



Influence of Teaching Effectiveness on Students' Learning Outcome

OBILOR, Esezi Isaac (Ph.D.)

**Department of Educational Foundations
Faculty of Education, Rivers State University
Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Email: esezirukanimgboh@gmail.com**

ABSTRACT

This study examined how teachers can be effective in the complex act of teaching and influence the learning outcome of students. A descriptive survey design was employed in the study using a sample of 368 teachers from 23 senior secondary schools in Rivers State. The instrument for data collection was a 66-item structured questionnaire titled Teaching Effectiveness and Students' Learning Outcome (TESLO) with a reliability coefficient of 0.87. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while the One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. It was found that teacher's course planning and organization; instructional delivery; communication skills; relationship with students; stimulation of classroom environment; and monitoring on students' work influence, to a high extent, the learning outcome of students. It was recommended among others that governments, school administrators, and all stakeholders must ensure, through regular training and retraining of teachers that teachers are masters of their teaching subjects and possess effective communication skills.

Keywords: Communication skills, learning outcome, instructional delivery, teaching effectiveness, teacher-student relationship.

INTRODUCTION

It is often very difficult to put together in one piece the complex task of the teacher. Yet it is very pertinent to articulate the teaching practices that influence students' outcomes. According to O'Neill (2009), teaching is a complex craft and it is impossible to capture in a page or two the sophistication of what good teachers do. Every teacher must have in mind, from the very beginning, that his role in education is to develop students who shall be knowledgeable and skilful enough to be effective as individuals and as members of the larger society. Effective teachers should have high expectations of their students in terms of both standards of learning and behaviour, and in addition, teachers should help these students meet those expectations.

For the teacher to be effective, he must be adequately equipped to perform this complex task of meeting students' expectation through the mastery of teaching content, building positive relationships with students, monitoring students' progress and providing feedback, using effective communication, acknowledging students' individual differences, encouraging students' responsibility, employing proper course organization and planning, stimulating the classroom environment, and using a variety of pedagogies to mitigate students' individual differences.

Effective teachers have a thorough knowledge of their subject content. There is nothing more important in the classroom than a teacher who is an expert in his area of specialisation (be it Mathematics, Economics, History, Psychology, Medicine, or whatever subject or discipline). There is no doubt the teacher needs passion, patience, effective communication skills, and many other qualities of a good teacher, but more than anything else he needs to know what he is talking about (what he is teaching)-mastery of teaching content. This is from where the teacher derives his authority. His classroom confidence and relationship with his students are functions of mastery of teaching content. Through this,

they inspire in their students a strong desire for learning. Their understanding of the teaching content, guides them on the most effective pedagogies to employ to enable effective teaching and learning and consequently improved students' learning outcomes. However, effective pedagogy comes only after proper course planning and organisation.

Planning for the delivery of a course is a dynamic process that involves bringing course outline to life. Course planning answers the following questions: What is to be taught? Who is to be taught? Who is to teach it? Why is it to be taught? How is it to be taught? When is it to be taught? In answering these questions, information about the course content, its purpose and who should benefit from it (students) will be provided. Next is information on who will teach the course (a Professor, or others), and what method(s) should be used to ensure the students benefit optimally from the instructions. Finally, planning provides information on when the course will be taught and for how long, including how many hours a week, the number of credit units, and methods of assessment. It has been shown that students excel when they feel the teacher is prepared, knowledgeable, and organized (Bain, 2004).

Adequate course planning and organization assess several key factors in the teaching and learning process: teacher's ability to clearly communicate course expectations, create course assignments that aid student learning, prepare lessons that demonstrate knowledge of course content, and emphasize relevant course concepts (Bain, 2004). Well-prepared and organised teachers produce high-achieving students, who score very high on aptitude and achievement tests, demonstrate very high grade point averages, and complete assignments in a more comprehensive and detailed manner (Teitel, 2004). Further, Teitel (2004) emphasised that a direct correlation exists between course organization and planning, and students' success: the more organized and planning-oriented a teacher is, the more likely students will view him as knowledgeable and be willing to learn the material in a structured manner. In contrast, receiving a low score on the course planning and organisation scale indicates that the teacher is likely not knowledgeable and so the course lacks cohesion and clarity leading to students' dissatisfaction.

Effective teachers use an array of teaching strategies because there is no single universal approach that suits all situations (Bhowmik, Banerjee, & Banerjee, 2013). Thus, effective teachers use techniques that best serve the learning needs of their students at different times and in different subjects. There are things that students can learn themselves through discovery, with the teacher structuring the learning to suit the situation. There are also things that require the teacher to teach in a more direct way. The effective teacher ensures that different methods of instructional delivery are put into use to accommodate the various teaching-learning situations to enhance students' learning outcome.

Effective teachers prioritise the material they address to ensure that it meets the course's learning objectives. They organise activities in strands, presenting content through small segments of instruction over several days, rather than planning one activity to address the entire concept. Effective teachers assign students activities that promote understanding of skills and knowledge, and focus on engaging students to build their communication and social skills, learn how to work independently and interdependently, and enhance their self-efficacy (Macsuga-Gage, Simonsen, & Briere, 2012). In other words, effective teachers help students learn on their own as well as with and from peers. They know that students learn best if they are provided with opportunities to learn not only from the teacher but also from other students and from sources outside the school that are now more readily accessible through various forms of technology. The effective teacher then monitors work of the students and rewards them using praise, reinforcement, and constructive feed-back, thereby improving their learning outcome.

The success of the teaching-learning process depends on the teacher's knowledge and the teacher's ability to communicate same to the students (Rawat, 2016). Communication plays a vital role in the transfer of knowledge from the teacher to the students. Learning is facilitated by communication which does not only help in the sharing of the teacher's knowledge with the students, but also creates an amicable environment to facilitate the sharing of ideas, opinions, and feelings among learners. According to Rawat (2016), communication is the most important social tool, which has the power of alteration, negotiation as well as the power to leave a long lasting impression on people's minds. Communication can be verbal and non-verbal. Verbal communication involves the use of the language whereas the non-verbal communication is essentially based on the use of expressions, gestures, actions, and so on. Both forms of

the communication are extremely important for complete transfer and understanding of the content the teacher presents. However, the teaching and learning process requires verbal communication much more than the non-verbal communication in the transfer of the knowledge.

Effective communication is a fundamental component of good teaching. A teacher's communication skills during lesson delivery are a distinguishing factor in student learning outcomes. Effective communication also increases in line with a teacher's degree of enthusiasm, level of stimulation from the classroom environment, and the use of challenging questions to provoke critical thinking skills. According to Sidelinger (2010), perceived teacher clarity from both verbal and non-verbal communication is strong predictor of students' willingness to participate in class and engage in self-regulated learning. In other words, students who take ownership of their assignments, communicate effectively with their teachers, and feel engaged and stimulated, experience a greater degree of student involvement and more positive student outcomes (Sidelinger, 2010). Open and effective communication builds rapport and allows teachers to connect with students both personally and professionally. Research demonstrates that students who feel that they can talk honestly and openly with their teachers are more academically successful (Drummond, 1995). Communication enables students to feel comfortable and safe in learning situations.

Communication also stimulates the classroom environment, creating an atmosphere that is both enthusiastic and motivating. A stimulating and engaging classroom environment is pivotal to student success. Class environments that stimulate positive emotions foster well-being and improved student outcomes (Williams, Childers, & Kemp, 2013). They further posited that students who experience positive emotions and are stimulated in the classroom also experience higher levels of motivation, and demonstrate behaviours that lead to academic success including studying, attendance, enhanced participation, and increased understanding of course materials.

Creating a positively stimulating classroom environment should be a priority to all effective teachers. According to Pang (2010), to stimulate students, effective teachers employ activity-based learning strategies, stating course expectations and goals, thereby helping students increase their self-regulation skills and take responsibility for their learning and application of material. A positively stimulating classroom environment encourages students to take ownership of their learning and also allows them to experience enhanced self-direction and self-awareness.

Building positive relationships with students requires purposeful actions. Actions which are deliberate and geared towards making students like school and learning. Most students come to school with missed feelings, some out rightly hate school and come to school expecting the worst. An effective teacher must accept students for who they are and make conscious efforts to change the bad to good and the good to better. To be able to do this, the teacher must know his students: their challenges, potentials, threats, weaknesses and strengths. The effective teacher looks for only the best in each student and always encourages them to be their best at all times. In building positive teacher-students relationship, the effective teacher must be passionate, patient, polite, empathic, and enthusiastic about the performance of his students.

According to Paolini (2015), effective teachers develop productive relationships with their students – they get to know them and take a particular interest in their overall development and progress. They treat their students with respect and expect the same in return. Effective teachers work collaboratively to benefit student learning. To connect with students and impact their lives personally and professionally, teachers must be student-centred and demonstrate respect for their background, ideologies, beliefs, and learning styles. The best instructors use differentiated instruction, display cultural sensitivity, accentuate open communication, and offer positive feedback on students' academic performance (Macuga-Gage et al., 2012).

Effective teachers closely monitor their students learning outcomes. This is done for several purposes which include the evaluation of how well an individual student learns new concepts, how well a student retains already learned concepts, and how effective teaching pedagogies are in meeting set curriculum goals. Monitoring and feedback enable effective teachers to provide students with regular feedback on students' performance, and give the teacher valuable information to assess the impact of their teaching.

Effective teachers understand the standards their students are expected to achieve and use a range of assessment methods to determine the extent to which students demonstrate desired learning outcomes or meet expected standards. The assessment methods include course evaluation, observations, pre- and post-tests, teacher-made tests, standardised tests, institutional data, and many others.

Course evaluation involves assessing student experience and satisfaction with courses offered in the departments and their general administration. This provides the departments, faculties and institution with students' perceptions of the classroom aspect of their educational experience. Teacher-made tests are tests developed by teachers in the institution and used within the institution, while a standardised test is any form of test that requires all test takers to answer the same questions, a selection of questions from a common bank of questions in the same way, and that is scored and interpreted in a standard or consistent manner which makes it possible to compare the relative performance of individual test takers or groups of test takers (edglossary.org, 2018). It is usually developed outside the institution for use by a large group of students regionally, or nationally, or internationally. Pre-test and post-tests are administered at the beginning and end of a programme respectively to enable the teacher measure the progress of students' learning, while institutional data is the review of both programme and student data collected at the institutional level with a view to appraising programme accreditation and upgrade, students and teachers mobility, students' CGPA, and others.

Statement of the Problem

Student's learning outcome is often claimed to be a function of teacher effectiveness. In other words, learners' performances are determined by how effective or ineffective the teacher is. How true this claim is, and by much teacher effectiveness influences the learning outcome of students are the focuses of this study: "Teaching effectiveness and students' learning outcomes".

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to enhance students' learning outcomes by providing opportunities for teaching effectiveness which will strengthen skill areas and identify aspects of teaching performance that need improvement. Specifically, the objectives of the study are to:

1. Examine the influence of course planning and organization on students' learning outcome.
2. Determine the influence of instructional delivery on students' learning outcome.
3. Determine the influence of communication on students' learning outcome.
4. Examine the influence of teacher-student relationship on students' learning outcome.
5. Examine the influence of stimulating classroom environment on students' learning outcome.
6. Determine the influence of monitoring on students' learning outcome.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does the teacher's course planning and organisation influence students' learning outcomes?
2. To what extent does the teacher's instructional delivery influence students' learning outcome?
3. What is the extent to which teacher's communication influence students' learning outcome?
4. To what extent does the teacher's relationship with students influence students' learning outcome?
5. What is the extent to which teacher's stimulation of classroom environment influence students' learning outcome?
6. To what extent does monitoring of students' work influence students' learning outcome?

Hypotheses

1. Teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher's course planning and organisation influences students' learning outcome.
2. Teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher's instructional delivery influences students' learning outcome.
3. Teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that communication skills influence students' learning outcome.
4. Teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher's relationship with students influences students' learning outcome.

5. Teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s stimulation of classroom environment influences students’ learning outcome.
6. Teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s monitoring of students’ work influences students’ learning outcome.

METHODOLOGY

Survey research design was adopted for this study. A survey research design is a developmental field study that systematically collects, analyses and synthesises quantitative data on a large representative sample of a given population (Kpolovie, 2010).

The population of the study is 7713 teachers of Senior Secondary Schools in Rivers State (Source: Rivers State Post Primary Schools Board, 2017). The sample is 366 computed using the Fluid Survey Sample Size calculator (which was approximated to 368 to enable 16 teachers to be selected from each Local Government Area (LGA) of the State. One school was drawn at random from each Local Government Area of the State giving 23 schools used for the study. Further, 16 teachers were drawn purposively from each of the 23 LGAs. The State has 3 Senatorial Zones, namely Rivers East, Rivers South East, and Rivers West. The analyses involved comparing the perceptions of teachers in the 3 Senatorial Zones.

A 66 item structured questionnaire titled Teaching Effectiveness and Students’ Learning Outcome (TESLO) was designed and administered on the 368 teachers in the State. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.87. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while the One-way Analysis of Variance (One-way ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Research Question 1: *To what extent does the teacher’s course planning and organisation influence students’ learning outcomes?*

Table 1: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which teacher’s course planning and organisation influence students’ learning outcomes

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
RIVERS EAST	128	3.2880	.27672	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS SOUTH EAST	112	3.2160	.17089	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS WEST	128	3.2310	.25541	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
Total	368	3.2450	.23252	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent

Very Low Extent = 1; Low Extent = 2; High Extent = 3; Very High Extent = 4

The result presented in Table 1 shows that Rivers East of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.2880 and standard deviation of 0.2767; Rivers South East of 112 teachers has a mean of 3.2160 and standard deviation of 0.1709; and Rivers West of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.2310 and standard deviation of 0.2554. The entire State of 368 teachers has a mean of 3.2450 and standard deviation of 0.2325. The above results indicate that teachers’ course planning and organization influence students’ learning outcome to a high extent. In other words, effective teachers’ course planning and organization enhance students’ learning outcomes.

Research Question 2: *To what extent does the teacher's instructional delivery influence students' learning outcome?*

Table 2: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which teacher's instructional delivery influences students' learning outcomes

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
RIVERS EAST	128	3.3333	.30098	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS SOUTH EAST	112	3.3850	.31437	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS WEST	128	3.3250	.30738	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
Total	368	3.3478	.29992	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent

Very Low Extent = 1; Low Extent = 2; High Extent = 3; Very High Extent = 4

The result presented in Table 1 shows that Rivers East of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.3333 and standard deviation of 0.3010; Rivers South East of 112 teachers has a mean of 3.3850 and standard deviation of 0.3144; and Rivers West of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.3250 and standard deviation of 0.3074. The entire State of 368 teachers has a mean of 3.3478 and standard deviation of 0.2999. The above results indicate that teachers' instructional delivery influence students' learning outcome to a high extent. In other words, students' learning outcome is sufficiently influenced by effective teachers' instructional delivery.

Research Question 3: *What is the extent to which teacher's communication skills influence students' learning outcome?*

Table 3: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which teacher's communication skills influence students' learning outcomes

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
RIVERS EAST	128	3.3920	.29724	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS SOUTH EAST	112	3.3290	.35332	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS WEST	128	3.2620	.25991	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
Total	368	3.3277	.30007	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent

Very Low Extent = 1; Low Extent = 2; High Extent = 3; Very High Extent = 4

The result presented in Table 1 shows that Rivers East of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.3920 and standard deviation of 0.2972; Rivers South East of 112 teachers has a mean of 3.3290 and standard deviation of 0.3533; and Rivers West of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.2620 and standard deviation of 0.2599. The entire State of 368 teachers has a mean of 3.3277 and standard deviation of 0.3001. The above results indicate that teacher's communication skills influence students' learning outcome to a high extent. In other words, students' learning outcome is sufficiently influenced by effective teachers' communication skills.

Research Question 4: *To what extent does the teacher’s relationship with students influence students’ learning outcome?*

Table 4: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which teacher’s relationship with students influences students’ learning outcomes

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
RIVERS EAST	128	3.2850	.25011	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS SOUTH EAST	112	3.3975	.22820	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS WEST	128	3.3183	.29698	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
Total	368	3.3336	.25697	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent

Very Low Extent = 1; Low Extent = 2; High Extent = 3; Very High Extent = 4

The result presented in Table 1 shows that Rivers East of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.2850 and standard deviation of 0.2501; Rivers South East of 112 teachers has a mean of 3.3975 and standard deviation of 0.2282; and Rivers West of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.3183 and standard deviation of 0.2970. The entire State of 368 teachers has a mean of 3.3336 and standard deviation of 0.2570. The above results indicate that teachers’ relationship with students influences students’ learning outcome to a high extent. In other words, students’ learning outcome is sufficiently influenced by effective teachers’ relationship with students.

Research Question 5: *What is the extent to which teacher’s stimulation of classroom environment influence students’ learning outcome?*

Table 5: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which teacher’s stimulation of classroom environment influences students’ learning outcomes

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
RIVERS EAST	128	3.3133	.23815	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS SOUTH EAST	112	3.4767	.57755	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS WEST	128	3.3233	.36142	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
Total	368	3.3711	.41166	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent

Very Low Extent = 1; Low Extent = 2; High Extent = 3; Very High Extent = 4

The result presented in Table 1 shows that Rivers East of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.3133 and standard deviation of 0.2382; Rivers South East of 112 teachers has a mean of 3.4767 and standard deviation of 0.5776; and Rivers West of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.3233 and standard deviation of 0.3614. The entire State of 368 teachers has a mean of 3.3711 and standard deviation of 0.4117. The above results indicate that teachers’ stimulation of the classroom environment influence students’ learning outcome to a high extent. In other words, students’ learning outcome is influenced by effective teachers’ stimulation of the classroom environment.

Research Question 6: *To what extent does teacher’s monitoring of students’ work influence students’ learning outcome?*

Table 6: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which teacher’s monitoring of students’ work influences students’ learning outcomes

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
RIVERS EAST	128	3.3870	.21990	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS SOUTH EAST	112	3.3340	.16474	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
RIVERS WEST	128	3.4280	.17937	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent
Total	368	3.3830	.18694	Influences learning outcome to a High Extent

Very Low Extent = 1; Low Extent = 2; High Extent = 3; Very High Extent = 4

The result presented in Table 6 shows that Rivers East of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.3870 and standard deviation of 0.2199; Rivers South East of 112 teachers has a mean of 3.3340 and standard deviation of 0.1647; and Rivers West of 128 teachers has a mean of 3.4280 and standard deviation of 0.1794. The entire State of 368 teachers has a mean of 3.3830 and standard deviation of 0.1869. The above results indicate that teachers’ monitoring of students’ work influences students’ learning outcome to a high extent. In other words, students’ learning outcome is influenced sufficiently by effective teachers’ monitoring of students’ work.

Hypothesis 1: Teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s course planning and organisation enhance students’ learning outcome.

Table 7: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on teacher’s course planning and organization, and students’ learning outcome

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.029	2	.014	.253	.778
Within Groups	1.539	365	.057		
Total	1.568	367			

The mean difference is not significant at .05: $F(2, 365) = .253, p > .05$

Table 7 presents the sum of squares of 0.029, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.014 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 1.539, degrees of freedom of 365, and a mean square of 0.057, while the total has 1.568 sum of squares and 367 degrees of freedom. The computed F is .253 which is statistically not significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s course planning and organisation influence students’ learning outcome” is not rejected, $F(2, 365) = .253, p > .05$. In other words, teachers in Rivers State are in a consensus that teacher’s course planning and organisation influence students’ learning outcome to a high extent.

Hypothesis 2: Teacher’s instructional delivery does not significantly influence students’ learning outcome.

Table 8: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on teacher’s instructional delivery and students’ learning outcome.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.025	2	.013	.134	.875
Within Groups	3.123	365	.095		
Total	3.148	367			

The mean difference is not significant at .05: $F(2, 365) = .134, p > .05$

Table 8 presents the sum of squares of 0.025, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.013 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 3.123, degrees of freedom of 365, and a mean square of 0.095, while the total has 3.148 sum of squares and 367 degrees of freedom. The computed F is .013 which is statistically not significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s instructional delivery influences students’ learning outcome” is accepted, $F(2, 365) = .134, p > .05$. In other words, teachers in Rivers State agree that students’ learning outcome is influenced, to a high extent, by teacher’s instructional delivery.

Hypothesis 3: Teacher’s communication skills do not significantly influence students’ learning outcome.

Table 9: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on teacher’s communication skills and students’ learning outcome.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.085	2	.042	.452	.641
Within Groups	2.527	365	.094		
Total	2.611	367			

The mean difference is not significant at .05: $F(2, 365) = .452, p > .05$

Table 9 presents the sum of squares of 0.085, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.042 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 2.527, degrees of freedom of 365, and a mean square of 0.094, while the total has 2.611 sum of squares and 367 degrees of freedom. The computed F is .452 which is statistically not significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s communication skills influence students’ learning outcome” is not rejected, $F(2, 365) = .452, p > .05$. In other words, teachers in Rivers State are in a consensus that teacher’s communication skills influence students’ learning outcome to a high extent.

Hypothesis 4: Teacher’s relationship with students does not significantly influence students’ learning outcome.

Table 10: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on teacher’s relationship with students and students’ learning outcome.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.080	2	.040	.593	.559
Within Groups	2.231	365	.068		
Total	2.311	367			

The mean difference is not significant at .05: $F(2, 365) = .593, p > .05$

Table 10 presents the sum of squares of 0.080, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.040 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 2.231, degrees of freedom of 365, and a mean square of 0.068, while the total has 2.311 sum of squares and 367 degrees of freedom. The computed F is

.593 which is statistically not significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s relationship with students influences students’ learning outcome” is accepted, $F(2, 365) = .593, p > .05$. In other words, teachers in Rivers State agree that students’ learning outcome is, to high extent, influenced by teacher’s relationship with students.

Hypothesis 5: Teacher’s stimulation of classroom environment does not significantly influence students’ learning outcome.

Table 11: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on teacher’s stimulation of classroom environment and students’ learning outcome.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.201	2	.101	.579	.566
Within Groups	5.730	365	.174		
Total	5.931	367			

The mean difference is not significant at .05: $F(2, 365) = .579, p > .05$

Table 11 presents the sum of squares of 0.201, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.101 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 5.730, degrees of freedom of 365, and a mean square of 0.174, while the total has 5.931 sum of squares and 367 degrees of freedom. The computed F is .579 which is not statistically significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s stimulation of classroom environment influences students’ learning outcome” is not rejected, $F(2, 365) = .579, p > .05$. In other words, teachers in Rivers State are in a consensus that teacher’s stimulation of the classroom environment influences, to a high extent, students’ learning outcome.

Hypothesis 6: Teacher’s monitoring of students’ work does not significantly influence students’ learning outcome.

Table 12: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on teacher’s monitoring of students’ work and students’ learning outcome.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.044	2	.022	.619	.546
Within Groups	.969	365	.036		
Total	1.013	367			

The mean difference is not significant at .05: $F(2, 365) = .619, p > .05$

Table 12 presents the sum of squares of 0.044, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.022 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 0.969, degrees of freedom of 365, and a mean square of 0.036, while the total has 1.013 sum of squares and 367 degrees of freedom. The computed F is .619 which is statistically not significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “teachers in Rivers State do not differ significantly that teacher’s monitoring of students’ work influences students’ learning outcome” is accepted, $F(2, 365) = .619, p > .05$. In other words, teachers in Rivers State agree that teacher’s monitoring of students’ work influences students’ learning outcome to a high extent.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study examined how teachers can be effective in the complex act of teaching and enhance the learning outcome of students. The study revealed that teacher’s course planning and organization; instructional delivery; communication skills; relationship with students; stimulation of classroom environment; and monitoring on students’ work enhance the learning outcome of students to a high extent.

The study found that teacher’s course planning and organisation enhance the learning outcome of students to high extent. Supporting this finding, Teitel (2004) emphasised that well-prepared and organised teachers produce high-achieving students, who score very high on aptitude and achievement tests,

demonstrate very high grade point averages, and complete assignments in a more comprehensive and detailed manner. Also agreeing with this finding Brain (2004) who posited that students excel when they feel the teacher is prepared, knowledgeable, and organized.

Teacher's instructional delivery was also found to enhance, to a high extent, the learning outcome of students. Inclined to this, Macsuga-Gage, et. al. (2012) declared that best teachers use differentiated instruction, display cultural sensitivity, accentuate open communication, and offer positive feedback which enhances students' academic performance. The use of different types of teaching methods has the tendency to meet the needs and individual differences of students.

The communication skills of teachers were found to enhance the learning outcome of students to a high extent. According to Sidelinger (2010), teacher clarity from both verbal and non-verbal communication is strong predictor of students' willingness to participate in class and engage in self-regulated learning. Learning is facilitated by communication which does not only help in the sharing of the teacher's knowledge with the students, but also creates an amicable environment to facilitate the sharing of ideas, opinions, and feelings among learners.

The study further found that teacher's relationship with students enhance students' learning outcome. In consonance with this finding, Paolinia (2015), opined that effective teachers work collaboratively to benefit students' learning: Effective teachers treat their students with respect and take a particular interest in their overall development and progress, thereby enhancing their learning outcomes.

It was also found that the learning outcomes of students are enhanced by teacher's positive stimulation of the classroom environment. Supporting this finding, Williams, Childers, and Kemp (2013) asserted that class environments that stimulate positive emotions foster well-being and improved students' learning outcomes. According to O'Neill (2009), monitoring of students' work enables effective teachers to provide students with regular feedback on students' performance, and give the teacher valuable information to assess the impact of their teaching. Agreeing with O'Neill (2009), this study found that the learning outcome of students is enhanced by monitoring of students' work and provision of feedback by teachers.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study have shown that students' learning outcome is enhanced to a large extent by teaching effectiveness which includes planning and organization of courses in ways that encourage students' participation and understanding; delivery and use of differentiated instructional materials which connote subject matter mastery and intelligence. Teaching effectiveness also involves creating stimulating and friendly classroom environment in which students are comfortable and free to learn; facilitating positive teacher-student relationship which makes the teacher available, approachable, and dependable; possession of effective communication skills by teachers; and monitoring of students' work to provide feedback to the students and valuable information to the teacher. On the whole, the effective teacher is one who possesses and demonstrates these attributes that enhance the learning outcome of students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Every school, and indeed every nation, would desire and welcome high students' learning outcome. To achieve this, teachers must be effective in putting together the complex task of teaching, and based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that school administrators, governments, and all stakeholders must ensure the following through regular training and retraining of teachers:

1. Teachers are masters of their teaching subjects. In other words subject mastery is very important in enhancing the learning outcome of students.
2. Course planning, organisation and delivery are student-centred and geared towards encouraging students' participation.
3. Teachers have effective communication skills which facilitate instructional delivery and friendly disposition of the teacher.

REFERENCES

- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bhowmik, M.; Banerjee, B.; & Banerjee, J. (2013). Role of pedagogy in effective teaching. *Basic Research Journals of Education Research and Review*, 2(1), 01 – 05.
- Drummond, M. (1995). The role of health economics in clinical evaluation. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 1(1), 71 – 75.
- edglossary.org. (2018). *Standardised tests*. Last updated on 11:12:15. Retrieved on 04/04/2018 from edglossary.org/standardized-test
- MacSuga-Gage, A. S., Simonsen, B., & Briere, D. E. (2012). Effective teaching practices that promote a positive classroom environment. *Beyond Behaviour*, 1 – 11.
- O’Neill, O. (2009). Ethics for communication. *European Journal of Philosophy*, 17(2), 167 – 180.
- Pang, K. (2010). Creating stimulating learning and thinking using models of activity-based learning and metacognitive-based activities. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 29 – 38.
- Paolini, A. (2015). Enhancing teaching effectiveness and student learning outcome. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, 15(1), 20 – 33.
- Sidelinger, R. (2010). College student involvement: An examination of student characteristics and perceived instructor communication behaviours in the classroom. *Communication Studies*, 61, 87 – 103.
- Teitel, L. (2004). *How professional development schools make a difference: A review of research*. (2nd Ed. Revised). Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Williams, K. H., Childers, C., & Kemp, E. (2013). Stimulating and enhancing student learning through positive emotions. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 13, 209 – 227.
- Rawat, D. (2016). Importance of communication in teaching learning process. *Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(26), 3058 – 3063.