

Investigative Analysis of Curriculum Implementation (Teaching/Lecturing) in Obafemi Awolowo University, ILE-IFE

Marie Onovroghene Salami

Department of Science and Technology Education
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife

Isaac Ayo Ojediran

Department of Science and Technology Education
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the type of environment under which the students of Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ile-Ife, Nigeria, receive lectures, found out the student/teacher ratio of some of the classes and analysed the teaching style of some of the lecturers and the frequency with which lecturers attend their lectures. The results showed that many of the venues in which Part One courses are taken by students across Faculties like Mathematics, English and Chemistry and other courses that are Special electives, are overcrowded. The number of lecture venues is not increasing in proportion to annual increase in the admission of students into OAU. It also found out that lecturers find it difficult to put in their best during lectures as the number of students in some of the lecture theatres is so large that there is the need for the use of a public address system which may not be available. The study concluded that the conditions, including environment, for teaching and learning in OAU could become better if teaching and learning facilities are adequately provided.

Key words: Special Electives, first generation Universities, National University Commission Benchmark

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum has been defined by different people in various ways which reflect the thinking, understanding and feelings of those who determine the content and context of curriculum (Ogbimi and Salami, 2015). All the definitions have some things in common like who the curriculum is prepared for, what to teach the learner and under what condition should the teaching and learning take place. Curriculum implementation is carried out in the classroom by teachers in primary and secondary schools and by lecturers in the university.

Effective implementation of a curriculum follows some guiding principles which are laid down by appropriately assigned bodies. In the case of Nigerian Universities, it is the National University Commission (NUC). NUC is responsible for determining the ratio of students to lecturers, the environment in which lectures are to be held, the equipment and materials needed for each practical class and the ratio of such materials and equipment to students. Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU) (formerly, the University of Ife) is one of the Nigerian Universities that the NUC oversees.

OAU was one of the first generation Universities to be established in Nigeria in the early 1960s. Its establishment was based on the Philosophy of Nigeria and the Nigerian National Policy on Education (NPE). The NPE in Nigeria is a statement of government's regulations, anticipations,

expectations, goals, requirements and standards for quality education delivery at all levels. Like most other developing countries, Nigeria is undergoing rapid economic, social and political reforms that included changes and innovations like Open and Distant Learning Programme, Expansion and Revitalization of the National Mathematics Centre, Teachers Registration Council and the introduction of Information and Communication Technology into school curriculum among others.

Teaching began in OAU in 1962 with an initial enrolment of 244 students (Faculty of Education, 2014). The student population rose to 28,758 in 2005/2006 Session and to 35,000 in 2016/2017 Session. Only a few lecture theatres have been added to those that existed since the 1980s. Only one of the added theatres has the capacity up to 1000 sitters. There are thirteen Faculties in OAU which are: Administration, Agriculture, Arts, Education, Environmental Design and Management, Basic Medical Sciences, Clinical Sciences, Dentistry, Law, Pharmacy, Science, Social Sciences and Technology. OAU students are expected to take and pass twelve units of compulsory Special Electives before they can be awarded the degree of the University. Such courses are usually taken by large numbers of students which need large lecture theatres. This probably means that students may be receiving lectures in congested venues and this could be contravening the NUC Benchmark standard.

The NUC is a body that was empowered by the Federal Government of Nigeria to lay down minimum standards for all programmes taught in Nigerian Universities (NUC, 2007). The major role of NUC is to ensure quality assurance in Nigerian Universities by regulating University procedure and accreditation processes. NUC takes responsibility for accreditation of all programmes offered in Nigerian Universities through specialised professional bodies. Benchmark Minimum Academic Standard (BMAS) is the frame of reference for such accreditation exercise. Once a programme gets full accreditation, it means such a programme can be taken by students for the degree for which the programme is accredited. The NUC (2007) recommendations include the following:

- The staff/ student ratio of 1:30 for all programmes.
- Physical Facilities: spaces like adequate classrooms, lecture theatres, auditoria, laboratories, studios, staff offices, workshops for technical and vocational education etc. These should be provided to ensure proper execution/implementation of programmes. Every Faculty of Education should have a Computer Laboratory, Internet Access and Resource Room.
- Equipment: Adequate equipment should be provided for laboratories, workshops and studios, relevant software materials and chemicals to be used along with the equipment should be supplied constantly, Each Department and indeed senior academic staff should be equipped with computers which should be from time to time replenished with the latest software materials. A well equipped teaching support unit (educational technology) should exist to provide media services for instruction and research.

The implementation of a curriculum in a Nigerian University is guided by the above recommendations. The implementation of a curriculum has been described by various researchers. According to Garba (2004), curriculum implementation is putting what has been planned into work for the achievement of the goals for which the curriculum is designed. Okebukola (2004) described curriculum implementation as the translation of its objectives from paper to practice. Curriculum implementation is defined by Ivowi (2004) as the translation of theory into practice or proposal into action. A more comprehensive definition of curriculum implementation was given by Onyeachu (2008). He said it is the process of putting all that have been planned as a curriculum document into practice in the classroom through the combined efforts of the teachers, learners, school administrators, parents as well as

interaction with physical facilities, instructional materials, psychological and social environment. These definitions show that curriculum implementation should take cognizance of the learner and the environment in which he is learning. However there are factors that may affect the implementation of curriculum and hence the intended curriculum might be different from the implemented curriculum.

Intended curriculum (Crocker and Branfield, 1986) is what has been set out in prospective curriculum by each university in line with NUC standard, in the case of Nigeria. It contains the objectives to be achieved, subject matter content to be learnt and recommendations of a wide range of teaching and learning strategies and materials that have been set out as guide lines. On the other hand, Implemented curriculum is modified and shaped by the interactions of students, teachers or lecturers, materials and daily life in the classroom. It is the actual instructional processes that take place in the classroom through the interactions of teachers, students and the learning environment. It is unfortunate, according to Fullan and Pomfret (1977), that there is lack of curiosity about what has happened to a curriculum between the time it was designed and various people who agreed to carry it out and the time that the consequences become evident. This means what happens between the planning stage and the implementation and its effects. This is the gap in the implementation of curriculum in OAU that this study wants to fill hence, the following questions are raised:

- ✓ Under what environment do OAU students receive lectures?
- ✓ Does the student/lecturer ratio comply with the NUC benchmark standard?
- ✓ What are the teaching styles of lecturers in OAU?
- ✓ Do OAU lecturers attend and deliver lectures regularly?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The specific objectives of the study are to

- ✓ find out the type of environment in which OAU students receive lectures;
- ✓ investigate the student/lecturer ratio of some of the classes;
- ✓ assess the teaching styles of some of the lecturers; and
- ✓ find out if OAU lecturers attend their lectures regularly.

METHODOLOGY

The population of the study was made up of the students and lecturers of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. Six Faculties were purposively selected from the thirteen Faculties based on the courses offered by those Faculties that are taken by all the students in the University. The subjects are SER001 (Use of English), MTH101 (Elementary Mathematics I), and SER002 (The Humanities and the African Experience). The Faculties selected were Arts, Education, Science, Basic Medical Sciences, Social Sciences and Technology. A total of 1052 respondents (1000 students and 52 lecturers) were randomly selected for the study. The National University Commission Benchmark was used as the frame of reference for the set objectives. Three instruments used to collect data for the study were: Students' Questionnaire for the Assessment of Curriculum Implementation (teaching/learning) in OAU which contained twenty items; Lecturers' Questionnaire for the Assessment of Curriculum Implementation in OAU, containing twenty items and an Observation Checklist/Rating Scale, used by the researcher to assess curriculum implementation in OAU which contained eighteen items. Data collected were analyzed using frequency and percentages.

Objective 1 : To find out the type of environment under which OAU students receive lectures
To find out the type of environment OAU students receive lectures, questionnaires were administered to the students and lecturers to sample their opinions on the academic environment in OAU. An observation checklist was also used to access the academic

environment in OAU. Strongly agreed, agreed, disagree and strongly disagree were scored 4,3,2,1 respectively. Mean scores above 2.50 were regarded as adequate and scores below that were inadequate. Responses got were analysed as follows

Table 1: Students' assessment of the Academic Environment in Obafemi Awolowo

	University				Mean
	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	
I hear everything the lecturer says during lectures in this course	158(15.8)	302(30.2)	289(28.9)	250(25.0)	2.37
Lecture venue is conducive for receiving lectures	224(22.4)	276(27.6)	263(26.3)	237(23.7)	2.48
Venue is properly ventilated with sufficient light	191(19.1)	237(23.7)	428(42.8)	145(14.5)	2.47
Every student see what is written on the white/chalkboard	183(18.3)	143(14.3)	542(54.2)	132(13.2)	2.38
Lecturer's voice is audible because every student can hear him/her	77(7.7)	142(14.2)	443(44.3)	337(33.7)	1.96
Lecturer makes use of public address system (PAS) when lecturing	145(14.5)	163(16.3)	409(40.9)	283(28.3)	2.17
Lecturer uses an overhead projector or power point when lecturing	46(4.6)	118(11.8)	289(28.9)	546(54.6)	1.66

The table above revealed that 46.0% of the respondents agreed to hearing everything the lecturer says during lectures with a mean score of 2.37. It was deduced that 50.0% agreed to conducive learning environment with a mean score of 2.48. It was observed that 57.3% of the students disagreed that the venues were properly ventilated with sufficient light with a mean score of 2.53. It was also observed that 32.6% agreed that every student can see what is written on the board with a mean score of 2.38 while 21.9% agreed that the lecturers' voice was audible with a mean score of 1.96. The table also revealed that 30.8% agreed that lecturers make use of a PAS with a mean score of 2.28 while just 16.4% agreed that their lecturers make use of overhead projector. Based on these deductions, it could be concluded that the conditions for teaching in Obafemi Awolowo University are inadequate.

Table 2: Lecturers' Assessment on Academic Environment

	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean
	There is a public address system (PAS) to use when teaching this course	5(9.6)	8(15.4)	35(67.6)	
The available PAS assist me in teaching effectively without straining my voice	19(37.0)	15(29.6)	14(25.9)	4(7.4)	2.94
All my students can hear me when I lecture with or without a PAS	15(28.9)	0(0.0)	25(48.1)	12(23.2)	2.34
All my students can see what I write on the white/chalkboard	13(25.0)	8(15.4)	27(51.9)	4(7.4)	2.58
Students do not complain or demand that I repeat what I say when I lecture	2(3.7)	12(22.2)	19(37.0)	19(37.0)	1.94
The class is too large for good quality lecture	12(22.2)	17(33.3)	15(29.6)	8(14.8)	2.63

The table above revealed that 25.0% of the lecturers agreed that a public address system is made available to them for teaching with a mean score of 2.27. The analysis also show that 66.6% agreed that public address system assists them in teaching effectively with a mean score

of 2.94 while 28.9% agreed that all their students could hear them with or without the PAS with mean score of 2.34. It was revealed that 40.4% agreed that all their students can hear them with mean score of 2.58 while 25.9% agreed that their students do not complain with mean score of 1.94 and 55.5% agreed that the class is too large for good quality lecture. It could be concluded that the lecturers believe there are not enough equipment for audibility and visibility in lecture venues and their classes are too large for quality lectures.

To further attest to the opinions of the lecturers and students in the study area, an observation was carried out by the researcher to assess the nature of the environment used by the teachers and the following deductions were made.

Table 3: Observation Checklist on Nature of Academic Environment in OAU.

	Excellent Freq(%)	Good Freq(%)	Satisfactory Freq(%)	Poor Freq(%)	Mean
Lecture venue contains all the students	12(21.9)	11(21.9)	8(15.6)	21(40.6)	2.27
Each student has a seat and a table on which to write	20(37.5)	7(12.5)	18(34.4)	8(15.6)	2.78
Lecture venue is properly ventilated	2(3.9)	20(37.5)	16(31.3)	14(28.1)	2.19
Lecture venue is properly illuminated naturally or with electric bulbs	20(37.5)	14(28.1)	13(25.0)	5(9.4)	2.94
Every student can hear lecturers clearly	8(15.4)	6(11.5)	10(18.8)	28(53.8)	1.88
Lecturer uses PAS so that all students can hear properly	13(25.0)	14(28.1)	7(12.5)	18(34.4)	2.43
There is a moveable PAS provided	13(25.0)	7(12.5)	13(25.0)	19(37.5)	2.25
There is a fixed PAS	5(9.4)	2(3.1)	3(6.3)	42(81.3)	1.42
There is an installed TV for recorded lectures	3(6.3)	3(6.3)	3(6.3)	42(81.3)	1.27
There is an installed intercom for students to hear what the lecturer says	3(6.3)	5(9.4)	0(0.0)	44(84.4)	1.37
There is a screen for PowerPoint presentation	8(15.6)	5(9.4)	8(15.6)	31(59.4)	1.81

The table above revealed that the lecture venues contain all the students by 40.6% poor level and 21.9% good level with mean score 2.27. It could be concluded that the lecture venues were not adequate for the students.

On observing the number of seats available to the students, the table revealed that there was an excellent level in 37.5% of the classes observed, a good level of 12.5% in classes observed, a satisfactory level of 34.4% and a poor level of 15.6%. It could be concluded that seats were available for the students in most of the classes but 15.6% of the classes did not have adequate seats.

On the ventilation in the venue, 3.9% of the classes observed had excellent ventilation, 37.5% had good ventilation while 28.1% of the classes had poor ventilation. Illuminations of the classes were observed and it was discovered that 37.5% of the classes had excellent ventilation with illumination, 28.1% had good ventilation with illumination while 9.4% had poor ventilation with illumination. It was also observed that students could hear lecturers well excellently in 15.4% of the classes while hearing was at a good level in 11.5% of the classes while hearing was poor in 53.8% of the classes. It was observed that lecturers had excellent use of a PAS in 25.0% of the classes and this was poor in 34.4% of the classes. Moveable Public Address System (PAS) was well available in 25.0% of the classes while there was a poor level

of availability of moveable PAS in 37.5% of the classes. 81.3% of the observed classes do not have affixed PAS while just 9.4% had fixed PAS very available. It was also observed that 81.3% do not have installed TV for recorded lectures and 84.4% of the classes do not have installed intercom for students to hear what the lecturer says and 59.4% of the classes do not have screen for Power points. It could then be concluded that availability of installed TV, installed intercom, screen for power point presentation, ability to hear the lecturer well, ventilation, efficient capacity of lecture venue and presence of a fixed PAS are poor in the classrooms observed.

Objective 2: Investigate the Student/teacher ratio in some classes

This objective was answered based on the responses of the lecturers and the observation Checklist. It was revealed that 81.0% of them agreed that they co-teach the course while 18.5% did not agree to co-teaching of their courses.

Table 4: Lecturers' Assessment of Student/Teacher Ratio

	Strongly Agree Freq (%)	Agree Freq (%)	Disagree Freq (%)	Strongly Disagree Freq (%)	Mean
Teaching this course is energy sapping because the class is too large	13(25.9)	19(37.0)	10(18.5)	10(18.5)	2.70
The class is too large for good quality lecturing	12(22.2)	17(33.3)	15(29.6)	8(14.8)	2.63
My classes are large and there is no co-teaching	12(22.2)	10(18.5)	24(48.1)	6(11.1)	2.54
Other colleagues were around to help control the large classes	8(15.6)	5(9.4)	8(18.8)	29(56.3)	1.78

It was revealed that 64.9% agreed that the course is energy sapping because the class is too large while 55.5% agreed that the class is too large for good quality lecturing while 40.7% agreed that the classes are too large and there is no co-teaching. The observation checklist also revealed that other colleagues were seen in just 25.0% of the lecturers and they were not around in 56.3% of the classes. It could be concluded that even though 81.5% of the lecturers agreed to co-teaching their courses, the student/teacher ratio is high as majority of them believe that their classes are too large.

Objective 3: Assess the Teaching styles of some of the lecturers

This objective was also answered based on the students and lecturers' responses as well as observation done in the lecture venues.

Table 5: Students' Assessment of Teaching Styles

	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean
I enjoy this course because I understand it very well	276(27.6)	362(36.2)	184(18.4)	178(17.8)	2.74
The lecturer makes the lecture very interesting with good illustration and explanation	217(21.7)	480(48.0)	138(13.8)	164(16.4)	2.75
Our lectures are delivered through lecture method	224(22.4)	480(48.0)	145(14.5)	151(15.1)	2.78
Our classes go out on field trips	86(8.6)	86(8.6)	349(34.9)	480(48.0)	1.78
Some of the lecturers speak in low tones in large classes and this discourages me from getting interested in the aspect they teach	375(37.5)	309(30.9)	145(14.5)	158(15.8)	2.86

The table above revealed that 63.8% (mean score=2.74) of the students enjoyed the course because they understand it very well while 69.7% (mean score=2.75) agreed that their lecturers make the lecture very interesting with good illustration and explanations. It was also revealed that 70.4% agree that lecture method is the major method used by their lecturers with a mean score of 2.78 while just 17.2% agreed that their classes go out on field trips with a mean score of 1.78. It was also revealed that 68.4% agreed that some lecturers speak in low tones and this discourages them in the classes. It could be concluded that the students agree that lecture method is the most dominant teaching method used by the lecturers and they rarely go on field trips while most of the lecturers use good illustrations and explanations.

Table 6: Lecturers Assessment on their teaching styles

	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean
I can control my class effectively no matter the size	35(66.7)	16(22.2)	6(11.1)	0(0.0)	3.84
I need some training to update my teaching and class control	16(22.2)	19(37.0)	16(22.2)	10(18.5)	3.13
I take time to explain difficult concepts to my students	31(59.3)	17(33.3)	4(7.4)	0(0.0)	3.52
My classes are interactive as I give time to students to actively participate by asking/answering questions and contributing points during my classes	27(51.9)	23(44.4)	2(3.7)	0(0.0)	3.48

It was revealed that 88.95 agreed that the can control their classes effectively with a mean score of 3.84 and 59.2% of the lecturers agreed that they need more training to update their teaching and class control with mean score 3.13. It was also revealed that 92.6% agreed that they take time to explain difficult concepts and 96.3% agreed that their classes are interactive as they allow the students to participate and contribute in classes.

Table 7 : Checklist on Teaching Style of Lecturers

	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Mean
	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	
The class began with the lecturer making the atmosphere friendly	13(25.0)	16(31.3)	15(28.1)	8(15.6)	2.66
The objectives of the lecture were written out clearly at the beginning of the class	18(34.4)	16(31.3)	3(6.3)	15(28.1)	2.71
Lecturer made effective use of chalk/white board	10(18.5)	13(25.0)	10(18.5)	19(37.5)	2.27
Lecturer gave room for interaction between students and lecturer	16(31.3)	12(21.9)	19(37.5)	5(9.4)	2.75
The lecturer summarized the lecture reflecting the objectives achieved at the end of the lecture	13(25.0)	19(37.5)	12(21.9)	8(15.6)	2.72

The checklist above revealed that 56.3% of the lecturers began their classes by making the atmosphere friendly with a mean score of 2.66 while 65.7% of the lecturers stated the objectives of the lecture clearly at the beginning of the class while 43.8% of the lecturers make effective use of chalk/whiteboard and 53.2% of the observed lecturers gave room for lecturer/student interaction and 62.5% of the lecturers summarized their lectures reflecting the objectives of the study.

Objective 4: To find out the frequency with which lecturers attend lectures

This was basically extracted from the students' questionnaire

Table 8: Students' Assessment of Lecturers' Attendance at Lectures

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean
	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	
Do your lecturers attend classes regularly?	474(47.4)	441(44.1)	46(4.6)	26(2.6)	3.33
Lecturer in my department attend classes punctually	447(44.7)	401(40.1)	79(7.9)	59(5.9)	3.21
My lecturers do not skip classes	342(34.2)	454(45.4)	145(14.5)	46(4.6)	3.07
The lecturer whose course I take keep strictly to lecture timetable	355(35.5)	401(40.1)	175(17.5)	53(5.3)	3.03
The lecturer makes us wait at lecture venues and may not attend the lecture without giving us reasons	112(11.2)	171(17.1)	414(41.4)	289(28.9)	2.08

It was revealed that 91.5% of the student's lecturers attend lectures regularly with mean score 3.33 while 84.8% of the lecturers were said to attend classes punctually with mean score 3.21 and 79.6% of the lecturers do not skip classes. It was also revealed that 75.6% of the lecturers whose courses are taken keep strictly to lecturing timetable while 28.3% of the lectures come late or do not attend lectures without reason. It could be concluded that the lecturers in the institution attend lecturers promptly and regularly.

Objective 5: To Investigate Lecturers Attitude to Work

The objective was achieved based on the students and lecturer's responses

Table 9: Students' Assessment on Attitude of Lecturers to Work

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean
	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	
The lecturer is confident while lecturing	256(25.6)	638(63.8)	53(5.3)	53(5.3)	3.10
The lecturer is friendly and approachable	263(26.3)	388(38.8)	217(21.7)	132(13.2)	2.78
There is encouragement from the lecturer for us to pass this course very well	158(15.8)	494(49.4)	230(23.0)	118(11.8)	2.69

The table above revealed that 89.4% of the students agreed that their lecturers are confident while lecturing while 65.1% agreed that their lecturers are friendly and approachable while 65.2% agreed that there is encouragement from their lecturers to pass the course very well. This shows that the students perceive that their lecturers have positive attitude towards their work.

Table 10: Lecturers' Attitude towards Work

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean
	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	
I enjoy teaching this course	39(74.1)	13(25.9)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3.75
The course is related to my area of specialization/research	40(77.8)	12(22.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3.85
I encourage my students to be interested in the course by speaking loud and clear	19(37.0)	23(44.4)	6(11.1)	4(7.4)	3.10

The above table revealed that all the lecturers sampled agreed to enjoying teaching their respective courses and they all agreed that they teach their areas of specialization. It was also revealed from the table that 81.4% of the lecturers encourage their students to be interested in the course by speaking loud and clear. It can be concluded that the lecturers have a good attitude to work.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concluded that despite the efforts of lecturers to carry out their teaching in OAU, the teaching environment, instructional facilities and class size are substandard viz-a-viz the NUC benchmark for academic standard. It is therefore recommended that the OAU administration and indeed the Nigerian government should provide sufficient fund to assist in meeting the required standard.

References

- Crocker, R. K. & Banfield, H. (1986). Factors Influencing Teacher Decisions on School, Classroom and Curriculum. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 3(9),805-816.
- Faculty of Education, (2014). Department of Science and Technology Education Handbook. Faculty of Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. OAU Press.
- Fullan, M. & Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(1). 335-397.
- Garba, M. (2004). *The Critical Role of Educational Resources on Curriculum Implementation* in Ojediran, A. I. (2015). A Study of the Philosophy, Structure and Implementation Strategies of Physics Teacher Education Curriculum in Southwestern Nigerian Universities. An Unpublished PH.D Thesis. 1-289.

Ivowi, U. M. O. (2004). *Curriculum Implementation and Implication for Schools* in Noah, A.O. K.; Shonibare, D.O.; Ojo. A. A. and Olujuwon, T. (Eds.) *Curriculum Implementation and Professionalizing Teaching in Nigeria, Lagos and Central*

National University Commission (2007). *Benchmark Minimum Academic Standard for Undergraduate Programmes in Nigerian Universities Education*. Abuja, Nigeria. 2-275.

Ogbimi, F. E. & Salami, M. O. (2015). *Evolution of Curriculum Development: Need for more Scientific Principles*.

Okebukola, P. A. O. (2004). *Curriculum Implementation in Nigeria: Strategies for the 21st Century* in Noah, A.O. K.; Shonibare, D.O.; Ojo. A. A. and Olujuwon, T. (Eds.) *Curriculum Implementation and Professionalizing Teaching in Nigeria, Lagos and Central Educational Services*. Educational Services.

Onyeachu, J. A. E. (2008). Curriculum Implementation at the Primary Education Level: Challenges for the 21st Century. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Research Development*. 10(1),38-49.

Scudder, R. R. (2005). *The Pedagogy of University Teaching. Assessing Learning: Classroom Assessment Techniques*. Rockville, M. D.: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association: Perspectives on Issues in Higher Education, Special Interest Group 10.