



**Revolutionising Assessment
and Evaluation Procedures
in Education**

Edited by
Charles V. Abe
Adams O. U. Onuka

**Revolutionising Assessment
and Evaluation Procedures
in Education**

**A Book of Readings in Honour of
Professor Promise N. Okpala**

Edited by

**Charles V. Abe
Adams O.U. Onuka**

Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd.
Gaaf Building, 110-112 Oyo Road,
Orogun, Off University of Ibadan,
Second Gate, Ibadan, Oyo State,
Nigeria.

Phone: 08023519154
stirlinghorden@yahoo.com
www.stirlinghorden.com

University Post Office
Box 20984
Ibadan
Oyo State, Nigeria

7 Ikioda Street
Jattu-Uzairue
Edo State, Nigeria

© Society for the Promotion of Academic Excellence

Published 2012

ISBN 978 - 978 - 032 - 195 - 6

All Rights Reserved

Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of research, private study, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act of Nigeria, this publication may not be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means, except with the prior permission in writing of the publishers or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd.
Lagos, Ibadan, Benin City, Jattu-Uzairue.

List of Contributors

Adams O. U. Onuka

*Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
+2348033564064, adamonuka@yahoo.com*

Adenike E. Emeke (Ph.D)

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Babajide Mike Bakare (Jnr)

*Assistant Registrar
WAEC, HQ Office, Lagos, Nigeria.*

Callistus C. Ofojebe (Ph.D)

*Quality Assurance Department
National Examinations Council (NECO), Minna, Nigeria.*

Charles Vincent Abe (Ph.D)

*charlesabe2004@yahoo.co.uk
Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.*

Comfort Oyebola Opasina (Ph.D)

Loyola College, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Emmanuel I. Anyanwu (Ph.D)

National Examinations Council, Minna, Nigeria.

Onyemaechi A. Eke

National Examinations Council, Minna, Nigeria.

Eugenia A. Okwilagwe (Ph.D)

*Institute of Education
University of Ibadan, Nigeria.*

Felicia M. Oduntan (Ph.D)

*Lord's Group of Schools Oyo,
Oyo- State, Nigeria.*

Felix Osa Ibode (Ph.D)

*Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
+2348023250926, felixibode@yahoo.com*

Contents

1. **Examining the Examiner:
Okpala and NECO Mandates** 1
Ikechukwu E. Anyanwu & Onyemaechi A. Eke
2. **Educational Assessment Practices for Quality
Assurance: The National Examinations Council's
Experience in Nigeria** 15
*Promise Nwachukwu Okpala, Omaze Anthony
Afemikhe & Emmanuel Anyanwu*
3. **Improving Continuous Assessment Process in
Nigerian Primary and Junior Secondary Schools** 27
Olakunle Sunday Akinsola
4. **Assessment as a Tool for Learning Improvement
at the Senior Secondary Education Level** 37
Adams O. U. Onuka & Toyin F. Akinyemi
5. **Creating Classrooms We Desire through
Assessment** 53
*Omaze Anthony Afemikhe, Sylvanus Yakubu Imobekha
& Jennifer Omo-Egbekuse*
6. **Assessment of Visually Impaired Candidates
in the West African Senior School Certificate
Examination (WASSCE)** 61
Mulikat A. Bello & Babajide Mike Bakare
7. **Assessment of Child Friendliness Environment in
Day Care Centres and Pre-Primary Schools in
South- West, Nigeria** 79
Felicia M. Oduntan
8. **Threats to Quality Assurance in Educational
Assessment** 99
Williams F. I. Onwuakpa & Callistus C. Ofojebe

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 9. | Towards Repositioning the Nigerian Public Examining for Improved Outcomes
<i>Folajogun V. Falaye</i> | 109 |
| 10. | Developing Effective Observation Skills in Lecturers as a Response to Meeting the Challenge of Assessment in Higher Education Curriculum
<i>Adenike E. Emeke</i> | 133 |
| 11. | Challenges of Public Examinations in Nigeria
<i>Comfort Oyebola Opasina</i> | 155 |
| 12. | Increasing Enrolment in Public Examinations and the Challenges in Quality of Assessment: The NECO Experience.
<i>Williams F. I. Onwuakpa</i> | 169 |
| 13. | Instruction and Evaluation Needs Assessment of Federal Teachers Scheme Beneficiaries in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria
<i>Eugenia A. Okwilagwe</i> | 179 |
| 14. | An Assessment of Sexual Behavioural Pattern of Undergraduates in the University of Ibadan
<i>Francisca C. Anyanwu & Sylvester Reuben Okeke</i> | 193 |
| 15. | Evaluation and Human Capital Development in Nigeria
<i>V.A Asuru</i> | 209 |
| 16. | Some Psychological Factors as Predictors of Senior Secondary School Students' Achievement in English Reading Comprehension in Ondo State, Nigeria
<i>J.A. Adegbile & W.C. Obinegbo</i> | 225 |

17. **Educational and Cultural Factors as Predictors of Examination Malpractice among SSCE Candidates in Benue State** 237
Felix Osa Ibode & Pila Nasela
18. **Family Environment and Gender as Determinant of Career Aspiration among Public Primary School Pupils in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State** 251
Ikmat Olanrewaju Junaid & Charles Vincent Abe

Instruction and Evaluation Needs Assessment of Federal Teachers Scheme Beneficiaries in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

13

Introduction

Supply of adequate and qualified teachers have been identified as core challenges to achieving the objectives of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme in Nigeria. These challenges have implications for achieving access, equity and quality of the programme (FGN, 2011) and of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the year 2015. As part of the scheme to achieve the (MDGs) in Nigeria, the Federal Government introduced the Federal Teachers Scheme (FTS), an initiative set to help mitigate the challenges of implementing the UBE programme by supplying adequate number of qualified teachers to the education sector. The scheme, therefore, ensures that a steady supply of qualified teachers is available at the basic level of education in all states of the federation.

The objectives of the scheme are:

1. Assisting states to reduce shortage of teacher requirement for the success of the UBE programme.
2. Exposing young NCE graduates to full practical experience in their chosen career.
3. Ensuring qualitative education of candidates in the UBE programme.
4. Providing employment to NCE graduates and invariably reduce poverty.
5. Providing adult literacy services to the community.

A professionally equipped teacher, no doubt, is a great asset to the learners and to the education sector. He/She has the expertise to exhibit superior performance on a set of relevant teaching activities (Ericsson & Smith, 1991) and performs teaching assignments and maximises students' learning with ease (Dodds, 1994) in Ajayi (1999). Also, he/she develops and uses teaching practices and strategies that optimises students' achievement under varying situations and conditions (Okwilagwe & Samuel, 2011).

Needs assessment ensures that the strengths and challenges of an implemented programme are identified, while the weaknesses are remediated. Affirming the importance of teacher factor in the classroom, Darling-Hammond (1999), reported that teacher experience is one major factor that has influenced learner's achievement in school subjects like Mathematics and Language (Reading). It must be observed that there is a great difference in the expertise displayed by pre-service teachers and experienced teachers even though overtime these novices learn on the job. But none-the-less, the problems caused by inexperience teachers is enormous. According to Tahir (2003) poor teaching process exhibited by inexperienced teachers in schools is one of the many problems facing the education system in Nigeria. It is in respect of this that Bamisaiye (1999) while making a case for teacher autonomy asserted that if student teachers and pre-service teachers are to be future autonomous professionals, they have to be prepared to intervene in both the lives of learners as well as be authorities on social expectations of education.

In view of the importance of the teacher element in the achievement of the UBE programme, and the need for regular evaluation of any implemented programme either formatively or summatively, to ascertain the level of progress, and proffer suggestions for improvement led to the conduct of this study. The FTS is still very young, formative assessment like the type being conducted here will provide timely feedback into the system for better implementation.

Research Questions

1. What is the instruction and evaluation needs of FTS beneficiaries in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria?

2. Are there differences in the teachers' instruction and evaluation needs in terms of their subject areas of specialisation?

Methodology

The study is a survey type of research.

Sampling Technique and Sample

Multi-stage sampling technique was used as follows: Uyo Senatorial district was randomly selected from the three senatorial districts in Akwa Ibom. Furthermore, 8 LGAs were randomly selected from the district. Having clustered the eight local governments into rural and urban then four public schools were purposively selected based on the availability of FTS beneficiaries in the schools in each LGA. A total of 241 FTS teachers whose areas of specialisation were science, social science, mathematics and English Language, were used in the study.

Instrumentation

The Moore's Assessment Profile (MAP) (1977) for assessing teachers' needs for improving instructional effectiveness in the classroom, was modified and used for data collection. MAP consisted of 40 items grouped into two: instructional (25 items) and evaluation (15 items). MAP was revalidated on 80 FTS teachers from 40 primary schools in Eket Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. These were not part of the study sample. It yielded reliability coefficients of 0.83 and 0.91 for the two sections using Cronbach Alpha method. Previous studies, Okwilagwe & Falaye (2005), Odinko & Osokoya (2004), Onocha & Okpala (1984) obtained valid and reliable estimates of construct and internal consistency of MAP as follows 0.93 and 0.87 for the two sections; 0.91 and 0.84 in that order.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Four research assistants administered the instruments on the respondents. The respondents responded on a three-point scale: 'Much Help is Needed' (3), 'Moderate Help is Needed' (2) and 'No help is Needed' (1). The profile of the teachers' needs was obtained by

calculating the percentages of respondents who indicated a need for each level of response. Chi square (X^2) statistics was used to determine significant difference in terms of area of specialisation.

Results

Table1(a): Overall Profile of FTS Teachers Perceived Instruction Needs

S/N	Instructional Need Statement: Do you as a teacher; need help to undertake the following instructional activities?	Levels of Need		
		Much help needed	Moderate help needed	No help needed
1.	Lesson presentation {Sequential, logical use of illustration to explain content}	41 (17.1)	183(75.94)	17(7.5)
2.	Use of motivational techniques while teaching	77(31.95)	145(60.17)	19(7.88)
3.	Handling of pupils questions	49(20.33)	174(72.20)	18(7.47)
4.	Constructing and using resources and material for effective teaching	124(51.45)	115(47.72)	2(0.83)
5.	Using modern teaching aids like the projector, white board etc.	198(82.16)	37(15.35)	6(2.49)
6.	Using research information to improve teaching	160(66.39)	73(30.29)	8(3.32)
7.	Writing instructional objectives in measurable terms	56(23.24)	160(66.39)	25(10.37)
8.	Developing appropriate daily lesson plan	26(10.79)	151(62.66)	64(26.56)
9.	Presenting lessons so that pupils discover facts by themselves	52(21.58)	181(75.10)	8(3.32)
10.	Developing in pupils effective study skills	39(16.18)	202(83.82)	0
11.	Developing pupils' ability to master subject concepts	81(33.61)	160(66.39)	0
12.	Handling slow learners	85(35.27)	140(58.9)	16(6.64)
13.	Re-enforcing good behaviour in pupils	51(21.16)	183(75.93)	7(2.91)
14.	Improvement on my mode of instructional delivery	53(21.99)	168(69.71)	20(8.30)
15.	Handling gifted and dull pupils in the same classroom while teaching	124(51.45)	110(45.64)	7(2.91)

16.	Developing pupils understanding of the relationship that exist between the subject and everyday life	80(33.20)	151(62.66)	10(4.15)
17.	Teaching large class effectively	83(34.44)	144(59.75)	14(5.81)
18.	Utilising information on records in order to identify more effective pupils needs	94(39.1)	128(53.11)	19(7.88)
19.	Using results of evaluation instrument to diagnose pupils problems while teaching	31(12.87)	187(77.59)	23(9.54)
20.	Determining what to teach	5(2.08)	130(53.94)	106(43.98)
21.	Presenting lessons on pupils appropriate class level	23(9.54)	123(51.04)	95(39.42)
22.	Improvement on my ability to teach mathematics	7(2.91)	170(70.54)	64(26.56)
23.	Improvement on my ability to teach social studies	7(2.91)	170(70.54)	64(26.56)
24.	Improvement on my ability to teach English Language	24(9.96)	154(63.90)	63(26.14)
25.	Improvement on my ability to teach primary science.	20(8.30)	140(58.09)	81(33.61)

Table 1 (b): Overall Profile of FTS Teachers Evaluation Needs

S/N	Instructional Need Statement: Do you as a teacher, need help in undertaking the following instructional activities	Levels of Need		
		Much help needed	Moderate help needed	No help needed
1.	Interpreting the results of pupils	2(0.83)	194(80.50)	45(18.67)
2.	Developing essay tests	18(7.47)	185(76.76)	38(15.77)
3.	Using observation instruments	94(39.0)	113(46.89)	34(14.11)
4.	Developing marking scheme	66(27.39)	151(62.66)	24(9.96)
5.	Developing standardize test	74(30.71)	122(50.62)	45(18.67)
6.	Reporting pupils progress to pupils	31(12.86)	145(60.17)	65(26.97)
7.	Reporting pupils progress to Parents and Guidance	58(24.07)	131(54.36)	52(21.58)
8.	Establishing validity of tests	98(40.66)	107(44.40)	36(14.94)
9.	Establishing reliability of tests	95(39.42)	126(52.28)	20(8.30)
10.	Interpreting results of made test	60(24.90)	156(64.73)	25(10.37)
11.	Interpreting the results of standardized test	74(30.71)	130(53.94)	37(15.35)
12.	Evaluating pupils progress by using various types of instruments {essay, multiple choice etc}	54(22.41)	144(59.75)	43(17.84)
13.	Utilising cumulative test results in the final evaluation of pupils	69(28.63)	142(58.92)	30(12.45)
14.	Directing pupils to evaluate their own progress	110(45.64)	113(46.89)	18(7.47)

Tables 1(a) and (b) present the overall profile of FTS teachers' perceived instruction and evaluation needs. Results in Table 1(a) shows --that 39-82% of FTS beneficiaries in Akwa-Ibom State have high priority need for 5 out of the 25 instruction items they responded to and 45-83% needed moderate help for 20 of the items. Table 1(b) shows that 39-41% of the FTS beneficiaries perceived that they have high priority evaluation needs for 4 of the 15 items they responded to but had moderate need for all of the items.

Table 2(a): Instructional Needs of FTS Teachers by Areas of Specialisation

S/N	Teachers' Area of Specialisation	Responses				X ²
		Much help needed	Moderate help needed	No help needed	Total	
1.	Social Science	57	63	6	126	28.884*
	Science	4	15	0	19	
	Mathematics	16	62	13	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	77	145	19	241	
2.	Social Science	28	97	1	126	31.872*
	Science	9	7	3	19	
	Mathematics	12	65	14	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	49	174	18	241	
3.	Social Science	78	47	1	126	16.341*
	Science	10	9	0	19	
	Mathematics	36	54	1	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	124	115	2	241	
4.	Social Science	116	10	0	126	25.310*
	Science	15	4	0	19	
	Mathematics	62	23	6	91	
	English Language	5	0	0	5	
	Total	198	37	6	241	
5.	Social Science	98	27	1	126	32.893*
	Science	8	11	0	19	
	Mathematics	54	30	7	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	160	73	8	241	
6.	Social Science	16	96	14	126	87.955*
	Science	10	6	3	19	
	Mathematics	0	49	42	91	
	English Language	0	0	5	5	
	Total	26	151	64	241	

7.	Social science	22	101	3	126	28.171*
	Science	7	8	4	19	
	Mathematics	23	67	1	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	52	181	8	241	
8.	Social Science	26	100		126	14.955*
	Science	7	12		19	
	Mathematics	6	85		91	
	English Language	0	5		5	
	Total	39	202		241	
9.	Social Science	32	94	0	126	15.876*
	Science	2	17	0	19	
	Mathematics	17	67	7	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	51	183	7	241	
10.	Social Science	24	96	6	126	19.898*
	Science	2	17	0	19	
	Mathematics	27	50	14	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	53	168	20	241	
11.	Social Science	51	75	6	126	45.729*
	Science	5	14	0	19	
	Mathematics	63	21	7	91	
	English Language	5	0	0	5	
	Total	124	110	7	241	
12.	Social Science	34	92	0	126	30.191*
	Science	4	12	3	19	
	Mathematics	42	42	7	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	80	151	10	241	
13.	Social Science	36	90	0	126	44.362*
	Science	4	15	0	19	
	Mathematics	38	39	14	91	
	English Language	5	0	0	5	
	Total	83	144	14	241	
14.	Social Science	3	50	73	126	32.286*
	Science	2	12	5	19	
	Mathematics	0	63	28	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	5	130	106	241	
15.	Social Science	6	63	57	126	24.623*
	Science	6	4	9	19	
	Mathematics	11	51	29	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	23	123	95	241	
16.	Social Science	7	82	37	126	15.984*
	Science	0	10	9	19	
	Mathematics	0	73	18	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	7	170	64	241	
17.	Social Science	7	82	37	126	15.984*
	Science	0	10	9	19	
	Mathematics	0	73	18	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	7	170	64	241	
18.	Social Science	12	74	40	126	24.411*
	Science	7	8	4	19	
	Mathematics	5	67	19	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	24	154	63	63	

*Significant at $P \leq 0.05$ (non-directional)

Table 2(b): Evaluation Needs of FTS Teachers by Area of Specialisation

S/N	Teachers' Area of Specialisation	Responses				X ²
		Much help needed	Moderate help needed	No help needed	Total	
19	Social Science	12	87	27	126	34.072*
	Science	6	10	3	19	
	Mathematics	0	83	8	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	18	185	38	241	
20	Social Science	41	69	16	126	12.879*
	Science	2	17	0	19	
	Mathematics	23	60	8	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	66	151	24	241	
21	Social Science	9	87	30	126	92.302*
	Science	6	4	9	19	
	Mathematics	54	31	6	91	
	English Language	5	0	0	5	
	Total	74	122	45	241	
22	Social Science	26	65	35	126	18.420*
	Science	0	13	6	19	
	Mathematics	5	62	24	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	31	145	65	241	
23	Social Science	33	73	20	126	26.070*
	Science	11	5	3	19	
	Mathematics	14	48	29	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	58	131	52	241	
24	Social Science	40	73	13	126	39.675*
	Science	6	11	2	19	
	Mathematics	52	18	21	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	98	107	36	241	
25	Social Science	44	75	7	126	13.996*
	Science	7	10	2	19	
	Mathematics	44	36	11	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	95	126	20	241	

26	Social Science	39	73	14	126	23.267*
	Science	9	6	4	19	
	Mathematics	12	72	7	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	60	156	25	241	
27	Social Science	24	77	25	126	27.729*
	Science	8	11	0	19	
	Mathematics	37	42	12	91	
	English Language	5	0	0	5	
	Total	74	130	37	241	
28	Social Science	38	68	20	126	15.620*
	Science	6	10	3	19	
	Mathematics	10	61	20	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	54	144	43	241	
29	Social Science	31	81	14	126	15.318*
	Science	7	9	3	19	
	Mathematics	26	52	13	91	
	English Language	5	0	0	5	
	Total	69	142	30	241	
30	Social Science	65	59	2	126	20.689*
	Science	7	9	3	19	
	Mathematics	38	40	13	91	
	English Language	0	5	0	5	
	Total	110	113	18	241	

*Significant at $P \leq 0.05$ (non-directional)

Table 2(a) shows that there is significant difference in FTS beneficiaries' instruction needs in terms of their subject areas of specialisation in 18 of the 25 items they responded to. Table 2(b) shows that there are significant differences in 12 of the 15 evaluation needs the beneficiaries responded to.

Summary of Findings and Discussion

Beneficiaries of FTS in Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria perceived that they need much help in classroom instruction in activities such as:

- constructing and using resources and material for effective teaching;
- using modern teaching aids like the projector, white board etc;
- using research information to improve teaching;
- handling gifted and dull pupils in the same classroom while teaching; and

- utilising information on records in order to identify more effective pupils needs.

These teachers 45-83%, also, perceive they need moderate help in 20 of the 25 items among which are these very important areas:

- sequential and logical lesson presentation;
- use of motivational techniques;
- handling the slow learners and pupils' questions,
- presenting lessons so that pupils discover facts by themselves;
- developing in pupils effective study skills;
- re-enforcing good behaviour in pupils;
- improvement on mode of instructional delivery;
- using results of evaluation instrument to diagnose pupils problems while teaching;
- improvement on ability to teach mathematics;
- improvement on ability to teach social studies; and
- improvement on ability to teach English Language.

Also, 39-41% of the beneficiaries perceived that they need much help in evaluation activities such as:

- using observation instruments;
- establishing validity of tests;
- establishing reliability of tests; and

Onocha• directing pupils to evaluate their own progress and 44-80% needed moderate help in all the 15 items.

In terms of the differences in FTS beneficiaries instruction and evaluation needs, findings indicated that these teachers' areas of high priority needs include:

- development of daily lesson plan;
- developing pupils effective study skills;
- presenting lessons so that the pupils discover facts themselves;
- using motivational skills;
- using research information to improve teaching;

- using modern teaching aids in teaching;
- developing and using resources and materials to aid teaching;
- handling pupils questions; and
- all aspects of evaluation of learning, interpreting and reporting various pupils' scores and performances.

Findings, also, indicated that teachers who specialised in different areas perceived that they are inadequate in handling other subjects. For instance, teachers who specialise in social science subjects like economics, social studies, government tend to perceive much help in instruction and evaluation needs in handling other subjects, followed by those who specialise in mathematics than those in English Language and primary science. About 70% of these teachers perceive such inadequacies. This should not be. Since the NCE programme trains teachers for the primary (lower and middle basic) and junior secondary (upper basic) schools, teacher trainees should be competent in more than one subject area. The programme should be re-structured so that teachers expand their subject area scope to forestall the situation on ground that tends to make one teacher to teach all subjects at the primary level. This situation makes the teacher 'a jack of all subjects.'

Findings in this study corroborate the works of Odinko and Osokoya (2004), Okwilagwe and Falaye (2005), who found that primary school teachers have instruction and evaluation needs. Findings tend to confirm the obvious that to a large extent, the FTS are actually novices, and may need a great deal of time to learn on the job perhaps through several workshops that may be organised for them on the many areas they identified as needs. This is because, basic issues relating to teaching such as; handling pupils questions, using learning materials, development of daily lesson plans, evaluation of learning, or interpreting pupils' performance among others are areas of high priority needs that tended to differentiate these groups of FTS teachers on the basis of their subject area of specialisation. Findings also, confirm Tahir's (2003) view. The inadequacies in instruction and evaluation competence identified among FTS teachers in this study, are not peculiar to the professionally prepared NCE teachers alone, but have been observed in other professions as well. Scholars such as Obanya (2004) observed that Nigerian university graduates are insufficiently

prepared for the world of work. To overcome these inadequacies, many establishments organise additional training for prospective employees prior to their being employed and continue to organise re-training programmes to enable them fit into job schedules.

These findings have implications for the training of teachers in our colleges and faculties of education, were these teachers are trained. There is also need for such training to focus more on classroom interaction and management, resource materials development and use, planning for teaching, improved way of handling learners' scores and performance and developing and using a variety of evaluation tools in the classroom in the twenty-first century and beyond.

Conclusion

FTS is a federal initiative in the right direction but its implementation has to be put into the right perspective in order to achieve the objective for which it was set up. Teachers are key to the interpretation and implementation of any curricula. Their training in discharging their duties is equally important. FTS beneficiaries in Akwa Ibom State and perhaps in some other states of the federation are deficient in basic skills necessary for executing effective pedagogic and evaluative activities in the classroom. Most essentially, is that the subject area they specialise in seem to impinge significantly on how they impart other subject area contents' where they have less comparative advantage.

Recommendations

In view of the findings in this study, it was recommended that:

- research outcomes are used in updating current NCE curriculum in the colleges of education;
- training and re-training of NCE graduate for proper service delivery;
- proper monitoring of the job activities of the beneficiaries; and
- perhaps extending the length of the training period for FTS, rather than taking their competence for granted.

References

- Ajayi, M. A. (1999). Developing Teaching Expertise: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century in Physical Education Teacher Preparation. In A. Abimbade (Eds) *Teaching and teacher preparation in the Twenty-first century*. (pp.145-151). Dept of Teacher Education Publication, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Bamisiaye, O. A. (1999). Autonomy in Teacher Education: Challenges for the Twenty-First Century. In A. Abimbade (Eds). *Teaching and Teacher Preparation in the Twenty-first Century*, (12-21). Dept. of Teacher Education Publication, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence. In *Teachers for the 21st Century Making the Difference*. Publication of the All Australian Ministries for Education on the Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century. Adelaide, Australia: Ministry of Education.
- Federal Government of Nigeria (2011). Federal Teachers Scheme (FTS) Information Booklet for Participants. Universal Basic Education Commission, Abuja.
- Obanya, P.A.I. (2004). *Education for the Knowledge Economy*. Musuro Publishers, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Odinko, M. N. & Osokoya, M. M. (2004). A Survey of Instructional Needs of Primary School Teachers in Nigeria. *WAJE* Vol. XXIV (1) 11-21.
- Okwilagwe, E. A. & Samuel, E. O. (2011). Students' Evaluation of Social Studies Teachers' Effectiveness in Selected Junior Secondary Schools in Oyo state. *African Journal of Educational Research*. Vol. 15 (1-2) 1-12.
- Okwilagwe, E. A. & Falaye, F. V. (2005). Teacher instruction and evaluation needs in imparting basic social studies knowledge at the primary school level: implications for teacher training. *WAJE*, vol. xxv, 23-33.

Onocha, O.C. & Okpala, P.N.(1984). Improving science teachers' use of instructional materials and evaluation practices: A survey of science teachers perceived needs in Bendel State, Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Curriculum Studies*. Vol. 11 (1), 105-116.

Tahir, G. (2003). *Basic education in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Stirling-Horden Publishers (Nig) Ltd.