

Teachers' Lesson Delivery and Secondary School Students' Oral Communication Skills in English in Ibadan North Local Government Area, Oyo State

Ogundele Eniola Racheal, Adeyemi Abiodun, Adeyinka

Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

E-mail: ogundeleeniola55@gmail.com, yemiadeyinka13@gmail.com

Submission Track:

Received: 10-11-2025, Final Revision: 15-01-2026, Available Online: 01-02-2026

Copyright © 2026 Authors



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between teachers' lesson delivery and secondary school students' oral communication skills in English in Ibadan North Local Government Area, Oyo State. Three research questions guided the study, exploring the level of teachers' lesson delivery, students' oral communication skills, and the relationship between both variables. The theoretical framework combined Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). A concurrent mixed-method design (QUAN + QUAL) was adopted. Ten public secondary schools were purposively selected, with one English Language teacher and ten students from each school. Data were collected using a Teacher Lesson Delivery Observation Rating Scale and a Students' Oral Interview Guide. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation were used for analysis. Findings revealed that teachers' lesson delivery was moderate (weighted mean = 3.64), with strengths in clarity and lesson structure but weaknesses in interactive oral activities. Students' oral communication skills were equally average (weighted mean = 3.64), with confidence as a strength but challenges in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. A significant positive relationship ($r = .851$, $p < .001$) was found between both variables. The study recommends that teachers adopt learner-centered strategies, conduct regular oral assessments, and educational authorities should organize professional development programs focused on oral communication pedagogy.

Keywords: Teachers' lesson delivery, oral communication skills, secondary school students, English language teaching, Ibadan North.

INTRODUCTION

Communication is an indispensable daily activity. It is estimated that about 75% of a normal human being's day is spent communicating in one form or another. Much of this communication involves listening and speaking, while less time is dedicated to reading and writing. It is commonly believed that the ability to speak clearly and eloquently is a hallmark of an intelligent and confident individual. Oral communication, therefore, goes beyond mere linguistic competence; it is a vital social skill essential for success in academic, professional, and personal domains.

Communication, in its simplest form, is the process by which people exchange information, ideas, feelings, or impressions in a way that ensures mutual understanding. According to Leagans (1961), communication is the process by which two or more people exchange ideas, facts, feelings, or impressions so that each gains a common understanding of the meaning, intent, and use of messages. The four major components of communication include speaking, listening, reading, and writing, each playing a complementary role in mastering a language. A truly effective communicator must demonstrate competence across all four areas.

Oral communication focuses on two main skills: speaking and listening. Listening is not a passive activity but a complex cognitive process that involves interpreting and making meaning from auditory input. As Richards (2008), Buck (2001), and Erickson (2015) explain, listening serves as a foundation for speaking. It helps trigger, shape, and organise verbal responses. It is for this reason that listening and speaking are often developed side by side. Children, even before formal schooling, begin to develop these skills as they listen and respond to people around them.

Coakley and Wolvin (1997) also assert that listening plays a critical role in students' learning at all levels. They argue that effective listening can significantly influence academic success. In classrooms and even at home, listening is often the most-used skill. Speaking, on the other hand, is a productive skill that requires confidence, clarity, and a good command of vocabulary and sentence structure. Traditionally, listening was viewed as a passive act, where the listener simply received spoken information. However, current perspectives,

including that of Clark and Clark (1977), redefine listening as an active and interpretive process. They note that comprehension is not just about hearing sounds but involves mental processes that help the listener construct meaning based on what they believe the speaker intends to convey. This shift emphasises that interpretation, context, and non-linguistic cues all contribute to understanding and that different listeners may derive meanings from the same spoken message. This reconceptualisation of listening has direct implications for teaching and assessing oral communication in the classroom.

Despite the centrality of listening and speaking in communication, many Nigerian students, particularly at the secondary school level, struggle to acquire effective oral communication skills. Several factors contribute to this issue; a major one is language anxiety, which is a psychological barrier that leads to a lack of confidence in speaking situations (Oladoyin et al, 2026). Many students, even after internalising grammar and vocabulary, are hesitant to speak in English due to fear of making mistakes, being ridiculed, or simply because they are unsure of themselves (Akinsola & Olaosebikan 2019). This anxiety hinders participation and limits their progress in mastering oral English.

Code-switching and code-mixing are common phenomena among Nigerian students, especially in urban and semi-urban environments where English is learned as a second language (Akinsola, 2025). While these linguistic strategies are often employed to aid comprehension, they are sometimes done improperly and can result in further confusion (Adetunji et al, 2024). Students may find themselves trapped between two languages, unable to express themselves fluently in either English or their mother tongue. In many instances, they neither master their native language (L1) nor acquire the target language (L2) adequately (Akinsola et al, 2017).

Environmental exposure is another external factor influencing students' oral communication development. In a typical Nigerian setting, especially among families where parents are not proficient in English, children are seldom exposed to correct models of spoken English (Adeyinka & Akinsola, 2021). The language spoken at home, in the community, and even in some schools may include various forms of Nigerian English or Pidgin English. While these varieties serve as practical communication tools, they may not

equip students with the formal oral proficiency required for academic and professional success (Fakeye et al, 2017).

Moreover, internal and external factors converge to reinforce poor oral language development. Internally, students may deal with self-esteem issues, shyness, or past negative experiences in classroom speaking activities. Externally, societal and institutional constraints, such as overcrowded classrooms, a lack of audiovisual teaching aids, limited exposure to native or fluent English speakers, and insufficient emphasis on oral communication in the curriculum, significantly undermine progress in this area.

In many Nigerian secondary schools, particularly in public schools located in urban and semi-urban areas, such as the Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State, oral communication skills are not prioritised (Olaosebikan & Akinsola, 2023). The typical English classroom often focuses on reading comprehension, grammar drills, and writing exercises. Listening and speaking are either assumed to be acquired naturally or left for students to learn at the university level. This neglect results in a significant gap between what students know theoretically and what they can express orally (Akinsola & Olaosebikan, 2019).

In most cases, there is no formal or consistent assessment of speaking and listening. While students are regularly tested in writing and grammar, oral language skills are rarely examined (Oladoyinbo et al, 2026). This lack of evaluation demotivates both students and teachers from prioritising them in their daily academic activities (Aiyede, 2020). It is often assumed that students who can read and write in English are also proficient speakers, yet this is far from reality.

Many students who appear academically strong on paper may struggle to express themselves verbally. The limited opportunities to practice oral skills in structured classroom environments make it even more difficult for them to gain confidence or receive corrective feedback. Oral communication skills are not receptive alone; they are productive. The fact that a student can internalise pronunciation does not mean they can reproduce it effectively in speech.

For this study, focus is on how the design and delivery of English Language lessons pose challenges for secondary school students. Teachers play a central role in developing

students' oral skills (Aiyede, 2023). However, many teachers are either not adequately trained in oral communication pedagogy or do not see it as a priority. A teacher's lesson delivery, the methods used to convey information, the use of teaching aids, classroom management, and opportunities for student participation can either support or hinder oral language development.

When lesson delivery is teacher-centred, students become passive recipients of knowledge. They rarely engage in speaking exercises, discussions, or role-playing activities that would allow them to practice speaking English. In addition, some teachers lack the verbal fluency or confidence to model correct pronunciation and sentence structure for their students. This situation creates a loop where the teacher and student reinforce poor oral habits due to inadequate instruction.

Curriculum planners and educational authorities have also contributed to this issue by emphasising written assessment over oral performance. Lesson plans may be developed with noble intentions, but if teachers do not adapt their methods to suit the learners' oral communication needs, little progress will be made. Teachers must be flexible enough to modify their lesson delivery and incorporate techniques that encourage speaking and listening in every lesson. Furthermore, in situations where native or fluent English speakers are not available, schools must invest in audio-visual tools, oral drills, and interactive speaking opportunities to help students acquire near-native fluency.

Oral communication is a vital skill that underpins academic achievement, self-confidence, and future career success. In Nigeria, where English serves as the official language of instruction, the ability to speak and understand English fluently is not just a desirable skill, it is a necessity. Despite the various internal and external challenges students face, the role of the teacher remains central. Teachers must create opportunities for oral expression, model appropriate language use, and assess these skills consistently. This study, therefore, focuses on understanding how teachers' lesson delivery influences the oral communication skills of secondary school students in Ibadan North Local Government Area. It aims to explore not only the challenges but also to suggest practical improvements that can enhance language learning outcomes.

Statement of the problem

Oral communication skills are important not only within the classroom but also in real-world interactions. In the Nigerian educational context, especially in secondary schools within rural and semi-urban areas like Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State, a significant number of students struggle to communicate effectively in English despite years of instruction. Many students can recognise and internalise grammatical structures, yet they falter when required to express themselves orally. This disconnection between linguistic knowledge and verbal expression signals deeper issues in how English language education is delivered.

One major factor influencing students' oral communication skills is the teacher's lesson delivery. In many classrooms, teachers tend to focus heavily on grammar, reading comprehension, and writing, while neglecting speaking and listening, the productive and receptive components of oral communication. Often, the absence of structured opportunities to practice these skills, combined with large class sizes and limited resources, hinders students' ability to develop fluency. Without an intentional focus on oral skills within daily lesson delivery, many students may leave secondary school with limited confidence and competence in spoken English.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of English language teachers' lesson delivery in Ibadan North Local Government Area?
2. What is the level of secondary school students' oral communication skills in English?
3. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' lesson delivery and students' communicative skills in English?

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

The study adopted a concurrent mixed-method research approach. of qualitative and quantitative data. This design allows for the simultaneous collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, with equal emphasis placed on both data. The purpose is to provide a

comprehensive understanding of how teachers' lesson delivery influences secondary school students' oral communication skills in public secondary schools.

The quantitative data were collected through the use of an observation rating scale to evaluate teachers' lesson delivery, while the qualitative data were obtained using interviews to engage the students' speaking and listening skills.

Population, Sample and Sampling Technique

The population of this study comprised all English Language teachers and secondary school students in public schools in Ibadan North Local Government Area, Oyo State. This study adopted a probability sampling technique in selecting participants from the population. According to records, there are 42 public secondary schools in Ibadan North Local Government Area, Oyo State. Out of these, 10 schools were selected using a purposive sampling technique, whereby secondary schools were picked at random. A purposive random sampling technique was considered ideal because it ensures unbiasedness in the selection of schools and the proximity of the schools.

From each of the selected schools, one English Language teacher handling Senior Secondary School 2 (SSS 2) was chosen, and the classroom observation was carried out twice. The SSS 2 class was selected because students at this level are at an advanced stage of language acquisition and are preparing for external examinations, which require strong oral communication skills. Ten students in the selected SSS 2 Class were picked at random for interviews in the study.

Research Instruments

Two instruments were used for data collection in this study:

- i. Teacher Lesson Delivery Observation Rating Scale
- ii. Secondary School Students Oral Interview Guide

Teacher Lesson Delivery Observation Rating Scale

The Observation Rating Scale was self-designed by the researcher. The observation rating scale and oral interview guide went through content and face validation by experts in English Language Education and the Faculty of Education.

It consisted of two sections:

Section A: Demographic Information (such as the subject specification, teacher's gender and the student's class level).

Section B: Twenty-four items rated on a 5-point Likert scale as follows:

1 = Poor

2 = Fair

3 = Average

4 = Good

5 = Excellent

The items assessed various aspects of teachers' lesson delivery, such as clarity of instruction, questioning techniques, feedback, and encouragement of student participation.

Secondary School Students Oral Interview Guide

The Oral Interview Guide was self-designed by the researcher. Four questions were used to serve as a guide for the interview.

It is rated on a 5-point Likert rating scale as follows:

1 = Poor

1 = Fair

3= Average

4= Good

5= Excellent

The face and content validity of the instrument were established through experts' review, after which the final copy was trial-tested on five English Language teachers in schools outside the geographical scope of the study. Interrater reliability coefficients of 0.84 and 0.76 were obtained respectively for Teacher Lesson Delivery Observation Rating Scale and Secondary School Students Oral Interview Guide.

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected from the classroom observation and interviews were analysed using descriptive statistics, inferential statistics and Pearson correlation. Descriptive statistics included frequency counts, percentages, means, standard deviation, weighted mean and threshold. The descriptive statistic was used to analyse the demographic characteristics of

respondents and to address research question one and two. A 5-likert rating scale was used with response options: 5- Excellent, 4- Good, 3- Average, 2- Fair, 1- Poor.

For research question three, Pearson correlation was used to identify if there is a significant relationship between Teachers' lesson delivery and Secondary School students' oral communication skills.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question One: What is the level of English Teacher's Lesson Delivery in Ibadan North Local Government Area?

Table 1: Analysis of the level of Teachers' Lesson Delivery in Ibadan North Local Government Area

N	ITEMS	E	G	A	F	P	MEAN	STD
1	The teacher begins the lesson by stating clearly the oral objectives to the students.	10 50%	4 20%	4 20%	1 5%	1 5%	4.05	1.19
2.	The teacher speaks clearly and audibly in the classroom.	16 80%	2 10%	2 10%	0 0%	0 0%	4.70	.65
3.	The teacher repeats phrases or rephrases when students do not understand.	5 25%	7 35%	2 10%	4 20%	2 10%	3.45	1.35
4.	The teacher gives room for students to ask and answer questions.	3 15%	6 30%	5 25%	5 25%	1 5%	3.25	1.16
5.	The teacher checks the student's oral communication with follow-up questions.	9 45%	3 15%	3 15%	3 15%	2 10%	3.70	1.45
6.	The teacher's follow-up questions help students speak in fuller sentences, use better vocabulary and explain their ideas clearly	6 30%	5 25%	6 30%	2 10%	1 5%	3.65	1.18
7.	The teacher corrects pronunciation and grammar without discouraging students.	9 45%	2 10%	3 15%	3 15%	3 15%	3.35	1.57
8.	The teacher distributes questions fairly across the class.	7 35%	3 15%	3 15%	4 20%	3 15%	3.35	1.53
9.	The teacher uses effective verbal & nonverbal classroom	5 25%	7 35%	4 20%	4 20%	0 0%	3.65	1.09

	communication strategies to support learners' understanding, participation, engagement and achievement of lesson objectives.							
10.	The teacher provides sufficient wait-time after asking questions before calling on students.	2 10%	5 25%	3 15%	5 25%	2 10%	3.10	1.12
11.	The teacher models good listening skills by paying attention to student's responses.	8 40%	2 10%	3 15%	5 25%	2 10%	3.45	1.50
12.	Teacher praises and reinforces correct and oral responses to build confidence.	10 50%	1 5%	3 15%	5 25%	1 5%	3.70	1.45
13.	The teacher included formal and informal assessments of the lesson's learning outcomes.	9 45%	7 35%	2 10%	1 5%	1 5%	4.10	1.19
14.	The teacher breaks down complex tasks into specific, easy-to-follow steps for students.	11 55%	4 20%	2 10%	2 10%	1 5%	4.10	1.25
15.	The teacher uses real-life examples or local context to make oral tasks relatable.	10 50%	5 25%	3 15%	1 5%	1 5%	4.00	1.17
16.	The teacher adopts a method that best suits the lesson	7 70%	1 10%	5 50%	4 40%	3 30%	3.25	1.51
17.	The teacher evaluates the lesson by summarising key points orally and vocabulary learned.	5 25%	3 15%	4 20%	4 20%	4 20%	3.05	1.50
WEIGHTED MEAN = 3.64 Threshold= 3.0								

Table 1 shows the results of teachers' lesson delivery during two classroom observations. With a weighted mean of 3.64, it is substantially higher than the threshold of 3.0. The teacher begins the lesson by stating clear objectives (Mean=4.05). This mean score of 4.05 is substantially higher than the threshold of 3.0, indicating that teachers consistently demonstrated excellence in communicating lesson objectives. With 50% of teachers rated as "Excellent" and only 10% rated as "Poor", this practice was well-established across the observed schools.

The teacher speaks clearly and audibly in the classroom (Mean =4.70). This item achieved the highest mean score of 4.70, far exceeding the threshold of 3.0. With 80% of teachers rated

"Excellent" and 10% "Good", clarity and audibility in speech emerged as the strongest competency amongst teachers. The teacher repeats phrases or rephrases when students do not understand (Mean =3.45). The mean score of 3.45 is moderately higher than the threshold, indicating the responsiveness to student comprehension difficulties. However, the distribution shows variability, with 25% rated 'Excellent' but 20% rated "Fair" and 10% "Poor".

The teacher breaks down complex tasks into specific, easy-to-follow steps for students (Mean= 4.10). The mean score of 4.10 significantly exceeds the threshold, with 55% of teachers rated "Excellent". This represents a major strength in instructional scaffolding, indicating that teachers understand the importance of breaking down for language learners. The teacher provides sufficient wait-time after asking questions before calling on students (Mean =3.10). While technically above the threshold at 3.10, this item represents a critical weakness when examined closely. Only 10% of teachers were rated "Excellent" while 25% were rated "Fair" and 10% "Poor".

The teacher evaluates the lesson by summarising key points orally and vocabulary learned (Mean =3.05). With a mean of 3.05, this item barely exceeds the threshold and represents the weakest aspect of lesson delivery. The distribution showed that 25% of the teachers were rated "Excellent" while 20 were rated "Fair" and 20 "Poor".

The teacher gives room for students to ask and answer questions (Mean = 3.25), with a mean of 3.25 marginally above the threshold. However, the ratings reveal the challenges: 15% were rated "Excellent" while 20% were rated "Fair".

Research Question Two: What is the level of Secondary School Students Oral Communication skills in Ibadan North Local Government.

Table 2: Analysis of the level of secondary school students' oral communication skills in Ibadan North Local Government

N	ITEMS	E	G	A	F	P	MEAN	STD
1	Confidence	65	24	6	4	0	4.52	.79

		65%	24%	6%	4%	0%		
2	Articulation& Pronunciation	13	49	28	5	4	3.62	.92
		13%	49%	28%	5%	4%		
3	Grammar & Vocabulary	33	19	24	19	4	3.59	1.25
		33%	19%	24%	19	4%		
4	Clarity of Ideas	18	36	30	12	3	3.54	1.02
		18%	36%	30%	12	3%		
5	Students pay attention and maintain eye contact when the teacher speaks.	7	9	2	1	1	4.00	1.08
		35%	45%	10%	5%	5%		
6.	Students respond promptly to the teacher's oral questions audibly.	9	6	2	2	1	4.00	1.21
		45%	30%	10%	10	5%		
7.	Students participate actively in oral discussions during the lesson.	3	3	8	4	2	3.05	1.19
		15%	15%	40%	20	10%		
8.	Students ask questions that show they have been listening.	8	5	3	2	2	3.75	1.37
		40%	25%	15%	10	10%		
9.	Students use appropriate vocabulary to express their ideas.	2	8	6	4	0	3.40	.94
		10%	40%	30%	20	0%		
10	Students can explain ideas clearly during discussions.	2	11	2	5	0	3.50	.94
		10%	55%	10%	25	0%		
11		0	7	9	2	2	3.05	.94

Students show improved oral fluency as the lesson progresses.	0%	35%	45%	10%	10%		
WEIGHTED MEAN = 3.64 THRESHOLD= 3.0							

Table 2 indicates that students' oral communication skills achieve a weighted mean of 3.64, which is higher than the threshold of 3.0. The item "Confidence" emerged as by far the strongest component of students' oral communication skills, with a mean of 4.52, which exceeds the threshold. With 65% students rated "Excellent", 24% rated "Good", 6% rated "Average", 4% rated "Fair" and 0% rated "Poor". This high confidence manifested in students' willingness to express personal opinions boldly, make evaluative statements about their teachers and engage in self-disclosure about their interests and goals.

The qualitative evidence provides explanatory depth for the quantitative findings. Student 14 stated with clarity and conviction: *"I want to be a Nurse"*, when asked about her career goals. Similarly, Student 17 expressed career aspirations: *"I want to be a doctor."* Student 19 and 21 response showed elaborative confidence: *"I want to be an Engineer. I like fixing bicycle."* Student 21 *"I want to be a Tailor. I like drawing fine clothes."* This elaboration shows students are not merely providing minimal responses but volunteering additional information, a proof of confident speakers.

Articulation and Pronunciation achieved a mean of 3.62, moderately above the threshold but representing one of the weaker core communication dimensions. Only 13% of the students interviewed were rated "Excellent". The 13% "Excellent" rating indicates only a small minority have achieved good speaking skills in English Language while the 49% "Good" represent students whose pronunciation is functional but marked by noticeable L1 interference.

Student 41 articulated the production difficulty: *"My teacher is doing well, she explain until we get it. But the way she say some words is too hard for us to repeat."* Student 42 acknowledged: *"She used to mix Yoruba small-small if we don't understand. They are trying their best. But the sound of the English is still hard for our head."* Student 44 expressed similar

challenges: *"She is a nice person. But the English sounds is hard, we are just learning the basic level for now."*

Students' ability to pay attention and maintain eye contact when the teacher speaks achieved a mean of 4.00, exceeding the threshold. The distribution shows 35% rated "Excellent", 45% "Good", 10% rated "Average", 5% rated "Fair" and 5% rated "Poor". This indicated that a good amount of 80% of students demonstrated good or excellent receptive engagement behaviours. This receptive strength is crucial for oral communication development because students who attend carefully to teacher modelling can internalize language patterns amongst others.

However, students consistently demonstrated they had been listening by accurately reporting what teachers said. Student 12 says: *"Our English teacher always teach us many things like Subject and predicate"* Student 20 noted: *"She used to tell us to repeat after her. I like it."*

Students' ability to respond promptly to the teacher's oral questions audibly achieved a mean of 4.00, exceeding the threshold. The distribution shows 45% rated "Excellent", 30% rated "Good". This indicated that 75% of students achieve good or excellent performance in oral behaviour. The qualitative evidence from interviews demonstrates this responsive capacity. For example, when asked about hobbies, Student 16 responded: "Saving money." When Student 18 was asked why he was in Art class, he responded: "I want to be a Soldier." Student 22 promptly stated: "To be a Pharmacist" when asked about career goals.

However, this swift response does not necessarily indicate that their responses are grammatically correct or fully elaborated. Audibility and promptness measure willingness and basic capacity to speak, and not the quality of production.

Students' ability to use appropriate vocabulary to express their ideas achieved a mean of 3.40, which is moderately above the threshold. The distribution shows 10% rated "Excellent", 40% rated "Good", 30% rated "Average", 20% rated "Fair". While half of the students (50%) achieved good or excellent performance, the concentration of 30% in "Average" and 20% in "Fair" indicated that vocabulary limitations affect the student population to varying degrees.

The qualitative evidence supports this pattern. From the interviews, students used expressions like "small-small" (meaning "gradually" or "a little"). Student 29 said: "I love reading story books o, not my school book o." The repetitive use of "o" (a Nigerian English discourse marker) and the qualification "not my school book o" shows limited vocabulary range. Student 33 stated: "I like reading story books, not my school book o".

Also, repetitive expressions dominated student speech patterns, with "She used to" appearing frequently: Student 15 said "she used to use our names for examples"; Student 31 said "she used to explain with textbooks"; Student 36 said "She used to use our names to give examples." This limited range of sentence starters indicates heavy reliance on memorised chunks rather than generative language use.

Students showed improved oral fluency as the lesson progresses achieved a mean of 3.05, barely exceeding the threshold. The distribution is rated 0% as "Excellent", 35% as "Good", 45% as "Average". This suggests that the lessons do not provide sufficient practice opportunities that would enable students to build momentum, internalise language patterns through repetitions.

Research Question Three: Is there a significant relationship between teachers' lesson delivery and secondary school students' oral communication skills?

Table 3 Correlation between teachers' lesson delivery and secondary school students oral communication skills?

Variables	N	Mean	STD.DEV	R	Sig.	Remarks
Teachers' Lesson Delivery	20	59.43	21.06	.851	<.001	Significant
Students' Oral Communication Skills in English Language	20	40.15	8.68			

The correlation analysis reveals a Pearson correlation coefficient of $r=.851$, indicating a very strong positive relationship between teachers' lesson delivery and students' oral communication skills. This correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level ($p=.001$), meaning there is less than a 0.1 probability that this relationship is by chance. Therefore, there is a relationship between teachers' lesson delivery and secondary school students' oral communication skills.

Discussion of the Findings

The findings of this study revealed that the level of teachers' lesson delivery in Ibadan North Local Government Area is moderate. Classroom observations showed that most teachers demonstrated basic teaching competence, particularly in areas such as clear speech, audibility, and explanation of lesson content. However, despite these strengths, significant weaknesses were observed in the overall quality of lesson delivery. Many teachers did not consistently create opportunities for students to engage in extended oral responses. Follow-up questions that could stimulate deeper thinking and fuller oral expression were limited, and students' participation was often restricted to brief answers rather than meaningful communication.

This finding supports Obadara (2005), who emphasizes that effective lesson delivery involves not only content knowledge but also the ability to organize lessons in ways that promote student participation and learning. The result also aligns with Haynes (2010), who describes lesson delivery as a process involving planning, classroom interaction, and evaluation. While evidence of planning was visible in most classrooms, the interaction was weak, as oral communication activities were not consistently integrated into lessons. Teachers tended to focus on explaining grammar rules and reading comprehension exercises rather than creating speaking opportunities for students. This implies that teachers may prioritize content coverage over skill development, particularly oral communication.

The findings also revealed specific strengths and weaknesses in lesson delivery. These weaknesses directly affect students' oral communication development because wait-time allows students to formulate responses, while oral evaluation reinforces learning and provides additional speaking practice. Richards (2008) emphasizes that teachers must give learners adequate time to process questions and construct responses, especially in second language contexts where students need extra time for cognitive processing. When teachers rush to provide answers or call on students too quickly, they discourage participation and reduce opportunities for oral practice.

Moreover, the finding that lesson evaluation is rarely conducted orally aligns with Olaofe (2013), who observes that oral English is often neglected in Nigerian classrooms or taught

theoretically rather than practically. When teachers conclude lessons with written exercises instead of oral summaries or discussions, they miss valuable opportunities to assess and reinforce students' speaking skills.

The findings also showed that secondary school students' oral communication skills of the selected schools in Ibadan North Local Government Area are average. This confidence manifested in students' willingness to express personal opinions, share their aspirations, and engage in self-disclosure during interviews. The qualitative data from student interviews provided rich evidence of this confidence. Students expressed themselves directly and without excessive hesitation. Student 23 stated boldly: *"I want to be a musician. I like singing and dancing."* Student 25 confidently said *"I want to be a Lawyer. I like reading novels."* Student 27 expressed without hesitation: *"I want to join Police. I like running."* These statements demonstrate students' comfort in expressing personal goals and preferences.

Student 30 showed particular confidence through elaboration: ***"I want to be a banker and count plenty money. I like playing football with my friends for street."*** The willingness to provide multiple pieces of information without being prompted indicates high communicative confidence. Student 32 expressed similar elaborative confidence: *"I want to be a teacher like my English teacher because I like her. Helping my mama sell her market for market square."*

However, despite this high confidence, students exhibited notable challenges in pronunciation, articulation, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary usage. Frequent mispronunciation of sounds and grammatical errors affected the clarity of students' speech.

This finding strongly supports Chomsky's (1965) distinction between competence and performance. While students may possess an internal understanding of English grammar and vocabulary (competence), their ability to produce correct and fluent speech (performance) remains limited. This explains why students can understand classroom instruction and follow lessons but struggle to express themselves clearly and accurately in spoken English. The gap between what students know and what they can say represents a fundamental challenge in second language learning.

The qualitative evidence vividly illustrates this competence-performance gap. Student 37 articulated: *"The teacher is a good person. But some grammar we don't know how they say it. The sound is different from how we talk."* Student 43 acknowledged: *"She is teaching us very well. But the sounds, we don't know it well. Sometimes we just say it the way we know."* Student 45 expressed similar challenges: *"She used to write for board and explain more. But the speaking is what we don't know, the sound is very hard for our mouth."*

These statements reveal students' awareness of their pronunciation difficulties and their accurate self-assessment of productive versus receptive skills. The phrases "the sound is different from how we talk" and "the sound is very hard for our mouth" suggest that while students may intellectually understand how words should sound, they lack the articulatory practice to reproduce those sounds accurately.

The findings also relate closely to Dell Hymes' concept of communicative competence, which emphasizes the ability to use language appropriately in social contexts, not just grammatical correctness. The average level of oral communication observed suggests that students have not fully developed communicative competence, largely because they lack sufficient opportunities to practice speaking English in meaningful, real-life situations. Hymes argues that communicative competence includes knowing when to speak, what to say, to whom, and in what manner. The students in this study demonstrated willingness to speak but lacked the linguistic resources and practice opportunities to do so effectively.

Furthermore, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1978) provides crucial insight into these findings. According to Vygotsky, language development is shaped by social interaction and the learner's environment. Student 46 stated: *"She is trying for us o. But the way they say the words in English, we don't know it very well."* Student 48 expressed: *"The teacher is trying her best for us, she used to mix Yoruba small-small so the work will not be too hard for our head. But English is just too much o, the way they say the words is hard for my mouth."*

Student 47 provided particularly revealing *"Our teacher is a nice person and she used to tell us stories in the class. But English is too much for my head o, the grammar is plenty and the sounds we don't know it very well. Me sha, I just want to know the one that will help me for my work, I don't need to know all the big-big one."*

These statements confirm Vygotsky's view that language acquisition does not occur in isolation but is profoundly influenced by the sociocultural context in which learners operate. In the Nigerian context, where English is rarely spoken at home or in the immediate community, students depend heavily on the classroom for oral practice. When classroom opportunities are limited, students' oral skills remain underdeveloped.

Additionally, students' ability to show improved oral fluency as the lesson progresses was only moderate and it suggests that lessons do not provide sufficient practice opportunities that would enable students to build momentum and internalize language patterns through repetition and use.

The findings confirm Olaofe's (2013) observation that the extent to which oral English is taught depends largely on the teacher's emphasis and enthusiasm for spoken English. Where oral activities are limited or treated as written exercises, students' speaking skills remain underdeveloped. The interviews revealed that students recognize and appreciate when teachers use certain strategies. Student 24 noted: *"My teacher is trying. She used to explain more so we can understand."* Student 28 said: *"I like the way she is teaching. She is a nice teacher."* However, these strategies alone are insufficient to develop full oral proficiency without sustained speaking practice.

The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between teachers' lesson delivery and secondary school students' oral communication skills. Students taught by teachers who used clear explanations, encouraged participation, corrected errors constructively, and asked follow-up questions demonstrated notably better oral communication skills than those taught in more teacher-dominated classrooms.

This finding strongly supports Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1978), which emphasizes the role of the teacher as a more knowledgeable other who guides learners through interaction within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Vygotsky argues that learning occurs first through interpersonal interaction before becoming internalized. When teachers actively engage students through questioning, discussion, and feedback, they create the social scaffolding necessary for students to move from assisted performance to independent mastery.

The classroom observations revealed clear evidence of this relationship, students demonstrated higher levels of oral participation and more developed speaking skills. Conversely, in classrooms where teachers dominated discourse and provided limited speaking opportunities, students' oral communication remained restricted to minimal responses.

The student interviews further illuminated this relationship. Students consistently mentioned specific teaching strategies that facilitated their understanding and encouraged their participation. Student 11 explained: *"Our teachers are teaching us. They are trying. They used to mix Yoruba and English. If they want to use examples, they will use our names in class so we can remember."* Student 32 noted: *"She is using the right method, she is teaching us very well."* Student 34 stated: *"They are teaching us the basic level, they are trying their best for us."*

These statements indicate that students recognize and respond positively to contextually relevant instruction. When teachers use students' names in examples or mix languages strategically for comprehension, they create meaningful connections between abstract language concepts and students' lived experiences. This practice aligns with Vygotsky's emphasis on culturally mediated learning and demonstrates how effective lesson delivery strategies can bridge the gap between students' existing knowledge and new language skills.

The result also aligns strongly with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT emphasizes learner-centered instruction, meaningful interaction, and real communication rather than rote memorization of grammatical rules.

However, the findings also revealed that many teachers have not fully embraced CLT principles. The moderate mean scores for student participation opportunities and distribution of questions across the class suggest that lesson delivery often remains teacher-centered. In such classrooms, a few students may dominate oral participation while others remain passive observers. This pattern contradicts CLT's emphasis on inclusive, student-centered instruction.

Furthermore, Ellis (1986) argues that language acquisition improves when learners are given opportunities to produce language, not just receive input. The findings of this study

show that teachers' lesson delivery determines how much opportunity students have to speak, practice pronunciation, and develop fluency. When teachers allocate more time to oral activities, ask questions that require extended responses, and create a supportive classroom environment, students develop stronger oral communication skills.

The qualitative data revealed students' appreciation for teachers who "explain more," "go back" when students don't understand, and "try their best." Student 8 stated: *"Our teacher is a nice person, she knows how to teach, anything you don't understand she will go back."* Student 13 noted: *"It is good, they teach us very well. The method she is using is good."* Student 31 said: *"She used to explain better, she used to explain with textbooks for the class."*

These comments indicate that students value patience, clarity, and responsiveness in their teachers, all characteristics of effective lesson delivery. However, the findings also revealed a critical limitation: even when teachers demonstrate good lesson delivery in other areas, the lack of systematic oral practice and assessment undermines students' speaking skill development. Student 35 acknowledged: *"My teacher is explaining more to us. But the sounds of the English, we don't know it very well. We only hear the one she say in class."* Student 39 stated: *"She is trying for the class. But we don't know the sounds very well, we need to hear more so we can know how to speak."* Student 49 expressed: *"She is using the right method and she used to explain more to us with the textbook. But English is plenty too much for me, especially the sounds and the pronunciation. I am trying to learn it small-small but it is not easy for my head at all."*

These statements reveal that while teachers employ helpful explanatory strategies, they may not provide sufficient focused practice in pronunciation and speaking. Students recognize their own deficiencies in oral skills and express a desire for more exposure and practice. The correlation between lesson delivery and oral communication skills also has important implications for teacher training and professional development. The finding that teachers' instructional practices directly influence student outcomes confirms the need for targeted training in oral communication pedagogy. As Obadara (2005) argues, teachers are central to educational success, but they must be equipped with appropriate skills and strategies to fulfill this role effectively. The moderate lesson delivery scores observed in this

study suggest that while teachers possess basic competence, they require additional support to develop expertise in teaching oral communication.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that teachers' lesson delivery significantly influences secondary school students' oral communication skills in English. The moderate level of lesson delivery observed in Ibadan North Local Government Area suggests that while teachers possess basic pedagogical competence, there is substantial room for improvement, particularly in adopting more interactive, student-centered approaches that prioritize oral communication development.

The very strong correlation between teachers' lesson delivery and students' oral communication skills confirms that instructional quality is a critical determinant of learning outcomes in oral English.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

Teachers should adopt more learner-centered, interactive teaching strategies that prioritize oral communication practice. Teachers should provide adequate wait-time after asking questions, allowing students sufficient time to formulate and articulate their responses. Teachers should integrate oral assessment into their regular evaluation practices. Administrators should provide teachers with regular professional development opportunities focused specifically on oral communication pedagogy.

The Ministry of Education should revise the English language curriculum to give equal emphasis to oral communication alongside reading and writing.

REFERENCES

- Adetunji, A. R., Fakeye, D. O., & Aiyede, E. I. (2024). *Bilingual and multilingual medium of instruction policy: A panacea for creating an inclusive learning environment in Nigeria*.
- Adeyinka, A. A., & Akinsola, I. T. (2021). Language diversity and the problem of ethnicity in Nigeria: Any solution in sight? In K. O. Ojokheta & K. O. Kester (Eds.), *Education re-engineering in the new normal world: Festschrift for Professor Rashid Adewumi*

- Aderinoye (pp. 784–796). John Archers (Publishers) Ltd. for Department of Adult Education, University of Ibadan.
- Aiyede, E. I. (2020). Language acquisition process: Implications for teaching English as a second language for sustainable development. *Journal of the International Association of Language Educators*, 414–426.
- Aiyede, E. I. (2023). Teachers' belief as correlates of coping with problems affecting English learning among secondary school students in Ibadan. *Babcock University Journal of Education*, 9(2), 113–124.
- Akinsola, I. T. (2025). Resource-person-mediated instruction and secondary students' learning outcomes in Yorùbá orature: A culturally responsive education. *Education Sciences*, 15(6), 661. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15060661>
- Akinsola, I. T., Idumu, A. I., & Adegoke, A. F. (2017). Dichotomizing language teaching and language learning practices. In D. O. Fakeye, S. A. O. Oladunjoye, I. A. Alade, B. O. Kayode-Olawoyin, O. R. Bateye, S. O. Olatunji, & O. S. Jayeoba (Eds.), *Further thought on language, education and curriculum nexus for sustainable development in Nigeria* (pp. 76–88). Constellation Books.
- Akinsola, I. T., & Olaosebikan, B. O. (2019). Influence of mother tongue interference on senior secondary school students' articulation of English sounds in Ibadan North Local Government Area. *International Journal of Arts and Social Sciences Education*, 3(1&2), 37–45.
- Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Coakley, C. G., & Wolvin, A. D. (1997). *Listening in the classroom* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Ehinderer, O. J., & Ajibade, Y. A. (2000). What our students say about how we teach. *Ife Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(1), 1–9.
- Ellis, R. (1986). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Erickson, F. (2015). *Language and learning in social contexts*. Cambridge University Press.

- Fakeye, D. O., Aiyede, E. I., & Fakeye, B. (2017). *A comparative analysis of language preference of students in secondary schools in Oyo State: Implication for curriculum implementation*.
- Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996). Academic listening/speaking tasks for ESL students: Problems, suggestions, and implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 297–320.
- Haynes, G. E. (2010). *Managerial communication: Strategies and applications*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Hornby, A. S., Gatenby, E. V., & Wakefield, H. (2005). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary: International student's edition* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hsiao, T.-Y., & Tseng, W. T. (2022). A meta-analysis of test-retest reliability in language anxiety research: Is language anxiety stable or variable? *SAGE Open*, 12(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221110812>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
- Leagans, J. P. (1961). *Communication and its importance*. <http://eagri.org/eagri50/AEXT392/Lec01.html>
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Obadara, O. E. (2005). The teacher factor in quality education. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 1(2), 45–52.
- Olaofe, I. A. (2013). Teaching English language in Nigerian secondary schools: The need for functional communicative approach. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(15), 155–162.
- Oladoyinbo, O. I., Ebai, W. A., & Akinsola, I. T. (2026). Theatrical storytelling and ESL learners' oral communicative competence: A quasi-experimental intervention. *Research Journal in Translation, Literature, Linguistics, and Education*, 2(1), 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.64120/79a9zt80>

- Olaosebikan, B. O., & Akinsola, I. T. (2023). Awareness of sustainable development related themes in selected African literature-in-English texts among senior secondary school students. *Babcock University Journal of Education*, 9(2), 94–112.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.