statistics | Sig. | Remarks     |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| P <sub>1</sub> | 0.220       | 3.696        | .000 | Significant |
| P <sub>2</sub> | 0.009       | 0.149        | .002 | Significant |
| P <sub>3</sub> | 0.097       | 1.628        | .005 | Significant |
| P <sub>4</sub> | 0.004       | 0.065        | .003 | Significant |
| Constant       | 2.115       |              |      |             |

R<sup>2</sup> = 0.142

F-ratio = 4.084 with degrees of freedom of 3 and 146, p= 0.004.

The results shown in Table 10, indicates that R<sup>2</sup> is 0.142. This implies that 14.2% in the variation in level of student learning can be explained by differences in the four factors of instructional plan delivery strategy. The remaining 85.8% variation in the level of level of student learning can be explained by other variables. With the p value of 0.004, F-ratio of 4.084 and degrees of freedom of 3 and 146, there was a significant regression equation at 0.05 level of significance.

## Conclusion

The study sought to determine the influence of instructional plan delivery strategy on student learning in Secondary Schools. The findings indicated that 91.3 % of the students stated that lesson plan was designed to ensure that it caters for all the different needs of the students and 86.7 % asserted that content of scheme of work was in line with the subject and topic objectives. Further, 76.7% of the students stated that the content of lesson plan was in line with the objectives of the lesson hence it reflects how the student was examined. Another 83.3 % of the students stated that time distribution in lesson plan was done such that all the planned activities were delivered in class as planned.

Above half (59.3%) of the students asserted that the lesson plan was always students centered and that the students stated that lesson was built upon prior student knowledge (71.3%). Another 70.7% of the students agreed that their teachers usually start lessons with highly motivating activities and the teachers usually summarize the lesson and focus on positive gains made by the end of the student’s lesson (81.3 %). As

for the instructional plan methods the teachers were familiar with, the study established that less than half of the teachers were familiar with dramatization (43.3 %), schemes of work (35.6 %) while 16.3 % were familiar with demonstrations and only 4.8 % were familiar with lesson plan. Further, 36.5 % of the teachers stated that the head teachers have provided KNEC syllabus while 33.7% stated that the head teachers had provided teachers with KICD syllabus and 29.8% stated that the head teachers had provided the teachers with lesson plan books.

The findings indicated that teachers try to prepare lesson plans that cater for all the different needs of the students and that time distribution in lesson plan was done such that all the planned activities were delivered in class as planned. Further, the study established that less than half of the teachers were familiar with dramatization, schemes of work and demonstrations.

## Recommendations of the study

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, it can be recommended that teachers should design lesson plans from schemes of work as obtained from



the topic objectives and incorporate teaching and learning aids.

### References

- Borich, G.D. (2007) *Observation Skills for Effective teaching* (3rd ed.) New Jersey: Merrill/ Prentice Hall.
- Burns, D. E.; Reis, S. M. (2010). Developing a thinking skills component in the gifted education program, *Roemer Review*, 14(2).
- Buzzetto–More, N. A., & Alade, A. J. (2006). Best practices in e-Assessment. *Journal of Information Technology Education* 5, 251–269.
- Cicek, V. (2013). Effective Use of Lesson Plans to Enhance Education. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(6): 334-341.
- Fabry, D. L. (2009). Designing learning experiences for comparability across delivery methods. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching* 2(1), 69–79.
- Mattern, K.; Shaw, E.; Xiong, X. (2009). The Relationship between AP Exam Performance and College Outcomes, The College Board. Research report.
- Waithanji, M. N. (2013). The Influence of Classroom Seating Position on Student Learning Gains in Primary Schools in Kenya. *Creative Education*. Vol.4, No.11, 705-712.
- Wulf, K. (2007). *Relationship of assigned classroom seating area to achievement variables*. *Educ. Res. Quart.*, 2, 56–62.