ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOUR, LEARNING PROCESS AND LEARNING OUTCOME OF PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS IN ETI-OSA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA.

By

SULE, SHEIDU A., *Ph.D*
drsulesa@yahoo.ca / ssule@unilag.edu.ng

&

MEMBERE ALBERT, ELIZABETH ESSANG
Department of Educational Management
University of Lagos, Nigeria.
elizabethmembere@gmail.com

Abstract

The study examined the relationships amongorganisationalbehaviour, learning process and leaning outcome of public primary school pupils in Eti-Osa Local Government Area of Lagos State. The study sought to determine how such variables as school structure, personality of teachers, qualification of teachers, availability of technological resources, the use of instructional materials, and teacher's teaching method affect the learning outcome of the pupils in the public primary schools. Descriptive survey research design was used to carry out the study and out of 2,447 primary six school pupils, 315 were selected using stratified random sampling technique. A researcher designed questionnaire titled "OrganisationalBehaviour, Learning Process and Learning Outcome" was used for data collection. The instrument was validated and tested for reliability and a reliability estimate of 0.80 was obtained. Data were collected by the researcher and trained research assistants. Research questions were analysed with the use of descriptive statistics of mean, percentage and frequency while inferential statistics of Pearson Product - Moment CorrelationCoefficient was used to test the research hypotheses. The findings of the study revealed that the structure of the school, personality of teachers, qualification of teachers, availability of technological resources, use of instructional materials, and teacher's teaching method all had significant relationships withlearning outcome of the primary school pupils. The findings thus revealed that organisationalbehaviour and learning process are related with the learners learning outcome. Based on the findings of the study and conclusions were herein drawn and a number of recommendations were made.

Keywords: Organisational behaviour, Learning process, Learning outcome, Technological resources.

Introduction

Organisational behaviour (OB) focuses on the behaviour of individuals and groups at work and how such behaviour affects overall job performance thereby being a determining factor in the ability of systems and organisations to achieve their goals and objectives. It seeks to understand how people act and interact within an environment as individuals, or while working in small or large groups within an environment and provide explanations for such behaviour. The main purpose of organizational behaviour is for management to see how it can best manage the different behaviours in the organisation either among groups and units within the organisation or individual behavior within the organisation so as to enhance

performance and achieve overall goals and objectives of the organisation. Organisations all come in different sizes all having various roles and functions which they play; contributing to the society at large in either positive or negative ways. Neeraja, (2011), defines it succinctly as:

> *The study of what people do in an organization and how the behaviour affects the performance of the organization, values and beliefs that are shared among members of an organization that affects the way they interact and accomplish certain tasks; the systematic study of how people, individual or group thinks, feels, behaves and acts within the organization as well as outside the organization and applying this; the study of the many factors that have an impact on how individuals and groups respond to and act in organizations and how organizations manage their environments, (p. 698).*

All organisations from world bodies like the United Nations whose main aim is that of maintaining international security and peaceful nations, conglomerates and small units all need to understand the behaviour and interactions among staff members so as to predict and determine members of staff who will work well in certain situations and how to better create teams that will produce greater results.

Schools are learning organisations meant to produce individuals who will contribute positively to the society and the world at large. "They are referred to as learning organisations because they learn through the exchange of information among subsystems, create conditions that support the learning of individual staff members and realign the entire structure and processes of the entire organisation to support continuous adaptation and change, Ron (1998). It is this role that qualifies the school to be referred to as an organisation whose system is open not closed. This definition of a school system as an open system comes to play as it has interactions not only within its internal environment but also its external environment. Allan and Fred (2012), "according to open systems theory, schools constantly interact with their external environment." Through its interactions with its external environment, it receives inputs from the external environment which it processes in its internal environment and sends these processed finished products in the form of output back into the external environment. It sometimes receives some of these outputs back as inputs in form of teachers who help in the process of transforming another type and set of input (students) into finished products (output). It is this input - process – output system that makes organisational behavior play a critical role in the learning process and outcome of students because they are highly dependent on the interactions that take place in the organizational behaviour of the schools. This stems from the fact that several factors influence organisational behavior and consequently organisational performance. The factors that influence organizational behaviour include and are not limited to leadership, attitudes, motivation, personality, communication, technology and the environment (internal and external). In a school organisation, organisational performance is evaluated based on the learning outcomes which show how well the students have been able to learn what has been taught. The learning outcome cannot be treated in isolation as it relies heavily on the learning process to give a high level of positive learning outcome. However, for the learning process and outcome to yield the required performance, the organizational behaviour of the school has to be one which its management takes cognisance of the interactions and behaviour within the school, make explanations for them and provide remedy where necessary for constructive results.

It is based on this interaction which the school has with its external environment and the critical role it plays to the society at large that makes the study of organizational behavior and learning process in schools a necessity.

Statement of the Problem

Primary education is a key educational level for any society because in instances where early childhood education is not available, the primary school usually becomes the first place where formal learning actually takes place. This is usually the case especially among developing countries thus making primary education very important. Primary education is the foundation upon which the education system is built. A child's experience of primary school and the education he or she receives there has a substantial and often crucial effect both on future attitudes to education and on future achievement. In Nigeria, primary education is the education given in a formal school setting to children aged 6-11+ (FGN, 2013). In trying to improve learning outcomes of pubic primary school pupils, the federal government has through the UBE scheme adopted the following strategies: enactment of necessary legislation; articulation of enabling policies; sensitisation and mobilisation of the target groups and all stakeholders; adequate planning, funding and management; optimal allocation and efficient utilisation of resources; adequate teacher training, recruitment and motivation; effective co-ordination of activities; encouragement and stimulation of the active participation of the private sector, non-governmental and voluntary organisations, as well as local communities in the scheme; establishment of working partnerships and collaboration agreements with the international community and donor agencies; and regular supervision, monitoring and evaluation of the scheme,Wali (2016). In line with the above, the National Primary Education Commission (NPEC) was re-established by Decree No. 96 of 1993 which provides arrangement for funding primary education in Nigeria. Furthermore, the Federal Government, having identified the teacher as the key actor in the education delivery process, recognised that no educational system surpasses the quality of its teachers. It therefore mounted aggressive programmes to enhance the status, raise the morale and welfare of teachers through improved salary structure, training and re-training as well as professionalisation of teaching. Despite all these, the learning outcomes of public primary school pupils has still not shown significant improvements as problems such as low academic performance and outcome, and inability of students to perform well in the society as outputs of the school system due to incompetence of not being able to put into practice what they learnt while in the school environment. The goals of primary education as enunciated in the National policy on education are not being substantially achieved. It is against this backdrop therefore that the need to investigate the relationships that exist among such variables asorganisational behavior, learning process and the learning outcome of public primary schools pupils in Eti-Osa Local Government Area of Lagos State, Nigeria becomes imperative.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to establish the relationships that exist among organisationalbehaviour, learning process and learning outcome of pupils in public primary schools in Eti-Osa Local Government Area of Lagos State. Specifically the study sought to:

i. Assess the relationship between the structure of the school and learners learning outcome of public primary school pupils.
ii. Determine the relationship between the personality of teachers andlearners learning outcome of public primary school pupils.
iii. Assess technological resources and the relationship they have with learners learning outcome of public primary school pupils.
iv. Determine the relationship between teachers' teaching methods andlearners learning outcome of public primary school pupils.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

i. What is the relationship between the structure of the school and pupils learning outcome?

ii. How does teacher's personality relate with pupils learning outcome?
iii. What is the relationship between the availability of technological resources andpupils learning outcome?
iv. How does the use of instructional materials relate with pupils learning outcome?
v. What relationship exists between teacher's teaching method andpupils learning outcome?

Research Hypotheses

The study was premised on the following null hypotheses:

i. There is no significant relationship between school structure and learning outcome of public primary school pupils.
ii. There is no significant relationship between the personality of teachers and learning outcome of public primary school pupils.
iii. There is no significant relationship between the availability of technological resources and learning outcome of public primary school pupils.
iv. There is no significant relationship between the use of instructional materials and learning outcome of public primary school pupils.
v. There is no significant relationship between teacher's teaching method and learning outcome of public primary school pupils.

Methodology

Research Design: The research design adopted for the study was a descriptive survey research design. The design is considered appropriate because it enables the researchers to generate data throughstandardised collection procedures based on highly structured research instruments and well defined study concepts and related variables.

Population of the Study: The population of the study consists of primary six pupils of public primary schools in Etiosa Local Government Area of Lagos State. There are a total of 35 registered public primary schools in the area with a total number of 2447 primary six school pupils for the 2016/2017 academic session (source: Lagos State Government State Universal Basic Education Board, 2017).

Sample and Sampling Technique: The participants used for the study were selected through the method of stratified random sampling. A total of 315 primary six public primary school pupils in Eti-Osa Local Government Area were randomly selected as participants for the study.

R*esearch Instrument:* A well-constructed and self-developed questionnaire titled "Organisational Behaviour, Learning Process and Learning Outcome (OBLPLO)" was used to get the desired information from the students. This was distributed to 315 participants which was 12.87% of the entire population. The questionnaire was divided into two sections (A and B). Section A was for collection of information on personal data of respondents, while Section B comprised questions that elicited responses from the respondents. The response options of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) were used by the respondents.

Validity of the Research Instrument: To establish the face validity, the instrument was given to two experts in the field of research for thorough perusal. Their independent inputs were utilized in the final draft of the instrument.

Reliability of the Research Instrument: The reliability of the research instrument was determined using a split half test method that involved odd and even numbered items to form the two halves. The two halves were administered to a sample of sixty students from two Primary Schools with similar characteristics, but were not part of the schools selected for the main study.. Spearman Brown Prophecy was used to determine the reliability of each half of the instrument. The correlation coefficient obtained

was further analysed using Spearman Brown Prophesy formula to determine the reliability of the whole instrument. A coefficient value of 0.80 obtained indicated that the research instrument was reliable; hence it was adopted for getting the desired information for the study.

Method of Data Collection: The researchers collected the needed data through the use of questionnaire and its administration in the selected schools. The administration of the questionnaire was carried out by the researchers and two research assistants. The records of students academic performance were also looked into by the researchers.

Method of Data Analysis: Responses from the questionnaire were analysed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics of mean, frequency counts and percentages were used in analysing demographic variables and research questions while the inferential statistics of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was also used to test the stated hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

The results of the hypotheses tested in the study are presented as follows:

Ho_1: There is no significant relationship between structure of the school and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools..

Table 1: Relationship between school structure and learners learning outcomes in the public primary schools

Variables	Mean Response	Std. Deviation	N	r-value	P-value	Decision
School structure	2.8571	.88974	315	.291**	.000	Reject the Null
Learners learning outcome	2.5049	.93881				

P<0.05, df= 313

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was run to assess the relationship between school structure and learners learning outcome. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear with both variables normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$), and there were no outliers. There was a moderate positive correlation between school structure and learners learning outcome, $r (313) = .291^*$, $p < .05$. From the r value obtained the coefficient of determination was estimated and this gave 0.085. The value of 0.085 was now used to determine the proportion of school structure explained by variation in learners learning outcome. Hence school structure explained only 8.4% of the variation in learners learning outcome in the public primary schools. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Ho_2: There is no significant relationship between the personality of teachers and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools.

Table 2: Relationship between personality of teachers and learners learning outcomes in the public primary schools.

Variables	Mean Response	Std. Deviation	N	r-value	P-value	Decision
Personality of Teachers	2.3521	1.0824	315	.129**	.024	Reject the Null
Learners learning outcome	2.5049	.93881				

P<0.05, df= 313

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was run to assess the association between school structure and learners learning outcome. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear with both variables normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$), and there were no outliers. There was a relatively weak positive correlation between school structure and learners learning outcome, $r (313) = .129^*$, $p < .05$. From the r value obtained the coefficient of determination was estimated and this gave 0.0166. The value of 0.0166 was used to determine the proportion of personality of teachers explained by variation in learners learning outcome. Hence personality of teachers explained only 1.66% of the variation in learners learning outcome in the public primary schools. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Ho_3: There is no significant relationship between pupils understanding of teacher's instructional delivery and learners learning outcome inthe public primary schools.

Table 3: Relationship between pupils understanding of teacher's instructional delivery and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools

Variables	Mean Response	Std. Deviation	N	r-value	P-value	Decision
Teacher's Qualification	2.0707	.95113	315	.182**	.002	Reject the Null
Learners learning outcome	2.5049	.93881				

P<0.05, df= 313

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was run to assess the association between teacher's qualification and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear with both responses on teachers qualification and pupils learning outcome normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$), and there were no outliers. A further test revealed a positive weak correlation between teachers qualification and learners learning outcome, $r (313) = .182^*$, $p < .05$. From the r value obtained the coefficient of determination was estimated and this gave 0.0331. The value of 0.0331 was now used to determine the proportion of pupils understanding of teacher's instructional delivery explained by variation in learners learning outcome. Hence pupils understanding of teacher's instructional delivery explained only 3.3% of the variation in learners learning outcome in the public primary schools. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Ho_4: There is no significant relationship between availability of technological resources and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools..

Table 4: Relationship between availability of technological resources and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools

Variables	Mean Response	Std. Deviation	N	r-value	P-value	Decision
Technological resources	1.9642	.88304	315	-.130**	.014	Reject the Null
Learners learning outcome	2.5049	.93881				

P<0.05, df= 313

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was run to assess the association between availability of technological resources and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear with both responses on technological resources and learners learning

outcome normally distributed, as was assessed with Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p < .05$), and there were no outliers. There was a very weak negative correlation between availability of technological resources and learners learning outcome, $r\ (313) = -.130^*$, $p < .05$. From the r value obtained the coefficient of determination was estimated and this gave 0.0169. The value of 0.0169 was now used to determine the proportion of school structure explained by variation in learners learning outcome. Henceavailability of technological resources explained only 1.69% of the variation in learners learning outcome in public primary schools. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Ho_5: There is no significant relationship between instructional materials and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools.

Table 5 : Relationship between the use of instructional materials and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools.

Variables	Mean Response	Std. Deviation	N	r-value	P-value	Decision
Instructional	2.2141	1.0449				
			315	.172**	.003	Reject the
Learners learning outcome	2.5049	.93881				Null

P<0.05, df= 313

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was run to assess the association between availability of instructional materials and learners learning outcome in the public primary schools. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear with both responses on instructional materials and learners learning outcome normally distributed, as was assessed with Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p < .05$), and there were no outliers. There was a weak positive correlation between availability of instructional materials and learners learning outcome, $r\ (313) = 0.172^*$, $p < .05$. From the r value obtained the coefficient of determination was estimated and this gave 0.085. The value of 0.0295 was now used to determine the proportion the use of instructional materials explained by variation in learners learning outcome. Hence the use of instructional materials explained only 2.95% of the variation in learners learning outcome in the public primary schools. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Summary of the Findings

i. There is a significant relationship between the structure of the school and learners learning outcome ($r=.291$; $df =313$ $p <0.05$).
ii. There is a significant relationship between the personality of teachers and learners learning outcome ($r=.129$; $df =313$ $p <0.05$).
iii. There is a significant relationship between pupils understanding of teacher's instructional delivery and learners learning outcome ($r = .182$; $df = 313$ $P < 0.05$).
iv. There is a significant relationship between availability of technological resources and learners learning outcome ($r = -.130$; $df = 313$ $p < 0.05$).
v. There is a significant relationship between use of instructional materials and learners learning outcome ($r = .172$; $df = 313$ $p < 0.05$).
vi. There is a significant relationship between teachers' teaching method and learners learning outcome ($r = .221$; $df = 313$ $p < 0.05$).

Discussion of Findings

The finding of the study revealed that there is a moderate positive relationship between school structure and learners learning outcome. In other words, school structure has a relationship with learners learning

outcome. This is in line with the findings of Lee et al. (2004), that school size and curriculum structure are typically linked….. and student academic achievement is lower in larger schools with size being an important issue for students from disadvantaged social background, both directly in terms of learning and indirectly in terms of differentiating environments that seldom favor low income students. Marijoribanks (2002) also supported this view in his study by stating that "school sector differences in outcomes are likely to be related to how schools vary in their social and academic structures." Also, the outcome of the second hypothesis which states a significant relationship between the personality of teachers and learners learning outcome is supported by Drew and Martin (2017), "personality traits have a significant moderating effect on learning outcomes."

Furthermore, hypothesis three whose findings shows that there is a significant relationship between pupils understanding of teacher's instructional delivery and learners learning outcome means that proper communication by the teacher which leads to better understanding for the pupils of lessons taught enables pupils perform well and achieve learning better outcomes. This view was observed by Stronge (2013) who asserts that in an analysis of educational productivity in the United States and other classroom, teacher classroom instruction was identified as one of the most significant variables that has great effect on student affective, behavioural and cognitive outcomes.

The result of hypothesis four shows that a relationship also exist between availability of technological resources and learners learning outcome. A school well equipped with the right technological resources will improve the learning outcomes. Cumming and Finch's diary(cited in Derek 2001) provide empirical evidence and valuable information that technological tools can both improve student learning of particular concepts as well as raise new awareness of student misconceptions and difficulties.

With respect to hypothesis five, the result shows a relationship between the use of instructional materials and learners learning outcome means that when teachers and students have the right tools for learning they will do better academically. Wambui (2013) in her findings found that instructional materials assist a lot in improving pupil's participation as learners are exposed to the real world of learning thereby enabling them tounderstand and retain information.

Furthermore and finally, hypothesis six found a relationship between teachers' teaching method and learners learning outcome thus reinforcing Ganyaupfu (2013) position that "students build a better understanding of the main concepts more effectively when they are engaged to solve problems during class activities.

Conclusion

The study revealed that significant relationships exist among organisational behavior, learning process and learners learning outcome. A well-structured school with the right technological resource, use of instructional materials and teaching methods will help to improve learners learning outcome. Furthermore, having the right attitude towards the pupils by the teacher will also have a positive impact on the pupils and help them achieve desired learning outcome.

Recommendations

i. Schools should be structured in a way that will enhance learners learning outcome.
ii. Teachers should display calm and warm personalities towards the learners.
iii. Teachers should frequently ask pupils questions when teaching to ensure they understand the lessons taught.
iv. Technological resources should always be provided andutilised in schools.
v. Instructional materials should be readily provided for use in schools.

vi. Teachers should use appropriate teaching methods and vary them when necessary to achieve learning outcomes.

References

Allan, C. O., & Fred, C. L. (2012).*Educational administration: Concepts and practices* (6thed.). USA: Cengage Learning. Cengage Learning. United Kingdom.

Derek, H. (2001). *The teaching and learning of mathematics at university level*: An ICMI study. Netherlands: Springer.

Drew, P., &Martin, C. (2017). *Handbook of research on teacher education and professional development.* USA: IGI Global.

FGN (2013).*National policy on education (6thed.).* Nigeria: NERDC.

Ganyaupfu, M. E. (2013). Teaching methods and student's academic performance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714.* Retrieved from www.ijhssi.org Volume 2 Issue 9‖ September. 2013‖ PP.29-35 on 12/12/2016.

Lee, V. Ready, D., &Welner, K. G. (2004).*Educational equity and school structure: School size, overcrowding, and schools-within schools.* Retrieved from: nepc.colorado.edu/files/1882.pdf on 3/05/2017.

Marijoribanks, K. (2002). *Family and school capital: Towards a context theory of students' school outcomes.* Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Neeraja, K. P. (2011). *Text book of communication and education technology for nurses*. New Delhi: Jaypeebrothers medical publishers (P) Ltd.

Ron, S. B. (1998). *Powerful learning. Association for supervision and curriculum development.* USA: Alexandria, Virginia.

Stronge, J. H. (2013). *Evaluating what good teachers do: Eight research based standards for assessing teacher excellence.* New York, USA: Routledge.

Thomas, A. (2010). *Understanding the learning process to effectively differentiate instruction.* Retrived from: Center for Development and Learning www.cdl.org/.../understanding-*the-learning-process-to-effectively-differentiate-instru… on 31/01/2017.*

*Wali, M. (2016).Professional Development of the U.B.E Teacher. dspace.unn.edu.ng:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/4705/1/Wali,%20Macaulay.pdf*on 17/1/2017.

Wambui, S. E. (2013).Effect of use of instructional materials on learner participation in science classroom in preschool in Kiine Zone Kirinyaga County Kenya. from: *cees.uonbi.ac.ke/sites/default/files/.../final%20project%20August%20%2020134 _0.pd...*on 25/04/2017.