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ABSTRACT This study investigated factors hindering teacher productivity in public secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. A descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. Three validated instruments were used. Teacher Productivity Questionnaire (r=0.75), Teacher Productivity Questionnaire for Vice Principal (r=0.82), and Teacher Productivity Questionnaire for student (r=0.72). Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study revealed among others that there was a significant effect of gender on teachers productivity (t=2.602; df = 1,088; p<0.05), the male teachers had higher level of productivity (X=135.21) than their female counterpart (X=133.55). There is a significant relationship between the Vice Principals’ and the Students’ assessment of teachers’ productivity (r =-.117; p<0.05). Conducive climate for the organization should be established to high effectiveness level. All these factors are to be recognized and taken into consideration by the education stakeholders so as to increase the teachers’ productivity level.

INTRODUCTION

When the teachers’ productivity declines, it has a correlation to the standard of education both in the short and the long term. Teachers exert a great influence on the students, and the children look up to them for guidance, support and protection. Children are supposed to learn from them informally by observing their attitude, mannerism, conduct and general behaviour, and formally through their teaching in the classrooms (Adu 2015: 1).

Teachers play a pivotal role in the education sector. It was widely believed that there is no nation greater than the quality of her teachers. For an education system to achieve the desired goals and the objectives, the teachers’ efficiency must be taken into consideration. The future of any educational level depends not only on the psychological factors but also the emotional factors of the teachers (Adu et al. 2012). The teachers’ role in the students’ academic achievement cannot be overemphasized. The educational attainment of students depends on the efficiency of the teachers. Hence, the teachers’ social, political, and economic well-being are very imperative.

Adu (2015: 1) contended that teachers, like people in the industry, are affected by their experiences. No matter what, the zeal of the teachers to put in their best can be hampered by many factors. These factors are referred to as the quality of work life (Adu et al. 2012). The quality of work has significant effects in teaching and learning as well as the teachers’ social interaction within and outside the school environment. According to Adu (2015), the quality of relationship a teacher has will determine his or her productivity. According to him, the organization culture must be taken into consideration.

According to Adu (2015: 2), organizations must recognize the role of human resources and treat them accordingly. He further described a high work environment as one in which people are “essentially members of an organization that challenge the human spirit, that inspires personal growth and development and that gets things done” this uniqueness enhances the sense of belonging and promotes productivity.

The educational sector of many countries including Nigeria seems to be one of the most difficult parastatal of employees with poor disposition. This sector has workers with bad attitude to work and recording a low level of job satisfaction (Adu et al. 2012). That is why there is a high level of criticism for the secondary education under this sector in the recent years. Such critics are from virtually all the education stakeholders and other influential individuals in the country. On several occasions, teachers are
the object of ridicule and criticism for the general problem of education as a sector (Adu et al. 2013).

Similarly, the quality of education has been a concern especially the decline in the standard of education in Nigeria has been worrisome. There is an urgent need to address this situation in order to avoid further deterioration.

Productivity in the educational sector can be taken as a measure of the success of operations of the activities that would lead to the realization of the goals and objectives of the sector in the economy just as applicable to other forms of the business or corporate organizations. As applicable to the educational system, the measure of the success of a school, otherwise known as the productivity level is hinged on the efficiency and effectiveness of the teachers which, in turn, is partly measured in terms of the students’ achievement in internal and external examinations as well as the ability of the schools’ products to defend their certificates (Adu 2015: 3).

The importance of productivity to the success of a school makes it necessary for the teacher to have a high level capacity, coupled with a sense of commitment, integrity and responsibility in order to achieve the objective of teaching and learning as applicable. The education sector remains critical and one of the largest employers of labour in the Oyo State. Hence, the government strives hard to increase its budgetary allocation to improve the development of the sector (Akinwumi 2010). The status accorded to education is not unconnected with the importance, which the citizenry, and indeed, the Nigerian government attach to it. Education is not only regarded as a very vital instrument of socialization, scientific and technological development, it is also a crucial factor in the economic development and the socio-political emancipation of the citizenry.

It is also established that for many teachers, there is little or no material and intellectual support for them in the form of on-the-job training and retraining. Increasingly, the quality of the teachers’ work life is worsening and this is negatively impacting the classroom experiences and adversely affecting the secondary schools’ products in the Oyo State. Apparently, there is the need to stem the existing anomalies of the teachers’ work life quality if their performance is to appreciably improve, especially given fact that the recurring increases in salaries have not provided the desired improvement in the performances (Adu 2015: 4).

Further, efforts in the past that did not pay due attention to the work life of the teachers had marginal positive results. How then does one motivate the teachers to sustainably provide quality services that would in that regard add value to the products of the school? (Adu et al. 2013). The quality of workforce in any organization can be regarded as one of the prime factors that propel the organization to achieve higher-level of productivity. The capacity and the sense of duty of the teacher would (other things being equal), significantly impact the productivity level of the school system in terms of the educational outcomes as represented by the quality of the students produced in the country. The level of efficiency and effectiveness, and the chances of an organization achieving its set goals depend primarily on the extent to which its workers are performing their defined roles (Emunemua et al. 2010).

With the above assertion about the decay level of education in Nigeria, there is a need for proactive steps by the management of education sector in the country to brace up to their responsibilities and contribute their quota to the improvement of education in the country. Most especially, in the secondary school education, the principal plays a pivotal role in an effective school administration. Teachers and learners are not left behind to play their parts in the effective teaching and learning. According to Jaiyeoba (2008), the teacher occupies a central position in the instructional setting. Adesokan (2010) aptly stated this when he asserted that the teacher is an important figure in promoting educational enterprises.

Anyanwu (2012) contended that teachers, like people in the industry, were affected by their experiences. No matter what, the zeal of the teachers to put in their best can be hampered by many factors. These factors are referred to as quality of work life (Adu et al. 2012). The quality of work has significant effects in teaching and learning as well as the teachers’ social interaction within and outside the school environment. According to Bharathi et al. (2011), the quality of relationship a teacher has will determine his or her productivity. According to them, the organization culture must be taken into consideration.
When the employees’ personal needs are aligned appropriately with those of the organization, it leads to satisfaction for both, the employer and the employees. It is on this basis that the personal factors relating to the teachers’ needs were also made a part of the work environment. Personal factors here refer to the personal needs such as a comfortable housing, optimal standard of living, benefits, retirement benefits, pay, and vocation period. These factors have been found to have a significant influence on the job outcomes (Adu and Adeyanju 2013). It is evident that the meeting of personal needs of the employees is an important factor that drives business (Adu 2015: 4). In fact, studies have shown that meeting the personal needs of personnel is profitable for businesses with accumulating research evidence pointing to the positive influence of need fulfillment on the company’s performance (Adu 2015: 5). Therefore, personal factors are also important in affecting job outcomes, especially in situations where personnel poor performance has been found.

Teachers exert a great influence on the students, the children look up to them for guidance, support and protection. Children are supposed to learn from them informally by observing their attitude, mannerism, conduct and general behavior, and formally through their teaching in the classrooms. That is why Adu et al. (2012) pointed out that the things to do to make the teachers work hard for the interest of the school and themselves are fundamental to a sustainable development in the educational sector. That is why this paper investigates factors hindering productivity of the teachers.

Objectives

The study investigates the factors that hinder teachers’ productivity in public secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria.

Research Questions

1. What are the factors hindering teacher productivity?
2. What is the level of teacher productivity in Oyo State secondary school?

Hypotheses

\[ H_0: \] Male and female teachers has no significant difference in their level of productivity.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research adopted a descriptive survey design to find out the factors hindering the teachers’ productivity in Oyo State Nigeria.

Population

The population of this study comprised of all teachers, vice-principals and students of the public secondary schools in Oyo State Nigeria.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Simple random sampling techniques were used to select 553 schools, 1,106 teachers, 2,212 students and 553 vice principals.

Research Instruments

Three instruments were used in the collection of data, namely:
1. Teacher Productivity Questionnaire.
2. Teacher Productivity Questionnaire for Vice Principal.
3. Teacher Productivity Questionnaire for student.

Validity of Instruments

Validity pertains to how an instrument measures what it is desired to measure. To determine the extent, to which the instrument used in this research measured what they were supposed to measure, a two-stage process was used to validate the instruments. It entailed requesting some experts, lecturers, and colleagues in the faculty of education to assist in reviewing the questionnaire items. Inappropriate items were expunged. The items of the questionnaires were designed to give sufficient information relating to the objectives of the research.

Reliability of the Instruments

Reliability of instruments refers to the accuracy or precision that is, consistency and
stability of any measuring instrument. It is possible for an instrument to be valid and not reliable, so, any instrument to be used must be valid at the same time reliable. In ensuring that the instruments used for this research were reliable, the researchers used the approach of test-re-test to measure the reliability of the instrument which was calculated using the Spearman Rank correlation formula.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics of percentage and inferential statistics of t-test and chi-square were used to analyze the data.

RESULTS

Research Questions 1: What are the factors hindering teacher productivity?

The result in Table 1 showed that marital friction ($X=2.43$), Unproductive committee work ($X=2.23$), Lack of training ($X=2.11$), Institutional procedures ($X=2.10$), Children problem ($X=1.98$), Difficult relation with colleagues ($X=2.12$), Supervisor relationship ($X=1.91$), lack of motivation ($X=2.00$), Work load ($X=1.98$) and Government policy ($X=1.97$) constituted the major hindrances to the teacher productivity. The reason for this was that they had a mean score that was more than the general mean which was ($X=1.92$). Statistically, any mean score within the range of the general mean or above implies that the particular hindrance affected teacher productivity level.

Research Question 2: What is the level of teacher productivity in Oyo State secondary school?

From Table 2, it is shown that the mean for students’ rating of teacher productivity was ($X=46.71$), which was lower to the general mean or total mean score for teacher productivity ($X=71.53$). Therefore, given that the mean score for students’ rating of teacher productivity is lower than the total mean for their productivity level, teacher productivity could be considered to be low in Oyo State. Furthermore, Vice Principal rating of teacher productivity was also examined to determine whether the teacher productivity is low or high in Oyo state.

Table 1: Descriptive table showing factors hindering teachers’ productivity in Oyo state secondary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems hindering productivity</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$X$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing house hold responsibility</td>
<td>22 (2.0)</td>
<td>202 (18.5)</td>
<td>442 (40.6)</td>
<td>424 (38.9)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>11 (1.0)</td>
<td>31 (2.8)</td>
<td>642 (58.9)</td>
<td>406 (37.2)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital friction</td>
<td>202 (18.5)</td>
<td>343 (31.5)</td>
<td>262 (24.0)</td>
<td>283 (26.0)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of promotion opportunity</td>
<td>11 (1.0)</td>
<td>53 (4.9)</td>
<td>568 (52.1)</td>
<td>458 (42.0)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non recognition of teachers’ authority</td>
<td>52 (4.8)</td>
<td>64 (5.9)</td>
<td>394 (36.1)</td>
<td>569 (52.2)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>316 (29)</td>
<td>609 (55.9)</td>
<td>133 (12.4)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation</td>
<td>11 (1.0)</td>
<td>285 (26.1)</td>
<td>488 (44.8)</td>
<td>306 (28.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor relationship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235 (21.6)</td>
<td>520 (47.7)</td>
<td>335 (30.7)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsiderate students</td>
<td>22 (2.0)</td>
<td>42 (3.9)</td>
<td>417 (38.3)</td>
<td>609 (55.9)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work load</td>
<td>171 (15.7)</td>
<td>42 (3.9)</td>
<td>470 (43.1)</td>
<td>407 (37.3)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult relation with colleagues</td>
<td>40 (3.7)</td>
<td>523 (48.4)</td>
<td>190 (17.4)</td>
<td>344 (31.4)</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165 (15.1)</td>
<td>441 (40.5)</td>
<td>433 (39.7)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>294 (27.0)</td>
<td>470 (43.1)</td>
<td>326 (29.9)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and school environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52 (4.8)</td>
<td>688 (63.1)</td>
<td>399 (31.1)</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of staff meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118 (10.8)</td>
<td>750 (68.8)</td>
<td>211 (19.4)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children problem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>303 (27.8)</td>
<td>495 (45.4)</td>
<td>262 (24.0)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional procedures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>354 (32.5)</td>
<td>571 (52.4)</td>
<td>83 (7.6)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficultly with other units</td>
<td>54.84</td>
<td>102 (9.4)</td>
<td>548 (50.3)</td>
<td>388 (35.6)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive committee work</td>
<td>193 (17.7)</td>
<td>325 (29.8)</td>
<td>75 (16.1)</td>
<td>337 (30.9)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Descriptive table showing the level of teachers’ productivity in Oyo state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$X$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Student’s rating</td>
<td>2212</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vice principal</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>62.45</td>
<td>12.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean</td>
<td>71.53</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In view of this, the mean score for Vice Principal rating of teacher productivity was also computed \( \bar{X} = 62.45 \). From Table 2, it can be seen that the mean score for vice principals’ rating of teacher productivity was lower than the total or general mean score for the teacher productivity \( \bar{X} = 71.53 \). Based on this, it was found that teacher productivity was low since the general mean score was higher than the mean score for the vice principal rating of teacher productivity. Thus, whether it is students’ rating of teacher productivity or the vice principal rating, it was evident from this result that teacher productivity was very poor.

**Testing the Hypotheses**

**HO1:** Male and female teachers has no significance difference in their level of productivity.

The result in Table 3 showed that there was a significant effect of gender on the teachers’ productivity \( t = 2.602; \text{df} = 1,088; p < .05 \). This result implies that the male teachers \( \bar{X} = 135.21 \) significantly reported higher level of productivity than the female teachers \( \bar{X} = 133.55 \). The result did not support hypothesis one, therefore, Ho1 is rejected.

**HO2:** Vice principals’ and students’ assessment of teacher productivity has no significant relationship

The result in Table 4 showed that the relationship between the students assessment of the teachers’ productivity and vice principals’ was positive and significant \( r = -0.56; \text{df} = 1,088; p < .05 \). This result implied therefore that the higher the students rating of their teacher productivity, the higher the Vice Principal rating of teacher productivity.

### Table 3: Independent t-test comparing male and female teachers’ level of productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ productivity</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>135.21</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>133.55</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Pearson Product Moment Correlation showing the relations of students’ rating and vice principal rating of teacher productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students rating</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>62.02</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vice principal rating</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>70.21</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship Between Vice Principal Rating and Students Rating of Teacher Productivity

The mean scores of vice principal rating of teacher productivity were higher than that of the students’ rating when contrasted. What this implied was that vice principal rating of teachers’ productivity was more reliable and perhaps more valid. In this regard, vice principals’ rating of teacher productivity can be used alone without the complement of the students’ rating of teacher productivity. Therefore, it is more appropriate to use the vice principals in the rating of teacher productivity than the students’ rating. The researchers are not saying that the use of students to rate teacher productivity is not effective but that the use of rating needs to be complemented with other raters. This will ensure validation of the rating and also complement the shortfalls in the students’ rating of their teachers (Emunemu et al. 2010).

School administrators, students, colleagues and the teachers’ self-evaluation have been used to evaluate teachers’ effectiveness. However students’ competence in the evaluation of the effectiveness of their teachers has been of great concern to researchers in education. However, the studies of Adenike (2011) suggested that students’ ratings were valuable indicators of the teaching effectiveness. Despite the fact that there are research reports in support of students’ rating of their teachers’ effectiveness, Nuhfer (2004) warned that students’ rating should be one of a comprehensive evaluation system and should never be the only measure of the teachers’ effectiveness. The school administrators’ evaluation has also been used to evaluate the teachers’ effectiveness. The accuracy of the school administrators’ evaluation of the teachers’ effectiveness has also been studied. Jacob and Lefgren (2012) found a positive correlation between a principal’s assessment of how effective a teacher was at raising students’ achievement and that teachers’ success in doing so was as measured by the value-added approach.

Level of Oyo State Teacher Productivity

The result of this study showed that teacher productivity was when the mean of the vice principal rating and the student rating of teacher productivity were compared to the total mean. Teachers’ lack of interest in their job results in low productivity and lack of attainment of the laudable goals of secondary education. Lack of motivation, low Quality of Work Life (QWL) factor and low job satisfaction resulted in low productivity. The lack of interest, concentration and continuity in the teacher work reduces their performance and productivity especially when coupled with the absence of on-the job training programmes, seminars and conference to update their knowledge and skills (Olaniyan and Ojo 2014). They therefore, become ill-motivated frustrated and unproductive.

From the research, it can be said, that the teachers’ work environment is poor so the attendant effect is poor productivity level. This research confirmed the result of the earlier studies by Adu et al. (2012) which revealed low teacher productivity. Satisfaction levels greatly affects the level of productivity and the organization as a goal-oriented institution should concern itself always with the level of satisfaction experienced by the workers in the systems. A measure of an intrinsic job satisfaction must however take into account the aspirations of the workers for only this can give a true measure of the degree of job involvement.

Difference Between Male and Female Teachers Level of Productivity

The findings of this study showed that male teachers’ productivity was more than their female counterparts. This is in line with the study of Ijaiya (2010), which succinctly described that in many organizations, male always produced more than the female because of their nature and less domestic responsibilities. Unlike the female counterparts who are more committed with their family responsibilities at home. They have to fulfill their conjugal responsibilities at the same time focus on their career. Nevertheless, lazy workers cut across all spheres of organization but married women have more challenges with their career because they are saddled with many responsibilities like taking care of the children, cooking and procreating while men are relatively free of these. However, the possibility of abuse by the lazy teachers cannot be ruled out (Adu et al. 2013)

CONCLUSION

Getting high quality job performances from the teachers depend on giving them the opportunities for personal growth, career develop-
ment, achievement, responsibility, recognition, reward and involvement in the decision-making among others. Based on the findings of this research, there is the need for all the stakeholders in education to take cognizance of factors like the personal factors and the reward system. All these and more contribute to the increase in the teachers’ productivity. It is widely accepted that no nation or educational system can rise above the quality of their teachers. The life of workers on the job must be improved by creating the kind of work environment that can contribute to the workers’ productivity which must be agreed upon by the government.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Government should increase incentives that comprise monetary and non-monetary packages that could bring about improved productivity, particularly the latter. The latter may be in form of car loans which are totally interest free, provision of reputable accommodation for the teachers as well as facilities for them to be able to build houses of their own, fellowship for overseas in areas relevant to their teaching subjects, sponsorship for conferences/seminars/workshops relevant to their profession, from time to time, etc. Government through Ministry of Education should look into the modalities of promoting issues relating to personal factors in order to enhance teacher productivity. The authorities have to recognize the influence of other factors such as different personality types and different skills and talents. They also have to reckon with the effects of organizational factors such as job design, the nature of an organization and effective remuneration and reward systems that would positively affect the teachers’ attitude with respect to their professional duties.
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