

**INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE GRAMMAR
TEACHERS USE IN ILORIN METROPOLIS**

BY

**Muhydeen Olaitan Abiola: Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, English Language
Education Unit, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria; E-mail:
muhydeen81@gmail.com/moabiola@alhikmah.edu.ng**

**Olaolu Adewale Ismail: Department of English and Communication, Institute of General Studies, Kwara
State Polytechnic, Ilorin; E-mail: adismason2@gmail.com**

**Imran Yusuf: Mewar International University, Masaka, Nasarawa State, Nigeria;
E-mail: yusuf.muraina@miu.edu.ng**

&

**Hawau Hammed: Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, English Language Education Unit,
Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria;
E-mail: muhydeen81@gmail.com; moabiola@alhikmah.edu.ng**

Abstract

English grammar appears to be one of the most difficult aspects of language. To teach it well, the usage of instructional materials in teaching English language is very important. The extent of teachers' use of the materials for teaching English grammar in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis, Kwara State was examined. It also analyzed the influence of teachers' gender, school type, school location, qualifications, and experience on teachers' material preference. The descriptive survey type was employed in this study. The target population comprised all the secondary school teachers in Ilorin metropolis Kwara State, Nigeria. Purposive sample technique was used to involve one hundred and nineteen (119) English language teachers from selected secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State. The data collected through Abiola's (2012) questionnaire were analysed using the percentage, mean and standard deviation rating, the t-test and the one-way ANOVA statistical techniques. The major finding of this study revealed that none of the predictor variables of gender, school type, school location, and qualification had any significant influence on English language teachers' use of instructional materials except experience during the teaching-learning process. This implied that English language teachers tended not be very proficient in the use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar. On the basis of these findings, it was recommended that textbook writers and publishers should avail the right kinds of materials needed in the course of writing by organizing the contents of their textbooks in line with the current English curriculum.

Keywords: English grammar, Instructional materials, Instruction, Resources and Syntax

Introduction

An efficient use of resources naturally induces understanding, promotes retention, eases recall and invariably sustains good learning. Abiola and Ajibade (2023) perceived resources as the fuels which propels the vehicle that an effective, outstanding teaching rides. The teaching of English language without instructional resources may certainly result in poor academic achievement. Thus, learning a foreign language such as English is affected by the kinds of instructional resources deployed while teaching it. Grammar, which is a component of language, is one of the most difficult aspects to teach well. But with efficient resources, learning becomes an enjoyable experience.

The system and structure of a language, or of all languages, is called its grammar (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985). It covers how words take on many forms and combine with other words to convey meaning. Grammar is crucial for effective communication because it ensures that sentences are clear, coherent, and easily

understood by speakers and readers of a language. Understanding and following grammar rules is essential for both written and spoken communication, as it helps convey meaning accurately and avoid misunderstandings. However, it is important to note that the rules of grammar can vary among different languages, and there may be variations and exceptions within a single language.

Key components of grammar include:

- i. **Syntax:** This refers to the rules that dictate the order of words in a sentence and how they are structured to convey meaning. It encompasses the arrangement of subjects, verbs, objects, adjectives, adverbs, and other sentence elements.
- ii. **Word Classes:** Words in a language are categorized into different parts of speech, such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections. Each part of speech has its own set of rules governing its usage and role in sentences.
- iii. **Tense and Verb Conjugation:** Grammar includes rules for indicating the time of an action or event through verb tenses (e.g., past, present, future). Verb conjugation refers to the changes verbs undergo to agree with the subject and tense of a sentence.
- iv. **Agreement:** Grammar rules also dictate agreement between different parts of a sentence, such as subject-verb agreement (e.g., "She sings" vs. "They sing") and pronoun-antecedent agreement (e.g., "He" vs. "They").
- v. **Punctuation:** Punctuation marks (e.g., periods, commas, semicolons, colons) are essential in grammar to clarify sentence structure and indicate pauses, lists, and other grammatical features.
- vi. **Sentence Structure:** Grammar defines how sentences are structured, including the use of clauses (independent and dependent), phrases (noun phrases, verb phrases, etc.), and sentence types (declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory).
- vii. **Modifiers:** Grammar rules govern the use of modifiers like adjectives and adverbs to provide additional information and description within sentences.
- viii. **Word Order:** Different languages have specific word order patterns (e.g., Subject-Verb-Object in English) that must be followed to create grammatical sentences.

Statement of the Problem

The use of instructional materials is crucial for effective teaching and learning of English grammar, but there is a lack of empirical evidence on how English language teachers in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis, Kwara State, Nigeria, utilize these materials and what factors influence their preferences. This study aims to fill this gap by examining the extent and patterns of teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar and the effects of teachers' gender, school type, school location, qualifications, and experience on their material choices. Overall, this research seeks to uncover the challenges and limitations associated with the utilization of instructional materials for teaching English grammar in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis, Kwara State, and provide recommendations for improving the availability and alignment of instructional materials with the curriculum.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, the following research questions were raised to guide the investigation:

1. What are the available instructional materials used in teaching English language grammar in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis?
2. What are the instructional materials commonly used in teaching English language Grammar in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis?

Research Hypotheses

- Ho₁:** There is no significant difference in male and female secondary school English language grammar teachers' use of instructional materials.
- Ho₂:** There is no significant difference in private and public secondary school English language grammar teachers' use of instructional materials.
- Ho₃:** There is no significant difference in the use of instructional materials for teaching English Grammar by rural and urban English language teachers.
- Ho₄:** There is no significant difference in the use of instructional materials for teaching English language Grammar by qualified and unqualified English language teachers.
- Ho₅:** There are no significant differences in the use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar among less experienced, experienced and very experienced English language teachers.

Methodology

The descriptive research design of the survey type was employed in the study. The total population included all senior secondary schoolteachers of English language teaching grammar in Kwara State. The target population included both junior and senior secondary schoolteachers of English Language in Ilorin Metropolis. Out of the 46 (27 public; 19 private) approved secondary schools in the locale, only 27 (17 public; 10 private) were selected for the study. Similarly, there were 1,309 (768 male and 541 female) teachers that were teaching in the public schools situated within the locale as at the time the research was being carried out. These figures were for all the teachers handling all the subjects. For this study, however, the sample consisted mainly of all the teachers handling the English Language. In both government and private schools, 114 were males while 97 were females – given a total of 211. All the sampled teachers were purposively selected since there were not very many English teachers because of paucity. 211 questionnaires were administered, but only 119 were properly filled and returned.

To carry out this research, a questionnaire adopted from Abiola (2012) was used. The original instrument was designed to measure teachers' use of materials for teaching English studies in secondary schools. The Section B of Abiola's questionnaire was divided into two sections: human resources and non-human resources. It was only the Section B Sub-Section V that was made use of in this study. The questionnaire which had both content and face validity was administered randomly in some schools in Kwara State to elicit information from the respondents. It was grouped into sections A and B. Section A was questionnaire on background information on teachers and school-related ones. It was designed to get the demographic information about the teachers' genders, school locations, school type, qualifications and experiences, while Sections B and C focused on identifying the extent of the respondents' utilisation and availability of the materials for teaching English grammar. Lastly, it found out the materials commonly used by teachers for teaching same. The questionnaire items were structured on a modified likert model namely, Never (N), Seldom(S), Often (O), Always (A) for Section B and Available (A), Not Available (NA) for Section C.

To re-validate the instrument, it was submitted to three experts in the Arts and Social Sciences Education Department of Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Kwara State to check and approve the structure and content of the instrument. The reliability of the instrument was ascertained through the test re-test technique of a three-week interval. A reliability coefficient of 0.76 was obtained then using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. Data collection were analysed using mean and standard deviation (SD) to answer the two research questions while the t-test statistics was used to test hypotheses one, two, three, and four. However, the fifth hypothesis was tested using the One-Way Analysis of variance. Data was coded and analysed using SPSS 20.0 version for windows.

Results

English language teachers were asked to indicate their gender, school type, location, qualification, and teaching experience.

Table 1: Demographic Data of Teachers (N = 119)

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	68	57.1
Female	51	42.9
School Location		
Urban	77	64.7
Rural	42	35.3
School Type		
Government-owned	71	59.7
Private-owned	48	40.3
Qualification		
Qualified	74	62.2
Unqualified	45	37.8
Experienced		
Less Experienced	57	47.9
Experienced	44	37.0
Very experienced	18	15.1
Total	119	100.0

Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents by gender, school type, school location, qualifications and teaching experience. It indicated that 68(57.1%) of the respondents were males while 51(42.9%) were females. It also pointed out that 77(64.7%) were teachers from urban schools, while 42 (35.3%) were teachers from schools located in the rural area. The Table further revealed that 71(59.7%) were teachers teaching in government-owned schools, while 48(40.3%) were teachers teaching in private-owned schools. More so, the table shows that the qualified English teachers were 74(62.2%), while the unqualified English teachers were 45(37.8%). Moreover, the table shows that by experience, out of the 119 teachers sampled, 57(47.9%) of them were less experienced (i.e. have less than ten years of teaching experience), 44 (37.0%) were experienced (i.e. had taught English language for a period between eleven and twenty years), while the remaining 18(15.1%) were more experienced (i.e. had taught English language for at least twenty-one years and above).

This part presents the result of the analyses on the opinions of the respondents on the availability and usability of instructional materials for teaching English language grammar. In drawing inferences from the mean, the following critical ranges of scores on a scale of 1-2 were used:

Research Question One: What are the available instructional materials used in teaching English Grammar in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State?

In drawing inferences from the mean on this research question, the following critical ranges of scores on a scale of 0 – 2 were used.

Table2: Table of Inference

Critical ranges	Inferences
1-1.49	Not Available
1.5 – 2.0	Available

Table 2 presents the critical ranges of mean scores on a scale of 0 – 2 (with 0 and 2 as the minimum and maximum obtainable scores, respectively) alongside their inferential meanings. Hence, an instructional material whose availability range falls between 0-1.49 is described as Not Available for use in the sampled school; conversely, an instructional material whose availability range falls between 1.5-2.0 is described as being Available.

Table 3: Instructional Materials Available for Teaching English Grammar in Secondary School (N=119)

S/N	Items	Mean	SD	Inferences
1	Realia (real-life/concrete objects	1.67	0.98	Available
2	Charts (flip charts, minimal charts, phonics chart	1.87	0.92	Available
3	Overhead projectors	1.34	0.11	Not Available
4	Slides	1.42	0.01	Not Available
5	Television programmes	1.95	1.16	Available
6	MP3 audio CDs	1.74	0.92	Available
7	The computer	1.89	1.09	Available
8	The video	1.54	1.13	Available
9	Slide-audio tape presentation	1.67	1.11	Available
10	Course textbooks	1.98	0.92	Available
11	Puppets	1.53	1.14	Available
12	Magazines/newspapers	1.60	1.02	Available
13	Audio-tape recorder/player	1.66	0.96	Available

Table 3 reveals that all the thirteen (13) research items that investigated the availability of the instructional materials for the English language grammar in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State were available except items 3 and 4 that were not available. This implied that out of the 13 items investigated, only 2 items were not available at the secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State.

Research Question Two: What are the instructional materials commonly used in teaching English language Grammar in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State?

In drawing inferences from the mean on this research question, the following critical ranges of scores on a scale of 0 – 4 were used.

Table 4: Table of Inference

Critical ranges	Inferences
1 – 1.49	Not at all
1.5 – 2.49	Seldom
2.5 – 3.49	Frequently
3.5 – 4	Very frequently

Table 4 presents the critical ranges of mean scores on a scale of 0 – 4 (with 0 and 4 as the minimum and maximum obtainable scores, respectively) alongside their inferential meanings. Hence, an instructional material whose usage range falls between 0-1.49 is described as Never in use; those between 1.5-2.49, 2.5-2.99 and 3-4 are described as Seldom, frequently, and very frequently in use, respectively. Never in use means hardly used or not used at all; Seldom in use means used occasionally; frequently in use means used at least in three out of five contact periods; very frequently in use means used in every contact period.

Table 5: Instructional Materials Used in Teaching English Grammar in Secondary Schools (N=119)

S/N	Items	Mean	SD	Inferences
1	Realia (real-life/concrete objects	3.18	.72	Frequently
2	Charts (flip charts, minimal charts, phonics chart	3.13	.59	Frequently
3	Overhead projectors	1.71	.84	Seldom
4	Slides	1.79	.88	Seldom
5	Television programme	1.64	.77	Seldom
6	MP3 audio CDs	1.71	.82	Seldom
7	The computer	2.25	1.09	Seldom

8	The video	1.94	.98	Seldom
9	Slide-audio tape presentation	1.99	.98	Seldom
10	Course textbooks	3.85	.48	Very Frequently
11	Puppets	2.02	.78	Seldom
12	Magazines/newspapers	2.88	.75	Frequently
13	Audio-tape recorder/player	1.87	.82	Seldom

Table 5 reveals that out of the thirteen (13) research items that investigated the extent of use of the instructional materials for teaching English Grammar in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State, items 1, 2, and 12, were frequently used while only item 10 was very frequently used. Conversely items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 13 were seldom used. This implied that out of the eighty-seven percent (87%) of the available instructional materials, only sixty percent (60%) were frequently made use of in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State.

Hypotheses Testing

Research Hypothesis One

Ho1: There is no significant difference in male and female secondary school English language grammar teachers’ use of instructional materials in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State.

The responses of male and female teachers on their use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar were compared using the independent sample t-test statistics.

Table 6: The difference in male and female teachers’ use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar (N=119)

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Df	T-value	Sig.	Decision
Male	68	30.8676	5.29123	116	2.124	0.168	Ho
Female	50	28.8800	4.63192				Accepted

Table 6 shows that the t-test calculated value (116) = 2.124, while its p-value is 0.168 at alpha level of 0.05. Since the p-value is greater than the alpha value (0.168>0.05), the hypothesis was thus accepted. It can be deduced that there was no significant difference in the use of instructional materials by both male and female English language grammar teachers.

Research Hypothesis Two

Ho2: There is no significant difference in private and public secondary school English language grammar teachers’ use of instructional materials.

The responses of the public and private school teachers on their use of instructional material for teaching English language grammar were compared using independent sample t-test statistics.

Table 7: The difference in private and public teacher’s use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar (N=119)

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Df	T-value	Sig.	Decision
Private	71	29.7746	4.88495	116	0.655	0.85	HO
Public	47	30.4043	5.43603				Accepted

Table 7 shows that the t-test calculated value (116) = 0.655, while its p-value is 0.085 at alpha level of 0.05. Since the p-value is greater than the alpha value (0.85>0.05), the hypothesis was thus accepted. This means that there was no significant difference in the use of instructional materials by both private and public school English grammar teachers.

Research Hypothesis Three

Ho3: there is no significant difference in the use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar by rural and urban English language teachers.

The responses of the rural and urban school teachers on their use of instructional material for teaching English language grammar were compared using independent sample t-test statistics.

Table 8: The difference in English teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar based on location

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Dt	t-value	Sig.	Decision
Urban	77	30.2987	5.25674	116	0.797	.407	Ho
							Accepted
Rural	41	29.5122	4.80688				

Table 8 shows that the t-test calculated value (116) = 0.797, while its p-value is 0.407 at alpha level of 0.05. Since the p-value is greater than the alpha value (0.407>0.05), the hypothesis was thus accepted. This means that there was no significant difference in the use of instructional materials by both urban and rural school English language grammar teachers.

Research Hypothesis Four

Ho: There is no significant difference in the use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar by qualified and unqualified English teachers.

The responses of the qualified and unqualified school teachers on their use of instructional material for teaching English language grammar were compared using independent sample t-test statistics.

Table 9: The difference in English teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar based on qualification

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Df	T-value	Sig.	Decision
Qualified	74	29.6757	5.10468	116	0.966	0.801	Ho
							Accepted
Unqualified	44	30.6136	5.09088				

Table 9 shows that the t-test calculated value (116) = 0.966, while its p-value is 0.801 at alpha level of 0.05. Since the p-value is greater than the alpha value (0.801>0.05), the hypothesis was thus accepted. This implies that there was no significant difference in qualified and unqualified English teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar.

Research Hypothesis Five

Hos: There are no significant differences in the use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar among less experienced, experienced and very experienced English language teachers.

The responses of the less experienced, experienced and very experienced school teachers on their use of instructional material for teaching English language grammar were compared using the One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics.

Table 10: The difference among English teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar based on teaching experience

Variable	Sum Of Squares	DF	Mean Square	Cal. F	Sig	Decision
Between groups	236.017	115	118.009	4.838	0.01	Ho
						Rejected
Within group	2804.906		24.390			
Total	3040.924					

Table 10 reveals that $F(2, 115) = 4.838, p < 0.05$. Since the p-value is less than the alpha value, the hypothesis was thus rejected. This implies that there was a significant difference among less experienced, experienced and very experienced English language teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar. In

other words, it can be deduced that English grammar teachers differ in their use of instructional materials based on their teaching experience.

To determine the direction of the difference, a Scheffe Post-Hoc analysis was carried out.

Table 11: Scheffe Post-Hoc analysis of significant difference among less experienced, experienced and very experienced teachers’ use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar

Experience	N	Subset for alpha 0.05	
		1	2
1-10 (less experience)	57	28.5789	
11-20 (experience)	43	31.1860	31.1860
21+(very experience)	18		31.8333
Sig		.119	.875

Table 11 reveals that the less experienced teachers with lower mean scores 28.57 in subset (1) was significantly different from the experienced and very experienced with higher mean scores of 31.18 and 31.83 respectively in the same subset (2). Thus, the experienced and very experienced teachers significantly differed based on their years of teaching experience compared to their counterpart with lower years of teaching experience in subset (1).

Discussion of Findings

Materials available and commonly Used by Teachers in Secondary Schools

The researcher found out that eighty-seven percent (87%) of the instructional materials investigated were available in the secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State. All the thirteen (13) research items were available except item 3 (overhead projector) and 4 (slide) that were not available. The researcher also found out that out of the eighty-seven (87%) percent of the available instructional materials, only sixty percent (60%) were frequently made use of in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis of Kwara State. This outcome agrees with that of Abudu, Lawal and Abiola (2020) who averred that teachers do not make adequate use of available facilities despite the fact that the investigated ICT facilities were recorded to be available.

Male and Female English Grammar Teachers’ Use of Instructional Materials for Teaching: it was discovered that there was no significant difference in the use of instructional materials by both male and female English grammar teachers for teaching. This outcome negated that of Abiola and Ajibade (2023) whose finding revealed a significant difference in the resources used by male and female teachers teaching English vocabulary. This showed that the resources used for teaching vocabulary differed based on teachers’ gender. The difference was in favour of the male teachers with a higher mean score. Nevertheless, the current finding corroborated that of Abudu, Lawal and Abiola (2020) whose finding revealed that there was no significant difference in male and female Oral English teachers’ use of ICT facilities for teaching. Similarly, it also agreed with the outcome of Abiola (2012). His finding revealed a no significant difference in male and female English studies teachers’ use of instructional resources for teaching. This finding seemed to also align with Llewellyn-Jones’ (2005) assertion that a woman can succeed in most activities as well as a man; she can equal him in physical and mental stamina. Similarly, a woman and is able to perform jobs which have been reserved for men in the past, increasingly (Abiola, 2012). Thus, gender has no direct influence on a teacher’s standard in the classroom (Ade. 1991; Adeshina, 2011).

Rural and Urban English Grammar Teachers’ Use of Instructional Materials for Teaching: The researcher also found out that there was no significant difference in rural and urban English language teachers’ use of instructional materials for teaching. This finding corroborated that of Abiola (2012). His finding indicated that rural and urban English language teachers claimed equal disposition to the use of instructional materials. They both made use of instructional materials at the same rate and frequency just in the same way they never or rarely made use of resources. This negated Abdullahi’s (2000) finding that geographical location of schools’ influence students’ performance in secondary schools. The finding of this study, however, maintained that students learn when they are actively involved in what they are learning. Learners’ involvement could be influenced by

teachers' use of available and selected resources for teaching English language in their respective classes. This is true as good teaching makes the learners remember most of teachers' points raised during teaching-learning process.

Private and Public-School English Grammar Teachers' Use of Instructional Materials for Teaching: This finding implied that private and public English language teachers claimed equivalence towards the use of instructional materials. This disconfirmed the study of Babayomi (1999) who observed that private schools performed better than public schools because of the availability and adequacy of teaching and learning resources in the former. Babayomi's statement implied that students' performance is linked with teachers' use of available resources. However, it confirmed the outcome of Abudu, Lawal and Abiola (2020) who found that there was no significant difference in public and private Oral English teachers' use of the ICT facilities employed in teaching. They both used the facilities at the same rate and frequency just in the same way they never or rarely made use of some other facilities. This also affirmed the findings of Abiola and Ajibade (2023) and Adeniyi-Egbeola and Abiola (2016) that public school teachers do not use the instructional materials for teaching vocabularies differently from their private school counterpart. They both made use of instructional materials at almost the same frequency just in the same way they hardly or never made use of some others. Abiola (2012) stated that there is a disconnection between the breathtaking cost of education and the quality of teaching the students are actually getting in return from those high prices – most especially from our private “international” schools.

Qualified and Unqualified English Grammar Teachers' Use of Instructional Materials for Teaching: The researcher found out that there was no significant difference in qualified and unqualified English teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching English grammar. This finding agreed with that of Abiola (2012) that qualified teachers do not differ from unqualified ones in terms of their use of instructional resources for teaching English language at secondary schools. This finding also corroborated the outcome of Abiola and Ajibade (2023) that there was no significant difference in qualified and unqualified teachers' use of resources for teaching vocabulary in senior secondary schools in Ibadan North. This seems to depict that qualified teachers do not differ from unqualified ones in terms of their use of instructional materials in teaching grammar. This study's outcome appeared to disconfirm Okonkwo's (2003) investigation into the relationship among schools, teacher variables and students' achievement in Mathematics as well as the utilisation of available instructional resources by teachers. His finding revealed that there was a significant difference in the utilisation of available instructional resources for teaching Mathematics between qualified and unqualified teachers.

Less Experienced, Experienced and very Experienced English Grammar Teachers' Use of Instructional Materials for Teaching: It was discovered that teaching experience had a significant influence on English language teachers' use of instructional materials for teaching. This difference was in favour of the experienced and very experienced English grammar teachers. The findings suggested that experienced and very experienced teachers appear to be familiar with quite a number of materials investigated. Thus, they do make use of those instructional materials during their classroom interactions with learners. Experience appeared to be very important in the teaching-learning process and this study has confirmed it. Thus, the saying, that experience is the best teacher, is justifiable. Nevertheless, this finding contradicts the outcome of Abudu, Lawal and Abiola (2020) who discovered that teaching experience had no significant influence on Oral English teachers' use of ICT facilities for teaching the English language. They concluded that the investigated teachers are not familiar with quite a number of the facilities listed. Thus, they did not employ them during their classroom interactions with learners. The outcome also contradicted the assertion of Abiola and Ajibade (2023) and Adegbile and Igweike (2002) that teaching experience has no place in teachers' excellent performance.

Conclusion

The finding of this study have indicated that none of the predicator variables of gender, school location, school type and qualifications had any significant influence on English grammar teachers' use of instructional materials except experience that had an influence on teachers' use of instructional material during the teaching-learning

process. Our position, therefore, is that experience matters in the course of the use of instructional materials. Thus, only experienced English grammar teachers will know, when, how, and the type of instructional materials to use during teaching-learning process.

Recommendations

Based on the outcome of this study, it was thus recommended that:

1. Teachers employ the use of various instructional materials during the teaching/learning process of English grammar. This would expose teachers to the knowledge needs for the use of the materials for teaching English grammar.
2. Curriculum planners and policy makers should know what kind of material to plan for and recommend. This would make the needs of learners to be met during the teaching/learning process of English grammar.
3. Textbook writers should employ the right kinds of materials needed in the course of writing and organizing the contents of textbooks in line with the current English grammar so as to achieve the desired goal of teaching and learning.
4. The publishers are employed to update their publications by ensuring that instructional materials highlighted in this study are made use of in their publications.

References

- Abdullahi, S. U. (2000). *Influence of gender, school type and location in Kogi State senior secondary school students' error in written English* (Unpublished Med. Thesis), University of Ilorin, Ilorin
- Abe, E. A. (1991). *Reading problems at the tertiary level & their solutions*. In E. E. Adegija (Ed.) *effective communication skills in teaching and learning: Basic principles*. Ilorin: General Studies Division, University of Ilorin, Ilorin.
- Abiola, M. O. (2012). *An analysis of resources used for teaching English studies in senior secondary schools in Kwara State Nigeria*. An Unpublished Masters' Dissertation University of Ilorin, Ilorin.
- Abiola, M. O. & Ajibade, B. K. (2023). A survey of the resources senior secondary school teachers uses in teaching vocabulary in Ibadan North, Nigeria. *Global Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3, 1, 1-8. Retrieved on 10th September, 2023 from asianonlinejournals.com/index.php/gjelt/issue/view/272 www.10.20448/gjelt.v3i1.4435.
- Abudu, Z. A., Lawal, M. A. & Abiola, M. O. (2020). The ICT facilities used in the teaching of oral English in secondary schools in Kosofe Local Government Area, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Education Humanities and Commerce*, 1, 3, 161-174. Retrieved on 10th September, 2023 from http://ijrehc.com/doc/ijrehc01_27.pdf.
- Adebile, J. A. & Igweike, G. N. (2002). Relative effects of teachers' length of service & attitude of English teaching on students' achievement in English Language. In R. A. Lawal I. Isiugo-Abanihe, & I. N. Owa (Eds.) *Perspective Linguistics in Language & Literature* (1st edition. 366-373), Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers (Nigeria) Limited.
- Adeniyi-Egbeola, F. O. & Abiola, M. O. (2016). Assessment of materials used in the teaching of vocabulary in senior secondary school in Ilorin West Local Government Area, Kwara State, Nigeria. *Ilorin Journal of Education*, 35(1), 19-29.
- Babayomi, A. O. (1999). *Comparative study of the teaching & learning resources in private and public secondary school in Lagos State* (An Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation) University of Lagos.
- Llewellyn-Jones, D. (2005). *Everywoman: A gynaecological guide for life*. Ibadan: Safari Books (export), Spectrum Books Limited.
- Okonkwo, S. C. (2003). Relationship between some schools' and teachers' variable and students' achievement in mathematics. *Journal of Science Teachers' Association of Nigeria*, 35(1), 45-49.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. USA: Longman.