

## International Journal of Research Publications

### **Influence of Capacity Building Programmes on Teachers' Lesson Preparation and Classroom Management Skills in Lower Basic Schools in The Gambia**

**Oladotun Opeoluwa OLAGBAJU, PhD**

*College of Education and Social Sciences*

*Legacy University, The Gambia.*

*dotunolagbaju@yahoo.com*

---

#### **Abstract**

There is no nation that can rise above the quality of her teachers. Therefore, capacity development programmes for teachers is a prerequisite for national development. Several factors enhance the quality of learning in classrooms notable among them is lesson preparation and classroom management. This study determined the influence of capacity building programmes on lower basic teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management. Two hypotheses were raised in the study and the research design is a survey. 300 teachers participated in the study and the data were analysed using linear regression and ANOVA statistics. The results showed that capacity building programmes significantly influenced teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management. Recommendations were made for the government and other stakeholders to conduct and supervise capacity building training programmes for teachers.

© 2019 Published by IJRP.ORG. Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of International Journal of Research Publications (IJRP.ORG)

**Keywords:** Capacity Building; Lesson Preparation; Classroom Management; Influence; Training

---

#### **1.1 Introduction**

Development in any nation is a product of an effective system of education from pre-basic to higher institutions of learning. From time immemorial, education has been the engine room that drives a nation and produces human resources for the different sectors of the national life. The effectiveness of teachers to a very large extent determines the quality of education. This is because teachers perform nation building roles through effective teaching or training of the needed manpower that will facilitate national development. Therefore, there is a need for teachers to be effective in the discharge of their duties especially with regards to raising competent and quality manpower or human resource that will contribute meaningfully to national development.

Suffice to say that effective teachers often demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency in

lesson preparation and classroom management to be able to guide learners to achieve the preset goals and objectives. Silverman (2009) posits that effectiveness in teaching involves the passion to persist in the face of students' failure, willingness to provide special remedial classes/tutorials to low achieving students, and skills to plan instruction that develops students' self-perceptions of their academic skills. Effective teaching in the 21st century requires more than subject mastery and a basic understanding of the educational theory (Simmons, 2010). Other factors such as lesson preparation and classroom management skills play critical roles in the teaching and learning process. Also, lesson preparation and classroom management among other factors have been found to be some of the parameters for measuring teachers' quality and effectiveness (Olatunbosun, 2006; Silverman, 2009; Adeosun et al, 2019).

The demand on the teaching profession in both developed and developing economies is that teachers must be effective in lesson preparation and delivery as well as efficient in classroom management. This is why most federal and state governments, especially in Africa, often organise capacity building programmes for teachers in order to ensure quality assure of the educational system and teachers' effectiveness. The Education Sector Policy in The Gambia (2016) in line with the National Development Agenda as articulated in Vision 2020 and states that prominence will be given to capacity building for sector management to enhance the performance of the education sector through several means such as organisational structure and decentralisation, policy and planning, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and Performance Management System (PMS).

The policy statement on basic education in The Gambia states that education is a child's right which should not be denied him/her on the basis of financial status, gender, religion, disability, geographical location and any other consideration. Therefore, basic education is free and available to all Gambians from grades 1-12. Some of the key indicators for measuring the achievement of goals in the lower basic level of education among countries are increase in school enrolment and literacy rates. Statistics show that the attainment of the compulsory and universal basic education in The Gambia by 2030 is highly possible. For example, girls' enrolment in lower basic education from 2010 to 2015 grew at an annual rate of 5.5% while that of boys grew by 4.9%. This trend resulted in the growth of girls' Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) from 89.1% in 2010 to 103.5% in 2015 compared to the GER for boys which increased from 87.5% in 2010 to 99.0% in 2015. One result of the change is that in formal lower basic schools, girls now represent over 50% of enrolment (Education Section Policy, 2016).

However, to achieve increase in literacy rates, it is important to enhance the effectiveness of teachers through access to periodic capacity building workshops and seminars for lower basic school teachers. According to Kante & Susso (2014), every institution that wants to be a leader in a competitive world, needs to maintain a high standard for its personnel. The importance of capacity building programmes for lower basic school teachers cannot be undermined because the lower basic level of education is the foundation upon which all the other levels of education are built. Also, lower basic education inculcates the requisite literacy and numeracy skills into individuals and teachers' effectiveness in this level guarantees national development.

Capacity building is any activity or process aimed at improving organisational or individual's skills to carry out key functions, solve problems, define and achieve pre-set objectives. To adequately attainment some of the policy objectives of the Education Sector Policy (2016 -2030), which include improvements in the quality of teaching and learning at all levels and learning

outcomes at all levels by 2030, there is a need to regularly plan and implement capacity building programmes for teachers across The Gambia, especially in the lower basic level of education. In recognition of this fact, the Ministry of Basic and Secondary Education (MoBSE) and other Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) in The Gambia often organise periodic capacity building trainings and workshops for basic and secondary school teachers. The trainings are designed to enhance teachers' effectiveness by increasing capabilities in methodology, lesson preparation, use of instructional materials, subject mastery, evaluation and classroom management among others.

In spite of the huge investment on capacity building of teachers in The Gambia, learning outcomes have not improved significantly, especially in external examinations. This suggests that there is disconnect between the content of the capacity building programmes for the teachers and the dissemination of the knowledge acquired when planning a lesson and in the course of teaching in the classroom. From the foregoing, it is expedient to investigate how capacity building programmes enhance lower basic teachers' effectiveness in lesson preparation and classroom management skills in The Gambia. Therefore, this paper determines the relationship between capacity building programmes and lower basic teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management skills.

## **1.2 Capacity Building: Concept and definition**

The purpose of capacity building is to improve an individual's skills or effectiveness in carrying out certain functions, solving problems, defining and achieving objectives. Also, capacity building in education can be explained as a set of programme designed to train or retrain in-service teachers so that the target audience (learners) at a particular school would be able to benefit from the training. Capacity building programmes can be planned at three levels which include personal development, organisational development, and institutional development. A well organized capacity building programme for teachers is expected to have positive influence on the quality of teaching-learning and in the long term, on students' learning outcomes.

The term, capacity building, is the process by which individuals and organizations acquire, improve, and retain the skills, expertise, knowledge, tools, aptitude and other resources needed to do their jobs competently or to a greater capacity. It is a series of programmes or activities aimed at improving professional competence or capabilities for the general good of an organisation. The focus of most capacity building programmes is on understanding the obstacles that frustrate or hinder people and organizations from achieving set goals and enhancing the abilities to achieve such goals. Capacity building includes a set of programmes or activities that foster self or organisational development.

Capacity building programmes are planned based on strategic and intent to inculcate, strengthen or develop the knowledge, skills, aptitude, competencies and abilities of people and organisations so they can achieve their goals and rise above their challenges. Capacity building programmes can be short-term refresher courses to equip individuals with new capabilities or improve effectiveness on the job. Capacity building programmes can be organised to benefit individuals (professionals, artisans, etc), communities (farmers' or traders' associations etc) or organisations (banks, corporate or professional bodies etc). Organization-based capacity building is used by ministries and agencies of the government and Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to enhance internal development, efficiency and effectiveness of workers.

One of such ministries of government is education which is saddled with the responsibility of teaching or training individuals to become responsible adults and citizens. Teachers are the facilitators of the goals of education and teaching is the tool. Therefore, teaching as a task can be very demanding and time consuming. It has been discovered that once teachers complete their initial training in the higher institutions or other teacher-training colleges, most of them hardly have the opportunity to continue to grow on the job professionally (Federal Ministry of Education, 2011). This is perhaps one of the challenges of the teaching profession in most African countries. According to Odeleye, Okunola, and Akinnola (2012), teaching is a very dynamic profession because the content changes from time to time. Therefore, to keep the teachers abreast of new discoveries, strategies or methodology and other innovations in their field, capacity building workshops are conducted periodically.

Similarly, teachers run a strict schedule in terms of the curriculum and making out time to update their knowledge base in their subject areas could be too demanding or affect meeting deadlines in terms of content coverage and quality lesson delivery. To overcome some of these overwhelming challenges, capacity building programmes provides an on- the- job training opportunity for in-service teachers. Many of the capacity building programmes are organised by the government and other concerned groups in The Gambia as a means of providing lower basic school teachers with the opportunity to gain knowledge as well as methodological skills in the critical subjects such that those who may not have studied them previously are able to improve their mastery.

Building the capacity of teachers involves a conscious attempt to upgrade knowledge base and inculcate new skills or improve on already acquired skills, abilities and strategies which will enable the recipients to react appropriately to the dynamics of education. The content of most capacity building programmes for teachers includes lesson delivery, lesson preparation, methodology, pedagogical strategies, use of instructional materials, communication skills, classroom discipline, management or control, and quality of classroom assessment or evaluation. Capacity building include training, workshop, skill acquisition programmes aimed at improving an individual, organisation and institution towards the achievement of set goals and objectives.

Moronkola, Adegbite and Moses (2004) aver that teacher training is compulsory and should be a continuous process. Capacity building remains an effective tool to train all untrained teachers and retrain professional teachers that are already on the job for the purpose of effectiveness in service delivery. Also, Ajayi (2004) notes that training and re-training of teachers through capacity building programmes is capable of enhancing effectiveness, performance and productivity in the school system. Therefore, to safeguard effectiveness, continuous professional training and development, there is need for government to organise capacity building programme at regular intervals for teachers at all levels of education.

### **1.3 Teachers' Lesson Preparation**

Lesson preparation is one of the important aspects of teachers' duties in a school. Adeosun et al (2019) avers that to achieve educational goals in primary education goals or behavioural problems, lesson preparation should consider factors such as the inadequacies in learning content, process and environment rather than the inadequacies of the child. Lesson preparation is essential before a teacher heads out to the class to teach learners. If a teacher did not properly prepare to teach in the class, there would be no effectiveness in teaching/learning and the quality or product of such a process will not meet the set goals of education. There is no basic

standard for the preparation of a lesson; however, a well prepared lesson must have certain characters according to the training manual for basic school teachers published in 2011 by Federal Government of Nigeria. Some of these are:

**1.3.1 Planning:** A good lesson preparation starts with effective planning. The following factors must be considered when planning a lesson:

- a) Content - what your pupils need to know in order to progress;
- b) Method - how you are going to teach this in a way they understand;
- c) Evaluation - how you judge what they have learned at the end of it.

In the process of lesson preparation, planning is a continual process which helps the teacher to think and prepare what is needed to help his/her pupils respond well. For your pupils to learn from your lessons, they need to be:

- i. interested – if they are not, nothing of any value will take place;
- ii. very clear about what you want them to do and achieve.

**1.3.2 Planning lessons:** It starts with decision making on the part of the teacher. He or she needs to consider the curriculum and break subjects and topics into sections that can fit into a lesson time. Now you need to use your skill to break these topics into lessons which pupils will find interesting. All the lessons to be planned need learning objectives, that is, what is it that pupils should learn, be able to do or be aware of at the end of the lesson. A learning objective is a statement about what you aim to do. For example:

At the end of the lesson, the pupils should be able to

- i. Recite letters A to J.
- ii. Mention words that begin with letters A to J.
- iii. Write letters A to J.

Lesson plans also need a learning outcome which is the expected change in behaviour or learning that is expected to occur. A successful lesson should include assessment or evaluation procedures, differentiation and transfer of learning.

**1.3.3 Preparing lessons:** Lesson preparation is concerned with all that the teacher needs to do (students' and teacher's activities) to be able to achieve the learning outcomes. A well prepared lesson is in three parts which are: introduction, lesson (teacher/students' activities) and checking on learning (evaluation/plenary session).

**Introduction:** At the start of a lesson, the learning objectives should be explained in a way pupils will understand so that they know exactly what is expected of them. Also, get them motivated or interested in what they are about to do by allowing them to share what they know already.

**Main part of the lesson:** In this section, teacher will explain new information and develop activities that help pupils to develop and confirm their own learning. These activities can be brainstorming, group work, problem solving, experimentation etc. The choice of activities or methodology should be aimed at helping the pupils to achieve the original objectives of the lesson in the most effective way.

**Checking on learning:** Evaluation is an integral part of the teaching-learning process. Therefore, plan for activities at the end and during the lesson to find out how much progress pupils have made. This should be done by referring to the learning objectives and summarizing the lesson by highlighting its key points.

## 1.4 Teachers' Classroom Management

Effectiveness in teaching starts with good management skills in terms of people (pupils/students, parents, colleagues), time, materials or resources, and classroom among others. Heijnen-Maathuis (2014) posits that effective and experienced teachers are aware that behavioural problems are relatively rare in classrooms where children are actively motivated and involved in the teaching-learning process. It is important to consider individual differences, pupils' background and other personality traits that can contribute to disruptive behaviours in the classroom. Similarly, Adeosun, Oni, Oladipo, Onuoha and Yakassai (2019) submits that the duties of an effective teacher includes classroom management, application of content to students' daily lives, development of critical thinking in students, working with new and evolving technologies to create meaningful and effective lessons, having students work in teams to ensure that all students receive an equal education regardless individual differences and finally staying current on new developments in the field of teaching as well as content areas.

Classroom management skills are needed to engage all manner of students in the class irrespective of their abilities, personalities or backgrounds and ensure that they are all learning per time. Although children do not learn at the same pace or in the same way, managerial skills on the part of the teacher can ensure that no one is left behind. Some of the important factors in classroom management are the teachers' perception of his/her roles or duties in the classroom, disposition to discipline, concept of classroom organisation or management. The job description of a teacher gives him/her a level of control over many of the factors that influence learning such as students' trust, resources, physical and emotional classroom environment, motivation, communication or interaction etc.

Effective teaching in the 21st century requires more than subject mastery and a basic understanding of the educational theory (Simmons, 2010). Other factors such as lesson preparation and classroom management skills play critical roles in the teaching and learning process. Another factor that enhances classroom management is differentiation which is the distribution of learning task and timing or pacing of students based on their intellectual abilities of students. Differentiation in learning is an important factor in classroom management because all the categories of learners in the classroom are actively engaged in the learning process. Interactions should be systematic and individualised in the teaching-learning process so that the teacher can focus attention on each learner's behavioural problems and effectively manage events as they unfold in the classroom.

To Heijnen-Maathuis (2014), ability to manage the problems of students in the classroom setting requires insight into where these difficulties may come from and why and when they arise. An understanding of the socio-economic factors that surround each member of the class will aid the teacher to be efficient in managing the student's behaviour. Inability on the part of a teacher to appreciate and manage these differences may impede learning and frustrate such child out of school thereby contributing to the school dropout rate. This is why it is important to equip and retrain teachers on classroom management skills through capacity building programmes. Also, participation in capacity building programmes facilitates collaboration among teachers and other educators to acquire new skills, knowhow and competence.

In addition, effectiveness in classroom management begins with taking charge of the classroom organisation or sitting arrangement. The teacher needs decide where children sit in the classroom or during certain lessons. This is because sitting arrangement in a classroom plays very important roles in learning, some of which include, increase in interaction, teachers' contact, students' attention, ability to focus on task, and decrease in noise or other hyperactive activities on



the part of the students. One of the first steps in classroom management is to decide who sits where and during which activity, based on the teacher's knowledge of his/her students. Therefore, a teacher needs to possess adequate classroom management skills to be able to effectively carry out his/her duties in the teaching-learning process.

### 1.5 Efforts at building the capacity of teachers in The Gambia

According to the Education Sector Policy of The Gambia (2016:7), prominence will be to capacity building for sector management to enhance the performance of the education sector through:

- i. Organisational structure and decentralisation – the organisational structure of the Ministry of Basic and Secondary Education (MoBSE) will be improved to enable the leadership to better co-ordinate and manage the programmes at all levels whilst Ministry of Higher Education, Research Science and Technology (MoHERST) will conduct an institutional assessment which will inform the way forward
- ii. Policy and planning – the central and regional directorates will be strengthened in terms of formulation, planning and monitoring and evaluation of education policy implementation
- iii. Financial management – a financial and procurement management system through training and computerised record keeping at all levels will be established and improved upon
- iv. Monitoring and evaluation – the EMIS and processes used for the monitoring and evaluation of the education system will be strengthened.
- iv. Performance Management System (PMS) – will continue to be reviewed and fine-tuned for careful targeting of resources for training, promotion and other rewards.

In line with the provisions of the policy on capacity building, several of such programmes are organised in The Gambia to improve teachers' effectiveness. Sperry (2016) reported that the very first edition of the International Education Conference was held in The Gambia on November 21, 2015 with 100 educators gathered on the campus of Banjul American Embassy School (BAES). The programme availed participants the opportunity to attend workshops, share ideas, and focus on inquiry-based education. It was financed by a self-help grant from the U.S. Embassy in Banjul, The Gambia and support from CEO Joseph Yorio of School Specialty, and a commitment to capacity building by the BAES faculty.

The contents of the programme included professional development plan, and commitment to lifelong learning. Some of the resource persons were Peace Corps Education Trainers. Some of the sessions in the conference included "*As Easy as ABC*" to "*An Eye for an Eye.*" The sessions were planned to help many of the teachers from the villages that often have no chalk, little paper, and no access to technology. The focus of the capacity building workshop by the BAES faculty was to help move their Gambian counterparts away from a basic-level drill-and-practice, question-and-answer format to the development of higher-level questioning and thinking skills. It was primarily about committed educators coming together to share ideas, meals, and laughter while asking questions that often had no answers. The capacity building programme was about educators coming together to work toward improving the quality of education for all children in The Gambia.

Similarly, Jonga (not dated) reported that a 3-day capacity building training workshop for 30 school managers (heads, deputies and senior teachers) from lower basic, upper basic and senior secondary schools across the Western Region was organised by the Gambian Teachers' Union (GTU) in conjunction with the Swedish Teachers' Union and Education International (EI). The

content of the capacity building workshop included topics such as effective school management skills, leadership qualities, roles, ethics, best practices in school management, school community relationship and GTU structures and programmes among others.

According to Kanteh & Susso (2014), one of the reasons for capacity building programmes for teachers in The Gambia is the desire to excel in a competitive world and maintain a high standard among teachers. They reported that the outcome of a 3-day capacity building programme organised by the Reach Education Centre for nursery school teachers. The programme attracted over 23 nursery school teachers from Greater Banjul and Foni Areas. The content was on equipping the teachers with requisite skills that will make them effective classroom teachers. However, there is a need to measure the influence of these programme on actual classroom practice in the basic schools especially with regards to lesson preparation and classroom management and this is the focus of this research.

### **1.6 Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance:

- Ho<sub>1</sub> Capacity building has no significant influence on teachers' effectiveness in lesson preparation.
- Ho<sub>2</sub> Capacity building has no significant influence on teachers' effectiveness in classroom management.

## **2.0 Theoretical Framework and Methodology**

### **Social Cognitive Learning Theory**

The theory was propounded in the 1960s by Albert Bandura and it stated that learning occurs in a social context with a dynamic and reciprocal interaction of the person, environment and behaviour. It lays emphasis on internal and external social reinforcements through experiences, expectations and expectancies. From this theoretical perspective, human effectiveness is viewed as a product of a dynamic interplay of personal, behavioural, and environmental influences. Using social cognitive theory as a framework, teachers can effectively perform the task of teaching and improve their students' emotional states and habits of thinking (personal factors), improve their academic skills and self-regulatory practices (behaviour) and change classroom arrangements that may work to undermine student success (environmental factors). This is explained in Bandura's social cognitive theory (1986) where personal beliefs are concerned with the conviction that one can successfully execute the behaviour required to produce the desired outcomes such as teachers' effectiveness in teaching-learning process. The behaviour exhibited by the teacher in the classroom and lesson preparation is determined by certain personality traits.

### **3.0 Methodology**

The study adopted the descriptive survey design because there is no form of manipulation as variables were described with regards to the existing conditions in the schools. The study obtained relevant data on the influence of capacity building training programmes on lower basic teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management in schools.

#### **3.1 Variables of the Study**

Independent Variable: The independent variable is capacity building programmes.

Dependent Variable: The dependent variables are teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management skills.



### 3.2 Population and sampling

The study population covered all the lower basic school teachers in the public schools in The Gambia. The sampling is a multistage random sampling procedure. Schools in the country are grouped into six regions by the Ministry of Basic Secondary Education. Using random sampling, regions 1, 2 and 5 were selected for the study. A total of 300 teachers were used in this study, 100 from each region.

### 3.3 Research Instruments: Validation and administration

Two different research instruments were used for data collection. These are a 4-point likert scale questionnaire and observation checklist as described below:

**3.3.1 Capacity Building Questionnaire (CBQ):** It is a 4-point instrument designed for the lower basic teachers. The instrument contains information on all the indices for measuring the influence of capacity building programmes on the teachers' effectiveness. The instrument contains fourteen (14) items on the content, environment of the training centre and competence of the resource person. CBQ was administered on teachers who have attended capacity building programme(s).

**3.3.2 Classroom Observation Rating Scale (CORS):** It is a checklist adapted from Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC), Nigeria. This observation checklist was adapted to 14 items from the original 55. Section A comprises the demographic data of the teachers. Section B has a 5-point rating scale and fourteen (14) items to elicit information on the teachers' effectiveness in lesson preparation and classroom management. CORS has rating scale response with scores ranging from 1 to 5. A high score on the scale indicates excellent lesson delivery and classroom management, while low scores indicate poor delivery and management. The instruments were validated and reliability tests were conducted using Cronbach alpha and reliability coefficient of 0.87 and 0.74 were obtained respectively. The research instruments were administered through the assistant head teachers and heads of schools. The CBQ was completed by teachers while the CORS was completed by the researcher while observing the teacher during the process of teaching.

### 3.4 Method of Data Analysis

The data collected were analysed using inferential statistics such as regression (linear regression) and ANOVA. Linear regression was used for the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

## 4.0 Results and Discussion

H<sub>01</sub> Capacity building has no significant influence on teachers' effectiveness in lesson preparation.

**Table 1: Showing the influence of teachers' Lesson Preparation**

| Statements                                                                  | Poor    | Fair      | Good       | Very good  | Excellent  | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-------|
| Clarity/feasibility of lesson objective stated in simple and clear language | 1(0.3%) | 2(0.7%)   | 98(32.7%)  | 109(36.3%) | 90(30%)    | 300   |
| Stated in terms of what learners are expected to achieve                    | 0(0%)   | 59(19.6%) | 22(7.3%)   | 100(33.3%) | 119(39.7%) | 300   |
| Achievable within the stipulated time                                       | 2(0.7%) | 2(0.7%)   | 160(53.3%) | 80(26.7%)  | 56(18.7%)  | 300   |

|                                                                                                                            |         |           |            |            |           |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----|
| The lesson plan took into account of pupils' background such as learning difficulties, needs/interest in relation to topic | 1(0.3%) | 24(8%)    | 146(48.7%) | 103(34.3%) | 26(8.7%)  | 300 |
| The lesson plan was appropriate and realistic in the light of lesson content and pupil's ability/skills /interest          | 0(0%)   | 59(19.6%) | 58(19.3%)  | 125(42%)   | 58(19.3%) | 300 |

---

**Table 1a: Descriptive Statistics**

|                                                                          |                | Statistic | Bootstrap <sup>a</sup> |            |                             |        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------|
|                                                                          |                |           | Bias                   | Std. Error | BCa 95% Confidence Interval |        |
|                                                                          |                |           |                        |            | Lower                       | Upper  |
| The lesson plan took into account of pupils' background such as learning | Mean           | 3.4300    | .0000                  | .0443      | 3.3466                      | 3.5101 |
|                                                                          | Std. Deviation | .77488    | -.00433                | .03149     | .71718                      | .82356 |
|                                                                          | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | 3.6267 |
| Workshop Objectives are often well laid out                              | Mean           | 3.5767    | -.0017                 | .0313      | 3.5234                      |        |
|                                                                          | Std. Deviation | .52762    | .00051                 | .02398     | .49299                      | .57026 |
|                                                                          | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .      |
| Clarity of instruction at workshop                                       | Mean           | 3.0200    | -.0011                 | .0452      | 2.9233                      | 3.1046 |
|                                                                          | Std. Deviation | .75376    | -.00154                | .02146     | .71712                      | .79047 |
|                                                                          | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          |                             | 3.42   |
|                                                                          | Mean           | 3.3567    | .0009                  | .0354      | 3.2867                      | 67     |

**Table 1c: ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model        | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F       | Si g.             |
|--------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 156.431        | 3   | 52.144      | 668.181 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
| Residual     | 23.099         | 296 | .078        |         |                   |
| Total        | 179.530        | 299 |             |         |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: The lesson preparation

b. Predictors: (Constant), The relevance of the content on the training manual, Workshop objectives are often well laid out, Clarity of instruction at workshop

c. Predictors: (Constant), The relevance of the content on the training manual, Clarity of instruction at workshop, Workshop objectives are often well laid out

Std. Deviation

N

300

0

0

.

.

a. Unless otherwise noted, bootstrap results are based on 300 bootstrap samples

**Table 1b: Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .933 <sup>a</sup> | .871     | .870              | .27935                     |

a. Predictors: (Constant), The relevance of the content on the training manual, Workshop objectives are often well laid out, Clarity of instruction at workshop

b. Dependent Variable: The lesson preparation

c. Predictors: (Constant), The relevance of the content on the training manual, Clarity of instruction at workshop, Workshop objectives are often well laid out

These variables statistically significantly predicted the lesson preparation,  $F(3, 296) = 668.181$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $R^2 = 0.871$ . All 3 variables added significantly to  $p < 0.05$  (Table 1a – 1c).

### Analysis of the results on Lesson Preparation

The result in table 1 showed the influence of teachers' effectiveness on lesson preparation; only 1(0.3%) reported poorly about clarity/feasibility of lesson objective was stated in simple and clear language, 2(0.7%) said it was fair, 98(32.7%) reported good, majority was 109(36.3%) for very good and 90(30%) stated excellent to that idea. In terms of what learners are expected to achieve, majority 119(39.7%) reported excellent followed by 100(33.3%) that said very good while the least was good with 22(7.3%). Out of 300 participants; majority 160(53.3%) reported very good to achieve the lesson plan within the stipulated time and equal number 2(0.7%) reported poor and fair respectively. The lesson plan took account of pupils' background such as learning difficulties, needs/interest in relation to topic; 146(48.7%) of the participants answered good followed by very good with 103(34.3%) and the lowest was poor with 1(0.3%). The lesson plan was appropriate and realistic in the light of lesson content and pupil's ability/skills/interest; 125(42%) of the participants answered good followed by fair with 59(19.6%) and the lowest was good and excellent with 58(19.3%).

H<sub>02</sub> Capacity building has no significant influence on teachers' effectiveness in classroom management.

**Table 2: Classroom Management**

| Statements                                                                                | Poor    | Fair     | Good      | Very good   | Excellent   | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| The teacher organized and conducted lesson talking into account the individual difference | 1(0.3%) | 1(0.3%)  | 78(26%)   | 105(35%)    | 115(38.3)   | 300   |
| The teacher ensured that learners were engaged                                            | 1(0.3%) | 20(6.7%) | 59(19.7%) | 105(35%)    | 115(38.3 %) | 300   |
| The teacher handled the disruptive behaviours appropriately                               | 0(0%)   | 2(0.6%)  | 60(20%)   | 110(36.7 %) | 128(42.7 %) | 300   |

### Classroom Management/Control

Table 3 presented class management/control; majority 135(45%) excellently reported about the lesson plan, followed by 93(31%) with very good support while the least was 1(0.3%) for poor response. In the execution of the lesson; 130(43.3%) were very good in support for the idea, 91(30.3%) supported excellently, 22(7.3%) was fair in such idea. The teacher ensures that learners were engaged in relevant learning activities; greater percent (39%) were very good in that support

followed by 30% for good and excellent respond from participants. The teacher handled the disruptive behaviours appropriately; 141(47%) reported excellently, 102(34%) reported good, 27(9%) said very good and fair while 3(1.0%) said it was poor.

**Table 3: Class Management/Control**

| Statements                                                                     | Distribution of Time |          |           |           |           | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
|                                                                                | Poor                 | Fair     | Good      | Very good | Excellent |       |
| In the lesson plan                                                             | 1(0.3%)              | 20(6.7%) | 51(17%)   | 93(31%)   | 135(45%)  | 300   |
| In the execution of the lesson                                                 | 1(0.3%)              | 22(7.3%) | 56(18.7%) | 130(43%)  | 91(30.3%) | 300   |
| <b>Class controlled</b>                                                        |                      |          |           |           |           |       |
| The teacher ensures that learners were engaged in relevant learning activities | 2(0.7%)              | 2(0.7%)  | 90(30%)   | 116(39%)  | 90(30%)   | 300   |
| The teacher handled the disruptive behaviours appropriately                    | 3(1.0%)              | 27(9%)   | 102(34%)  | 27(9%)    | 141(47%)  | 300   |

**Influence of Capacity Building on Teachers' Class Management**

**Table 2 &3a: Descriptive Statistics**

|                                                                  |                | Statistic | Bootstrap <sup>a</sup> |            |                             |         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------|
|                                                                  |                |           | Bias                   | Std. Error | BCa 95% Confidence Interval |         |
|                                                                  |                |           |                        |            | Lower                       | Upper   |
| The teacher organized and conducted lesson talking into account. | Mean           | 4.1067    | .0028                  | .0483      | 4.0059                      | 4.2141  |
|                                                                  | Std. Deviation | .82313    | -.00147                | .02529     | .78082                      | .86923  |
|                                                                  | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |
| Cross ventilation of training venue                              | Mean           | 2.4933    | .0042                  | .0485      | 2.3995                      | 2.5933  |
|                                                                  | Std. Deviation | .81988    | -.00265                | .02600     | .77362                      | .86345  |
|                                                                  | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |
| Availability of logistics at training venue                      | Mean           | 2.5700    | .0042                  | .0619      | 2.4416                      | 2.7126  |
|                                                                  | Std. Deviation | 1.04342   | -.00364                | .02645     | .99454                      | 1.08884 |
|                                                                  | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |
| Training facilities in the training venue                        | Mean           | 2.6600    | .0046                  | .0661      | 2.5155                      | 2.8089  |
|                                                                  | Std. Deviation | 1.10837   | -.00297                | .02671     | 1.05501                     | 1.15537 |
|                                                                  | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |

a. Unless otherwise noted, bootstrap results are based on 300 bootstrap samples

**Table 2 & 3b: Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .908 <sup>a</sup> | .824     | .822              | .34700                     |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Training facilities in the training venue, Cross ventilation of training venue, Availability of logistics at training venue

b. Dependent Variable: The class management.

**Table 2 & 3c: ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model        | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|--------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 166.945        | 3   | 55.648      | 462.152 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
| Residual     | 35.642         | 296 | .120        |         |                   |
| Total        | 202.587        | 299 |             |         |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: The class management

b. Predictors: (Constant), Training facilities in the training venue, Cross ventilation of training venue, Availability of logistics at training venue

These variables statistically significantly predicted the class management,  $F(3, 296) = 462.152$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $R^2 = .824$ . All 3 variables added significantly to  $p < 0.05$  (Table 2 & 3a-c).

### **Influence of Capacity Building Programmes on Teachers' Classroom Management**

Table 2 presented class management/control; majority 134(45%) excellently reported the teacher do encourage individual participation in both group and class, followed by 133(44%) with very good support while the least was 2(0.6%) for fair response. The teacher planned the activities to arouse and sustain interest of pupils; 114(38%) were very good in support for the idea, 91(30.3%) supported good and excellently and 2(0.7%) was for poor and fair.

**Table 4: Lesson Delivery Methodology**

| Statements                                                                  | Poor    | Fair    | Good      | Very good | Excellent | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| The teacher encouraged individual participation in both group and class     | 0(0%)   | 2(0.6%) | 31(10.3%) | 133(44%)  | 134(45%)  | 300   |
| The teacher planned the activities to arouse and sustain interest of pupils | 2(0.7%) | 2(0.7%) | 91(30.3%) | 114(38%)  | 91(30.3%) | 300   |



# **The influence of Capacity Building Training on Classroom Management**

**Table 4a: Descriptive Statistics**

|                                                                         |                | Statistic | Bootstrap <sup>a</sup> |            |                             |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------|
|                                                                         |                |           | Bias                   | Std. Error | BCa 95% Confidence Interval |         |
|                                                                         |                |           |                        |            | Lower                       | Upper   |
| The teacher encouraged individual participation in both group and class | Mean           | 4.3267    | .0005                  | .0370      | 4.2546                      | 4.3954  |
|                                                                         | Std. Deviation | .69875    | -.00213                | .03467     | .63120                      | .75785  |
|                                                                         | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |
| Having good understanding of the training manual                        | Mean           | 3.1567    | -.0003                 | .0457      | 3.0700                      | 3.2367  |
|                                                                         | Std. Deviation | .85707    | -.00195                | .02358     | .81775                      | .89757  |
|                                                                         | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |
| Preparedness for training                                               | Mean           | 3.2833    | -.0011                 | .0448      | 3.1837                      | 3.3633  |
|                                                                         | Std. Deviation | .85175    | -.00218                | .02497     | .80991                      | .89027  |
|                                                                         | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |
| Presentation of the training content                                    | Mean           | 2.5667    | -.0005                 | .0591      | 2.4475                      | 2.6849  |
|                                                                         | Std. Deviation | 1.05638   | -.00079                | .02760     | 1.00465                     | 1.10840 |
|                                                                         | N              | 300       | 0                      | 0          | .                           | .       |

a. Unless otherwise noted, bootstrap results are based on 300 bootstrap sample

**Table 4b: Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .898 <sup>a</sup> | .806     | .804              | .30914                     |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Presentation of the training content, Having good understanding of the training manual, Preparedness for the training

**Table 4c: ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model        | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|--------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 117.699        | 3   | 39.233      | 410.532 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
| Residual     | 28.288         | 296 | .096        |         |                   |
| Total        | 145.987        | 299 |             |         |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: The lesson delivery methodology

b. Predictors: (Constant), Presentation of the training content, Having good understanding of the training manual, Preparedness for the training

b. **Dependent Variable: Lesson delivery methodology**

These variables were statistically significantly predict the lesson delivery methodology,  $F(3, 296) = 410.532$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $R^2 = 0.806$ . All 3 variables added significantly to  $p < 0.05$  (Table 4a – 4c).

### **The Influence of Capacity Building Programme on Teachers' Lesson Preparation**

Hypothesis 1 reveals the significant influence of capacity building on teacher's effectiveness in lesson preparation. The result reveals *R Square* of 0.871. The *R Square* was the coefficient of determination that states the proportion of the variance of teachers' training on lesson preparation that can be explained by variation in capacity building. Thus, 11.9% of the variation in teachers' effectiveness was influenced by differences in capacity building. The ANOVA summary reveals a *p*-value of 0.000. This implies that the influence of capacity building on teachers' lesson delivery was significant [ $F_{(3,296)}=668.181$ ,  $p<0.05$ ]. Capacity building training programme significantly influenced teachers' lesson preparation. This implies that teachers who have attended capacity building training programmes were more effective in lesson preparation in schools. The teachers stated the lesson objectives in simple and clear language using measurable verbs. The lesson planned was appropriate and realistic within the stipulated time. This finding corroborates the submission of Thomas (2013) in a study carried out on teacher preparation effects on students' academic achievements in SS2 Biology practical; that teacher who prepared well was able to deliver the lesson and make meaningful impact on pupils' life. Also, in the same vein, teachers' preparation is essential in the process of equipping teacher before he heads out to the class to teach learners.

### **The Influence Capacity Building on Teachers' Classroom Management**

Hypothesis 2 reveals that capacity building training programme significantly influenced teachers' classroom management. The result revealed *R Square* of .824. The *R Square* is the coefficient of determination that states the proportion of the variance of teachers' classroom organization management that can be explained by variation in capacity building. Thus, 12.1% of the variation in

teachers' classroom management is influenced by differences in capacity building. Therefore, teachers who have attended capacity building programmes are more effective. Further, the ANOVA summary reveals a p-value of 0.000 and [ $F_{(3,296)}=462.152, p<0.05$ ].

The teachers coordinated and controlled the class well and time was appropriately distributed in the planning and execution of the lesson. Learners with disruptive behaviours were carefully handled and all the learners were engaged in relevant learning activities. This result is in-line with that of Silverman (2009) and Thomas (2013) that the teacher whose preparation is high have significant effect on their classroom management. Also, capacity building programme influenced the teachers' ability to organise and manage the classroom. Similarly, Simmons (2010) carried out a study on "teacher skills for the 21<sup>st</sup> century" also noted that effective teaching in the 21st century requires more than a basic understanding of educational theory rather requires classroom management which they always emphasised in most of the teachers capacity building training programme.

### **Summary of Findings of the Study**

The study examined the influence of teachers' capacity building programmes on teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management. The study considered lesson preparation and classroom management as dependent variables while the independent variable was capacity building programme in The Gambia. Two hypotheses were formulated, and it was revealed that capacity building significantly influenced teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management. The study found out that capacity building programmes have high influence on teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management. The study discovered that capacity building training programmes significantly influenced teachers' lesson preparation skills (Table 1a-1c); also, capacity building training programme significantly influenced teachers' classroom management skills (Table 2 & 3a-c);

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, capacity building training programme significantly influenced the effectiveness of teachers' lesson preparation and classroom management during teaching-learning process.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following were recommended to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the basic level of education:

1. The government of Gambia should put more effort in capacity building of basic school teachers because basic education is the foundation of all other levels of education.

2. The Gambian government should devise improved methods of organising capacity building programme.
3. There is a need to set up supervisory team that would regularly monitor the trained teachers.

## References

- Ajayi, I. A 2004. Towards improving the internal efficiency of secondary schools in Ado-Ekiti Local Government Area of Ekiti State. *Nigerian Journal of Advanced Research*, 1(1): 101 – 109.
- Federal Ministry of Education, 2011. NTI/MDGs Resource Persons' Guides.
- Olatunbosun, S.M. (2006): Student, Teacher and School Environment as Determinants of Student Academic Performance in Chemistry. University of Ibadan, Ibadan. 13-34
- Bandura, A. (1986). From thought to action: Mechanisms of personal agency. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 15, 1-17.
- Kanteh, M. & Susso, A. (2014) Gambia: Three Day Capacity Building for Nursery School Teachers Ends. Retrieved online 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2019 from <https://allafrica.com/stories/201408042027.html>
- Jonga, M. (nd). Capacity building Training for teachers held. Retrieved online 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2019 from [http://www.gambia.dk/forums/topic.asp?ARCHIVE=true&TOPIC\\_ID=5627](http://www.gambia.dk/forums/topic.asp?ARCHIVE=true&TOPIC_ID=5627)
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. 2013. National policy on education. Lagos: Government Press.
- FGN/UBE. 2011. Key resources for basic education teachers. (A TESSA Material for Teachers in Sub-Saharan Africa). Federal Teachers' Scheme Capacity Building Workshop. Abuja. (Training Manual)
- Silverman, S. 2009. Teacher Efficacy. [www.education.com](http://www.education.com). Retrieved 23<sup>rd</sup> of February, 2019
- Matthias, E (2009). Education capacity building: The consequence of multi-lateral involvement.
- Simmons, C. 2010. Teacher skills for the 21<sup>st</sup> century eHow. [http://www.ehow.com/list\\_6593189\\_teacher-skills-21st-century.html](http://www.ehow.com/list_6593189_teacher-skills-21st-century.html)
- Adeosun, O., Oni, A., Oladipo, A. Onuoha, S. & Yakassai, M. (2019). Teacher training quality and effectiveness in the context of basic education: An examination of Primary Education Studies (PES) Programme in two colleges of education in Nigeria.
- Odeleye, D.A., Okunola, O.M. and Akinola, F. (2012). Effect of MDGs/NTI capacity building workshops for primary schoolteachers on pupils' academic performance in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Continental Journal Education Research* 5(2), 1-11. Nigeria: Wilolud Journals. Retrieved 1<sup>st</sup> March from [www.wiloludjournal.com](http://www.wiloludjournal.com)
- Moronkola, O.A., Adegbite, J.A. and Moses, R.O.A. (2004). Repositioning teaching and teaching education in Nigeria in Elaturoti F. And Babarinde K. (Eds). *Teacher's Mandate on Education and Social Development in Nigeria*. Stirling-Harden Published (Nig.) Ltd.
- Levels of capacity building. Foroyaa Newspaper Burning Issues. Issue No. 27/2008. 5-6 March, 2008. Retrieved online 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2019 from <https://www.sportanddev.org/en/toolkit/capacity-building/levels-capacity-building>
- Sperry, S.A. (2016). Gambia Hosts "Best Practices in Education" Conference. Retrieved online 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2019 from [https://tieonline.com/view\\_article.cfm?ArticleID=1801](https://tieonline.com/view_article.cfm?ArticleID=1801)
- Heijen-Maathuis, E. (2014). Effective teaching and classroom management is about the whole child and whole school development for knowledge, skills and human values. Retrieved 6<sup>th</sup> August, 2014 from [www.goole.com](http://www.goole.com)
- Ministries of Basic and Secondary Education and Higher Education Research Science and Technology (2016). EDUCATIONSECTOR POLICY 2016 – 2030. Accessible, Equitable and

Inclusive Quality Education for sustainable Development.