IMPACT OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION ON LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE OF PRINCIPALS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN

KANO STATE, NIGERIA

BY

Mohammed Sadisu GARBA
P13EDFC8044

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND CURRICULUM,
FACULTY OF EDUCATION,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA, NIGERIA

JANUARY, 2018

IMPACT OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION ON LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE OF PRINCIPALS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN

KANO STATE, NIGERIA

BY

Mohammed Sadisu GARBA
P13EDFC8044

SUPERVISORS:
DR. E. I. MAKOJU
DR. M. I. HARBAU

A DISSERTATION SUMBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF A MASTER'S DEGREE IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING,

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND CURRICULUM,
FACULTY OF EDUCATION,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY
ZARIA, NIGERIA

FEBRUARY, 2017

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in the Dissertation entitled Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance of Principals in Secondary Schools in Kano State, Nigeria has been carried out by me in the Department of Educational Foundations and Curriculum, Faculty of Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this Dissertation was previously presented for another Degree or Diploma at this or any other Institution.

_____ _____

Mohammed Sadisu GARBA Date

CERTIFICATION

This Dissertation entitled IMPACT OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION ON LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE OF PRINCIPALS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KANO STATE, NIGERIA by MOHAMMED SADISU GARBA meets the regulations governing the award of the Degree of Master of Education (Educational Administration and Planning) of the Ahmadu Bello University, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr. E. I. Makoju — Date
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Dr. M. I. Harbau — Date
Member, Supervisory Committee

Prof. B. Maina — Date
Head of Department,
Educational Foundations and Curriculum

Prof. S.Z. Abubakar — Date
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

DEDICATION

To my mother, Hajiya Hassana Garba, the driving force in my academic pursuits, my lovely wife Zaynab and beautiful kids for their support, prayers and patience.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to appreciate Almighty Allah (S.W.T) who is the source of wisdom and encouragement for seeing me through the time of admission to the completion of my course. My indebtedness goes to my supervisors, Dr. E.I Makoju and Dr. M.I. Harbau, who provided limitless guidance to me during the entire duration of my course. To The Head of Department, Educational Foundations and Curriculum, Prof Bashir Maina, through whom Allah gave me the opportunity to embark on this journey, may Allah reward you Sir. Special thanks to my parents Late Malam Garba Muhammadu Gwari and mother Hajiya Hassana Garba whose prayers, love and support took me through this mile's journey in life**.** I am also grateful to my family, my wife and kids, my sisters and brothers for their support and patience during this programme, without which I would not have been able to complete. To Dr A.A Dada, I sincerely appreciate your efforts in making my work a success. To my course mates, I appreciate your spirit of spirit-de-corps.

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance of principals in Secondary Schools in Kano State, Nigeria. Five research objectives were raised for the study among which are to: ascertain the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State; determine the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State; and assess the impact of material resource allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. These objectives were formulated into five corresponding research questions and hypotheses. The study adopted survey research design. The population of the study consisted of 546 principals and 5,096 teachers. A sample size of 55 principals, 509 teachers and 10 Ministry of Education Officials were used in the study. An open-ended type of questionnaire was used to generate data for the study. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha technique which showed a reliability value of 0.79. The bio-data of the respondents were analyzed using descriptive statistics in the form of tables, frequency counts and percentages, while the research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation. All the five null hypotheses were tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at P = 0.05 (5%) level of significance. Findings among others showed that there is significant impact in the leadership performance of principals, teachers and MOE officials based on the qualified personnel allocation, funding allocation, material resource allocation as well as time resource allocation. Recommendations were made, among others, that Kano State government should realign staffing structures to accommodate the strengths and weaknesses of existing staff, and find ways to recruit and retain quality staff through compensation and support systems. Also, government at local and state level should ensure that administrative staff develop financial management skills for tem to understand the limits and flexibility of fund allocation sources in school management.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cover Page		i
Title Page		ii
Declaration		iii
Certification		iv
Dedication		v
Acknowledgements		vi
Abstract		vii
Table of Contents		viii
List of Tables		xi
List of Appendices		xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION		
1.1	Background to the Study	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem	5
1.3	Objectives of the Study	7
1.4	Research Questions	8
1.5	Research Hypotheses	8
1.6	Basic Assumptions	9
1.7	Significance of the Study	9
1.8	Scope of the Study	12
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE		
2.1	Introduction	13
2.2	Conceptual Framework	14
2.2.1	Resource Allocation	14
2.2.2	Leadership and Performance	19
2.2.3	Qualified Personnel	26
2.2.4	Funding	27
2.2.5	Material Resource	27
2.2.6	Time Resource	28
2.2.7	Curriculum Resource	28
2.3	Theoretical Framework	29
2.4	Criteria for Allocating Resources	30
2.5	Allocation of Human Resources	43

2.6 Allocation of Material Resources 53
2.7 Allocation of Financial Resources 57
2.8 Time Allocation 68
2.9 Secondary School Education in Nigeria 76
2.10 Empirical studies 78
2.11 Summary 81

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction 83
3.2 Research Design 83
3.3 Population of the Study 83
3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques 84
3.5 Instrumentation 85
3.5.1 Validity of the Instrument 86
3.5.2 Pilot Study 86
3.5.3 Reliability of the Instrument 86
3.6 Procedure for Data Collection 87
3.7 Procedure for Data Analysis 87

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction 88
4.2 Bio-data of Respondents 88
4.3 Response to Research Questions 89
4.4 Hypotheses Testing 98
4.5 Summary of Hypotheses Testing 105
4.6 Summary of Major Findings 106
4.7 Discussions of Findings 106

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary 110
5.2 Conclusions 111
5.3 Recommendations 112
5.4 Suggestions for Further Study 112
References 114
Appendices 125

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Population of the Study 84

Table 2: Population and Sample Distribution 85

Table 3: Status of the Respondents 88

Table 4: Gender of the Respondents 89

Table 5: Impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 90

Table 6: Impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 92

Table 7: Impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 94

Table 8: Impact of time resource allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 96

Table 9: Impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 97

Table 10: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the Impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 98

Table 11: Summary of Scheffe's Multiple Comparison Test on the Impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 99

Table 12: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 100

Table 13: Summary of Scheffe's Multiple Comparison Test on the Impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 101

Table 14: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 101

Table 15: Summary of Scheffe's Multiple Comparison Test on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 102

Table 16: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 103

Table 17: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State 104

Table 18: Summary of Hypotheses Tested 105

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I: Letter of Introduction 125

Appendix II: Resource Allocation Questionnaire 126

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Secondary education which serves as a link between primary and tertiary levels, is vital to national development. Resource allocation at this level is very vital to achievement of educational objectives and increase leadership performance. In ether words, leadership produces change that includes establishing direction through visioning, aligning people with the vision and strategies; motivating and inspiring staff. Resource allocation is a process and strategy involving an organisation deciding where scarce resources should be used in the production of goods or services. The study of educational resource allocation has traditionally focused on the distribution of state and federal revenues among schools with particular attention to equity in school funding.

Fairness in resource allocation is not only important for ensuring equity in education opportunities, it is also related to the performance of the education system as a whole. But in many school systems, resources are not allocated equitably regardless of their socio-economic profile. On average, disadvantaged schools tend to have smaller classes, they also tend to be more likely to suffer from teacher shortages, and shortages or inadequacy of educational materials and physical infrastructure, than advantaged schools (Pablo, 2014). Also in general, schools with more socio-economically disadvantaged students tend to have lower-quality resources than schools with more advantaged students.

The sustenance of qualitative secondary education depends largely on adequate allocation of physical and material resources in the schools; such as physical facilities like spacious and well ventilated classrooms, adequately equipped laboratories and technical workshops, well-stocked libraries, assembly halls, recreational ground, farm

land, gymnasia, health centers, counseling rooms, staff offices and conveniently placed urinals and latrines with sufficient allocation of material resources which are made up of items of furniture, laboratory materials (consumable and nonconsumable), motor vehicles, instructional tools, books and other stationery items as well as utilities such as electric power, gas and potable water in the schools will enhance organizational performance; and most important, effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes (David & Yongmei, 2012).

This assumes that qualitative secondary education can be effectively sustained if the schools are well funded. As succinctly put by Afolabi, Oyewusi and Ajayi (2008), "the success of any secondary school depends upon the resources available to it. Money is very important in this respect because by it, all other vital elements in the school can be obtained such as buildings, purchase of equipment, payment of teachers' salaries and allowances and running expenses". They also maintained that school leaders cannot survive or carry out its functions effectively without adequate financial resources at its disposal. Money is needed to pay staff, maintain the plant and keep services going. In his own contribution on the importance of funding the school system, Mussazi (1982) in Afolabi, Oyewusi and Ajayi (2008) remarked that: "for schools to function effectively, they need sufficient money, money is needed to buy textbooks, establish new buildings, pay teachers' salaries, buy science equipment and maintain other services that are required by a school to carry out its functions as an educational institutions". Of all the multifarious problems facing secondary school administration in Kano state today, none is as persistent and as agonizing as the one relating to the allocation and management of the available resources in the schools.

School leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas internationally. It plays a key role in improving school outcomes by influencing the

motivations and capacities of teachers, as well as the school climate and environment. Effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling (Beatriz, Deborah & Hunter, 2008). As countries are seeking to adapt their education systems to the needs of contemporary society, expectations for schools and school leaders are changing. Many countries have moved towards decentralisation, making schools more autonomous in their decision making and holding them more accountable for results. At the same time, the requirement to improve overall student performance while serving more diverse student populations is putting schools under pressure to use more evidence-based teaching practices.

As a result of these trends, the function of school leadership across schools is now increasingly defined by a demanding set of roles which include financial and human resource management and leadership for learning. There are concerns across countries that the role of principal as conceived for needs of the past is no longer appropriate. In many countries, principals have heavy workloads; many are reaching retirement and it is getting harder to replace them. Potential candidates often hesitate to apply, because of overburdened roles, insufficient preparation and training, limited career prospects and inadequate support and rewards. These developments have made school leadership a priority in education systems across the world. Policy makers need to enhance the quality of school leadership and make it sustainable.

Research has shown that school leaders can make a difference in school and student performance if adequate resources are allocated to them to enable them make important decisions. However, adequate resource allocation alone does not automatically lead to improvements unless it is well supported. In addition, it is important that the core responsibilities of school leaders be clearly defined and

delimited. School leadership responsibilities should be defined through an understanding of the practices most likely to improve their performance.

Performance has long been a focus for organisations concerned with increasing efficiency and productivity (Won-joo & Frank, 2009). However the management of 'leadership capacity' is a relatively more recent consideration. Organisations across all sectors now regard leadership as a key enabler of organisational performance and competitive advantage and are investing greater and greater sums into leadership development activities (Raelin, 2004). Given this level of investment it is not surprising that many have now turned their attention to how best to manage their leadership talent to ensure succession, progression and the delivery of organisational objectives.

Leadership is one of the most widely discussed and researched aspects of an organisation. Leadership assumes that organizations perform best when sufficient resources are allocated and leaders take actions that influence people to work harder or more efficiently. That is, leaders take action that lead to greater organizational success, typically measured by revenue and profit growth. By the same logic, great leaders are the ones who gain the most for their organizations. Good leadership is not about treating people as a means to some other end. Good leaders take care of their people and as well enrich their lives. Gill (2006), opined that good leadership is characterized by the quality of interactions rather than hierarchical level; team problem solving; conversation rather than instructions, shared values, and beliefs; and honesty and a desire for the common good.

Traditionally, school leaders focused on the management of resources allocated to their school. A well-run school where buses run on time, the facility is clean, and the halls are orderly and quiet used to be the mark of an effective school leader. With the shift to leadership for learning, maintaining an orderly environment is necessary but not

sufficient to meet the expectations and accountability requirements facing educators today. Education leaders need a systems approach in complex organizations of schools. In order to ensure the success of all students and provide a high-performing learning environment, education leaders manage daily operations and environments through efficiently and effectively aligning resources with vision and goals. Extolling the impact of resource allocation on leadership performance, leaders identify and allocate resources equitably to address the unique academic, physical, and mental health needs of all students. Leaders address any conditions that might impede student and staff learning, and they implement laws and policies that protect safety of students and staff. They promote and maintain a trustworthy, professional work environment by fulfilling their legal responsibilities, enacting appropriate policies, supporting due process, and protecting civil and human rights of all. In view of the above, this study is specifically set out to ascertain the impact of resource allocation on leadership performance in senior secondary schools in Kano State.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

School leaders experience difficulty in deciding the balance between higher order tasks designed to improve staff, student and school performance (leadership), routine maintenance of present operations (management) and lower order duties (administration). The increased responsibilities and accountability of school leadership are creating the need for effective resource allocation, both within schools and across schools. School boards also face many new tasks. While stakeholders consider resource allocation vital for effective school leadership, these practices remain rare and often unclear; and those involved are not always recognized for their tasks.

As the key intermediary between the classroom, the individual school and the education system as a whole, effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling. Within each individual school, leadership can contribute to improve student learning by shaping the conditions and climate in which teaching and learning occur. Funding may be another fundamental factor in relations to resources, availability and accessibility of fund in a giving organisation is not just enough rather, proper management and utilization of such funds is highly crucial especially in an organisation like school. Observation shows that most secondary school in Kano State may likely be having problem of mismanagement especially management of funds (Shoshani, 2001). This could be as a result of corruption, political involvement in education, appointment of unqualified personnel to handle financial sector in the school. Shortage of facilities (computer) that will man the affairs of assessing, controlling and keeping record related to financial expenditure.

Of all the numerous problems facing secondary school administration in Kano State today, none is as persistent and as agonizing as the one relating to the allocation of resources in the schools (Monk & Hussain, 2000). The recent free education in Kano State has led to the rapid expansion of the secondary school system. It is no gainsaying that such rapid expansion of the school system will bring about high demand for more school buildings, more qualified and competent teachers and clerical staff and instructional facilities for effective teaching and learning in the schools. Therefore, one of the most effective ways of sustaining free qualitative education is to supply the schools adequately with highly competent and well motivated human resources.

Furthermore, most school leaders failed to address other staff or stakeholders who contradict the vision by displaying low or negative expectations; contests or eliminates courses and grading policies that contradict the vision and mission as a result

of inadequate resource allocation in the school. Many a time, the school leaders neglect the use of outputs from a school-wide assessment to identify priority areas for improvement and to set measurable goals with specific grade level and content areas targets; names milestones and benchmarks of student progress and develops a school improvement plan that identifies a strategy to reach school-wide targets and goals.

Resource allocation might strengthen management and succession planning. Resource allocation across different people and organisational structures might help to meet the challenges facing contemporary schools and improve school effectiveness. The fact is that one of the major factors maximizing the gulf between educational goals and accomplishments has been the way resources have been allocated. Following the above stated problems, this study sought to ascertain the impact of resource allocation on leadership performance in senior secondary schools in Kano state.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study was set to achieve the following objectives:

1. Ascertain the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;
2. Determine the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;
3. Assess the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;
4. Investigate the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State; and
5. Find out the impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

1.4 Research Questions

In pursuance of the objectives of this study, the following research questions were formulated for the study:

1. What impact does qualify personnel allocation have on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?
2. In what way do funding allocation impact on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?
3. What is the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?
4. What is the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?
5. How does curriculum resources allocation impact leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were postulated for this study:

HO_1. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;

HO_2. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;

HO_3. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;

HO_4 There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State; and

HO_5 There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

1.6 Basic Assumptions

The study was carried out with the assumptions that:

1. When qualified personnel are allocated to school's leadership performance of principals in secondary schools will be improved;
2. Adequate fund allocation may impact on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;
3. Adequate material resources allocation will impact on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State;
4. Good use of time allocation is assumed to have impact on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State; and
5. Effective use of curriculum resources is assumed to have positive impact on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

1.7 Significance of the Study

Leadership is commonly seen as an important variable affecting organizational performance. Leadership is a broader concept where authority to lead does not reside only in one person, but can be distributed among different people within and beyond the school. School leadership can encompass people occupying various roles and functions

such as principals, deputy and assistant principals, leadership teams, school governing boards and school-level staff involved in leadership tasks.

Findings of this study will reveal the importance of resource allocation on the leadership performance in secondary schools. This study will be of significant to the students, teachers, curriculum planners, school administrators, education board, educational system and the society at large. To the students, the proper allocation of resources both in human and material would afford them the opportunity to use diverse of learning facility that would enable them to effectively learn and retain what they have taught and thereby advancing their academic performance in the school.

Adequate allocation of resources in the school will enable teacher to make use of appropriate instructional material to supplement his/her teaching which will help enhance students innovative and creative thinking as well as help them become plausibly spontaneous and enthusiastic. There is increasing evidence that within each individual teachers, school teachers can contribute to improve student learning by shaping the conditions and climate in which teaching and learning occur. If resources are well allocated to the school, teachers will be highly motivated and will be prepared to face the challenges that might be posed whenever there is economic recession. Teachers must be assigned appropriate classes. The study will aid the staff development programs and accord prominent attention to it. Moreover, fringe benefits will be reviewed continually rather than tied to agitation, especially in those cases wherein such benefits are justified by economic and social pressures. Since teacher efficiency could be greatly impaired by the inadequacy of instructional resources, the study will reveal the need to adequately equipped secondary schools. The science laboratories, libraries, technical workshops and home economics rooms will as well be equipped.

The study is also significant to educational system and society at large. This is because when adequate resources are being allocated to school and teachers solidify their teaching with diverse of available instructional materials and the learners learn effectively, the knowledge acquired will reflect in the society positively.

Findings from this study will help principals to advise the Government and other stakeholders on the: type of resources needed in schools. Thus, accurate information on the needs of the school will be given. Also, it will help principal to be responsible for safe keeping of the facilities. As much as possible, the resources be protected from fire, theft and any other form of disasters. Principals play an important role in strengthening the ties between school personnel and the communities that surround them (Fullan, 2005). Leaders of the most successful schools in challenging circumstances of inadequate resource allocation are typically highly engaged with and trusted by the schools' parents and wider community (Hargreaves, Halász and Pont, 2008).

It is hoped that findings from this study will stimulate government to supply relevant and adequate resources to schools at the right time. This would enhance the implementation of education objectives. This will assist Government and other stakeholders to set aside substantial amount of money for the provision of resources in the secondary schools.

This study will serve as source of literature to other researcher and encourage them to undertake further research towards providing solutions to the highlighted problems associated with the resource allocation in secondary school.

1.8 Scope of the Study

This study impact of resource allocation on leadership performance in senior secondary schools in Kano state is aimed at investigating the opinions of principals, teachers and non-academic staff on the impact of resource allocation on leadership performance in secondary schools in Kano state. Respondents will be drawn randomly from the secondary schools within the state.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This Chapter reviewed relevant literature on the Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance in Secondary Schools in Kano State. Therefore the review covers the following sub-headings:

1. Conceptual Framework;
2. Resource Allocation;
3. Leadership and Performance;
4. Qualified Personnel;
5. Funding;
6. Material Resource;
7. Time Resource;
8. Curriculum Resource;
9. Theoretical framework;
10. Criteria for Allocating Resources;
11. Allocation of Human Resources;
12. Allocation of Material Resources;
13. Allocation of Financial Resources;
14. Time Allocation;
15. Secondary School Education in Nigeria;
16. Empirical studies; and
17. Summary.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

The study of educational resource allocation has traditionally focused on the distribution of state and federal revenues among schools with particular attention to equity in school funding. More recently, however, increasing attention has been directed to what happens to resources once they reach local districts and are allocated internally across alternative instructional and non-instructional services. In the mid-1990s, a series of studies sponsored by the CPRE Educational Finance and Productivity Center utilized bivariate statistical analyses to document patterns in school resource allocation across alternative functions (Monk, et al., 1996; Nakib, 1996; Odden, et al., 1995). One of the striking findings of this research was the high degree of uniformity in the way public schools allocate spending across broad expenditure categories. Hence, the various concepts of this study are discussed as follows.

2.2.1 Resource Allocation

The method by which the state allocates the budget to the school system can serve as an important instrument for achieving desired improvements in levels of educational attainment, social equity and other social policy targets. In many school systems, the allocation of school budgets is done according to a needs-based funding formula. A needsbased formula allocates budgets differentially to schools on the basis of the socioeconomic background of the student body; schools with students whose parents have low levels of education, who have a large number of siblings, and those living in rural areas will be in receipt of larger budgetary allocations. School finance issues are of paramount concern to all levels of the education system – national, state, district, and school. Indeed, every child's future, as well as the future of a society in general, depends largely on the quality of the educational system.

A needs-based school funding formula distributes education resources on a per-pupil basis according to the student's background. The allocation formula used in England (a statutory requirement of the School Finance Regulations) provides an example of a needs-based formula. This formula assigns high weights to student background factors such as whether or not a pupil is entitled to a free meal at school (Adnett et al., 2002). The formula used in Holland compensates for students of disadvantaged backgrounds; a larger compensation is allocated to non-Dutch students from a disadvantaged background than to Dutch students from a disadvantaged background (Ritzen et al., 1997; Canton & Webbink, 2002). A third example is that of the state of Florida, which allocates larger compensatory funds dichotomously, according to student background variables such as English as a Second Language (ESL) and eligibility for hot meals (Owens & Maiden, 1999). Similarly, the city of San Francisco's resources are also distributed dichotomously, according to the specific needs of each student, such as special education, ESL, and socioeconomic status (Shambaugh, Chambers, and DeLancey, 2008). Israeli allocation at the primary school level also compensates students according to their background, but unlike the dichotomous compensation allocation in use in San Francisco and Florida, the compensation is 'diagonally' allocated. That is to say, the extent of allocation is positively correlated with the depth of the need (Shoshani, 2001).

Needs-based formula funding is generally regarded as an improvement on traditional, evenly-based school funding (like, input-based methods). School funding formulas can be instruments of educational policy, including policies aimed at change and reform. Because formulas can operate at the school level, and because they can be sensitive to a wide variety of cost factors and inputs (e.g., different categories of

students), they can be effective instruments for reform, provided that they are properly deployed (Cohn & Geske, 1990; Ross & Levacic, 1999; Levacic & Vignoles, 2002).

Evenly-based funding formulas offer horizontal equity, but do not provide differential levels of resources based on differing needs. A funding formula designed to provide equality of inputs is regressive (that is, it enlarges the achievement gap). This is so because evenly-based funding does not encourage vertical equity, considering that the needs of students vary according to their differing academic-achievement starting points; equality of inputs is actually regressive in that it allocates to schools the same resource amount, regardless of the average profile of academic starting points of the student body.

Local districts do, of course, vary to some extent in their internal resource allocation (for example, among regular classroom instruction, special needs instruction, instructional support, administration, or operations and maintenance), and a small literature offers insights regarding systematic factors that account for these variations. Monk and Hussain (2000) analysis isolates the influence of structural factors such as district size (scale economies), per-pupil funding level, community wealth (resident preferences and ability to pay) and student socioeconomic characteristics. Small districts, for example, lack economies of scale so they tend to devote a larger share of their spending to administration than large districts that can lower the average cost of fixed administrative services by spreading them over more students. In addition, in districts with high per-pupil funding, instruction's share of spending tends to decline as various discretionary support functions command a larger budget share (Monk, et al., 1996).

Much of the available literature on public school finances addresses the revenue side of the budget. Attention has focused on mechanisms that states use to fund public schools and comparisons of per-pupil funding levels. States differ widely in their funding arrangements and formulas for public schools (Nelson, et al., 2004; Belfield, 2008), but available research indicates that in most states owned schools receive considerably less per-pupil revenue (Belfield, 2008; Nelson, et al, 2003; Fordham Institute, 2005; Miron & Urschel, 2010). However, education is and will continue to be one of the primary means by which inequity is addressed. Public funds will continue to be allocated in support of educational programs, and the rationale for these investments will likely continue to be made in terms of creating social equity alongside excellence. Consequently, the purposeful and productive allocation of resources to support equitable access to high-quality learning opportunities becomes a major component of education policy and leadership at the federal, state, and local levels.

Leaders at all levels of the education system are charged with making decisions about how to effectively distribute and leverage resources to support teaching and learning. However, resource allocation consists of more than assigning dollar amounts to particular schools or programs. Equally, if not more important, is the examination of the ways in which those dollars are translated into action by allocating time and people in productive ways. In this respect, leaders are concerned not only with the level of resources and how they are distributed across districts, schools, and classrooms but also with how these investments translate into improved learning. Of critical importance, resource allocation practices must reflect an understanding of the imperative to eliminate existing inequities and close the achievement gap. All too often children who are most in need of support and assistance attend schools that have higher staff turnover,

less challenging curricula, less access to appropriate materials and technology, poorer facilities, and lower overall performance.

Allocating and developing resources to support improvement in teaching and learning are thus fundamental leadership challenges (Plecki, Alejano, Knapp & Lochmiller, 2006). Although they alone are not responsible for the enduring inequities of public education, nor will they alone ensure that the schools make good on the promise of education as society's great equalizer, leaders like Principal, his leadership team, and the groups of leaders at the central office who take these matters seriously are in a particularly good position to guide the distribution and use of resources that are a part of the solution. To that end, they and education policymakers must be informed about emerging resource practices and cognizant of the ways incentives can be used to create conditions that support teaching and learning.

Resource allocation in education does not take place in a vacuum—instead, it often reflects policy conditions that form a context in which opportunities for effective leadership can be created. For example, effective leaders know how to use data strategically to inform resource allocation decisions and to provide insights about the productivity, efficiency, and equity of resources. The roles, responsibilities, and authority of leaders at each level of the education system also impact whether and how they are able to allocate resources to particular districts, schools, programmes, teachers, and students. Further, the type of governance structure that is in place also affects decisions about resources and incentives. Governance issues arise as leaders become involved in raising revenue and distributing educational resources. These activities are shared by multiple entities, including the voting public, state legislatures, local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers' associations. Each of these

connections can provide insights into how to allocate resources and provide incentives that powerfully and equitably support learning, for both students and education professionals.

2.2.2 Leadership and Performance

Leadership is commonly seen as an important variable affecting organizational performance. While the concept has been extensively studied, there is still much to be discovered regarding how leadership affects variables such as allocation of human resources, material resources, financial resources, time resources, and performance. Most of the research on leadership has been in for-profit organizations. While research on leadership in human services organizations is increasing, there is still a limited amount of research knowledge to guide practice in our field. One seminal article in social work described the importance of administrative "behaviours, attitudes, practices, and strategies" in ensuring effective service outcomes (Patti, in Packard, 2008).

In a recent survey of theory and practice in leadership, Northouse (2004:2) concluded that "there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it". Northouse's definition will besed here: Leadership is defined as "a process by which an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve common goals". The term followers will be used to describe those whom the leader is attempting to influence. The term subordinates is often used in organizational settings, but the term followers suggests that leaders can be in any role or position, and a bureaucratic hierarchy is not necessarily implied. Additionally, the concept of shared leadership contradicts the notion of "solo" or unilateral leadership. According to Gill (2006:30), shared leadership is characterized by the quality of interactions rather than

hierarchical level; team problem solving; “conversation rather than instructions, shared values, and beliefs”; and “honesty and a desire for the common good”.

Another useful way to frame leadership is to contrast it with management. According to Kotter (1990), management produces predictability, order, and consistency regarding key results and includes planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving. Leadership produces change and includes establishing direction through visioning, aligningpeople with the vision and strategies, and motivating and inspiring staff. One conceptualization for human services organizations defines administration as a combination of leadership andmanagement (Roberts-DeGennaro and Packard, 2002). Leadership includes visioning, change management, strategy development, organization design, culture management, and community collaboration. Management includes program design, financial management, information systems, human resource management, program evaluation, and project management.

Effective execution of management functions often requires leadership. Leadership is often seen as a key factor in coordinating and aligning organizational processes (Lewis, Packard & Lewis, 2007). As with any aspect of organizational functioning, it should focus on organizational performance, and most important, effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes. Leadership can, to a large extent, affect management capacity through the design of organizational systems. A leader must assess contingency factors in the environment and in staff and the situation, considering staff characteristics and using leader-member processes to shape organizational climate and culture. Other factors, including program capacity (e.g., the service delivery model) and client characteristics, will affect ultimate outcomes. Leaders can impact program

capacity through the use of evidence-based practice in program design. In this model, job satisfaction is seen as an intermediate outcome that can also affect an organization's effectiveness.

Leadership can be observed at several levels: groups, teams, programs, agencies, communities, societies/countries, and even worldwide (e.g., international affairs). The focus here will be on program/agency leadership: organizational leadership for organizational performance. Another important aspect of the leadership context in the education sector is the growing emphasis on evidence-based practice (McNeece & Thyer, 2004). This plays out in two ways in a discussion of leadership. First, in its traditional usage, evidence-based methods should be used by leaders in the design and implementation of the programmes of their agencies. Second, evidence-based practice principles can be used in assessing the theories, models, and practice guidelines for leadership. The newly emerging field of evidence-based management is an example of this application (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006; Rousseau, 2006).

A common approach to leadership assumes that organizations perform best when leaders take actions that influence people to work harder or more efficiently. That is, leaders take action that lead to greater organizational success, typically measured by performance. By the same logic, great leaders are the ones who gain the most for their organizations as represented by a narrow set of financial measures. This view is as universal as it is wrong. Good leadership is not about treating people as a means to some other end. Good leaders take care of their people and enrich their lives. The shift to a people-based economy is particularly evident when one considers young workers in today's labour force. Gone are the days when employees, thankful to have any job at all, would tolerate adverse working conditions or rude managers in exchange for a

paycheck. The fundamental shifts brought on by people-empowering technologies, as well as changes in cultural norms about work, require organizations to place less emphasis on control and a more sincere emphasis on people. Because power implies control, we do not describe good leaders as powerful. People don't want to be controlled. Great leaders are those who show care and concern and genuinely do things to contribute to the lives of the people they lead. In fact one could argue that the whole idea of power—getting people to do what they otherwise would not—is anathema to good leadership.

Corporate leaders are accountable for more than merely financial performance. Particularly in today's political environment, greater attention should be placed on social, ethical, and environmental concerns. To address this broader approach to leadership, the researcher set forth a people-first view of leadership that balances a multiplicity of objectives with the needs, wants and values of the people in and around an organization. A key dimension of the approach is that leadership is not so much about what leaders do, but about the context and conditions that leaders establish—that is, culture and values. These contexts and conditions provide the apparatus for organizational performance to emerge. Essentially, the approach, which draws on pre-existing conceptualizations of leaders as servants, prioritizes people as the drivers of organizational success.

School leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas across countries because it plays a key role in improving classroom practice, school policies and connections between individual schools and the outside world. There is increasing evidence that within each individual school, school leaders can contribute to improved student learning by shaping the conditions and climate in which teaching and learning

occur. A large body of research on school effectiveness and improvement from a wide range of countries and school contexts has consistently highlighted the pivotal role of school leadership in making schools more effective (Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000; Townsend, 2007).

An important finding emerging from the research is that the relationship between school leadership and student learning is mostly indirect. As school leaders work mainly outside the classroom, their impact on student learning is largely mediated through other people, events and organisational factors such as teachers, classroom practices and school climate (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). The finding that the relationship between leadership and student learning is mediated through such factors underscores the powerful role of the school leader in helping to create the conditions for effective teaching and learning.

School leaders influence the motivations, capacities and working conditions of teachers who in turn shape classroom practice and student learning. Moving a step further, the research on school leadership effects has revealed a number of leadership roles and responsibilities that are particularly conducive to enhancing student learning. Findings of the research on leadership effects have recently been consolidated in a number of reviews and meta-analyses. These show that certain leadership practices are associated with measurable improvements in student learning (Hallinger and Heck, 1998; Marzano *et al.*, 2005; Robinson, 2007; Waters *et al.*, 2003). This report identifies four major domains of responsibility as key tasks for school leadership to improve teaching and learning within their schools: supporting and developing teacher quality, defining goals and measuring progress, strategic resource management and collaboration with external partners.

School leadership also plays a major role in education reform. Much has been written about top-down versus bottom-up strategies for school improvement and there is widespread agreement that the two need to be combined and synchronised (Fullan, 2001; Hopkins, 2008; Moos & Huber, 2007). While higher levels of the educational system can provide policy directions for schools, their success often depends on the motivations and actions of leaders at the school level. For centrally initiated reforms to become meaningful to all school-level stakeholders, they need to be associated with internal school improvement activities in a coherent way (Stoll *et al.*, 2002). Successful implementation and institutionalisation of reform requires for further background information on research concerning factors influencing student learning and conceptual and methodological challenges related to the impact of school leadership.

Therefore, unless school leaders feel a sense of ownership of reform and agree with its purposes it is unlikely that they will engage their staff and students in externally defined reform objectives. School reform is more likely to be successful if school leaders are actively involved in policy development and formulation. Continuous dialogue and consultation between policy makers and those who lead schools at the front line are thus essential for successful large scale reform. In addition, school leaders are in charge of connecting and adapting schools to their surrounding environments. According to Hargreaves *et al.,* (2008), school leaders will increasingly need to lead "out there" beyond the school, as well as within it, in order to influence the environment that influences their own work with students. In small towns and rural areas, school leaders have traditionally stood among the most important leaders in their communities. While it may be argued that urbanisation, immigration and school size have weakened school-community ties, these and other pressures on family structures have at the same

time contributed to make the community responsibilities of school leaders even more important today.

School leaders play an important role in strengthening the ties between school personnel and the communities that surround them (Fullan, 2001). Leaders of the most successful schools in challenging circumstances are typically highly engaged with and trusted by the schools' parents and wider community (Hargreaves *et al.*, 2008). They also try to improve achievement and well-being for children by becoming more involved with other partners such as local businesses, sports clubs, faith-based groups and community organisations and by integrating the work of the school with welfare, law enforcement and other agencies (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007).

Moreover, in rapidly changing societies, the goals and objectives to be achieved by schools and the ways to get there are not always clear and static. In increasingly globalised and knowledge-based economies, schools must lay the foundations for lifelong learning while at the same time dealing with new challenges such as changing demographic patterns, increased immigration, changing labour markets, new technologies and rapidly developing fields of knowledge. As a result of these developments, schools are under enormous pressure to change and it is the role of school leadership to deal effectively with the processes of change. A great variety of scenarios for the future of schooling could be imagined from current societal trends and different contexts.

Finally, it should be noted that, while much of the discussion here may imply that leadership is a rational activity, there are powerful contextual factors—including the agency's policy and political arena and economic, social, and technological forces (Lewis et al., 2007) and internal dynamics such as organizational power and politics

(Gummer & Edwards, 1995)—that impact the behaviour and effectiveness of leaders. Some of the leadership approaches, including strategic leadership and contingency theory, provide tactics to deal with these organizational complexities. Other tactics, such as influence skills, are also relevant.

2.2.3 Qualified Personnel

The success of education to a large extent depends on the quality of personnel that goes into it. It has been observed recently that people who are recruited into teaching force are of poor quality. Lop-sided recruitment will not produce better performance, Improvement in instructional practices will not occur. Dubbin (1990) once argued that the most important single variable for staff development effort is motivation. The existence of low morale in school today has in a sense resulted in a negative driving force to staff development activities in Human resources practices. Research in private sector organizations has explored the links between human resource management practices and work unit, to organization effectiveness (Batt, 2002; Becker & Genhart, 1996). This study however seeks to examine the link between human resources practice and teacher performance competency.

Apparently, educational institutions have developed into complex and functional field of endeavour from the previous simple experiences. Changes in technology, economic, social and political sectors have contributed immensely to this development. Therefore, for educational institutions to stay abreast in this rapidly changing environment, they must adapt to the new technologies and the changing life world. These issues pose many problems and challenges for school managers. Consequently, the management of human resources in the school system are of the utmost importance in order to achieve the overall goals and objectives of the schools.

2.2.4 Funding

Education funds refer to budgetary allocations that are readily available or that are going to be made available at a stated time by governments or institutions for the purpose of paying salaries, allowances and benefit, and the building and provision of educational infrastructure to aid teaching and learning. Funding is to provide resources usually in form of money, financial or other values such as effort or time for a project, a person, a business or public institution. World Bank (1994), stated in its report on Nigeria tertiary institutions that equipment for teaching, research and learning are either lacking or very inadequate and in a bad shape to permit the institutions the freedom to carry out the basic functions of academics. In the same vein, Ochuba (2001), opined that it is worrisome to note that Nigeria tertiary institutions are fast decaying. Olomola (2013:26) defined funding as continuous setting aside an allocation of money for a special purpose. In the field of education, money need to be set aside and allocated for the proper management of its affairs.

2.2.5 Material Resource

Execution of educational programmes demands that resources are provided if success is to be achieved. Government, school proprietors, parents and other stakeholders are expected to provide the resources for their schools. The Government stated that all stakeholders would be involved in every aspect of school management. Provision of resources inclusive, however, this aspect is one of the most neglected areas in the school system (Olagboye, 2004). The quality of the products bears a direct relationship with the quality of the facilities deployed in the process of the production. According to Porpst cited in Ibrahim (2013), useful types of resources are to be contacted by the planners and the management team. Castaldi (1997) opines that

educational materials are those things of education which enable a skillful teacher to achieve a level of instructional effectiveness that far exceeds what is possible when they are not provided.

2.2.6 Time Resource

Time resource allocation could be perceived as the development of a process and tools that helps someone to be more productive and efficient. Thinking about time management is to ensure that objectives are accomplished within a time limit. The review of literature reveals various researches in time allocation. Akomolafe (2005), Ajayi (2007) and Hassanzabeh and Ebadi (2007) posited that administrators can make good use of their time by reducing their time wasters. Ajayi (2007) defined a time waster as something that occurs in the day that is not necessary to the day or an activity that consumes more than necessary time. MacKenzie in Akomolafe (2005) listed the following as time wasters: telephone interruptions, drop-in visitors, conversation with colleagues, unscheduled meetings among others. Hence, proper time management (allocation) strategies as pointed by researchers include: delegation of duties to competent subordinates; avoidance of procrastination; avoidance of multi-tasking; minimize clutter and paper on one's desk. These are some of the basics of effective time management.

2.2.7 Curriculum Resource

Curriculum refers to what a learner is required to encounter, study, practice and master (Black & Williams, 1998). It entails taking decisions about what should be taught, how it should be taught and when it should be taught. The resources that schools provide to teachers can have a significant effect on curriculum. For example, if a school purchases a certain set of textbooks and requires teachers to use them, those textbooks

will inevitably influence what gets taught and how teachers teach. Technology purchases are another example of resources that have the potential to influence curriculum. If all students are given laptops and all classrooms are outfitted with interactive whiteboards, for example, teachers can make significant changes in what they teach and how they teach to take advantage of these new technologies. However, new curriculum resources require schools to invest in professional development that helps teachers use the new resources effectively, given that simply providing new resources without investing in teacher education and training may fail to bring about desired improvements. In addition, the type of professional development provided to teachers can also have a major influence on curriculum development and design.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

Resource allocation is the process whereby an organization determines how to apportion its production factors among the various productive activities in which it aims to engage. The process has a number of different aspects, involving economic, social, political and technical considerations. Hence, the process of resource allocation, whereby an organization determines how best to apportion its factors of production between the various productive activities in which it wishes to engage. It is suggested that none of the academic approaches to date has provided an entirely coherent picture of the process, in part because of the contradictory models of the process that they generate. Researchers and policymakers have long wondered whether granting schools greater autonomy to make resource allocation decisions would result in any real difference in spending patterns. Many observers anticipate that decentralizing budgeting authority from districts to schools will permit more efficient resource use that conforms better to schools' particular needs.

The axiomatic theory of resources allocation will be used for this study. The theory according to Dianati, Shen and Naik (2005), extended in three directions. First, they quantify fairness of continuous-dimension inputs, where resource allocations vary over time or domain. Second, by starting with both a vector of resource allocation and a vector of user-specific weights, and modifying the axiom of partition, the writers derive a new family of fairness measures that are asymmetric among users. Finally, they (Dianati, Shen & Naik, 2005) develop a set of four axioms by removing the axiom of homogeneity to capture a fairness-efficiency tradeoff.

2.4 Criteria for Allocating Resources

As we see in Principals in Kano State public secondary school, naira alone do not fully describe the resources necessary to operate a successful school or school district. Indeed, the resources needed to actively and fully support the education system are inherently complex and require an understanding that goes far beyond assessing the level of spending or how the naira are distributed. Educational leaders must be able to examine the ways in which those naira are translated into action by allocating time and people, developing human capital, and providing incentives and supports in productive ways. In other words, this school's principal and the zonal officials who oversee and support his work, not to mention state policymakers whose actions affect the resources he has to work with, are concerned with three basic categories of resource (Plecki, Alejano, Knapp & Lochmiller, 2006):

- *Money.* Activities at several levels of the system, typically occurring in annual cycles, determine both the amount of money that is available to support education and what it will be used for. No one level of the system has complete control of the flow, distribution, and expenditure of funds.

- *Human capital.* People "purchased" with the allocated funds do the work of the educational system and bring differing levels of motivation and expertise, developed over time through training and experience.

- *Time.* People's work together happens within an agreed upon structure of time (and assignment of people to tasks within time blocks) that allocates hours within the day and across the year to different functions, thereby creating more or less opportunity to accomplish goals.

These resources are thus intimately linked to one another. Each affects the others and even depends on the others to achieve its intended purpose. An abundance of money and time, for example, without the knowledge, motivation, and expertise of teachers (human capital) does little to maximize the learning opportunities created for students. Furthermore, an abundance of human capital without money or time to distribute it does little to alter practice in classrooms or to share expertise with others. From their position of influence over the acquisition, flow, and (intended) use of resources, educational leaders thereby undertake a massive attempt to coordinate and render coherent the relation among all three kinds of resource in relation to whatever goals they set out to achieve.

As the goal of focusing effort on the improvement of learning becomes more central, what educational leaders are expected to do and accomplish through the allocation of resources has changed. Historically, supporters of education were more concerned with the naira amount allocated per pupil, and they spent much of their political capital advocating for increases from one year to the next. Educational leaders were responsible for creating balanced budgets with the naira they had available and accounting for expenditures in a responsible manner—a sufficiently complex task in

large school districts. Little attention was paid to how resources were related to performance or to what type of performance was expected (Plecki, Alejano, Knapp and Lochmiller, 2006). The standards-based reform movement of the past several decades changed the situation fundamentally, by prompting new questions about what the learning standards should be and how educators should be held accountable for improved performance. In response, educators have become more focused on results, while taking the stance that higher performance cannot be accomplished without adequate resources. Thus, a sea change has occurred, prompting educational leaders to consider how resource allocation is related to building high-performing systems that work for all students.

If they take seriously the charge to become more learning focused, leaders critically examine the equity, efficiency, and effectiveness of *existing* resource allocation policies and practices and make decisions regarding ways in which resources might be *reallocated* in more productive ways. This resource reallocation challenge is as important in an era of standards-driven reform and accountability for results as it is difficult to realize. Given the considerable variation in the needs, capacities, and contexts of schools, it is striking—though not surprising—that for the most part, resource allocation patterns in K–12 education are relatively uniform (Nakib, 1995; Lankford and Wyckoff, 1995; Monk et al., 1997; Miles & Darling-Hammond, 1998). The uniformity Improving Leadership for Learning of leaders' responses to these varied needs may simply signal a safe course, the most easily defended set of decisions in a context of competition for scarce resources. Beneath the surface of this course of action, however, conflicting expectations, tensions, and barriers may be impeding leaders'

ability to think more creatively about how to organize and allocate limited resources and act strategically. These barriers exist at all levels of the education policy system.

In such a situation, leaders might wish for definitive understanding about the impact of particular investments on student learning, yet the state of knowledge here is very incomplete (National Research Council, 1999). The highly contextual nature of schools, the variation in which any particular improvement strategy is implemented, the motivational conditions that are present, and the need to adapt strategies to fit specific circumstances all interact with the resources brought to bear on learning improvement goals. Consequently, leaders act in response to particular needs and learning challenges with limited evidence of performance.

In such a context, and despite differences among states, districts, and schools, educational leaders face some common problems of practice with respect to resource allocation. Four of these are central to leadership that focuses on learning:

1. *Targeting achievement gaps.* Making resource-related decisions that seek to close achievement gaps and have good prospects for enhancing the equity of educational outcomes.
2. *Organizing schools and districts to enable the alignment of resources with learning improvement agendas.* Structuring time, the nature and assignment of staff, and programs so that they collectively emphasize learning improvement priorities.
3. *Managing the politics of learning-focused leadership.* Mediating the political pressures associated with decision making about resources that emphasize learning improvement and with the redistribution of authority to act.

4. *Developing the human capital of the school or district.* Providing supports, incentives, and opportunities for learning that build motivation and expertise, thereby fostering higher performance.

These problems of practice are intertwined and cannot be addressed in isolation. Rather, they are part of leaders' daily work that is shaped by the varying contexts and conditions of practice and by the capacity of leaders to develop multiple strategies that work in a mutually reinforcing way. For example, the success of a decision to adopt an inquiry-based science curriculum for grades 4–6 will also depend on how time has been organized and allocated for science, how supports for teachers to develop new instructional strategies are provided, and how accountability pressures to improve learning simultaneously in other subject areas are addressed. Thus each problem of practice we describe interacts with and is influenced by leadership action aimed at addressing other areas of concern.

Targeting achievement gaps. Most prominent among these problems of practice, particularly for urban leaders, is the need to address the stark disparities in achievement among different groups of students. Driven in part by current federal policies, if not by the state and local district, the commitment to reduce these disparities is an inescapable goal for district and school leaders. The key leadership act is to "put the money where the rhetoric is," by making achievement gaps basic reference points for all or most resource-related decisions. This is a tall order, especially given the lack of certainty about which course of action might make the greatest headway toward this goal.

The effort to target achievement gaps can mean various things in the actual resource allocation process, and it may look different at the state, district, or school

level. School leaders, for example, may need to examine how well school programmes prevent students from systematically "falling through the cracks," given the school's attention to learning issues, curriculum, or articulation between grades. Districts may need to wrestle with how equitably they allocate teaching staff to schools. States will need to ponder what they can do, beyond setting standards and accountability mechanisms, to keep these mechanisms from becoming punitive and to provide real assistance to districts and schools that struggle to reduce achievement gaps. In all these instances, the crux of the challenge is not the education system's lack of concern but its failure to free up resources that significantly and meaningfully address student learning needs—especially for students of color, students from disadvantaged backgrounds, or students for whom English is not their first language (Plecki, Alejano, Knapp and Lochmiller, 2006). At a minimum, the leadership act consists of evolving and pursuing a theory of action that prioritizes this work and lays out specific activities that explicitly address achievement gaps (for example, Resnick and Glennan, 2002).

Organizing schools and districts to enable the alignment of resources with learning improvement agendas. How schools and classrooms are designed, how teachers are organized into teams and subject departments, how schedules are set up, how contractual safeguards are created to ensure favorable working conditions—all these and more affect leaders' ability to allocate resources in service of a learning improvement agenda. Many have advocated for a fundamental rethinking of how resources are allocated and who controls the available resources (Odden, 2001). Achieving this change will require changing the policy systems and structures that encourage, support, and maintain existing patterns of behaviour that prevent emerging educational goals from being realized (Schlechty, 1997).

Once again, the relative uniformity in criterial to resource allocation is a tip-off that current practices may not be taking full account of the varied learning needs of particular schools, classrooms, or students. The technical, formula-based approach to allocating human resources (four-fifths of the operating budget in most school districts) is accompanied by a history of limited discretion for decision making on the part of school leaders to configure resources in different ways. The leadership act is to imagine alternatives to current practice and create the organizational conditions that enable resources to be used in more flexible and purposeful ways.

Managing the politics of learning-focused leadership. Directing or redirecting resources to learning improvement priorities is likely to challenge existing interests at all levels of the educational system. As has been well documented, the internal political pressure of schools and education systems affects leadership activities (Raywid et al., 2003). These political pressures are, in part, generated by competing demands (Hill and Celio, 1998) stemming from a variety of sources, including actors both inside and outside the education system. They include federal and state policymakers, school boards and superintendents, education associations, community leaders and stakeholders, teachers and instructional staff, as well as parents and the media. Each of these stakeholders has different expectations for the education system and different views as to how resources should be allocated and utilized.

Developing the human capital of schools and districts. One of the major allocation tasks district and school leaders assume concerns human resources. As an ever-growing body of research indicates, highly qualified teachers are a hugely important factor affecting student achievement in the classroom (Levin and Quinn, 2003; Rice, 2003). The quality of school leadership, as well, is becoming important in

this era of rethinking what schools do and how they do it. Given that at least three quarters of fiscal resources are spent on people, leaders cannot help but pay attention to the ways in which human resources are brought to bear on equitable access to knowledge for students, teachers, and leaders. Here, three interrelated puzzles confront leaders at multiple levels of the system:

- *Human resources can be, and generally need to be, developed.* They are not fixed commodities (as many allocation models seem to assume)—but rather, through a variety of capacity-enhancing measures, can be nurtured so that staff attain and exercise a greater level of expertise. This is especially true of leadership resources and instructional expertise, both of which require careful nurturing over time if schools and districts wish to increase their focus on learning improvement.

- *Decisions about human resources often raise questions about reallocation, as well as development,* because human resources are frequently not well aligned with learning improvement priorities to begin with. As such, reallocation decisions are likely to generate significant resistance, which means that leaders pursuing learning improvement agendas need to be astute managers of politics, as well as knowledgeable about the learning issues at hand.

- *Human resources "vote with their feet"*—that is, while they may be assigned to a position, staff may not stay there (or even accept the assignment to begin with) if attention is not paid to the conditions that motivate professional people to commit to pursuing particular improvement goals in particular settings.

So the educational leaders who take a learning improvement agenda seriously are inevitably involved in imagining ways to develop and deploy the human resources at

their disposal. Addressing these kinds of allocation issues is the central business of learning-focused leadership. Absent a commitment to learning improvement that is more than rhetorical, leaders at each level of the educational system are likely to engage in a process in which leaders' visions of possibility interact with stakeholder interests and an array of constraints—chief among them, the existing allocations of funds, people, and time to various purposes within the system. At a minimum, such a process is simply a matter of horse-trading among competing interests, within the boundaries set by allocation parameters (available funding for the year, filled and open position slots in each school and across a district, projected enrollment increases or decreases, etc.). Beyond the minimum, the process may be directed by some guiding principles—or competition among guiding principles. But the process is always essentially political.

In contrast, learning-focused leadership aspires to a more robust allocation process that affords more ways, in principle, for resources to be directed to learning improvement priorities. This process adds to the equation a theory of action (hopefully a coherent one) shared by leaders or members of leadership teams (or even broad-based coalitions pursuing learning improvement goals, as at the state level) that prioritizes specific improvement goals and articulates a set of strategic actions that make the achievement of these goals more likely. The process also places greater emphasis on evidence: By seeking information about learning needs, current programs, emerging conditions, and the effects of prior investments, leaders seek more fully informed ways of developing and appraising allocation options. The process is still political in that it seeks to balance a number of competing interests, but it introduces into the debate a potentially powerful set of considerations that otherwise might not get adequate voice. The leaders' initial act is to structure and guide such a process so that the focus on

learning, strategies for addressing it, and the evidence that can inform decisions are fully heard.

Within this process, leaders do various things to keep the process focused on learning improvement: They engage multiple perspectives and competing interests, especially those that place value on learning improvement; they manage the process of deliberation so that learning priorities remain central to decision making; they champion particular allocation outcomes that keep equitable learning goals in view; they develop ways of guiding the use of resources, once allocated; and they seek and interpret evidence about the uses and effects of resource allocation and use. If feedback loops and a culture supporting data-informed decision making are well established (Knapp, Copland, Swinnerton and Monpas-Huber, 2006), a kind of allocation "cycle" may appear, in which the equity and effectiveness of resource allocations are continuously assessed, relevant resources for furthering improvement priorities are identified and acquired (within constraints and resource parameters), and these resources are distributed according to need. In practice, the process is likely to be far messier than this image may convey, but one can still discern the central role that learning improvement priorities, strategies, and evidence play.

Both the financial conditions of the school, district, or state and the political conditions in the respective local and state communities are central features of this context. These constraints include the budget practices of the school district and the prior year's financial decisions; the fixed or unanticipatable costs associated with the physical plant (e.g., building maintenance) or human resources (e.g., health care benefits); the demand for accountability—both for specific funds and for system performance; the stipulation of labour agreements and the relationship between the

school district and the education association; as well as the conflicting expectations of parents and the general public. Each of these constrains leadership actions and precludes certain resource-related decisions that might be desirable, given a learning-focused approach to leadership.

Existing budgets and the budgetary cycle. Clearly, existing budgets and the budget process constrain the range of options leaders may consider in any given year, as in the past. The budget process is an interrelated series of activities that involves the state, district, and school levels. At the state level, for example, education-related expenses are viewed alongside other public goods, including transportation, social services, and law enforcement. Thus, state-level leaders are constrained by the needs of other public services just as they are by the revenues available. The state's budget assumptions, in turn, set parameters for district-level budgetary decisions. How many students attend school in a particular district and how much the state allocates per pupil determine how the district constructs its budget. Acknowledging fixed costs, such as insurance and building maintenance, the district then typically allocates positions and some discretionary funds to schools, thereby heavily influencing the resources (e.g., dollars, numbers of staff) available to leaders in schools. Regardless of whether the district designs its budgets centrally or involves schools using a school-based budgeting model, the resources at the school level are typically a reflection of what is available, not what may be necessary to adequately support the learning needs of students.

Fixed or unanticipatable costs. Adding to this situation, the fixed costs of education also constrain state, district, and school-level leaders. Expenses for building maintenance, telecommunications, utilities, supplies, legal support, health insurance, and other employee benefits must be considered and funded with the same resources

used for teaching and learning activities. The revenue available to spend on classroom teachers, for example, is somewhat dependent on the cost of health insurance and other benefits that the district must account for. These costs constrain leadership activities because they must be funded regardless of how they relate to teaching and learning.

Conditions in the policy environment. Costs are only one kind of constraint that affects resource allocation. Various policies regulate what is available for leaders to allocate, how those resources can be used, and how their use must be accounted for. For example, leaders at all levels of the education system are constrained by the policies governing how public education and school districts, in particular, can generate revenues. The multiple layers of government and the overlapping authorities for making decisions about education may send mixed messages about what funds (e.g., categorical funds) can be used for, which may or may not coincide with local learning improvement priorities. Finally, a focus on accountability directs leaders' attention to investments that appear to line up most closely with how their schools will be judged.

Collective bargaining agreements. Contractual agreements with local education associations also constrain leaders' ability to make resource decisions—particularly as they relate to evaluating, allocating, and managing human resources. Contracts frequently specify the amount of time that teachers can be expected to teach and participate in meetings or out-of-classroom professional learning activities. Assignment practices give senior teachers priority when choosing assignments, which often limits choices available for novice teachers. Additionally, teachers' associations wield considerable political influence at state, local, and national levels.

Each of these conditions not only limits leaders' range of options or discretion in the process of allocating resources but also contributes to multiple (and often

conflicting) expectations among parents and the public about what schools should provide in terms of resources and how they should provide them. The upshot is complicated political territory in which learning-focused leaders must proceed artfully to pursue strategic courses of action that take these many factors into account. Activities under way at the state, district, and school levels represent current thinking about how to leverage people, money, and time to pursue learning improvement goals. Relatively little research establishes the effectiveness or feasibility of these strategies, but some scholarship helps to understand what these strategies are trying to accomplish and what their prospects for success might be.

Generally speaking, we know that teachers are not evenly distributed across schools, and it is often the case that schools serving children in poverty have lower teacher retention, less experienced staff, and higher percentages of teachers who lack the preparation and expertise necessary for their teaching assignment (Ingersoll, 2002; Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, and Wyckoff, 2000). Leaders at state, district, and school levels are grappling with ways to reduce these inequities so that all students have the teachers they need and all schools are productive learning environments that support high-quality teachers and teaching. Some of the emerging strategies include alterations to teacher compensation systems that reward performance or provide differential pay for particular knowledge and skills (Milanowski, 2003). Other ideas include reorganizing time in the school day for teachers to collaborate and participate in professional learning and reallocating staffing to accomplish particular improvement strategies, such as lowering class size in targeted grades or subject areas (Odden and Archibald, 2001). Each of these emerging strategies involves making decisions about how money, time and people are allocated.

2.5 Allocation of Human Resources

Policies and practices at different levels of the educational system determine who has responsibility and authority for ensuring that human resources is developed and distributed in equitable and effective ways across districts and inside a district's schools. First, state policies that regulate teacher and principal credentialing affect the pool of available educators, as do institutions of higher education that engage in the professional preparation of educators. Though the dynamics of the labour market lie largely beyond the reach of educational leaders at the local level, their efforts can enrich the pool and bring some new individuals to fill open positions. Given the pool of possible candidates—and given the existing staff resources at one time—strategies for bringing human resources to bear on learning improvement priorities concentrate on

- Hiring staff;
- Distributing staff to schools;
- Attracting and retaining qualified teachers; and
- Matching staff skills with students' learning needs.

Hiring staff: The zonal education serve as the primary hiring agent, subject to state requirements regarding certification and locally bargained agreements regarding hiring processes. A typical urban zonal education hiring process consists of a candidate's formal application, a paper screening done by a human resource department, a zonal education human resource interview, and a zonal education referral for an interview at a school for a specific school placement. Three factors contribute to the failure of zonal education to consistently hire high-quality teachers: late vacancy notification requirements, teacher association transfer requirements, and late budget timetables and inadequate forecasting (Levin and Quinn, 2003). In a study of 510 Pennsylvania school

districts, only one-quarter of the districts advertised outside of the state, and 17 percent advertised only within the district (Strauss et al., 2000). In this same study, one-third of districts reported that they filled full-time openings with district substitute teachers or part-time teachers already known to district officials. The authors also note that "most districts spend less than two hours with candidates prior to hiring them" (Strauss et al., 2000, p. 412). The nature of hiring practices underscores possible entry points for improving the ways that new human resources are secured—in particular, by reconsidering the operation of central office human resource departments, the way hiring is implicated in collective bargaining agreements, and the expanded role of schools in the hiring process.

While zonal education hiring practices often limit the ability of the school principal to screen and select teachers that possess the particular skills needed at the school, there is a trend toward allowing greater school-level decision-making discretion with respect to hiring staff. Some urban districts, like Kano municipal have adopted hiring processes that allow applicants to apply directly to the school, giving more control to principals and site hiring teams to select candidates. This is particularly advantageous for hard-to-staff schools that suffer from chronic teacher turnover. Though a decentralized hiring system provides an opportunity to have closer interactions with potential hires, it assumes that the school has (1) accurately assessed the specific learning needs of the students in the school and the school's existing capacity to meet those needs, (2) determined the types of skills needed to be a successful teacher in the specific subject area(s) and context of the unfilled position, and (3) developed a hiring process that determines not only if candidates possess those skills but also if they can be successful using them given the school context. The move toward the greater authority and responsibility of principals for hiring and retaining staff has

important implications for the ways school administrators are prepared for their positions and, once in them, helped to learn how to do them well.

Distributing teachers to schools: Most districts distribute teaching resources (as well as many other staff resources, like counselors, reading specialists, instructional coaches) through a set of procedures based primarily on student enrollment, student-teacher ratios, and the number of students with special learning needs. This process provides a base allocation of teachers and other instructional and support staff to individual schools. Under this base teacher allocation model, schools are typically budgeted for *average*, not actual, teacher salaries (Rubenstein and Miller, 2005). As various studies point out, this traditional method yields intradistrict spending disparities. Research conducted by Steifel, Rubenstein and Berne (1998) reports low variations in base funding across schools in each city, but it also finds lower teacher salaries in high-poverty schools, sometimes offset by more staff relative to pupils. The low salaries are indicative of the number of inexperienced teachers generally found in most high-poverty schools. Further still, a study looking at naira spent per school in four urban districts showed that averaging teacher costs drives significant amounts of money out of schools serving poorer students and toward better-off schools (Roza and Hill, 2004). Findings such as these have prompted leaders to seek alternative allocation strategies that help to level the playing field for more affected schools, such as through weighted student funding and school-based funding.

Attracting and retaining qualified teachers: A more specific picture of who enters teaching and what affects their longevity in teaching positions is being developed by research, which helps pinpoint the kinds of schools and districts most likely to be successful in recruiting and retaining teachers, as well as the impact of school working

conditions and compensation—not to mention teacher preparation, induction, and mentoring strategies—on teacher recruitment and retention (summarized in Allen, 2005). This line of research also helps to determine the efficacy of particular recruitment and retention strategies and policies in bringing new teachers into the profession, including specifically targeted populations.

Working conditions and compensation, in particular, are likely to have particular relevance to questions of resource (re)allocation. The research provides some support for the expected conclusion that schools with greater administrative support and teacher autonomy have lower attrition (Allen, 2005). Similarly, increased compensation tends to increase the rate of teacher retention, but that result depends on factors such as teachers' gender, level of experience, and job satisfaction (Allen, 2005). As for the recruitment of new teachers, various strategies are being tried, among them early recruitment efforts and loan forgiveness programs, but these are not well studied yet (Allen, 2005). Leadership at several levels has a central role in fashioning and implementing these strategies, and yet we know less than we should about the way leadership tools such as compensation and incentives help leaders manage the human resource of the school's teaching workforce. Leadership and the organization of the school clearly have a lot to do with how likely staff members are to stay in their positions (Ingersoll, 2001).

Matching teachers' skills with student learning needs: Even if school leaders are able to attract qualified teachers to their schools, whether through traditional or site-based hiring systems, they are still left with the challenge of configuring staff and supporting and retaining teachers in ways that will maximize student learning. This challenge is particularly evident with novice teachers, who need additional support and assistance as they develop their craft in the first few years of teaching. There, a "support gap"

typically exists between novice teachers in low-income schools as compared to their colleagues in more affluent schools (Johnson et al., 2004). Novice teachers in low-income schools are less likely to come to their positions through timely hiring, less likely to have experienced mentors, and less likely to have access to a curriculum that is aligned with state standards (Johnson et al., 2004). Other recent research regarding more accomplished teachers—those who have earned certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards—also highlights disparities in the distribution of this teaching resource among high- and low-poverty schools: In five of six states studied, poor, minority, and low-performing students were less likely to have access to teachers with National Board Certification (Humphrey, Koppich, and Hough, 2005). Ensuring that all teachers are adequately prepared, matched to their teaching assignment, and supported in their work is an enormous challenge.

Allocating and nurturing the appropriate human resources to address the learning needs of student populations such as these have huge implications for school leaders in particular. First of all, they have the responsibility to foster a more collaborative school culture and infuse relevant professional development opportunities to support it. Furthermore, they often have an important role in recruiting and assigning teachers or other staff to work with youngsters with special learning needs and to do so equitably, with attention to the match between teachers' strengths and students learning needs. As for English language learners (ELL), that match is not always close, as demonstrated by research in California that found systematic inequity in ELL students' access to instructional resources, such as fully certified teachers and appropriate instructional materials (Gandara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly and Callahan, 2003). This research identified resources that are necessary for ELL students to achieve high

academic standards, among them, well-qualified teachers whose primary assignment is to work with the ELL students, rigorous curriculum and courses for all ELL students and affirmative counseling to take those courses, and professional development for all teachers, with a specific focus on effective strategies for teaching English throughout the curriculum. Each of these aspects of high-quality instruction implies the judicious allocation of human and other resources by district and school leaders, beginning with providing ELL students with capable teachers. Ensuring that all teachers are adequately prepared, matched to their teaching assignment, and supported in their work is an enormous leadership challenge. It is a key aspect of managing human resources effectively, efficiently, and equitably.

Allocation of human resources in Nigeria educational system includes the adequate supply of teachers and the non-teaching staff. The activities involve getting the teachers and non-teaching staff to work towards the attainment of educational goals. The goals are to attract, develop, motivate and retain staff in order to achieve the purpose of education. Getting the right result through people is the most important function of the school leader. The process involve attracting the right staff and retaining them to work effectively towards the success of the educational system. The efficiency of the school depends largely on the teachers competence. Nwankwo (1985, cited in Olaleye, 2013); Olukunle (2001) noted that, education anywhere has to attract high caliber of teachers so as to improve quality and productivity. The qualities of school personnel are vital to the operative of good schools. The ministry of education manages the available human resources through the Teaching Service Commission (TESCOM) and State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB).

The success of education to a large extent depends on the quality of personnel that goes into it. It has been observed recently that people who are recruited into teaching force are of poor quality. Lop-sided recruitment will not produce better performance, Improvement in instructional practices will not occur. Dubbin (1990) once argued that the most important single variable for staff development effort is motivation. The existence of low morale in school today has in a sense resulted in a negative driving force to staff development activities in Human resources practices. Research in private sector organizations has explored the links between human resource management practices and work unit, to organization effectiveness (Batt, 2002; Becker and Genhart, 1996).

Apparently, educational institutions have developed into complex and functional field of endeavour from the previous simple experiences. Changes in technology, economic, social and political sectors have contributed immensely to this development. Therefore, for educational institutions to stay abreast in this rapidly changing environment, they must adapt to the new technologies and the changing life world. These issues pose many problems and challenges for school managers. Consequently, the allocation of human resources in the school system are of the utmost importance in order to achieve the overall goals and objectives of the schools.

Technological advancement has resulted in the use of new methods of teaching while government intervention in education has induced constant changes in national educational policies in Nigeria. Also, the demand for better pay, more benefits, less work by the staff and the lack of basic infrastructure in the schools are some of the problems the human resources manager has to cope with and manage properly to enable him meet the set goals and objectives of the school system (Peretomode and Peretomode, 2005). Human resources management in education implies effectively

coordinating the activities of staff, students and parents so as to achieve educational aims and objectives (Adeniyi, 2004). The National Policy on Education (FRN, 2009) clearly spells out the broad responsibilities of managing schools as employment, promotion, deployment and discipline of teachers among others. Successive governments in Nigeria have made efforts towards the effective allocation and management of human resources in educational institutions. However, certain challenges still persist with staff training and development, teachers' workload, performance evaluation, supervision of instruction, conditions of service, staff turnover and motivation, disciplinary problems among students and teachers, promotion policies and so on.

To adequately handle the forgoing challenges, efforts should be geared towards the effective management of staff and students in secondary schools. The importance of human resources management has been stated but there is not much information on its relationship with the academic performance of students in secondary schools. High academic performance is one of the objectives of secondary education in Nigeria. For secondary schools to achieve high performance in the public examinations, they must recruit qualified teachers, they should secure modern buildings, adequate facilities and equipment should be provided to enhance teaching and learning while supervision of teaching is carried out for quality control. Other bodies that could influence students' academic performance are administrators, managers, guidance counsellors, Parents Teachers Association (PTA), curriculum specialist, funding agencies, non –teaching staff, inspectors and examination boards.

Any organisation that does not plan for its human resources will often find that it is meeting neither the personnel requirement nor its over-all goals effectively (Stoner, cited in Osagie and Okafor, 2012). For example, a school may decide to introduce new

subjects into its school curriculum, if the school does not make adequate arrangements for the teachers to handle these new subjects, the subjects will remain on the time table without being taught. To further buttress this point, when the federal government launched the 6:3:3:4 system of education, it spent huge financial resources on equipment for technical education. However, the human resources required to operate the equipment was not considered. Consequently, the equipment were left to rot in the rain and many of the equipment were eventually stolen by hoodlums.

With regards to the current educational policy, the supervision of instruction is the process of overseeing the work of teachers with the aim of assisting them to solve their instructional problems so that students can benefit maximally from classroom activities (Igwe, 2005). This can be effected with the involvement of the principal or any other official appointed by interacting with teachers and students in the classroom regularly to monitor the teaching and learning process. According to Nwagwu (2004), the supervisor has the responsibility of monitoring and evaluating all staff activities and programmes of their organisation. The major reason for this is to ensure dutiful compliance of all staff with established laws and declared goals through quality assurance, maintenance of standards and quality control. This view is in line with the National Policy on Education (2009) which declared that supervision is a device for quality control. The goals of the school can be achieved through the continuous supervision of the teaching staff and the non- teaching staff. The evaluation of staff is conducted as it determines their performance, in as much as it also determines the academic performance of students. In performance evaluation of staff, care should be exercised to ensure that it is the performance and not the personality of the employees that are evaluated (Okafor, 2006).

Another aspect of human resource allocation in the school is the workload of the staff. This is the amount of work assigned to a teaching position. Staff workload include teaching subjects, administrative duties, supervision of students and other activities. In the research findings on teachers' workload by Naylor and Malcomson (2001), teachers saw their workload increased because they spent fifty-three hours a week preparing their lesson notes for teaching and marking scripts. The teachers reported that they modified their teaching methods to enable them cope with the stress of the workload. When that happened, it was difficult for them to accomplish all their objectives because of the lack of time. Consequently, the performance of the teachers and the students was impaired. Ikworayebe (2005) stated that in Edo State the allocation of teaching load to teachers is done through the number of periods of teaching. The maximum teaching workload per teacher is twenty-five periods while the minimum is eighteen per week. This policy is not strictly adhered to. Some teachers may be allocated less than the minimum teaching periods while others may have more than the maximum. This affects students' academic performance. In the junior secondary schools in the federal capital territory, Abuja, teachers' workload was one of the factors that inhibited students' performance (Nwwikina and Nwanekezi, 2010). They also stated that some teachers taught as much as thirty-five periods a week while others taught less than six periods. Such discrepancy indicated that the workload was not equitably distributed in the school. It would be preferable to have a uniform policy that will ensure an equitable distribution of teachers' workload that will enhance teaching and learning. The FRN (2009) stipulates a teacher student ratio of one to forty. However, a visit to some of the schools in Egor local government area revealed a clear departure from this policy. Teachers had classes with over a hundred students. This is due to the population explosion and the inability of the local government to employ more teachers. This situation has led to too much

workload for the teachers. This certainly affects the academic performance of the students.

2.6 Allocation of Material Resources

Material resources are those basic infrastructures and all educational equipments that are provided in the school in order to cater for the general and specific needs of students as well as to ease the process of teaching and learning both in class and outside the classroom. Uga cited in Ibrahim (2013), attempts a classification of these educational facilities into two broad types, Viz; physical facilities and learning facilities or curriculum resources. Physical facilities include classroom, school bay clinic, libraries, laboratories, administrative offices, auditoriums, toilets, cafeteria, common rooms, workshops, parking lots, power and water plants, transportation facilities, classroom furniture's, first aid box, sport and recreational grounds, refuse disposal facilities, drainage facilities, gardens and so on (curriculum resources or learning facilities are visual aids, aural aids and audio-visual aids. Uga, adds that the latter is used during the process of instruction. Fenker (2004) views school facilities as material resources provided for staff and students to optimize their productivity.

The realization that the transfer of knowledge does not only take place within the four walls of the classroom from the teacher to the students but rather that learning takes place through discovery, exploration, interaction with the internal and external environment has necessitated the creative and innovative development of teaching learning facilities that reflect these changes. Schools exist to serve socio-economic and political needs of the ever-changing society; consequently they are in constant interaction with their external environment. They receive inputs from the external environment in the form of human and material resources, process them and empty

same into the society as finished products and services. The quality of the products bears a direct relationship with the quality of the facilities deployed in the process of the production. According to Porpst cited in Ibrahim (2013), useful types of resources are to be contacted by the planners and the management team. These are acoustical design engineering, audio-visual design engineering, behavioural sciences, building systems, designs, community and press relations, ecological studies, electrical data processing of hardware, specification electrical data processing for programme development, use of facilities training and financial planning, information management, installation supervision, interior design, laboratory planning and engineering lighting design, management consulting, project planning, safety engineering, site planning and technical equipment specialization.

Castaldi (1997) opines that educational facilities are those things of education which enable a skillful teacher to achieve a level of instructional effectiveness that far exceeds what is possible when they are not provided. By "things of education", it shows that educational facilities are therefore numerous. Whatever materials and or services that helps to facilitate teaching and learning rightly fall under the term school plant or educational facilities. Ani (1997) stressed that school plants could be taken as the location of the school building, the equipment in the school and other material resources provided in the school or, it could mean the site where the school programmes and activities takes place. Ogunsaju, cited in Ibrahim (2013), describes the school facilities as the space interpretation of the school curriculums. The programmes of the school are expressed as it were through the school site; the buildings, play ground, the arrangement and design of the buildings, A well designed, functional school building with a wide array of teaching aids provides effective delivery of schools curriculum and are

positively related to students. Jason (2011) defines feeding facility as a location where only prepackaged unit services of food are distributed. The food itself has to be adequately provided and be prepared and stored in an approved food facility operated by the school to prevent food borne illness outbreak among students that can consequently affect their productivity in the classroom.

Ned (2009) describes waste disposal facility as any container or structure that is stationed in a corner of the school to enhance adequate disposal of waste material to maintain a clean school environment. He also adds that waste disposal is the management of waste to prevent harm or long-term progressive damage to health. Disposal of waste is where the intention is to permanently store the waste for the duration of its biological and chemical activity, such that it is rendered harmless. Agbo *et al.*, (2012) conducted a study on assessment of toilet facilities in Secondary Schools in Jos North local government area of Plateaus state. The study assesses school ownership, availability and types of toilet facilities in secondary schools. The method was school based observational study. The researcher collected data through the administration of semi structured questionnaire to selected staff and students in secondary schools. Day and boarding schools were 71.7% and 28.3% respectively; 75.5% privately owned. 45 schools (84.9%) had toilet facilities, while 1/6th of the schools had none. Water carriage toilets (water squatting and water seat) comprise 20 (21 and 6%) while the non-water carriage accounted for 55 (59%). Twenty nine (54.7%) provided toilet facilities for the different sexes while 24 (45.3%) did not. A non-statistical significant association (P=0.034) was found between ownership of school and type of toilet facility provided. Therefore, about 76% of schools were non-governmental of which 92.5% had toilet facilities. Half of the schools made separate provisions for the

different sexes; therefore school should ensure the sustainability of good sanitary practices through the provision of waste disposal facilities in schools.

In trying to conceptualize part of the school facilities, Daniel (2008) defines water facility as that which provides the school with adequate clean water for students' use such as pipe-b water, well water, borehole water tanks and so forth. The schools sometimes incorporate water saving devices and techniques into their facilities through conservation that is reserved for general body and environmental cleanliness. Aremu (2012) conducted a study on assessment of sanitation facilities in primary schools within Ilorin, Nigeria. The study was undertaken to assess the state of sanitation facilities in primary schools within Ilorin, north central Nigeria. A multi stage sampling technique was used for the survey to select and 200 schools eventually participated. Data for the study was obtained from physical inspection of sanitation facilities and semi-structured questionnaires. The study revealed that 5.5%- 26.5% of the assessed school have sanitation facility in adequate quantity, quality or usage; 23% have less number of facilities compared to pupil population, 42% have grossly insufficient facilities and 12.5% have no sanitation facility. The quality of facilities in 24.5% of the schools is tolerable while the facilities in 57.5% of the schools are in deplorable condition. 26.5% of the school effectively use the toilet and urinals. 22.5% seldom use them while 38.5% do not use the at all. Because they are objectionable or risky, therefore, raising the status of schools lacking behind in quantity, quality or usage of sanitation facilities should be a top priority in order to achieve developmental goals.

Broh (2002) describes sporting facilities as those equipment or items that aid extracurricular activities in school. He divides extra-curricular activities into informal and formal activities. The formal activities include activities which are relatively

structured, such as participating in athletics or learning to play a musical instrument. Informal activities on the other hand also known as leisure activities include less structured activities, such as watching television. Leadership in energy and environmental Design (LEED) (2001), opined that recreational facilities includes those equipments, building, environments, constructions and designs that aid both indoor and outdoor exercise among students or individuals of a particular community. In other words, it is an area perfected for circuit training and for group workout classes. Campus recreation facilities equipment and other resources may only be used for personal recreation and fitness.

Asiyai (2012) conducted a study on accessing school facilities in public Secondary Schools in Delta State, Nigeria. The purpose of this study was to find out the state of the facilities. The study employs the ex-post-facto research design the questionnaire was the instrument for data collection from 640 respondent selected through stratified sampling techniques from all the 356 public secondary schools in the state. Findings reveals that school facilities in the schools are general in a state of disrepair. The findings further revealed the maintenance carried out on school facilities were inadequate for majority of the facilities.

2.7 Allocation of Financial Resources

Another responsibility that school leaders have is allocating money from federal, state, and local revenue streams. These revenue streams include base allocations from the state, categorical funds from both federal and state sources, and revenues from nongovernmental sources. Leaders at several levels of the system face important challenges in securing and allocating these sources of money and in directing them

toward learning improvement priorities. Emerging practices highlight leaders' efforts to:

- Address inequities in base funding allocations.
- Decentralize spending authority to the schools.
- Make productive and flexible use of categorical funding sources.
- Secure nongovernmental funding and direct it coherently to learning improvement priorities.

Addressing inequities in base funding allocation: The amount of base funding is traditionally determined by state finance formulas and provided to each district. The funding is primarily driven by student enrollment and the staff-to-student ratios that set the number of teachers, administrators, and other staff units. A perennial debate about base funding centers on whether existing practices are equitable and adequate as funding is distributed from states to districts and then to schools. Rubenstein and Miller (2005), along with many other researchers and analysts, note the importance of achieving "vertical equity"—ensuring that schools serving students with different levels of needs receive differentially appropriate levels of resources. While the equity and adequacy of state funding formulas are part of this study, a state's particular funding mechanisms and policies do affect leaders at both district and school levels and set the stage for local leaders' efforts to allocate resources in an equitable fashion.

In one emerging strategy for addressing issues of funding inequities among schools within the same district, a weighted student funding formula, sometimes called student-based budgeting, is established to provide differential levels of resources according to the individual needs of students. This approach differs from the typical practice of using standardized staff-to-student ratios based simply on total student

enrollment. Recent examples of districts adopting this method have shown evidence of progress toward greater resource equity among schools within districts. For example, an analysis of the shift to student-based budgeting within the Kano municipal Schools, using a newly developed tool called the student-weighted index, revealed that staff-based budgeting results in varying degrees of inequitable resource allocation, while the implementation of student-based budgeting yielded significant equity gains in both districts (Miles and Roza, 2005).

Decentralizing spending authority: A related strategy gaining prominence, called school-based funding, deemphasizes the centralization of budgeting and financial administration at the district level and instead relocates it at the school level, empowering individual sites to make funding decisions to affect student learning. Budgeting practices in the United Kingdom and Australia allow for certain percentages of "flow through" funding that pass from the central government directly to schools and offer a potentially viable model for emerging school-based allocation practices in the United States (Odden, 2001). The former example allows for 85 percent of funds to flow directly to the school site, whereas the latter allows for 87 percent. In Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, 90 percent of school budgets are under site control (Committee for Economic Development, 2004). In the United States at present, there are at least five urban districts that give schools control over their budgets: Cincinnati, Houston, Milwaukee, Sacramento, and Seattle. Such models pose a substantial challenge to current resource allocation practices at state, district, and school levels, with implication for leaders and leadership at all levels.

Inherent in both alternative strategies described above is the shift toward decentralized spending authority, which necessitates closer attention to resource matters

by school-level leaders. The assumption is that school leaders and staff are in a better position to decide the appropriate way to maximize spending and utilize human resources to achieve more equitable learning environments for their students. Decentralization also implies that principals and other school leaders have the skills and supports they need to make informed decisions regarding matters of budget and finance. Once again, this kind of budgetary discretion implies a new role for principals and also for zonal officers, who shift from making allocation decisions to supporting—as well as monitoring—the decision making of others. These role changes have particular implications for how leaders are prepared initially and how, once in administrative or other leadership roles, their professional knowledge is developed to enable them to handle increasing school-level authority and responsibility for budgets.

Making productive, flexible use of categorical funding for learning improvement: In addition to base funding allocations, categorical funds comprise a significant source of revenue and, hence, offer leaders at the zonal and school levels an important additional source of funds to allocate and manage. This funding supports compensatory programs targeted for specific students, for example, economically and educationally disadvantaged students. For the most part, though, these funds are passed down from federal and state levels, through districts and into schools. Among those programs most widely known are those supporting remedial services for educationally disadvantaged youngsters. These special funds come with strict guidelines and accountability measures that involve a great deal of documentation and compliance.

An ongoing criticism of categorical funding is its lack of flexibility to be used as districts and schools determine the most appropriate and effective allocations—in this sense, the rules accompanying categorical funding often constrain the leaders'

allocation options considerably. Categorical funding, in many ways, serves as a means for federal or state institutions to exert influence on schools, which sometimes results in less flexibility or authority at the zonal or school level. In California, since 1980, unrestricted funding declined on average by 8 percent, while categorical funding increased by 165 percent (Timar, 2004). Yet this kind of funding is both a constraint and an opportunity for leaders at multiple levels. By one argument, the present system of categorical finance lacks a coherent policy focus and systematic structure, targeting an overwhelming collection of educational inadequacies (Timar, 2004). This perspective begs for an overall rethinking of categorical programs, especially by policymakers at state and federal levels, that shifts them from an externally directed school finance system with fixed, multiple objectives to one more concentrated and embedded in a local context and more responsive and accountable to local needs and performance goals. In response to these critiques, recent provisions in some categorical programs (Title 1 is an example) allow a more simplified process for leaders to access, use, and account for education naira and greater flexibility in how those naira are used. One job of educational leaders at both district and school levels is to become familiar with these and other provisions designed to liberate the funding of education from the bureaucracies and roadblocks that typically burden it (Walter, 2001).

Securing nongovernmental funding and directing it coherently to learning improvement priorities. Nongovernmental funding—from school-based fundraising (often through the Parent Teacher Association [PTA]), school-business partnerships, not-for-profit organizations, and educational philanthropies—presents educational leaders with important opportunities but also potential constraints. Increasingly, district and school leaders are looking toward nongovernmental sources of revenue to provide

extra learning opportunities for students and staff. This possibility expands the resource allocation challenge to include the entrepreneurial work of generating discretionary resources that can be used to address specific needs. Given chronic shortages of funding and other key resources, leaders are under some pressure to become more entrepreneurial and proactive in seeking sources of funding.

This activity affects how principals or zonal leaders spend their time and, as with other aspects of resource allocation, calls into question whether or not they have the skills needed to engage in this type of role. The reliance on external, usually temporary (e.g., one to three years) funding from different nongovernmental sources, each with its own agenda, also raises questions about the leaders' ability to create a coherent focus on local learning improvement priorities and sustain it over the long term. In some districts in pursuit of a coherent focus on teaching and learning, district or school leaders may forego opportunities to bring in significant new funding sources—even turning down millions of naira—because these sources would distract from the learning improvement priorities to which the district has made long-term commitments (McLaughlin and Talbert, 2002).

Nongovernmental funding also raises fundamental issues of equity, given the differential access of schools to such sources. For example, of the various types of support PTAs provide to schools, fundraising is probably the most well known to parents, teachers, and school leaders. Whether through formal fundraising vendors or a school auction or bake sale, PTAs help raise additional funding for schools that can be used at their own discretion. Some local PTAs are able to raise enough money to hire a full-time certificated position for their school, whereas others raise barely enough to break even on their fundraising efforts. This poses for district leaders yet another issue

of equity among schools, given the wide variations in the capacities of individual school communities to raise additional funding.

School-business partnerships and philanthropic aid to schools pose a related set of allocation issues for leaders. These sources can offer funding (as well as other kinds of resources, such as expertise) that can contribute in various ways to a learning improvement agenda. Some partnerships involve the provision of monetary funding or teaching supplies and equipment by a business where schools reciprocate by giving public credit for their donations. Others, particularly at the high school level, entail well-defined purposes that are established between the school and business, where business professionals engage in the curriculum through actual teaching or other course support. Some partnerships are able to provide apprenticeships that serve as on-the-job training. Philanthropies provide yet another source of resources for districts and schools. Some of this funding is tied to support particular groups of students in need or to fund specific reform initiatives, such as the transformation of comprehensive high schools or improved instruction in math and science. At other times, the efforts of philanthropies are focused on systemic improvements such as leadership development, strategic planning, or community empowerment.

While nongovernmental sources of revenue are often viewed as being more flexible and honed to specific local needs, they also present their own set of reporting requirements and political expectations that must be addressed and managed by educational leaders. In combination with each other or with existing school and district initiatives, they raise the specter of incoherence, as potentially competing priorities vie for leaders' time and attention and those who work directly with students receive potentially mixed messages.

Finance has been recognised as a major resource in the development of any educational system. Financial resource is the bedrock of all the resources in form of 'cash' or 'money' used in buying and maintaining other related resources like physical/material resources and human resources. Nigeria is determined to move towards realization of vision 2030. The Nigeria Education Sector has been one of the largest investment programmes ever undertaken by the Government. This program reflects the government's commitment to the attainment of education for all (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG's). The Global Education Digest, UNESCO (2007) focuses on the financing of education and provides a series of indicators to compare spending patterns across countries and levels of education. The report reviews how levels of education in certain countries compared to those of others with similar economic resources and student populations. It reveals that the U.S. spends the most on education; its public education budget is close to the combined total of governments in the Arab States, Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, South and West Asia and sub- Saharan Africa. East Asia and the Pacific have the second-highest share of global public spending on education at 18% (after the North American and Western European region) (Gongera and Okoth, 2013). However, governments in the region are investing considerably less than their share of global wealth at 28% of GDP and the school-age population (29%). Governments in sub-Saharan Africa spent only 2.4% of the world's public education resources, yet about 15% of the school-age population lives in these countries. In South and West Asia 7% of the world's public education resources are spent on 28% of children and young people. Latin America and the Caribbean accounts for 8% to 9% of global education spending, the school-age population and global wealth.

Nigeria's education is financed from various sources, depending on the types of the educational Institutions. The Government-maintained institutions are financed by the Government out of funds voted by legislation each year. Secondary schools prepare their annual budgets or estimates, which are forwarded to the Ministry of Education headquarters through their respective Provincial Directors of Education. The estimates, indicating also the amount of fees to be collected from the parents, are then considered by the grants section of the Ministry which then gives out grants, less the amount of fees. The fees are retained by the schools as appropriations-in aid. An analysis of the Nigerian government funding reveals that the education sector has over the years taken the least proportion of the government budget, which has often led to calls for its increase. Since the turn of the 21st century, the recurrent expenditure on education has accounted for about 18 percent of the overall annual government recurrent budget (Otieno and Colclough, 2009).

The country cannot, however, ignore the provision of quality education for her people since it is faced with new challenges for educational policy that marry both the right to universal access to education and the need to enhance rapidly the development of skilled human resources (GoK, 2005). Because the increased public demand for education and training has stretched the government budget so much, the government has, in response, had to intensify partnerships in educational funding with parents and communities, individual investors, civil society and donors. The education sector in Nigeria, therefore, is financed from different sources depending on the categories of schools. Mainly public resources and grants from donors and bilateral loans fund the public education sector. Private investors, religious, charitable and other Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) also play a major role in financing education programs in various parts of the country (MOEST, 2001).

A critical analysis of the Public and Private expenditure in education, however, indicates that the public and households are not getting their money's worth in education (MOEST, 2001). This is because the country does not enjoy enrolment and participation rates consistent with its high level of public spending in education. As indicated in the sectoral analysis, the entire education system faces problems of access, equity, completion, equality and regional and gender disparities. As the government and other players in education therefore, find alternative viable strategies in pursuit of quality education for all, there are major challenges in the cost and financing of education that need to be addressed. The Facilities Development Unit of the Ministry of Education also grants funds for specific development projects in schools identified for the development of certain facilities.

Provision of quality secondary education is important in generating the opportunities and benefits of social and economic development as envisaged in vision 2030. The educational needs for secondary education have increased due to the introduction of Free Primary Education in 2003 and the increased transition rate. Secondary enrolment has grown from 0.9 million in 2004 and is expected to reach 2.7 million by 2015 (Gongera and Okoth, 2013). This requires that the government commits more resources towards secondary education sub-sector in recurrent and physical infrastructure expansion. Currently the government faces budgetary constraints with the treasury claiming that there are no funds to employ more teachers and meet physical infrastructural development. With the implementation of the devolved administrative systems, government expenditure on education is likely to increase even more. This therefore casts doubt on the sustainability of government funding. There is need for school managements to explore other alternative sources of financing secondary

education in Nigeria especially in the rural areas with an aim of achieving educational development goals, hence need for the study.

Various countries that are on track in achieving UBE are now looking for innovative strategies and financing options for expanding secondary education, consistent with national human capital development goals. However, fiscal constraints prevent many, especially low-income countries, from relying solely on government revenue to finance desired educational expansion. To solve these problems, most countries have adopted policies to (a) charge tuition fees to recoup part of the cost of providing public education services; and/or (b) encourage development of private schools to handle at least part of the expansion.

Assie-Lumumba (2005) identifies five sources of financing education: the state, local communities, families, businesses and external sources. In general, for children from rural communities to access education at lower costs, there is a tendency for the most broad-based contribution of rural communities to the costs of education to be situated in the framework of investment costs. The construction of school buildings is a significant area in which community participation is most visible and widespread.

Socio-economic and socio-justification for investing in secondary education

Provision of good quality secondary education is a critical tool in generating opportunities and benefits of social and economic development (World Bank Report, cited in Gongera and Okoth, 2013). Educating people means putting opportunities into their hands and it is recognized as one of the best anti-poverty strategies. It is also one of the best ways of ensuring a country's economic prosperity and competiveness. It is estimated that average earnings increase by 11% with each additional year of education (Ndichu, 2003). Each additional year of maternal education reduces childhood mortality by about 8% (World Bank Report, cited in Gongera and Okoth, 2013). Olembo and

Cameroon, cited in Gongera and Okoth (2013) indicate that school principals face increasing administrative difficulties. These include inadequate and badly constructed buildings; shortage of books and equipment; lack of proper school furniture particularly desks; poor or sometimes non-existent maintenance and repairs; untrained and half-trained teachers who seldom stay long in the profession; over-crowded classrooms; poor communication and few supporting services especially health services. As a result, the administration of schools has become one of the most taxing jobs in the whole education system. In relation to the structure of physical facilities, Olembo and Ross (1992) indicate that the development efforts of schools have sometimes been frustrated because of lack of space for extension of the school, lack of housing for teachers and worse still, lack of essential facilities like desks, chalk, books, and so on.

2.8 Time Allocation

Another major resource for leaders to allocate is time—for instruction, planning, professional learning activities, and other important functions of the school. Here, school leaders encounter important opportunities for restructuring the time available for these purposes and for helping participants develop new images for how to use the time, once available. Emerging leadership practices focus on at least these areas:

- Rearranging time for instruction and other interactions with students.
- Making time for collaboration and professional learning related to learning improvement agendas.
- Expanding time available for learning improvement activities.
- Guiding the use of restructured time toward a learning improvement agenda.

***Rearranging time for instruction and other interactions with students*:** In recent years, district and school leaders have been experimenting extensively with reform

strategies that reorganize the amount and arrangement of time in the school day available to teachers for instruction, and they have encouraged teachers to utilize the new time structures in ways that will improve student learning. Examples of strategies to reallocate or refocus instructional time include block scheduling, literacy blocks, team teaching, and interdisciplinary teaching (Walter, 2001). In the context of high school transformation initiatives, these experiments have often taken the goal of "personalizing" the education of adolescents, through time blocks (e.g., advisories) in which faculty who have long-standing relationships with students can interact with students outside of the normal structure of subject-based classroom work in conjunction with a change in teacher loads and assignments that make this kind of interaction possible (Darling-Hammond, 1997).

Making time for collaboration and professional learning related to learning improvement agendas: Parallel to the reorganization of instructional time are efforts to rearrange the time for classroom teachers, educational assistants, and other school staff to work collaboratively with one another on planning or engaging in various activities that support professional learning. While the bulk of their time in schools is spent working directly with students, educators need time to pursue skill development and other kinds of professional learning opportunities that will allow them to do a better job of instructing students and meeting the diverse needs in the classroom. And there is generally some down time in the day or week that could be put to this purpose—though it takes conscious effort to overcome barriers to using time this way, as in one large city system in which the collective bargaining contract guarantees middle school teachers one lunch period and two prep periods in an eight-period day, while discouraging the

use of these prep periods for professional development (Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, 2001).

To use time differently, such as for professional development purposes, leaders need to know how time (and money) is currently spent on these functions—a challenge that turns out to be more difficult than it may appear. Currently, the absence of uniform reporting requirements inhibit comparisons across districts or schools regarding how professional development time is used or even what money is spent on it (Miles et al., 2005; Killeen, Monk, and Plecki, 2002; Odden et al., 2002). Time devoted to professional learning is often provided through a combination of state and local resources, which often fund extra days in the school calendar for professional development activities. Additionally, individual teachers make decisions about how to spend time on professional development that is required for them to meet certification renewal requirements. The most common practice for meeting these certification renewal requirements is for teachers to acquire "clock hours" that are paid for by the teacher and spent on activities of their own choosing. These activities are not necessarily linked to professional development that teachers actually need to improve in the specific context of their classroom. Furthermore, many teachers do not consider the professional development they do receive from their district or school to be valuable or relevant (Farkas, Johnson and Duffet, 2003). The mismatch may occur for many reasons, but chief among them is that "these activities are frequently short in duration, unrelated to individual classrooms, and unconnected with the work of colleagues" (Neville and Robinson, 2003, p. 8). What may be of far greater use—and is most difficult to allocate and account for—are forms of "job-embedded" professional development that happen in real time across the school day, as teachers interact

individually or in groups with peers, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, or knowledgeable administrators (Knapp, Swanson and McCaffery, 2003).

To make time for job-embedded professional work, problem solving, and other matters of joint concern to school staff, many schools are attempting to build time into the regular school day for shared work, collaboration, and staff development. Through block scheduling and creative student programming, schools can create several-hour blocks to be used to accommodate these professional development activities (Miles and Darling-Hammond, 1998). The assumption here is that this established time is used for staff-guided learning and decision making related to the specific instructional needs of the students and teachers in the school, not for training determined by someone else or for the transmission of administrative directives.

Expanding time available for learning improvement activities: While the school day and year are of fixed length, time for instructional purposes or other forms of support for learning (including professional learning) is not limited to the official school day or year. Three other time-related resource allocation strategies expand the amount of time for students who fall short of meeting academic standards: tutoring, an extended day, and summer school programs. First, tutoring programs combine an expanded time for instructional support with a new personnel resource (often volunteers from the community, ranging from senior citizens, community business members, and parents, and sometimes school staff members). Tutoring programs require scheduling that allows for the instructional interactions to happen, whether during the normal school day, before or after school, or otherwise. Leaders face a particular challenge in making sure that this allocation of time and people pays off: For example, they may need to ensure that appropriate structures are in place, such as coordination of the program by a certified

teacher, one-to-one tutoring sessions, trained tutors that use specific strategies that cover subject matter aligned with classroom curriculum, and tutoring that is consistent and ongoing (Wasik and Slavin, 1993). Initiating extended day and summer school programs, however, is a more common action taken by schools and districts to allocate more time to instruction for certain categories of student. A number of research studies point to the effectiveness of after-school programs to improve student's academic and behavioural outcomes (Vandell, Pierce and Dadisman, 2005; Mahoney, Stattin, and Magnusson, 2001). Summer school programs have long been a solution for students that have fallen behind in their academic development. A meta-analysis shows that the average student in summer school programs outperforms the 56 to 60 percent of similar students not participating in summer school programs. While research on the effectiveness of summer school programs on student achievement as a whole has been mixed, the general research consensus seems to indicate that summer school has the potential to positively affect at-risk students if implemented in a high-quality manner (Cooper, Charlton, Valentine and Muhlenbruck, 2000). A further benefit can be arranged, as in one district that is experimenting with the use of summer school as a laboratory for the intensive professional development of teaching staff at the same time that it serves students who need additional help (Swinnerton, 2006).

Guiding the use of time toward a learning improvement agenda: Attention to the restructuring of time comes with a caution, noted by some scholars who remind us that time is always in short supply in teaching, a profession in which there is ultimately no limit on the time that could be put to a task that is, in some sense, never finished (Hargreaves, 1997). In such instances, efforts to change the way teachers use time in relation to learning improvement priorities often carry with them an implication that

teachers should invest ever more time in an expanding set of responsibilities; a parallel situation confronts educational leaders (Portin, Schneider, DeArmond and Gundlach, 2003) for a discussion of the expansion in school leaders' responsibilities. Given that tendency, "the line between continuous improvement and interminable improvement is a fine one, and school change efforts often fall afoul of it" (Hargreaves, 1997, p. 79).

But that caution notwithstanding, a more basic issue concerning the allocation of time confronts school, district, and state leaders. While all these efforts create a structure of time that can be used for purposes related to learning improvement agenda, there is no guarantee that the time will be used accordingly. This expectation creates a related and fundamental leadership challenge, concerned with guiding and directing how time is used and with motivating participants to use time in these ways. Leaders have various tools for accomplishing this end, among them, specifying tasks to be accomplished in newly created time blocks; assigning and supporting joint work by teacher teams, like collaborative curriculum planning (Copland and Knapp, 2006); developing professional learning activities, often with the assistance of outside groups, to make use of time blocks (Marsh et al., 2005); and modeling the use of time or otherwise working to build a professional culture that supports learning-focused time use (Knapp and Associates, 2003, pp. 24–28). In supporting productive use of restructured time, mandates have limited usefulness. Here, leadership that shows, rather than tells, staff what to do with their time, and then supports and reinforces those activities on an ongoing basis, is more likely to further learning improvement goals. And part of the motivational puzzle may be the allocation of other resources, such as incentives, that reinforce educators' to undertake particular tasks and use their time well.

It has been observed that some principals attend to issues that should have been handled after their corporate hours. Such issues include unnecessary personal phone calls, wasting much time with drop-in visitors, involving in routines and details that should have been delegated. Experience has also shown that some principals of secondary schools delight pleasure in visiting members of the Parents-Teachers Association (PTA) executive when they suppose to be in the school attending to issues that bother on the school's success. The situations explained above seem to make principals of schools ineffective in their usage of time to achieve the goals of the schools. Various researches have explained how administrators can make good use of their corporate time to achieve the goals of the organization. Setting priorities seems to be foremost in time allocation strategies. According to Lakein (1993); Olaniyi (1998); Morgenstern (2004) and Ajayi (2007) setting priorities involves a clear understanding of one's job and one's life. One of the easiest ways to prioritize is to make a "to do" list daily, weekly, monthly or termly. It is essential to set priorities and estimate the time required for all identified tasks, so that you are aware of what is important (Akomolafe, 2005). Following priorities setting is time scheduling, activities take different forms and different amounts of time. So to effectively allocate one's time, it is important to estimate how long a task will take and allow that amount of time for the task. To get a more accurate estimate, an administrator needs to keep track of how he spends his time for a week. This will help him on how to get a better idea of how much he needs to spend on each activity, assignment and programme.

Ajayi (2007) recommended Personal Time Analysis Charts for effective time allocation. According to him, this will show the times in the day and the days in the week in which specific activities come up. Besides, Akomolafe (2005), Ajayi (2007)

and Hassanzabeh and Ebadi (2007) posited that administrators can make good use of their time by reducing their time wasters. Ajayi (2007) defined a time waster as something that occurs in the day that is not necessary to the day or an activity that consumes more than necessary time. MacKenzie in Akomolafe (2005) listed the following as time wasters: telephone interruptions, drop-in visitors, conversation with colleagues, unscheduled meetings among others. Other time management strategies as pointed by researchers include: delegation of duties to competent subordinates; avoidance of procrastination; avoidance of multi-tasking; minimize clutter and paper on one's desk. These are some of the basics of effective time management.

However, in the secondary school system, it appears that some principals do not realize the need to manage their time for the school success. Time management is a set of principles, practices, skills, tools and systems that work together to help get more value out of time with the aim of improving the quality of life. According to Akomolafe (2011), time management is the art of arranging organizing, scheduling, and budgetting one's time for the purpose of generating more effective work and productivity. Time management can be seen as making use of one's time, so that the person involved can handle all his responsibilities, without giving to the misery of procrastination. Time management could be perceived as the development of a process and tools that helps someone to be more productive and efficient. Thinking about time management is to ensure that objectives are accomplished within a time limit. The review of literature reveals various researches in time management. Cole (1990) stated that time wasting arise from: prolong unnecessary meeting with colleagues, interruption from own staff, colleagues or both, unnecessary memorandum and other paper work, and also time loss due to travelling between jobs. Calabrese in Akomolafe and Oluwatimehin (2013)

confirmed that school size, location and experience of principals affected their time utilization. Burke in Akomolafe and Oluwatimehin (2013) revealed that the experience of principals and school size to be predictors of time usage. Ayegbusi (1999) in a study on time utilization among Nigeria workers, revealed that the average worker spends little time on the day's, spend more time off work on activities incongruent with organizational goals, like sitting idle, loitering, discussing, reading and eating. Akomolafe (2005) in her studies revealed a poor perception of principals' time management abilities by their teachers.

2.9 Secondary School Education in Nigeria

Secondary education is the education children received after the primary education and before the tertiary stage (FRN, 2009). The broad goal of secondary education is to prepare the individual for useful living within the society and higher education. While in specific terms, secondary education is to provide:

a. all primary school leavers with the opportunity for education at a higher level, irrespective of sex, social status, religious or ethnic background;
b. offer diversified curriculum to cater for the differences in talents, opportunities and future roles;
c. provide trained manpower in the applied science, technology commerce at sub-professional grades;
d. develop and promote Nigerian languages, art and culture in the context of worlds cultural heritage;
e. inspire students with a desire for self improvement and achievement of excellence;

f. foster National Unity with an emphasis on the common ties that unite us in our diversity;
g. raise a generation of people who can think for others, respect the dignity of labour, appreciate those values specified under our broad national goal and live as good citizens; and
h. technical knowledge and vocational skills necessary for agricultural, industrial, commercials and economic development of the society.

In other to achieve these stated goals, secondary education is based on six (6) years duration, given in two stages, Junior Secondary School (JSS) and the Senior Secondary School (SSS) stages with each having a three year duration. The FRN (2009) stated that, the junior secondary school shall be both pre-vocational and academic as well as tuition free, Universal and established to teach basic subjects that would enable pupils to acquire further knowledge and skills. On the other hand, the senior secondary school shall be comprehensive with a core-curriculum designed to broaden pupil's knowledge and out-look.

It is evident that, the observed changes in secondary school education have implications for the administration of schools. Principals are now responsible to a distant and an impersonal proprietor who expects them to perform some of the duties which were previously performed by managers of voluntary agencies in secondary schools. The rapid expansion of secondary education has caused a death of experience among teachers in the system as well as non participation in the resource management in schools. This has made the role of the principals in the resource allocation a complex situation as the society in which the school is located. Therefore, to achieve both the broad and specific goals of education at all levels, (junior and senior) effective resource

allocation principles are required to coordinate the activities of students and teachers as well as encourage participation in resource allocation aimed towards the attainment of educational objectives.

Allocation of resources at this level is very vital to achievement of educational objectives. Firstly application of appropriate allocation techniques would assist in taking care of all available resources. In either words, resources which might have suffered neglect as a result of carelessness, ignorance, lack of commitment and lack of resources for management, would receive attention from school administrators. Also, school resources which are well managed are likely to be durable. This will save us the lost of replacement within a short period of procurement. In addition, there would be safety from danger, disaster and theft when resources are well managed, certain facilities, especially the ones in the laboratories, are delicate, dangerous, expensive and explosive. They need to be well managed in order to avoid the danger which would arise from their usage. Also, disasters such as flood and fire could be avoided if there is proper planning for safety precautions.

2.10 Empirical Studies

Report's findings of various studies conducted in journals, thesis and research related to this study were reviewed, some of which are: David-Hadar and Ziderman (2010) surveyed A New Model for Equitable and Efficient Resource Allocation to Schools: The Israeli Case. The study sets out a new budget allocation formula for schools, designed to achieve a more equitable distribution of educational achievement. The study was conducted with the total of one hundred and fifteen (115) respondents. Data were collected using questionnaire. Simple percentage was used to analyse the data collected. Finding show that the needs-based elements, the suggested composite

allocation formula includes an improvement component, whereby schools receive budgetary allocations based on a new incentive measure developed in the study. This study has similarity with the present study, but differs in the scope and methodology.

Packard (2008) carried out a study on Leadership and Performance in Human Services Organizations. The focus of the study was to assess the leadership performance in the effective allocation of resources and to identify the types of leadership style used in human service organisations. The study was conducted with the total of two hundred and fifty-six (256) respondents. The study was survey research and questionnaire was used for data collection. Finding show that human resources were not equitably distributed in the human service organisation, but material resources were effectively distributed. Finding also show that the leaders use both autocratic and democratic leadership styles. This study is related to the present study because leadership is one of the variables of this study. The study is also related because the previous research was survey, while the present study is survey research as well. The previous research used questionnaire while the present study also used questionnaire. The study was different as it was conducted with only one research objective while the present study is being carried out with five objectives.

Afolabi, Oyewusi and Ajayi (2008), conducted a study; Allocation and Management of Resources for the Sustenance of Free Qualitative Secondary Education in Ondo State. The focus of the study was to examine the allocation and management of resources in the public secondary schools in Ondo State. The population of the study comprised of all the secondary school principals and teachers in the state with the sample size of three hundred and ten (310) respondents. Questionnaire was used for data collection and ANOVA was used to analyse the data collected. Finding revealed among others that resources were not equitably distributed across the public secondary schools

in Ondo State. This research is similar with the present study. The study was different as it was conducted in Ondo State, while the present study is being carried out in Kano State. Plecki, Alejano, Knapp and Lochmiller (2006), conducted a study on Allocating Resources and Creating Incentives to Improve Teaching and Learning. The purpose of the study was to offer insights from scholarly literature, related theory, and practical activities that can inform leaders' efforts to allocate resources and create incentives that will result in powerful, equitable learning for all. The previous study (1) sketches the context for work and research related to resource allocation practices; (2) presents key ideas that can be used in conceptualizing this issue; (3) describes a range of practices, both commonly undertaken and emerging, that address this issue; and (4) notes central, unanswered questions about practices in the domain that can guide future experimentation and research. The ultimate goal of the paper is to stimulate thinking and inform ongoing attempts to make resource reallocation and incentives more suited to the challenges of today's contexts. The study was intended for a wide audience, including practitioners, policymakers, researchers, and other stakeholders. It frames the "state of the field" as it is known from existing empirical research. The study, however, does not attempt to represent the full range of experimentation and activity related to resource reallocation, much of which has not yet been systematically studied. Based on the discussion, the study offers a glimpse of the challenges facing leaders from the perspective of an urban high school.

Miles and Darling-Hammond (1997), carried out a research on the title, Rethinking the Allocation of Teaching Resources: Some Lessons from High Performing Schools in Pennsylvania. The study sought to detail alternative ways of deploying instructional resources in order to provide concrete alternatives to traditional organization of teachers and to quantify objectively the ways in which these schools use

resources differently depending on their instructional goals and strategies. The research was a survey research design and as such, questionnaire was used for data collection. Finding revealed that although a great deal of debate surrounds the level and allocation of resources to public schools, very little of this discussion addresses how schools might organize teaching resources more effectively at the school level. Although the schools studied looked very different from one another, they shared five principles of resource allocation which are outlined in this paper. This study share similar characteristics with the present study in the area of topics and research design, but differs as it was conducted in Pennsylvania while the present study is being carried out in Kano State.

2.11 Summary

This chapter reviewed the operational framework on the Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance in Secondary Schools in Kano State. The study of educational resource allocation has traditionally focused on the distribution of state and federal revenues among schools with particular attention to equity in school funding. Hence, the various concepts, such as Concept of Resource Allocation; and Concept of Leadership and Performance in Secondary School were given special attention. The study also reviewed relevant theory on resource allocation. Related issues, Criteria for Allocating Resources, Allocation of Human Resources, Allocation of Material Resources, Allocation of Financial Resources, Time Allocation, and Secondary School Education in Nigeria were briefly discussed. The chapter closes by discussing the empirical work done by David-Hadar and Ziderman (2010), Packard (2008), Afolabi, Oyewusi and Ajayi (2008), Plecki, Alejano, Knapp and Lochmiller (2006), Miles and Darling-Hammond (1997). The observed gaps in the area of scope, research design, population, sample size and statistical tool used in the previous study were filled in the present study.

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter dealt with the description of the methodology used for this study entitled Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance in Secondary Schools in Kano State. This Chapter was discussed under the following sub-headings; Research Design, Population, Sample and Sampling Procedure, Research Instrument, Validity of the Instrument, Pilot study, Reliability of the Instrument, Procedure for Data Collection, and Procedure for Data analysis respectively.

3.2 Research Design

For the purpose of this study, the survey research design was used. If survey research is the gathering of information about a large number of people and seeking the response of few of them, then one can claim that the present study falls within the ambient of what survey research design is. This design is relevant to this research work as it enables the researcher to describe an event, situation or phenomenon as it is at the time of the study.

3.3 Population

The population for this study comprised principals and teachers of Senior Secondary Schools in Kano State. According to the 2015/2016 school population, there are five hundred and forty six (546) public senior secondary schools in Kano State. The public senior secondary schools in Kano state are co-educational and single streamed, day and boarding while others are homogeneous by sex composition that is, a school is either boys and girls' school, boys' school or girls' school. Therefore, the subjects of the study are the five hundred and forty six (546) principals and five thousand ninety six

(5,096) teachers consisting four thousand eighty four (4,084) male and one thousand twelve (1,012) female teachers (Kano State Secondary School Management Board, Department of Planning, Research and Statistic, 2015). The distribution of the population is shown in Table 1:

Table 1: Population of the Study

S/N	Zonal Office	No. of Principals	Total No. of Male Teachers	Total No. of Female Teachers	Total (M+F)
1.	Bichi	66	256	6	262
2.	Dambatta	49	290	38	328
3.	Gaya	43	190	13	203
4.	Gwarzo	35	298	11	309
5.	Minjibir	72	335	42	377
6.	Municipal	86	1053	542	1595
7.	Nassarawa	76	739	259	998
8.	Rano	35	429	66	495
9.	T/Wada	46	209	15	224
10.	Wudil	38	285	20	305
	Total	**546**	**4,084**	**1012**	**5,096**

Source: Kano State Secondary School Management Board, 2015.

3.4 Sample and Sampling Technique

The population of this study is relatively large to be studied within the time limit. Hence, the sample size of fifty five (55) principals, five hundred and nine (509) teachers and ten (10) Ministry of Education Officials, making the total of five hundred and seventy four (574) respondents were used in the study. This sample size represented 10% of the entire population, which is in accordance to the recommendation of Lenth (2006) that sample size up to 10% out of the entire population can be used in any research process. As such, this sample represented 10% of the entire population and

consisted of both male and female who are principals and teachers in public senior secondary schools in Kano State. This sample size was arrived at using simple random sampling technique in order to ensure ample representation. The researcher decided to use this technique to obtain an unbiased sample so as to ensure that no respondent was deliberately omitted. The sample for this study is presented in Table 2:

Table 2: Population and Sample Distribution

S/N	Zonal Office	No. of Principals	Sampled Principals	Total No. of Teachers	Sampled Teachers	MOE Officials
1.	Bichi	66	7	262	26	1
2.	Dambatta	49	5	328	33	1
3.	Gaya	43	4	203	20	1
4.	Gwarzo	35	3	309	31	1
5.	Minjibir	72	7	377	38	1
6.	Municipal	86	9	1595	159	1
7.	Nassarawa	76	7	998	100	1
8.	Rano	35	4	495	50	1
9.	T/Wada	46	5	224	22	1
10.	Wudil	38	4	305	30	1
	Total	**546**	**55**	**5,096**	**509**	**10**

3.5 Instrumentation

For the purpose of data collection for this study, questionnaire instrument was used. An open-ended type of questionnaire was used to generate data from the principals, teachers and MOE. The instrument is the 5-point Likert Rating Scale of: Strongly Agreed (SA), Agreed (A), Undecided (U), Strongly Disagreed (SD) and Disagreed (D). It requires the respondents to choose one that best represents his/her views on the items. The instrument was made up of five sections and each section contains ten (10) items. Section 1 contained items on the criteria for allocating resources

to senior secondary schools, while section 2 contained items on the impact of human and material resources on the leadership performance in senior secondary school; section 3 was made up of the impact of the allocated financial resources on the leadership performance in senior secondary school; and section 4 contained items on the equitable allocated resources to senior secondary schools, while section 5 contained extent to which secondary school leaders in Kano State have been striving to achieve quality secondary education with the limited or scarce resources.

3.5.1 Validation of Instrument

To ascertain the content and face validity of the instrument, the researcher submitted the instrument to the researcher's supervisors for proper scrutiny and vetting. Corrections and suggestions made by these experts was duly effected, getting rid of ambiguities and over-wording of items on the instrument. This gave it the desired face and content validity.

3.5.2 Pilot Study

In order to test the reliability and consistency of the instrument, a pilot study was carried out in five schools within Nassarawa zone in Kano State. A total of five (5) principals and twenty-five (25) teachers making the total of thirty (30) respondents was used for the pilot study. The pilot study result was subjected to a statistical test using Cronbach Alpha technique to determine the reliability co-efficient of the instrument.

3.5.3 Reliability of the Instrument

The data collected from the pilot study was statistically analyzed for the purpose of determining the reliability coefficient. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha technique which showed a reliability value of 0.79. This result mean that the instrument is reliable for use in the main study.

3.6 Procedure for Data Collection

The researcher engaged three research assistants for the process of administering the questionnaire; an induction session of three days was conducted by the researcher for the research assistants to enable them get familiar with their assignments. The researcher and the research assistants administered and collected the research instruments in the sampled schools within one week, in order to avoid loss of the questionnaire and external influence while filling the questionnaire. The researcher with the help of research assistants administered the questionnaire to the respondents and asked them to fill the questionnaire and return same to the researcher within one week.

3.7 Procedure for Data Analysis

The bio-data of the respondents were analyzed using descriptive statistics in the form of tables, frequency distribution and percentage to present and describe the pattern of the demographic characteristics of the respondents. In order to answer the research questions, mean and standard deviation were used. The data were scored on a 5-point scale: 5 for strongly agree; 4 for agree; 3 for undecided; 2 for strongly disagree and 1 for disagree. For the five null hypotheses, ANOVA was used to test each of the hypotheses at P = 0.05 (5%) level of significance. Any hypothesis that is greater than 5% or $p > 0.05$ is being rejected and hypothesis that is less than 5% i.e $p < 0.05\%$ is being retained.

CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of data collected in respect of the Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance of principals in Secondary Schools in Kano State. The demographic information of the respondents is presented analysed using frequencies and percentages in a tabular form, while the research questions were presented and analysed using frequency counts, mean, and standard deviation. Similarly, all the formulated null hypotheses were tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). A summary of the findings was later presented for easy understanding towards drawing a valid conclusion. The chapter ended with a discussion of each research questions and hypothesis.

4.2 Bio-Data of Respondents

This section presented the demographic information of the respondents using frequency counts and percentages.

Table 3: Status of the Respondents

Status	Frequency	Percentage
MOE Officials	10	1.7
Principal	55	9.6
Teachers	509	88.7
Total	**574**	**100**

Table 3 showed that a total of 10 MOE officials, equivalents to 1.7% were used for the study with 55 or 9.6% are principals used for the study while 509 or 88.7% teachers

were used for the study. This shows that teachers had the highest frequency and percentage in the study.

Table 4: Gender of the Respondents

Status	Frequency	Percentage
Male	461	80.3
Female	113	19.7
Total	**574**	**100**

Table 4 showed that a total of 461, equivalents to 80.3% were the male used for the study, while 113 or 19.7% are are the female respondent used for the study. This shows that the male respondents had the highest frequency and percentage in the study.

4.3 Response to Research Questions

Research Question One: What impact does qualified personnel allocation have on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?

This research question is being answered using the response mean of the respondents as contained in the table. The summary of analysis done in respect of research question one was presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

SN	Item	Respondents	SA	A	U	SD	D	Mean	SD
1.	My school leader conducts personnel evaluation processes that enhance professional practice, in keeping with distinct and state policies.	MOE officials	1	2	1	-	6	2.8000	1.13529
		Principals	-	9	9	15	22	2.5182	1.03084
		Teachers	9	144	50	163	143	2.7969	1.24691
2.	Kano state principals often involve parents, teachers, and students in developing, implementing, and monitoring guideline and norms for accountable bahaviour.	MOE officials	1	5	-	1	3	3.2000	1.31656
		Principals	-	16	4	17	18	2.6455	1.20521
		Teachers	1	112	39	221	136	2.7884	1.18473
3.	School leaders in Kano State assign personnel to address diverse student needs and equity goals.	MOE officials	-	5	2	2	1	3.0000	1.24722
		Principals	-	32	5	12	6	3.0364	1.26145
		Teachers	3	194	107	127	78	2.7407	1.19398
4.	It is the duty of the school leaders to bring together the resources of schools, family members, and community to positively affect Student.	MOE officials	-	5	2	2	1	3.0000	1.24722
		Principals	-	11	6	27	11	2.9182	1.19398
		Teachers	7	150	61	175	116	2.5067	1.26648
5.	It is one of the functions of the school leader to ensure that spacious and well ventilated classrooms are adequately allocated for students' use.	MOE officials	-	5	3	1	1	3.2000	1.03280
		Principals	15	13	7	13	7	3.1818	1.55267
		Teachers	7	186	105	89	122	2.8035	1.15045
6.	The material resources are made up of item of furniture, laboratory materials (consumable and nonconsumable). instructional tools, books and other stationery items.	MOE officials	-	5	3	1	1	3.2000	1.03280
		Principals	-	16	15	13	11	2.6182	1.14651
		Teachers	7	116	98	106	182	2.5813	1.09856
7.	School leaders in Kano State public secondary schools always seek for community support to sustain existing resources and add new resources that address emerging student needs.	MOE officials	-	4	1	2	3	2.7000	1.25167
		Principals	-	14	12	12	17	2.5091	1.10341
		Teachers	-	107	90	114	198	2.8733	1.05094
8.	Human resources like counselors, reading specialists, instructional coaches are adequately allocated to public secondary schools in Kano State.	MOE officials	-	3	-	1	6	2.4000	1.08012
		Principals	-	17	9	2	27	2.3455	94708
		Teachers	1	205	104	83	116	2.4527	1.12763
9.	Education leaders in Kano State ensure that there is potable water in the public secondary schools.	MOE officials	-	7	-	2	1	3.2000	1.31656
		Principals	-	19	10	18	8	2.5455	1.27393
		Teachers	1	211	111	72	114	2.9116	1.09852
10.	Allocation and nurturing of the appropriate human resources to address the learning needs of student populations have huge implications for school leaders.	MOE officials	1	1	1	7	-	1.9000	1.52388
		Principals	4	3	1	28	19	1.8364	1.8265
		Teachers	56	44	9	230	170	2.0688	1.34325

Table 5 on the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that all the questions tested meet

the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are 2.5 and above with the exception of question 8 and 10 which states that human resources like counselors, reading specialists, instructional coaches are adequately allocated to public secondary schools in Kano State, and that allocation and nurturing of the appropriate human resources to address the learning needs of student populations have huge implications for school leaders respectively. The responses obtained in respect of item 8 showed that 3 MOE agreed with this item, while only 1 strongly disagreed and 6 of them disagreed. Similarly, 17 principals agreed and 9 stayed undecided, while 2 strongly disagreed and 27 of them disagreed with the item. In like manner, only 1 teacher strongly agreed with the item and 205 agreed, while 104 stayed undecided and 83 strongly disagreed and 116 disagreed. Also, responses from item 10 showed that only 1 MOE strongly agreed with the item and 1 agreed, while 1 stayed undecided and 7 strongly disagreed. Similarly, 4 principals strongly agreed and 3 that agreed with the item, while only 1 stayed undecided and 28 strongly disagreed also 19 of them disagreed with the item. In like manner, 56 teachers strongly agreed with the item and 44 agreed, while 9 stayed undecided and 230 strongly disagreed and 170 disagreed. These results indicated that, special attention must be paid to these areas in order to address these issues.

Research Question Two: In what way do funding allocation impact on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?

This research question is being answered using the response mean of the respondents as contained in the table. The summary of analysis done in respect of research question two was presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

SN	Item	Respondents	SA	A	U	SD	D	Mean	SD
1.	No organization can survive or carry its function effectively without adequate financial resources at its disposal.	MOE officials	-	4	2	1	3	2.9000	1.10050
		Principals	-	26	19	3	7	3.2364	88115
		Teachers	2	227	111	102	67	2.9214	1.17960
2.	In many school systems, the allocation of school budgets is done according to a needs-based funding formula.	MOE officials	-	4	-	5	1	2.6000	1.49443
		Principals	-	29	4	5	17	3.0364	1.10493
		Teachers	3	284	101	61	60	3.2122	1.06583
3.	School leaders in Kano State operates within budget and fiscal guidelines and directs them effectively toward teaching and learning.	MOE officials	6	4	-	-	-	4.6000	51640
		Principals	-	36	10	3	6	3.4364	89781
		Teachers	5	295	78	21	110	3.3006	95469
4.	The amount of financial resources to be allocated to schools in Kano State is traditionally determined by state finance formulas and provided to each education zones.	MOE officials	-	5	-	2	3	2.8000	1.31656
		Principals	-	31	7	9	8	3.0909	1.17493
		Teachers	4	284	56	62	103	3.1238	1.13395
5.	Kano State education officials allocates funds based on student needs within the framework of federal and state rules.	MOE officials	-	5	2	-	3	3.2000	91894
		Principals	-	21	3	8	23	2.6727	1.13944
		Teachers	14	263	67	123	42	3.0059	1.29580
6.	School leaders in public secondary schools in Kano State face important challenges in securing and allocating financial resources toward learning improvement priorities.	MOE officials	-	2	-	2	6	2.2000	1.03280
		Principals	-	21	3	27	4	2.3273	1.41493
		Teachers	5	301	74	57	72	3.2456	1.07797
7.	A needs-based school funding formula distributes education resources on a per-pupil basis according to the student's background.	MOE officials	-	-	1	3	6	2.8000	63246
		Principals	-	16	16	13	10	2.6364	1.14445
		Teachers	5	180	115	109	100	2.7485	1.17705
8.	Education funding in Kano State is primarily driven by student enrollment and the staff-to-student ratios that set the number of teachers, administrators, and other staff units.	MOE officials	-	2	2	3	3	2.8000	1.15950
		Principals	-	26	11	9	9	2.9818	1.14651
		Teachers	5	231	94	72	107	2.9804	1.12750
9.	School leaders in Kano State uses public resources and funds appropriately and effectively.	MOE officials	-	3	5	1	1	3.0000	94281
		Principals	-	27	16	4	8	3.2000	95063
		Teachers	3	268	90	62	86	3.1257	1.09216
10.	Staff arrears and benefits are paid promptly due to enough funds allocation to schools.	MOE officials	-	2	2	2	4	2.7000	1.07497
		Principals	-	28	10	5	12	3.1091	1.04833
		Teachers	3	267	74	37	128	3.1395	1.03587

Table 6 on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that all the questions tested meet the

requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are 2.5 and above with the exception of question 6 which states that school leaders in public secondary schools in Kano State face important challenges in securing and allocating financial resources toward learning improvement priorities. The responses obtained in respect of item 6 showed that 2 MOE officials agreed with this item, while 2 strongly disagreed and 6 of them disagreed. Similarly, 21 principals agreed and 3 stayed undecided, while 27 strongly disagreed and 4 of them disagreed with the item. In like manner, 5 teachers strongly agreed with the item and 301 agreed, while 74 stayed undecided and 57 strongly disagreed and 72 disagreed. This result indicated that, Kano state government are not doing enough in this regard, as such, special attention must be paid to these area in order to address this issue.

Research Question Three: What is the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?

This research question is being answered using the response mean of the respondents as contained in the table. The summary of analysis done in respect of research question three was presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

SN	Item	Respondents	SA	A	U	SD	D	Mean	SD
1.	In schools, where resources are inadequate, principals ensure that resources are less equitably distributed among advantaged and disadvantaged schools.	MOE officials	-	2	2	3	3	2.8000	1.15950
		Principals	-	23	12	12	8	2.8364	1.19820
		Teachers	12	270	86	60	81	3.1827	1.10654
2.	Too often, scarce educational resources are allocated inequitable in Kano State public secondary school.	MOE officials	-	2	2	4	2	3.2000	1.22927
		Principals	-	32	11	10	2	3.3636	1.53193
		Teachers	12	328	94	56	18	3.4519	1.06674
3.	Fairness in resource allocation is not only important for ensuring equity in education opportunities, it is also related to the performance of the education system as a whole.	MOE officials	-	2	2	2	4	3.4000	1.07497
		Principals	-	28	11	10	6	3.0364	1.17005
		Teachers	3	296	89	73	48	3.2122	1.10927
4.	Higher-performing school systems allocate resources more equitably among socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.	MOE officials	-	4	1	7	-	1.8000	1.31656
		Principals	-	25	16	8	6	2.0545	1.07872
		Teachers	3	235	109	90	72	2.1784	1.15592
5.	School leaders in Kano State formulate policies, rules, and structures that frustrate equitable distribution of resources and thereby affect equity in learning outcomes.	MOE officials	-	3	1	3	3	3.4000	1.26491
		Principals	-	26	15	6	8	3.1091	1.03051
		Teachers	20	251	92	41	105	3.2043	1.0637
6.	Principals in disadvantaged schools tended to report that their schools had adequate educational resources as much as. if not more than, principals in advantaged schools reported.	MOE officials	-	4	-	1	5	2.7000	1.15950
		Principals	-	32	8	6	9	3.2000	1.07841
		Teachers	3	251	91	55	109	3.0747	1.07693
7.	Urban educational zones tend to allocate resources more equitably across all schools, regardless of their socio- economic profile.	MOE officials	-	5	2	-	3	3.2000	91894
		Principals	-	27	15	2	11	3.2182	89631
		Teachers	3	243	155	36	72	3.2063	94049
8.	The purpose of leadership in public secondary schools is to create powerful and equitable allocation of resources to schools in Kano State.	MOE officials	-	5	5	-	-	3.5000	52705
		Principals	-	36	17	2	-	3.5818	68559
		Teachers	9	319	134	44	3	3.4833	90396
9.	The disadvantaged schools tend to have smaller classes and are more likely to suffer from teacher shortage.	MOE officials	-	5	5	-	-	3.5000	52705
		Principals	-	29	19	3	4	3.3455	84367
		Teachers	10	267	136	41	55	3.2947	97387
10.	Supporting disadvantaged schools does not necessarily mean providing them with more resources, but rather with high-quality human and material resources.	MOE officials	-	3	3	4	-	2.5000	1.35401
		Principals	4	24	22	2	3	3.4545	85674
		Teachers	38	203	146	75	47	3.1611	1.16442

Table 7 on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that all the questions tested meet the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are 2.5 and above with the exception of question 4 which states that higher-performing school systems allocate resources more equitably among socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools. The responses obtained in respect of item 6 showed that 4 MOE agreed with this item, while only 1 stayed undecided and 7 strongly disagreed. Similarly, 25 principals agreed and 16 stayed undecided, while 8 strongly disagreed and 6 of them disagreed with the item. In like manner, 3 teachers strongly agreed with the item and 235 agreed, while 109 stayed undecided and 90 strongly disagreed also 72 teachers disagreed with this item.

Research Question Four: What is the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?

This research question is being answered using the response mean of the respondents as contained in the table. The summary of analysis done in respect of research question four was presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

SN	Item	Respondents	SA	A	U	SD	D	Mean	SD
1.	In this school, the principal allocate quality time for conducting regular classroom visitation.	MOE officials	-	4	-	3	3	2.50000	1.35410
		Principals	-	-	-	35	20	1.3636	48548
		Teachers	28	123	32	163	163	2.3910	1.30203
2.	In this school, the principal allocate time to check the teachers lesson plans/notes.	MOE officials	1	8	1	-	-	4.0000	47140
		Principals	-	31	8	2	14	2.2364	96155
		Teachers	10	174	48	197	80	2.4499	1.35156
3.	In this school, the principal helps the teachers to manage their time by making sure they come to school on time.	MOE officials	1	-	-	6	3	1.7000	1.25167
		Principals	-	14	2	16	23	2.2545	1.14209
		Teachers	28	94	41	188	158	2.2456	1.27537
4.	In this school, the principal is busy doing nothing worthwhile.	MOE officials	1	7	-	-	2	3.7000	94868
		Principals	-	18	10	20	7	2.4727	1.28891
		Teachers	27	255	81	56	90	3.2120	1.13508
5.	Time is one of the resources that an administrator needs to manage efficiently in order to achieve organizational goals.	MOE officials	1	1	1	6	1	3.0000	1.49071
		Principals	-	19	7	21	8	2.6364	1.31605
		Teachers	3	255	120	85	76	2.9705	1.13337
6.	In this school, the principal spend little or no time on students activities.	MOE officials	1	-	2	2	5	2.3000	1.15950
		Principals	-	16	13	7	19	2.6909	1.03410
		Teachers	12	224	125	29	119	2.1395	98921
7.	The principal efficiently manage himself and all his activities within a time range in this school.	MOE officials	1	2	1	1	5	2.7000	1.25167
		Principals	-	29	15	5	6	3.2364	98062
		Teachers	11	200	71	99	128	2.7957	1.21243
8.	In this school, the principal spends too much time in writing and signing letters and little time for supervision of teachers.	MOE officials	2	1	1	-	6	2.4000	1.28668
		Principals	8	19	5	16	7	2.9273	1.50129
		Teachers	32	153	38	103	183	2.3621	1.26886
9.	The principal assigned time to teachers by making sure they are punctual to every lesson and teach fully utilizing the periods meaningfully in this school.	MOE officials	1	1	1	2	5	2.4000	1.26491
		Principals	5	18	6	18	8	2.7091	1.44879
		Teachers	2	217	66	122	102	2.1544	1.24254
10.	The principal of this school has a record of his time allocation and tasks which help him manage time appropriately.	MOE officials	2	1	1	4	2	2.5000	1.64992
		Principals	-	21	7	14	13	2.3364	1.2377
		Teachers	3	142	55	161	148	2.3674	1.20881

Table 8 on the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that most of the questions tested fall below the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are less than 2.5 with the exception of question 5 and 7 which states that time is one of the resources that an administrator needs to manage efficiently in order to achieve organizational goals, and that principal efficiently manage himself and all his activities within a time range in the school.

Research Question Five: How does curriculum resources allocation impact leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State?

This research question is being answered using the response mean of the respondents as contained in the table. The summary of analysis done in respect of research question five was presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

SN	Item	Respondents	SA	A	U	SD	D	Mean	SD
1.	In this school, the library is well stocked with relevant and current books.	MOE officials	-	5	-	4	1	1.6000	1.5055
		Principals	2	23	10	17	3	2.3182	1.3620
		Teachers	29	140	52	136	152	2.5560	1.2947
2.	In this school, teachers make use of the available instructional materials in their teaching.	MOE officials	-	1	-	6	3	1.6000	9660
		Principals	2	3	2	30	18	1.7091	1.0305
		Teachers	3	43	8	224	231	1.7623	8898
3.	In this school, instructional materials are not vandalized.	MOE officials	3	-	-	6	1	2.3000	1.8885
		Principals	-	-	1	27	27	1.5273	5393
		Teachers	4	69	16	148	272	2.0354	9673
4.	In this school, laboratory materials are adequate.	MOE officials	-	5	3	2	-	2.1000	1.1972
		Principals	4	11	10	19	11	2.4545	1.3446
		Teachers	29	144	83	145	108	2.6149	1.3105
5.	In this school, adequate and relevant teaching materials are provided.	MOE officials	-	-	-	10	-	3.0000	0000
		Principals	-	1	-	29	25	2.5091	6047
		Teachers	12	121	36	128	212	3.3654	1.1637
6.	Provision of instructional materials is very important because it aids learning faster.	MOE officials	-	1	3	2	4	2.3000	9486
		Principals	1	12	10	10	22	2.4909	1.0864
		Teachers	12	172	80	102	143	2.3033	1.1956
7.	In this school, the chalkboard/blackboards are available and well maintained.	MOE officials	-	9	1	-	-	1.9000	3162
		Principals	1	38	14	1	1	1.6727	6398
		Teachers	35	249	84	52	89	3.2475	1.1353
8.	In this school, instructional materials are not stolen.	MOE officials	-	8	2	-	-	2.2000	4216
		Principals	1	39	11	1	3	1.6545	6996
		Teachers	17	278	69	93	52	2.1454	1.2225
9.	In this school, adequate and relevant learning materials are provided.	MOE officials	-	2	2	-	6	2.3000	8432
		Principals	2	15	8	8	22	2.1545	1.1420
		Teachers	34	156	51	142	126	2.1346	1.3443
10.	In this school, teachers improvise teaching aids and use for their teaching-learning process.	MOE officials	2	3	-	4	1	2.3000	1.7511
		Principals	1	16	7	16	15	2.4727	1.2450
		Teachers	34	175	59	145	96	2.1191	1.3652

Table 9 on the impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that most of the questions tested

fall below the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are less than 2.5 with the exception of question 5 which states that adequate and relevant teaching materials are provided in the school. The responses obtained in respect of item 5 showed that all the MOE strongly disagreed with this item. Similarly, only 1 principals agreed, while 29 of them strongly disagreed and 25 of the principals disagreed with the item. In like manner, 12 teachers strongly agreed with the item and 121 agreed, while 36 stayed undecided and 128 strongly disagreed also 212 teachers disagreed with this item.

4.4 Hypotheses Testing

All the five hypotheses postulated for this study were tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The summary of this analysis is being presented as follow:

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Data collected from principals, teachers and ministry of education officials (MOE) were analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The summary of hypothesis tested is presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the Impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Status	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-ratio	F-critical	Prob.
Between Groups	31.202	2	31.202	18.911	3.15	.000
Within Groups	564.287	572	1.650			
Total	**595.488**	**574**				

Table 10 showed the f-ratio value of (18.911) at 2 degrees of freedom 572 and at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The critical value (3.15) is less than f-ratio value (18.911),

the probability level of significance P(.000) is less than 0.05. This means that there is significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to reject the hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE on the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Table 11: Summary of Scheffe's Multiple Comparison Test on the Impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Respondents	N	Mean
MOE officials	10	15.68
Principals	55	33.71
Teachers	509	31.83

Table 11 on the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that the response mean of teachers was found to be closer to that of principals, indicating that the difference between the two respondents was not significant. On the other hand, the response mean of MOE officials was found to be lesser than that of principals and teachers. This shows that MOE officials differ significantly in their responses regarding the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Data collected from principals, teachers and ministry of education officials (MOE) were analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The summary of hypothesis tested is presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Status	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-ratio	F-critical	Prob.
Between Groups	37.603	2	37.603	24.145	3.15	.004
Within Groups	532.618	572	1.557			
Total	**570.221**	**574**				

Table 12 showed the f-ratio value of (24.145) at 2 degrees of freedom 572 and at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The critical value (3.15) is less than f-ratio value (24.145), the probability level of significance P(.004) is less than 0.05. This means that there is significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to reject the hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Table 13: Summary of Scheffe's Multiple Comparison Test on the Impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Respondents	N	Mean
MOE officials	10	45.80
Principals	55	39.93
Teachers	509	48.99

Table 13 on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that the response mean of MOE officials was found to be closer to that of teachers, indicating that the difference between the two respondents was not significant. On the other hand, the response mean of principals was found to be lesser than that of teachers and MOE officials. This shows that principals differs significantly in their responses regarding the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Data collected from principals, teachers and ministry of education officials (MOE) were analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The summary of hypothesis tested is presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Status	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-ratio	F-critical	Prob.
Between Groups	42.466	2	42.466	36.376	3.15	.001
Within Groups	399.255	572	1.167			
Total	**441.721**	**574**				

Table 14 showed the f-ratio value of (36.376) at 2 degrees of freedom 572 and at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The critical value (3.15) is less than f-ratio value (36.376), the probability level of significance P(.001) is less than 0.05. This means that there is significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to reject the hypothesis which states that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Table 15: Summary of Scheffe's Multiple Comparison Test on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Respondents	N	Mean
MOE officials	10	5.371
Principals	55	11.18
Teachers	509	11.75

Table 15 on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State showed that the response mean of principals was found to be closer to that of teachers, indicating that the difference between the two respondents was not significant. On the other hand, the response mean of MOE officials was found to be lesser than that of principals and teachers. This shows that MOE officials differs significantly in their responses regarding the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Data collected from principals, teachers and ministry of education officials (MOE) were analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The summary of hypothesis tested is presented in Table 16.

Table 16: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Status	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-ratio	F-critical	Prob.
Between Groups	.107	2	.107	.088	3.15	.767
Within Groups	413.883	572	1.210			
Total	**413.988**	**574**				

Table 16 showed the f-ratio value of (.088) at 2 degrees of freedom 572 and at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The critical value (3.15) is greater than f-ratio value (.088), the probability level of significance P(.767) is greater than 0.05. This means that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to accept the hypothesis which states that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Hypothesis Five: There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

Data collected from principals, teachers and ministry of education officials (MOE) were analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The summary of hypothesis tested is presented in Table 17.

Table 17: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

Status	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-ratio	F-critical	Prob.
Between Groups	.396	2	.396	.297	3.15	.586
Within Groups	455.453	572	1.332			
Total	**455.849**	**574**				

Table 17 showed the f-ratio value of (.297) at 2 degrees of freedom 572 and at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The critical value (3.15) is greater than f-ratio value (.297), the probability level of significance P(.586) is greater than 0.05. This means that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to accept the hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

4.5 Summary of Hypotheses Testing

This section presents the summary of all the null hypotheses tested in the course of this study.

Table 18: Summary of Hypotheses Tested

N/S	H_0 Statement	Statistical Tool Used	Result	Level of Sig.	Remark
1.	There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	F-ratio is 18.911, while the f-critical is 3.15 at 0.05 level of significance.	0.05	**Ho** was rejected. This means that significant impact existed in the opinions of respondents.
2.	There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	F-ratio is 24.145, while the f-critical is 3.15 at 0.05 level of significance.	0.05	**Ho** was rejected. This means that significant impact existed in the opinions of respondents.
3.	There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	F-ratio is 36.376, while the f-critical is 3.15 at 0.05 level of significance.	0.05	**Ho** was rejected. This means that significant impact existed in the opinions of respondents.
4.	There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	F-ratio is .088, while the f-critical is 3.15 at 0.05 level of significance.	0.05	**Ho** was retained. This means that there is no significant impact in the opinions of respondents.
5.	There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	F-ratio is .297, while the f-critical is 3.15 at 0.05 level of significance.	0.05	**Ho** was retained. This means that there is no significant impact in the opinions of respondents.

4.6 Summary of Major Findings

The following findings emerged in view of the hypotheses tested for this study:

1. There is significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.
2. There is significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.
3. There is significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.
4. There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.
5. There is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State

4.7 Discussion of Findings

Findings on hypothesis one revealed that there is significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to reject the hypothesis which states that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in

Kano State. To further substantiate this, the descriptive analysis carried out on research question revealed that all the questions tested meet the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are 2.5 and above with the exception of question 8 and 10 which states that human resources like counselors, reading specialists, instructional coaches are adequately allocated to public secondary schools in Kano State, and that allocation and nurturing of the appropriate human resources to address the learning needs of student populations have huge implications for school leaders respectively. On the other hand, this result supported the finding of Packard (2008) whose finfing on a study on Leadership and Performance in Human Services Organizations showed that human resources were not equitably distributed in the human service organisation.

Hypothesis two revealed that there is significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to reject the hypothesis which states that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. Likewise, the result of research question two showed that all the questions tested meet the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are 2.5 and above with the exception of question 6 which states that school leaders in public secondary schools in Kano State face important challenges in securing and allocating financial resources toward learning improvement priorities. This finding agrees with the finding of Afolabi, Oyewusi and Ajayi (2008), that financial resources were not equitably distributed across the public secondary schools.

The finding on hypothesis three revealed that there is significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The

implication of this result is to reject the hypothesis which states that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. This finding was further supported by the descriptive analysis carried out on research question three which revealed that all the questions tested meet the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are 2.5 and above with the exception of question 4 which states that higher-performing school systems allocate resources more equitably among socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools. This is in line with the outcome of Miles and Darling-Hammond (1997) that allocation of resources to public schools needs to be effectively organized at the school level.

Hypothesis four revealed that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to accept the hypothesis which states that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on time allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. Similarly, the finding on research question four showed that most of the questions tested fall below the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are less than 2.5 with the exception of question 5 and 7 which states that time is one of the resources that an administrator needs to manage efficiently in order to achieve organizational goals, and that principal efficiently manage himself and all his activities within a time range in the school.

Hypothesis five revealed that there is no significant impact in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. The implication of this result is to accept the hypothesis which states that there is no significant impact in the

opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on curriculum resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. This result was further substantiated as analysis of research question four showed that most of the questions tested fall below the requirement for acceptance that is, all the items are less than 2.5 with the exception of question 5 which states that adequate and relevant teaching materials are provided in the school. The responses obtained in respect of item 5 showed that all the MOE officials strongly disagreed with this item. Similarly, only 1 principals agreed, while 29 of them strongly disagreed and 25 of the principals disagreed with the item. In like manner, 12 teachers strongly agreed with the item and 121 agreed, while 36 stayed undecided and 128 strongly disagreed also 212 teachers disagreed with this item. This result have correlation with the finding of Plecki, Alejano, Knapp and Lochmiller (2006), that when adequate curriculum resources is not effectively distributed, can hinder leadership performance at school level.

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

This study assessed the Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance of Principals in Secondary Schools in Kano State. Chapter one presented the five (5) objectives raised for this study which include to: ascertain the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State; determine the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State; and assess the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. These objectives were formulated into five corresponding research questions and hypotheses. Chapter two reviewed literatures that are related to the study, while chapter three presented the methodology used in the study. Descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. The population of the study consisted of 546 principals and 5,096 teachers. A sample size of 55 principals, 509 teachers and 10 Ministry of Education Officials, making the total of 574 respondents were used in the study. An open-ended type of questionnaire was used to generate data for the study. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha technique which showed a reliability value of 0.79.

The data collected were scored on a 5-point rating scale before it was subjected to statistical analysis. The bio-data of the respondents was analyzed using descriptive statistics in the form of tables, frequency counts and percentages, while the research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation. All the five null hypotheses were tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at P = 0.05 (5%) level of significance. Findings among others showed that there is significant difference in the

opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of qualified personnel allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. There is significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of funding allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State. Also, there is significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and MOE officials on the impact of material resources allocation on leadership performance of principals in secondary schools in Kano State.

5.2 Conclusion

Leaders at all levels of the education system are charged with making decisions about how to effectively distribute and leverage resources to support teaching and learning. Resources are always scarce (economists often assert that scarcity is part of the definition of a "resource"). Therefore, fairness in resource allocation is not only important for ensuring equity in education opportunities, it is also related to the performance of the education system as a whole. Qualified personnel allocation like counselors, reading specialists, instructional coaches to public secondary schools in Kano State is the key to efficient leadership performance, because, allocation and nurturing of the appropriate human resources to address the learning needs of student populations have huge implications for school leaders. In this way, conclusion was drawn that school leaders in public secondary schools in Kano State are faced with important challenges in securing and allocating financial resources toward learning improvement priorities. Findings from this research has demonstrated a strong relationship between adequate resources allocation and leadership success in secondary schools.

5.3 Recommendations

In the light of the finding from this study, it is recommendations that:

1. Kano State government should realign staffing structures to accommodate the strengths and weaknesses of existing staff, and find ways to recruit and retain quality staff through compensation and support systems;
2. Government at local and state level should ensure that administrative staff develop financial management skills so they can better understand the limits and flexibility of fund allocation sources in school management;
3. Policy makers should integrate a resource allocation strategy that is based on school and student needs by using input or collaboration from parents, teachers, and administrators who have access to material resource allocation data;
4. School leaders should find opportunities to interact with their peers to communicate successful resource allocation practices or seek guidance on barriers or challenges they face in time allocation; and
5. Since teacher efficiency could be greatly impaired by the inadequacy of curriculum or instructional resources, secondary schools should be adequately equipped with these resources.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Study

Suggestions for further studies are made that:

1. There should be evaluation of the allocation and management of resources for sustenance of free Qualitative Secondary Education in Nigeria.
2. Perceptions of stakeholders on prudent management of human material and financial Resources in Higher Education are to be assessed; and
3. Opinions of policymakers on the relationship between equity resource allocation and students' performance in secondary schools should be sought.

REFERENCES

Adeniyi, (2004). Psychosocial Environment and Human Resource Management in Educational Institutions. *Journal of Educational Management and Planning* vol1 No1 p141.

Adnett, N., Bougheas, S., & Davies, P. (2002). Market-based reform of public schooling: some unpleasant dynamics. *Economics of Education Review, 21* (4), 323-330.

Afolabi, F.O., Oyewusi, L. M., & Ajayi, M. A. (2008). Allocation and Management of Resources for the Sustenance of Free Qualitative Secondary Education in Ondo State. *Nebula*, 5(4)

Agbo, H.A., Envuladu, E.A. & Zoakah, A. I. (2012). An Assessment of Toilet facilities in secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area of Plateau State. *Greener Journal of Educational Research.*

Ajayi, I. A. (2007). *Issues in school management*. Lagos: Bolabay Publications.

Akomolafe, C. O. & Oluwatimehin, B. F. (2013). Principals' Time Management in Secondary Schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)* 4(1): 13-16. Retrieved from www.jeteraps.scholarlinkresearch.org

Akomolafe, C. O. (2005). Principals' time management abilities in secondary schools in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Administration and Planning, 5*(1), 58-67.

Akomolafe, C.O. (2011). *Time Resource Management in Management of Higher Education in Africa*. Uyo, Nigeria: Abaam Publishing Co.

Allen, M. (2005). *Eight questions on teacher recruitment and retention: What does the research say?* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Available at: http://www.ecs.org/trrreport.

Ani, C.I (1997). Procurement management and maintenance of the School Plant in Alice N.N. Al (Ed), *Dynamics of education administration and management*. The Nigerian perspective. Akwa: Mcks Publishers.

Aremu, A.S. (2012). Assessment of Sanitation Facilities in Primary Schools Within Ilorin, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences in Environmental Sanitation.*

Asiyai, R.I. (2012). Assessing School Facilities in Public Secondary Schools in Delta State Nigeria, *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia.*

Assie-Lumumba, G. (2005). *Status of Education in Kenya: Indicators for Planning and Policy Formulation.*Nairobi: IPAR Special Report.

Ayegbusi, O.S. (1999). Time utilization among Nigeria workers. in Oluwatimilehin B.F. *Principals' time management and students' discipline in secondary school in Ondo State*. An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Ado – Ekiti.

Batt, R. (2002). Managing Customer services; Human resources practices, quit, rates and sale growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(3), 587-598.

Beatriz, P., Deborah, N., & Hunter, M. (2008). *Improving School Leadership: Policy and Practice. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development*. Retrieved form www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

Becker, B., & Genhart, B. (1996). The impact of Human resource management on organizational performance: progress and prospects/ *Academy of Management Journal* 39 (4), 779-801.

Belfield, C. (2008). *Funding Formulas, School Choice, and Inherent Incentives*. Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit.m

Black, P., & Williams, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *80*(2), 139-148.

Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2000). Understanding teacher labor markets: Implications for educational equity. In Plecki, M. L., & Monk, D. H. (Eds.), *School finance and teacher quality: Exploring the connections* (pp. 55–84). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education, Inc.

Broh, B.A. (2002). *Linking extra curricular programming to academic achievement*: Who benefits and why? (Electronic Version). Sociology of education, 75,69-96. Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (2001*). Facility construction report* Corvallis.

Canton, E. & Webbink, D. (2002). The Dutch education system: Options for institutional reform. CPB Report, 2002/2: The Hague, 26-31. Retrieved on June 9, 2007 from http://www.cpb.nl/eng/pub/cpbreeksen/cpbreport/2002_2/

Castaldi, B. (1997). *Educational facilities planning remodeling and management*. Baston: Aliyu and Bacon.

Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy (2001). *Third Year Analytic Memo—District M*. Unpublished state and district debriefing summary, CTP Core Study. Seattle, WA: Author/University of Washington.

Cohn , E. & Geske, T.G. (1990). *The Economics of Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Cole, (1990). *Management theory and practice*. London: The Guernsey Press Co-Ltd

Committee for Economic Development (2004). *Investing in learning: School funding policies to foster high performance*. Washington, D.C.

Cooper, H., Charlton, K., Valentine, J. C., & Muhlenbruck, L. (2000). Making the most of summer school: A meta-analytic and narrative review. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *65*(1, Serial No. 260).

Copland, M. A., & Knapp, M. S. (2006). *Connecting leadership and learning: Reflection, planning, and action*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Daniel, A. B. (2008). Participation in school based extracurricular activities and adolescent adjustment (Electronic Version). *Journal of Leisure Research*, (37) 51-77.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blue print for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

David, A. & Yongmei, N. (2012). *Is Administration Leaner in Charter Schools? Resource Allocation in Charter and Traditional Public Schools*. Michigan State University Press.

David-Hadar, I. B., & Ziderman, A. (2010). A New Model for Equitable and Efficient Resource Allocation to Schools: The Israeli Case. *IZA Discussion Paper* No. 4822

Dianati, M., Shen, X., & Naik, S. (2005). A New Fairness Index for Radio Resource Allocation in Wireless Networks, *in Proceedings of WCNC*.

Dubbin, S.S. (1990). Maintaining competence through updating in S.L. Wills & S.S. Dubin (eds) *Maintaining Professional competence.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., & Duffett, A. (2003). *Stand by me: What teachers really think about unions, merit pay, and other professional matters.* New York: Public Agenda.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2009). *National policy on education*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Education.

Finn, C., Manno, B., & Vanourek, G. (2000). *Charter Schools in Action: Renewing Public Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (third edition), Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and Sustainability: System Thinkers in Action*, Sage Publications Ltd., Thousand Oaks, CA.

Gandara, P., Rumberger, R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). English learners in California schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11*(3).

Gill, R. (2006). *Theory and practice of leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gok J. (2005). Adoption of Operation Costs of Secondary Education: A Case Study of Nyando District in Kenya. *Research Paper presented at the First National Workshop for the Educational Management Society of Kenya* Held at Migori Teachers college on 12th to 14th April, 2010.

Gongera, E. & Okoth, O. N. (2013). Alternative Sources of Financing Secondary School Education in the Rural Counties of Kenya: A Case Study of Kisii County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol.4, No.4. Retrieved from www.iiste.org.

Gummer, B., & Edwards, R. (1995). The politics of human services administration. In L. Ginsberg & P. Keys (Eds.), *New management in human services* (2nd ed. pp. 57–71). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). "Exploring the Principal's Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995", *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9 (2), 157 191.

Hargreaves, A. (1997). Rethinking educational change: Going deeper and wider in the quest for success. In Hargreaves, A. (Ed.), *Rethinking Educational Change with Heart and Mind*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Hargreaves, A., Halász, G., & Pont, B (2008). "The Finnish Approach to System Leadership", a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at *www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership* and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.

Hassanzabeh, R., & Ebadi, A. G. (2007). Measure the share of the effective factors and time management. *World Applied Science Journal, 2*(3), 168-174.

Hill, P. T., & Celio, M. B. (1998) *Fixing urban schools*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Hopkins, D. (2008). "Realising the Potential of System Leadership", in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.

Humphrey, D. C., Koppich, J. E., & Hough, H. J. (2005, March 3). Sharing the wealth: National Board Certified Teachers and the students who need them most. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(18). Retrieved May 23, 2006, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n18/.

Ibrahim, H. P. (2013). Assessment of Provision of Facilities in Secondary Schools in Minna Metropolis, Niger State. Unpublished M.Ed Thesis, Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto.

Igwe, S. O. (2005). Supervision, Evaluation and Quality Control in Education. In current Issues In Educational Management In Nigeria (Eds.) In N. A. Nwagwu., E. T. Ehiametalor, M.A Ogunu, Mon Nwadiani (Eds). *Current issues in Educational Management in Nigeria* (pp. 32-45). Association for Educational Administrator and Planning (NAEAP).

Ikworayegbe, M. G. (2005). *The study Of Teachers Workload In Private and Public Secondary Schools in Edo North Senatorial District*. Unpublished M.Ed Project, University of Benin, Benin City.

Ingersoll, R. (2001). *Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of schools.* Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/Reports.html#Turnover.

Ingersoll, R. (2002). *Out-of-field teaching, educational inequality, and the organization of schools: An exploratory analysis.* Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/Descriptions.html#OutOfField.

Jason, S.S. (2011). Service Learning: Facilitating academic learning and character development (Electronic Version). *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 83, 16-25.

Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Kauffman, D., Liu, E., & Donaldson, M. L. (2004, October 29). The support gap: New teachers' early experiences in high-income and low-income schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 12*(61). Retrieved June 9, 2006, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n61/.

Killeen, K., Monk, D., & Plecki, M. (2002). School district spending on professional development: Insights from national data (1992–1998). *Journal of Education Finance, 28*(1), 25–49.

Knapp, M. S., & Associates (2003). *Leading for learning sourcebook: Concepts and examples.* Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Knapp, M. S., Copland, M.A., Swinnerton, J. A., & Monpas-Huber, J. (2006) *Data-informed leadership: Insights from current research, theory, and practice*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Knapp, M. S., Swanson, J., McCaffery, T. (2003). *District support for professional learning: What research says and has yet to establish.* Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Chicago, April 21–25.

Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: The Free Press.

Lankford, H., & Wyckoff, J. (1995). Where has the money gone? An analysis of school district spending in New York. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 17*(2), 195–218.

Lenth, R. V. (2006). *Java Applets for Power and Sample Size* (Computer software). Last accessed on the 2nd of November 2007 at URL: http://www.stat.uiowa.edu/~rlenth/Power.

Levacic, R., & Vignoles, A. (2002). Researching the links between school resources and student outcomes in the UK: A Review of issues and evidence. *Education Economics, 10*(3), 313-331.

Levin, J., & Quinn, M. (2003). *Missed opportunities: How we keep high-quality teachers out of urban classrooms.* New York: The New Teacher Project.

Lewis, J., Packard, T., & Lewis, M. (2007). *Management of human service programs* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson/Brooks Cole.

Mahoney, J. L., Stattin, H., & Magnusson, D. (2001). Youth recreation center participation and criminal offending: A 20-year longitudinal study of Swedish boys. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 25*(6), 509–520.

Marsh, J. A., Kerr, K. A., Ikemoto, G. S., Darilek, H., Suttorp, M., Zumer, R., & Barney, H. (2005). *The role of districts in fostering instructional improvement: Lessons from three urban districts partnered with the Institute for Learning.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2002). *Reforming districts: How districts support school reform*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington. Retrieved from http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/Reports.html#Reforming

McNeece, C., & Thyer, B. (2004). Evidence-based practice and social work. *Journal of Evidence-Based Practice, 1*(1), 7–25.

Milanowski, A. (2003, January 29). The varieties of knowledge and skill-based pay design: A comparison of seven new pay systems for K–12 teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11*(4). Retrieved May 23, 2006 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n4/.

Miles, K. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Rethinking the Allocation of Teaching Resources: Some Lessons from High Performing Schools*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Miles, K. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Rethinking the allocation of teaching resources: Some lessons from high-performing schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 20*, 9–29.

Miles, K., & Roza, M. (2005). *Understanding student-based budgeting as a means to greater school resource equity*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs, Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved June 6, 2006, from http://www.crpe.org/workingpapers/pdf/SBB_MilesRoza.pdf.

Miron, G. & Urschel, J. (2010). *Equal or Fair? A Study of Revenues and Expenditures in American Charter Schools*. East Lansing, MI: The Great Lakes Center for Education Research & Practice.

MOEST (2001). *Determinants Female Access to Primary Education, a Case of Kaloleni Division*, Kilifi District, M-Ed Thesis, Kenyatta University, Unpublished.

Monk, D. H & Hussain, S. (2000). Structural influences on the internal allocation of school district resources: Evidence from New York State. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22 (1),* 1-26.

Monk, D. H., Roellke, C. F., Brent, B.O. (1996). *What Education Dollars Buy: An Examination of Resource Allocation Patterns in New York Public School Systems*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Monk, D., Pijanowski, J., & Hussein, S. (1997). How and where the education dollar is spent. *The Future of Children: Financing Schools 7*(3). Washington, D.C.: Princeton-Brookings.

Moos, L., & Huber, S. (2007). "School Leadership, School Effectiveness and School Improvement: Democratic and Integrative Leadership" in Townsend, T. (ed.) (2007) *International Handbook of School Effectiveness and Improvement*, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Morgenstern, J. (2004). *Time management from the inside out*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Nakib, Y. (1995). Beyond district-level expenditures: Schooling resource allocation and use in Florida. In Picus, L., & Wattenberger, J. L. (Eds.), *Where does the money go? Resource allocation in elementary and secondary schools* (pp. 85–105). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Nakib, Y. (1996). Beyond district-level expenditures: Schooling resource allocation and use in Florida. In L. Picus and J. Wattenberger (Eds.), *Where Does the Money Go?* (pp. 106-131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Nancy, M. S. & Karen, M. K. (2008). Performance Expectations and Indicators for Education Leaders. *Journal of Council of Chief State School Officers: State Consortium on Education Leadership*.

National Research Council (1999). *Making money matter: Financing America's schools*. Ladd, H., & Hansen, J. (Eds.). Committee on Education Finance, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Naylor, O. & Malcomson, L. (2001). Issues and problems in educational administration planning & implementation in Nigeria, in V. Peretomode (eds). *Introduction to educational administration, planning & supervision*. Lagos: Joja Education Research & Publishers.

Ndichu, O. (2003). Education for the Decade: A Demarcation of Imperatives. In Kimuyu P. Wagacha, M. And Abagi O. (Eds). *Kenya's Strategic Policies for the 21st Century, Macroeconomic and Sectoral Choices*. Nairobi: IPAR

Ned, C. (2009). *A vital instrument for predicting college success*. Available http://www.fairtest.org/facts/satvalidityhtml Retrieved on 6th January, 2011.

Nelson, F., Rubenstein, M., & Mahoney, L. (2004). *Financing Autonomy: Charter School Finance Case Studies.* Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Neville, K. S., & Robinson, C. J. (2003). *The delivery, financing, and assessment of professional development in education: Pre-service, preparation and in-service training*. Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project.

Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nwagwu, N.A. (2004). Personnel Management. In N. A. Nwagwu., M. E. Ijeoma., C. C. Nwagwu (Eds). *Organisation and Administration of Education. Perspectives and Practices* (pp 48 -55) Benin City. Festa Printing Press Ltd.

Ochuba, V.O. (2001). Strategies for Improving the Quality of Education in Nigeria Umiversities. In Nwagwu, N.A., Ehiametalor, E. T., Ogunu, M.A., & Nwadiani, M. (Eds) *Current Issues in Educational Management in Nigeria*. Nigeria: NAEAP.

Odden, A. (2001). The new school finance. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(1), 85–91.

Odden, A. Monk, D., Nakib, Y., & Picus, L. (1995). The story of the education dollar: No academy award and no fiscal smoking gun. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 77(2), 161-168.

Odden, A., & Archibald, S. (2001). Committing to class-size reduction and finding the resources to implement it: A case study of resource reallocation. *Education Policy Analysis Archives 9*(30). Retrieved June 2, 2006, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n30/.

Okafor, C. A. (2006). *Organisational Characteristics, Practices, and Performance in Nigeria*. A Ph.D Dissertation Submitted to School of Postgraduate studies, University of Benin, Benin City.

Olagboye, A.A. (2004). *Introduction to educational management in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Daily graphics (Nigeria) Limited.

Olakunle, N.P. (2001). Teacher education, school effectiveness and improvement; A study of academic and professional qualification on teachers' job effectiveness in Nigeria secondary schools. *The African symposium* 5(3) pp 17-37.

Olaleye, F. O. (2013). Improving Teacher Performance Competency through Effective Human Resource Practices in Ekiti State Secondary Schools. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics, and Management Studies*, vol.1, No.11, 2, p. 125.

Olaniyi, W. O. (1998). *Conceptual approach to educational administration.* Ondo: Patrick Ade Printing Press.

Olembo, N.A. & Ross, L. (1992). *Fundamentals of Research in Behavioural Sciences and Humanities*. Calabar: Wuse Publishers (Nig) Limited.

Olomola, S.O. (2013). Impact of Funding on the Management of Private Secondary Schools. *Nigeria Education Journal, 5*(2), 14-19.

Osagie, R. O. & Okafor, C. J. (2012). Relationship between Human Resources Management variables and students' academic performance in secondary schools

in Egor Local Government Area, Edo State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Educational Studies 4(1), 2012 147.*

Otieno, J. O. & Coldough, T. (2009). The impact of cost sharing strategy on access, equity and quality of secondary education in Rachuonyo District, Kenya (Masters Research Paper, Maseno University,(2002).Unpublished.

Owens, T. & Maiden, J. (1999). A comparison of interschool and interdistrict funding equity in Florida. *Journal of Education Finance* 24 Spring, 305–318.

Pablo, Z. (2014). *What Makes Schools Successful? Resources, Policies and Practices*. Paris: PISA, OECD Publishing.

Packard, T. (2008). Leadership and Performance in Human Services Organizations. *Managing for Performance*, 2(4), 143-164.

Peretomode, V. F. & Peretomode, O. (2005). *Human Resources Management. Principles, polices and practices*. Lagos: Onosomegboho Ogbinaka Publishers Ltd.

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. (2006). *Hard facts, dangerous half-truths and total nonsense: Profiting from evidence-based management*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Plecki, M. L., Alejano, C. R., Knapp, M. S., & Lochmiller, R. C. (2006). *Allocating Resources and Creating Incentives to Improve Teaching and Learning***.** Center for the study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach, L. (2003). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the school principalship*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.

PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007). *Independent Study into School Leadership: Main Report*, Department for Education and Skills, London.

Raelin, J. (2004). Don't bother putting leadership into people. Journal of *Academy of Management Executive*, (18), 131-135.

Raywid, M. A., Schmerler, G., Phillips, S. E., & Smith, G. A. (2003) *Not so easy going: The policy environments of small urban schools and schools within schools*. Charleston, WV: AEL.

Resnick, L., & Glennan, T. (2002). Leadership for learning: A theory of action for urban school districts. In Hightower, A. M., Knapp, M. S., Marsh, J. A., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal* (pp. 160–172). New York: Teachers College Press.

Rice, J. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.

Ritzen, J., Van Dommelen, J., & De Vijlder, F. (1997). School finance and school choice in the Netherlands. *Economics of Education Review, 16* (3), 329- 335.

Roberts-DeGennaro, M., & Packard, T. (2002). Framework for developing a social administration concentration. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 22*(1/2), 61–77.

Robinson, V.M.J. (2007). *School Leadership and Student Outcomes: Identifying What Works and Why*, Australian Council for Educational Leaders,Winmalee, NSW, Australia.

Ross, K., & Levacic, R. (1999) (Eds.). *Needs-Based Resource Allocation in Education: Via Formula Funding of Schools.* Paris: UNESCO Publishing**.**

Rousseau,D. (2006). Is there such a thing as "evidencebased management"? *Academy of Management Review, 31*(2), 256–269.

Roza, M., & Hill, P. (2004). How within-district spending inequities help some schools fail. In Ravitch, D. (Ed.), *Brookings Papers on Educational Policy: 2004* (pp. 201–228). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Rubenstein, R., & Miller, L. (2005). Allocating resources within a big city school district: New York City after *Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. New York*. Syracuse, NY: Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs Center for Policy Research, Syracuse University.

Scheerens, J., & Bosker, R. (1997). *The Foundations of Educational Effectiveness*, Elsevier Science Ltd., Oxford.

Schlechty, P. C. (1997) *Inventing better schools: An action plan for education reform*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Shambaugh, L.S., Chambers, J.G., & DeLancey, D. (2008). *Implementation of the weighted student formula policy in San Francisco: a descriptive study of an equitydriven, student-based planning and budgeting policy* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2008–No. 061). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory West. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

Shoshani Committee (2001). *Report of the Committee appointed for Examining the Budgetary Allocation Mechanism's*. Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education. (in Hebrew). Retrieved on June 9, 2007 from http://cms.education.gov.il/NR/rdonlyres/3F2D67A5-0E18-4078-A0F7-D39A81F9FB8F/5660/doch_male1.doc

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., & Collarbone, P. (2002). "Leading for Change: Building Capacity for Learning", in *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (Leithwood, K. and P. Hallinger, eds.), pp. 41-73, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Strauss, R., (2000). Improving teacher preparation and selection: Lessons from the Pennsylvania experience. *Economics of Education Review 19*, 389.

Swinnerton, J. A. (2006). *Learning to lead what you don't (yet) know: District leaders engaged in instructional reform.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*, Falmer Press, London.

Timar, T. (2004). Categorical school finance: Who gains, who loses? *Working Paper Series 0402.* Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE).

Townsend, T., (ed.) (2007). *International Handbook of School Effectiveness and Improvement*, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2007). Management and Maintenance in the use of Educational Buildings and Equipment, (Division of Educational Policy and Planning), in *Journal of Educational Management and Planning (JEMP)*, Vol., No. 1 April 2008.

Vandell, D. L., Pierce, K. M., & Dadisman, K. (2005). Out-of-school settings as a developmental context for children and youth. In Kail, R. (Ed.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* (Vol. 33). Academic Press.

Walter, F. (2001). *District leader's guide to reallocating resources.* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved May 22, 2006, from http://www.nwrel.org/csrdp/reallocating.pdf.

Wasik, B., & Slavin, R. E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28*, 178–200.

Won-joo, Y., & Frank, M. (2009). Leadership and the Performance of People in Organizations: Enriching Employees and Connecting People. *Journal of Forum for people performance management and measurement*.

World Bank (1994). *Tertiary Education: The Lesson of Experience*. The World Bank: Washington DC.

APPENDIX I
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Educ. Admin & Planning Section,
Department of Educ. Found. & Curr.,
Faculty of Education,
Ahmadu Bello University,
Zaria, Kaduna State.

Dear Sir/Madam,

The researcher is a Postgraduate student of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master degree in Education (Educational Administration and Planning), the student is conducting a research on "Impact of Resource Allocation on Leadership Performance in Secondary Schools in Kano State". The questionnaire that follows was designed to obtain information from you. You are therefore requested to go through the questionnaire carefully and respond to all items. All information provided will be used mainly for the purpose of this study and strictly treated as confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

GARBA, Mohammed Sadisu

APPENDIX II

RESOURCE ALLOCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Data of Respondents

Instructions: Please tick (√) in the appropriate box that relates to you. Do not tick more than one good for each statement.

Section A: Bio-Data

1. Status
   a. Principal [ ]
   b. Teacher [ ]
2. Gender
   a. Male [ ]
   b. Female [ ]
3. School Ownership
   a. Private [ ]
   b. Public [ ]
4. School Type
   a. Day School [ ]
   b. Boarding [ ]
   c. Boarding/Day [ ]
5. School Location
   a. Rural [ ]
   b. Urban [ ]

Instructions: Please tick (√) in the appropriate box that relates to your opinion. Do not tick more than one good for each statement.

Section B: Opinions of principals, and teachers on the various criteria for allocating resources to senior secondary schools in Kano State.

S/N	Item statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Human capital development in schools influences the allocation of resources to secondary schools in Kano State.					
2.	The allocation of educational resources is as important as the amount of resources available.					
3.	The fixed or unanticipatable costs associated with the physical plant is one of the criteria for allocating resources in secondary schools in Kano State.					
4.	Various policies regulate what is available for leaders to allocate, how those resources can be used, and how their use must be accounted for.					
5.	Activities at several levels of education, typically occurring in annual cycles, determine both the amount of money that is available to support education.					
6.	Resources are allocated to Kano State secondary schools based on the needs, capacities, and contexts of schools.					
7.	The standards-based reform movement of the past several decades changed the criteria for allocating resources to secondary schools in Kano State.					
8.	Contractual agreements with local education associations also constrain leaders' ability to make resource decisions—particularly as they relate to allocating and managing resources.					
9	The need to address the stark disparities in achievement gap among different groups of students remain the major criteria for allocating resources in secondary schools in Kano State.					
10.	Resource allocation is often thought of as an investment of naira, time, and people in the enterprise of public education.					

Section C: Opinions of principals and teachers on the extent to which allocated human and material resources have impact on the leadership performance in senior secondary school in Kano state.

S/N	Item statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	My school leader conducts personnel evaluation processes that enhance professional practice, in keeping with district and state policies.					
2.	Kano State principals often involve parents, teachers, and students in developing, implementing, and monitoring guidelines and norms for accountable behaviour.					
3.	School leaders in Kano State assign personnel to address diverse student needs and equity goals.					
4.	It is the duty of the school leaders to bring together the resources of schools, family members, and community to positively affect Student.					
5.	It is one of the functions of the school leader to ensure that spacious and well ventilated classrooms are adequately allocated for students' use.					
6.	The material resources are made up of items of furniture, laboratory materials (consumable and nonconsumable), instructional tools, books and other stationery items.					
7.	School leaders in Kano State public secondary schools always seek for community support to sustain existing resources and add new resources that address emerging student needs.					
8.	Human resources like counselors, reading specialists, instructional coaches are adequately allocated to public secondary schools in Kano State.					
9	Education leaders in Kano State ensure that there is potable water in the public secondary schools.					
10.	Allocation and nurturing of the appropriate human resources to address the learning needs of student populations have huge implications for school leaders.					

Section D: Opinions of principals and teachers on the impact of the allocated financial resources on the leadership performance in senior secondary school in Kano state.

S/N	Item statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	No organization can survive or carry its function effectively without adequate financial resources at its disposal.					
2.	In many school systems, the allocation of school budgets is done according to a needs-based funding formula.					
3.	School leaders in Kano State operates within budget and fiscal guidelines and directs them effectively toward teaching and learning.					
4.	The amount of financial resources to be allocated to schools in Kano State is traditionally determined by state finance formulas and provided to each education zones.					
5.	Kano State education officials allocates funds based on student needs within the framework of federal and state rules.					
6.	School leaders in public secondary schools in Kano State face important challenges in securing and allocating financial resources toward learning improvement priorities.					
7.	A needs-based school funding formula distributes education resources on a per-pupil basis according to the student's background.					
8.	Education funding in Kano State is primarily driven by student enrollment and the staff-to-student ratios that set the number of teachers, administrators, and other staff units.					
9	School leaders in Kano State uses public resources and funds appropriately and effectively.					
10.	A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring efficient, and effective allocation of fund for a safe learning environment.					

Section E: Opinions of principals and teachers on the equitable resources allocated to secondary schools in Kano State regardless of their socio-economic profile.

S/N	Item statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	In schools where resources are inadequate, principals ensure that resources are less equitably distributed among advantaged and disadvantaged schools.					
2.	Too often, scarce educational resources are allocated inequitably in Kano State public secondary schools.					
3.	Fairness in resource allocation is not only important for ensuring equity in education opportunities, it is also related to the performance of the education system as a whole.					
4.	Higher-performing school systems allocate resources more equitably among socio-economically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.					
5.	School leaders in Kano State formulate policies, rules, and structures that frustrate equitable distribution of resources and thereby affect equity in learning outcomes.					
6.	Principals in disadvantaged schools tended to report that their schools had adequate educational resources as much as, if not more than, principals in advantaged schools reported.					
7.	Urban educational zones tend to allocate resources more equitably across all schools, regardless of their socio-economic profile.					
8.	The purpose of leadership in public secondary schools is to create powerful and equitable allocation of resources to schools in Kano State.					
9	The disadvantaged schools tend to have smaller classes and are more likely to suffer from teacher shortages.					
10.	Supporting disadvantaged schools does not necessarily mean providing them with more resources, but rather with high-quality human and material resources.					

Section F: Opinions of principals and teachers on the extent are the secondary school's leader in Kano State have been striving to achieve quality secondary education with the limited or scarce resources at their disposal.

S/N	Item statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Education leaders ensure quality secondary education and success of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning.					
2.	Allocation of resources to secondary school is very vital to achievement of educational objectives.					
3.	Government commits more resources towards secondary education sub-sector in recurrent and physical infrastructure expansion.					
4.	School leaders ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning.					
5.	An effective school leader builds strong relationships with the school board, zonal and state education leaders to influence policies that can bring about quality secondary education.					
6.	Provision of good quality secondary education is a critical tool in generating opportunities and benefits of social and economic development.					
7.	Education leaders ensure quality secondary education by being ethical and acting with integrity.					
8.	Secondary school leaders ensure the quality secondary education by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission, and high expectations for every student.					
9	School leaders collaborate with families and stakeholders who represent diverse community and mobilize community resources that improve teaching and learning in Kano State.					
10.	Education leader ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success.					