

**EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES
OF PRINCIPALS IN NIGERIAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

BY

DUBI NJIDDA ENSLEY
Ph.D/EDUC/05610/2008-09
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING

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

MAY, 2014

**EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES
OF PRINCIPALS IN NIGERIAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

BY

DUBI NJIDDA ENSLEY

Ph.D/EDUC/05610/2008-09

**A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO SCHOOL OF POST-GRADUATE
STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING, DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND CURRICULUM, FACULTY
OF EDUCATION, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA**

MAY, 2014

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation on “Evaluation of Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Nigerian Secondary Schools” was written by me as a record of my personal research work. It has not been presented in any previous application for the purpose of the award of higher degree. All quotations have been indicated and the sources of information are specifically acknowledged by means of references.

Dubi Njidda Ensley

Date

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled “Evaluation of Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Nigerian Secondary Schools” by Dubi, Njidda Ensley meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Administration and Planning of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contributions to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr. Makoju E.I.
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. Dare M.O.
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. Maina B.A.
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. Maina B.A.
Head of Department

Date

Prof. Joshua A.A.
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

Date

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to the memory of my late brother, Mr . Kyanake Dubi Deputy Commission of Police rtd```` for his encouragement to pursue higher education and to my wife, Charity B. Dubi, who supported me throughout the research period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, praise be to God for sparing my life and giving me the strength and guidance to complete this study. I wish to register my profound gratitude to Dr. E. Makoju whose interest in this work has been particularly tremendous and unequal and for his immense support, technical observations and proper guidance throughout the period of this study. I am similarly grateful to Dr. M.O. Dare my second supervisor for his concern and constructive criticisms towards the completion of the study. Dr. B.A. Maina was more than a supervisor as far as this work is concerned. The support and encouragement that I enjoyed from him during the course of writing this work will forever remain in my memory. His level of encouragement, criticisms, technical observations and ideas have contributed greatly to make this work a reality. I am particularly grateful to Dr. (Mrs.) A.A. Igunnu for her contribution, constructive criticisms and guidance throughout the period of this work. I indeed appreciate her efforts and encouragement. I can not afford to ignore Dr. O.I. Bongotons for his innate love, encouragement and support from the start of this study to the completion stage. I appreciate most sincerely and with all sense of humility his concern throughout the period of this study.

I am highly indebted to my wife Charity Bwalam Dubi for her encouragement, cooperation, patience, interest and immense contribution towards the completion of this work. Her invaluable love will always be remembered and appreciated. I am also grateful to my children who missed my fatherly love and companion during the years spent on this programme.

My sincere appreciation goes to the management of College of Education, Hong for giving me the opportunity to pursue this degree. I am particularly grateful to the provost and staff of the institution for their support and encouragement.

My sincere appreciation also goes to Mr. Richard S. Jatau who contributed in no small measure to the completion of this work. I also thank W.O.I. Elisha Dubi (Rtd) and W.O.I. Edan Dubi (Rtd) for their support, Grace Tommy for typing the entire work and a host of others not mentioned here. May the Almighty God bless and reward you. Amen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	i
Declaration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Certification	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Dedication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Acknowledgement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
Abstract	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vii
Table of Contents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	viii
List of Tables	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	xiii
List of Appendices	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	xvi
Operational Definition of Terms/Abbreviations-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	xvi

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background to the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
1.3	Objectives of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
1.4	Research Questions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
1.5	Hypotheses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
1.6	Basic Assumptions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
1.7	Significance of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
1.8	Scope of the Study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1	Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
-----	--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

2.2	Conceptual Framework	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
2.2.1	Concept of Leadership	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
2.2.2	Leadership Qualities	-	-	-	-	-	-	19
2.2.3	Leadership Styles	-	-	-	-	-	-	23
2.2.4	Instructional Leadership	-	-	-	-	-	-	28
2.2.5	The Principal as an instructional Leader or Administrator in Secondary School	-	-	-	-	-	-	31
2.2.6	Objectives of Secondary School Education in Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
2.3	Curriculum Implementation-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
2.4	Instructional Supervision	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
2.5	Staff Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	48
2.6	Provision and Utilization of Instructional Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
2.7	Maintenance of School Physical Facilities-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57
2.8	Motivation of Staff and Students-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63
2.9	Institutional Planning of Academic Programmes	-	-	-	-	-	-	72
2.10	Delegation of Authority	-	-	-	-	-	-	78
2.11	Effective Communication Network	-	-	-	-	-	-	82
2.12	Empirical Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	88
2.13	Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	91

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	93
3.2	The Research Design	-	-	-	-	-	-	93
3.3	Population of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	94

3.4	Sample and Sampling Techniques	-	-	-	-	-	-	95
3.5	Instrumentation	-	-	-	-	-	-	98
3.6	Validation of Research Instrument	-	-	-	-	-	-	99
3.7	Pilot Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
3.8	Administration of Research Instrument	-	-	-	-	-	-	101
3.9	Methods of Data Analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-	101

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF DATA ANALYSIS

4.1	Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	102
4.1.1	Rate of Return of Questionnaire	-	-	-	-	-	-	102
4.1	Presentation and Discussion of Bio-data	-	-	-	-	-	-	105
4.2	Analysis of Responses	-	-	-	-	-	-	109
4.3	Hypotheses Testing	-	-	-	-	-	-	165
4.3.1	Null Hypothesis 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	166
4.3.2	Null Hypothesis 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	167
4.3.3	Null Hypothesis 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	168
4.3.4	Null Hypothesis 4	-	-	-	-	-	-	171
4.3.5	Null Hypothesis 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	173
4.3.6	Null Hypothesis 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	174
4.3.7	Null Hypothesis 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	177
4.3.8	Null Hypothesis 8	-	-	-	-	-	-	180
4.3.9	Null Hypothesis 9	-	-	-	-	-	-	181
4.3.10	Summary of Hypotheses Testing	-	-	-	-	-	-	183
4.4	Discussions on Findings	-	-	-	-	-	-	188

4.5	Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	195
-----	---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	198
5.1.1	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Curriculum Implementation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	199
5.1.2	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Instructional Supervision	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200
5.1.3	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Organisation of Staff Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	201
5.1.4	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Provision and Utilisation of Instructional Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	201
5.1.5	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in the Maintenance of School Physical Facilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	202
5.1.6	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in respect of Staff and Students Motivation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	203
5.1.7	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in respect of Institutional Planning of Academic Programmes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	203
5.1.8	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in respect of Delegation of Authority	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	204
5.1.9	Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in respect of Communication Network	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	204
5.2	Conclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	205

5.3	Recommendations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	206
5.4	Suggestions for Further Studies			-	-	-	-	-	209
	References	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	210
	Questionnaire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	221

Appendix B: Krejcie and Morgan's Table for Determining Sample Size

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Population of Respondents and Sample Size -	-	-	-	95
Table 3.2	Geo-Political Zones and Their States	-	-	-	96
Table 3.3	Sample States Selected for the Study -	-	-	-	97
Table 4.11	Rate of return of questionnaire	-	-	-	103
Table 4.2.1	Distribution of Respondents by Proprietors or School Ownership				105
Table 4.2.2	Distribution of Respondents by Gender	-	-	-	106
Table 4.2.3	Distribution of Respondents by Status	-	-	-	107
Table 4.2.4	Distribution of Respondents by Years of Experiences			-	107
Table 4.2.5	Distribution of Respondents by Highest Qualification			-	108
Table 4.3.1	Opinions of respondents on the impact of instructional leadership practices of principals on the administration of Nigerian Secondary Schools in curriculum implementation	-	-	-	111
Table 4.3.2	Opinions of respondents on the impact of instructional leadership practices of principals on the administration of Nigerian secondary schools in instructional supervision	-	-	-	117
Table 4.3.3	Opinions of respondents on the impact of instructional leadership practices of principals in organisation of staff development	-	-		123
Table 4.3.4	Opinions of respondents on instructional leadership practices of principals in the provision and utilization of instructional materials-	-	-	-	130
Table 4.3.5	Opinions of respondents on instructional leadership practices of principals in the maintenance of school physical facilities	-			136

Table 4.3.6	Opinions of respondents on instructional leadership practices of principals in staff and students' motivation - - -	142
Table 4.3.7	Opinions of respondents on instructional leadership practices of principals in institutional planning of academic programmes	148
Table 4.3.8	Opinions of respondents on instructional leadership practices of principals in delegation of authority - - - -	154
Table 4.3.9	Opinions of respondents on instructional leadership practices of principals in communication network- - - -	160
Table 4.4.1	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in curriculum implementation	166
Table 4.4.2	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the perception of respondents in respect of principals' leadership practices in instructional supervision - - - -	167
Table 4.4.3(a)	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the principals' perception of respondents in respect of principals' leadership practices in staff development - - - -	169
Table 4.4.3(b)	Scheffe's Post Hoc Test on the Perception of Respondents in Staff Development - - - - -	170
Table 4.4.4(a)	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the perception of respondents on the instructional leadership practices of principals' in provision and utilization of instructional materials - - - - -	171

Table 4.4.4(b)	Scheffe's Post-Hoc Test on the perception of respondents in the provision and utilization of instructional materials - - -	172
Table 4.4.5	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the Instructional Leadership Practices in the maintenance of school physical facilities - - - - - - - -	174
Table 4.4.6(a)	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in staff and students' motivation-	175
Table 4.4.6(b)	Scheffe's Post-Hoc test on the perception of respondents in staff development - - - - - - -	176
Table 4.4.7(a)	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in institutional planning of academic programmes - - - - -	178
Table 4.4.7(b)	Scheffe's Post-Hoc test in institutional planning of academic programmes - - - - - - -	179
Table 4.4.8	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the perception of respondents in instructional leadership practices of principals in delegation of authority - - -	180
Table 4.4.9	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the perception of respondents in instructional leadership practices of principals in communication network - - - - -	182
Table 4.4.10	Summary of hypotheses testing - - - - -	184

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A - Questionnaire -	-	-	-	-	-	-	222
Appendix B - Krejcie and Morgan's Table for determining sample size from							
a given population	-	-	-	-	-	-	230
Appendix C - National Summary of Post-Primary schools	-	-	-				231
Appendix D - Number of secondary schools by states				-	-	-	232
Appendix E - West African Examination Council Result by State 2007						-	233
Appendix F - West African Examination Council Result by State 2008						-	234

ABSTRACT

This study focused on “Evaluation of Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Nigerian Secondary Schools”. The study was specifically interested in finding out the instructional leadership roles played by secondary school principals in Nigeria. In other words, the study evaluated the opinions of Teachers, Ministry of Education Officials and principals in respect of principals’ instructional leadership practices in Nigerian secondary schools. The mass failure in examinations, non-coverage of school syllabus, wastage in human and material resources teacher incompetence, examination malpractice, absenteeism and so on were assumed or alleged to be the result of inability of principals to effectively play their instructional leadership responsibilities in their schools. The critical areas examined were curriculum implementation, instructional supervision, staff development, provision and utilization of instructional materials, motivation, maintenance of school physical facilities, institutional planning of academic programmes, delegation of authority and communication network. Nine hypotheses were formulated to find out the significant differences in the opinions of the three groups of respondents. The researcher reviewed relevant literature to establish the theoretical bases for the study. The descriptive and survey methods were adopted for investigations and data collection. Through stratified random sampling technique, twelve states in the six geo-political zones of Nigeria were selected for the study. One thousand, two hundred (1,200) respondents comprising of 960 Teachers, 96 Ministry of Education Officials and 144 Principals were selected as samples. Out of the 1,200 copies of questionnaire designed and administered by the researcher, 900 were filled and returned. The questionnaire as the basic instrument was vetted by experts in Educational Administration and Planning and statisticians and was also subjected to pilot study in Taraba State Secondary Schools. The One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Scheffe’s Post-Hoc test were used to test the null hypotheses. Five out of nine hypotheses were accepted while four were rejected. The four rejected hypotheses were subjected to Scheffe’s post-hoc test to determine the extent of significant differences in the respondents’ opinions. The major finding of the research indicated that the instructional leadership role performed by principals showed high level of instructional leadership responsibilities in curriculum implementation, instructional supervision, maintenance of school facilities, delegation of authority and communication network. Furthermore, the study also revealed that principals of secondary schools in Nigeria did not adequately give attention to staff development, provision of school instructional materials . motivation of staff and students and planning of school programmes.. The study also revealed that extra-curricular activities such as sports, clubs, debate and so on were not encouraged and promoted by secondary schools principals in Nigeria. Recommendations such as the need to get firm grip of the school curriculum in order to offer useful advice and assistance to teachers, and the need to develop various motivational techniques such as honours, praise, involving teachers in decision making, open door policy etc and the need to engage staff in several staff development programmes to constantly upgrade their knowledge and skills were offered. Finally, suggestions were also made for further research in the area of improvement in teaching and learning in secondary schools in Nigeria.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Instructional leadership: This is a particular form of leadership that emphasises the improvement or promotion of teaching and learning in the school system. It involves setting goals, allocating resources, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, evaluating teachers, and facilitating academic activities. It also refers to the knowledge and skills principals possess to effectively support academic programmes or anything principals do to improve teaching and learning.

Evaluation: It is a process through which performances are assessed or appraised to determine progress in teaching and learning.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The future of a country depends on the quality of education given to its citizens, because, education assures the future of the society and provides continuity. For this reason, educational managers responsible for educational institutions have important responsibilities in ensuring quality outputs. This is so because educational system is in continuous interaction with social, political, cultural and economic systems which surround it. The emphasis by the public nowadays according to Wayne and Miskel (2008) is on efficiency, academic achievement and employment skills which require effective leadership from the principal. Ukeje (1991) argued that Nigeria is reaching a period where teaching is fast becoming the last hope for the hopeless, that is a profession for those who have nothing else better to do. This poses a challenge for dynamic instructional leadership in Nigerian secondary schools where the head is expected to create a conducive atmosphere that will give both staff and students hope and encouragement.

Leadership has been identified by researchers as a crucial factor in instructional effectiveness. It is a major factor in determining the success and progress of an institution. It is the key to success in every organization because it can either influence the climate of the school positively or negatively. Without effective leadership, even an institution full of talented teachers will surely drift without purpose. It is therefore the key to achieving collective excellence. It is the leader who most greatly affects the organisational climate and provides direction, motivation and inspiration for the school.

In other words, the success of any institution depends largely on the ability of the leader to maintain a conducive environment for the development of its members. Instructional leadership differs from that of a school administrator or manager. Principals who pride themselves as administrators are too preoccupied in dealing with strictly administrative duties compared to those who are instructional leaders (Brookover and Lezotte 1982). It is through instructional leadership that the principal can ensure that standards are not only maintained, but also improved upon to achieve expected objectives. This requires that a leader must have mission and vision to effectively utilize both human and material resources to achieve the expected goals.

Based on this reasoning, the principal who is regarded as the instructional leader must come to grips with the proper management of all affairs related to academic activities, so as to promote teaching and learning in the school. The principal is the person responsible for managing the instructional activities of the secondary school in Nigeria with the resources available at his disposal to ensure the achievement of secondary school educational goals and objectives. He is the chief executive and responsible for all that happens in his school. This is to say that the principal is the key person responsible for creating conducive school climate and learning environment that encourage the professional development of teachers and academic performance of students. He sets clear goals, allocates resources, manages curriculum, monitors lessons, evaluates teachers, organizes and implements plans, policies and programmes meant to achieve school objective (Fagbamiye 2004). His role is both complex and demanding that, it is by his action or inaction that the educational goals have to be judged (Udoh and Akpa 1990). It is therefore, expected that the principal as the school instructional leader

will engage in a variety of effective instructional leadership practices that are concerned with the elements of the instructional processes. The world of today is characterized by constant changes and the principal more than any other human being stands at the apex of these changes. His influence extends beyond the confines of the school and everyone sees him as reservoir of knowledge and skills.

However, there are complaints, accusations and reports that the present caliber of principals are deficient, inefficient and not up to the task of bringing about needed changes, because they do not respond adequately to standard based accountability, guiding and directing instructional improvement and incorporating revolutionary new information technologies in schools (Wayne and Miskel 2008). In a study Akpa (1990) found that principals deemphasized academic and instructional activities such as supervision, teaching and so on. This could be probably why Adesina and Ogunsaju (1984) argued that headship should not be for every teacher who has the requisite academic and professional qualifications, rather, it should be reserved for those who in addition to the necessary academic and professional qualifications, have the essential qualities of a good instructional leader. It is probably on this regard that Hughes (1970) also warned that it is no longer possible to believe that practical experiences alone constitute valid management training because according to him, the quality of experience can vary widely. Many reports have indicated that principals are important elements that either improve or impede academic progress of secondary schools in Nigeria.

The Nigerian secondary school education has for some time now become a source of concern to Nigerians. The concern focuses essentially on the quality of education which has been declining at an alarming and embarrassing rate (Nnoli and Sulaiman

2000). While some people attributed the causes of decline to grossly inadequate funding of the system, collapse of the educational infrastructure, poor salaries for teachers, examination malpractices, cultism, incessant strikes in the system, anti-intellectual attitudes of past regimes, others attributed it to the inability of principals to coordinate, direct and supervise instructional activities in their schools (Nnoli and Sulaiman 2000). The results of WASSCE of 2007 and 2008 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2009) are examples of the rate of decline in Nigerian secondary school education system which requires that principals should emphasise and improve their skills in instructional leadership. Out of 1,275,838 secondary school students that sat for 2007 WASSCE, only 26,606 representing 2.1% had minimum entry requirements into Nigerian tertiary institutions. Out of 1,339,171 candidates that sat for WASSCE in 2008, only 38,420 representing 2.8% students had the minimum requirements for admissions. This means that 1,249,232 representing 97.9% out of 1,275,838 would not gain any admission in 2007/2008 session while 1,330,751 representing 97.2% out of 1,369,171 candidates in 2008 did not qualify for 2008/09 admissions into tertiary levels. Who is to blame for the decline? It is clear from the results above that something is wrong with the instructional leadership role of principals since they are responsible for instructional activities of their schools. Ogunneye (2005) argued that it is not only the provision of funds, infrastructure, remuneration of staff and so on that can restore sanity and quality expected, but able and effective instructional leadership. He opined that a good, honest, hardworking and visionary principal will turn a poor school around and give it a good name image.

For an organization to be able to meet the expectations of its set role, it must be effectively and efficiently organized and managed. For the effectiveness of the

organization, there are variety of functions to be performed and behaviours to be enacted by the members. The most significant of these functions in secondary schools are those performed by the principals. These functions consist of duties, obligations and formal expectations of the behaviours of the position holders. To achieve the purpose for which the role was created, the role incumbent must behave in such a way that his duties are successfully done and his obligations discharged. This requires professional training to enable one perform his duties and obligations as expected, because adequate understanding of one's role leads to effective performance. In addition, the characteristics of the present students and even teachers are such that call for expertise instructional leadership.

However, there are accusations and reports that the Nigerian secondary school principals are not trained to handle constant changes in instructional activities in their schools. In her findings, Nosiri (1976) attributed the causes of poor instructional performance of principals to misunderstanding of their instructional roles and how to relate them. UNESCO (2000) revealed that most secondary schools principals in Nigeria have not yet been adequately trained or exposed to the tasks they perform, because many of them are inexperienced. This explains why Ozigi (1982) stated that in Nigeria, most secondary schools principals are new in the profession. The Federal Ministry of Education in a survey which analysed the problems of education sector revealed that principals require training in instructional leadership to enable them function effectively in curriculum implementation and coordination of instructional activities. This is because the organization, instruction and purpose of the school, reflect to a great extent on the personality of the head.

Many programmes have been mounted to train and upgrade teachers in this country. For instance, National Teachers' Institute, Faculty of Education, Institutes of Education in Nigerian universities and special training programmes have been established to train and improve teachers, but no institution is specifically established to train senior teachers or principals to handle instructional leadership activities. This is confirmed in the National Policy on Education (2004) where the policy stated that all teachers in educational institutions in Nigeria shall be professionally trained. Does it mean that principals' performance in instructional leadership is adequate enough that requires no training or upgrading in this technological era?

In Hong-Kong, America and other countries of the world, institutions were established specifically for the training of senior teachers for the position of principalship. The goal is to have lasting improvements in instructional leadership. The recipients are issued certificates and licenses to head schools as instructional leaders. There are even attempts to change the title of principalship to instructional leadership to enable the heads function effectively in school system (Brookover and Lezotte, 1982). In Nigeria, the position of principalship is based on experience and promotion. This is because the Nigerian civil service relies mostly on years of experience and promotion to elevate people from one cadre to the other, especially from the classroom to the management levels. This was criticized by Wong and Ng (2003) when they argued that an individual could be promoted from a position of competence to a position of incompetence because the individual could be insufficiently experienced and new in the new position. Because of rapid expansion in secondary schools, young graduates who have not had adequate experiences were called upon to head schools.

There are also reports that principals of Nigerian secondary schools are more of administrative leaders rather than instructional leaders because according to the reports, they are mostly preoccupied with strictly administrative duties at the expense of instructional responsibilities. Oghuvbu (2005) reported that principals in Delta State were not committed to their instructional leadership role. Principals according to Brookover and Lezotte (1982) are too pre-occupied in dealing with strictly administrative duties in their offices, leaving the instructional responsibilities in the hands of teachers alone. In a study, Kitari and Westhuizen (1997), found out that principals viewed school fees and money matters as their major concerns. UNESCO (2000) in a survey in Nigerian secondary schools revealed that principals spent much time travelling between their schools and the controlling agencies or Ministry of Education, thus, losing grip of the situation in their schools. In a study in Kwara State Otu (1984) reported that principalship is becoming more and more of professional administrative position rather than professional teaching position. The principal may understand more than his staff about the mechanics of administering the school and may have superior training in instructional leadership, but unless he knows how to work with the teachers and students and how to keep educational programmes moving forward, he is not a true instructional leader. On the basis of the above exposition, this study was set to evaluate the instructional leadership practices of principals on the management of Nigerian secondary schools.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Secondary education occupies an important place in the Nigerian education system, and also serves as the link between the primary and higher levels. As the leader

of secondary school, the principal is regarded as the chief executive and responsible for all that happens in the school (Oyediji and Fasasi 2006). In specific terms Lunebury and Ornstein (2008) viewed the functions of the principal as setting instructional directions, sensitive, result-oriented, team work, judgement, organizational ability, effective communication, development of others and developing self. He is well respected because people see him as reservoir of knowledge and skills.

However, it has been observed that academic and instructional activities including curriculum development, teaching and instructional supervision are treated with less vigour by principals (Akpa 1990). This observation was further corroborated by Mulkeen, Chapman, Dejaeghere and Leu (2007) who also observed that most school leaders in African countries do not have regard for instructional leadership and thus viewed it as not part of their duties. This is why Togneri (2003) observed that principals focused more on the administrative parts of their roles.

Over the years, leaders of secondary schools in Nigeria have been accused of various lapses (Hale 2009). They are said to be inexperienced and accused of failing to provide direction and adequate leadership for their schools. Ukeje and Ethiametalor (1998) stated that most of our educational leaders display non-collegial system which breeds informal groups, conflicts, cleavages and ultimately crises.

People nowadays no longer agree that secondary school graduates are in any way comparable to primary school graduates of yesteryears. Above all, there have been several agitations especially from parents that the missionary bodies should take over their schools so as to improve instructional leadership and better performance in examinations.

Governments are also worried that inspite of huge sums invested on education, things are not getting better with the sector. The question one asks here is that what is wrong with the present instructional leadership practices of principals? In other words, are the principals not adequately performing their instructional roles as expected?

There are complaints and reports that many principals do not devote much time and attention in planning, supervising, coordinating, directing and influencing academic activities in their schools (Ndu 1991). There are also complaints that teachers are no longer efficient and productive because they do not make optimal use of the available time to see that the students acquire necessary skills, knowledge and attitudes as specified in the schools' curricular activities because of poor instructional leadership practices displayed by principals (Nnabuo 1997). Although some reports indicate that there are a lot of factors (commitment, professional growth, school environment, prevailing culture, teachers' innovativeness etc) associated with teachers' performance, several studies seem to relate organizational leadership to teacher productivity (Fagbamiye 2004) In other words, teachers' performance in instructional activities has direct or indirect connection with the principals' instructional leadership responsibility. The principal is expected to provide the appropriate instructional leadership which will assist teachers to contribute maximally to quality education.

The inaction of the principals towards instructional leadership activities results in problems such as loss of sense of direction, mass failure in examinations, examination malpractice, class absenteeism by both teachers and students, non-coverage of syllabus, wastage in human and material resources, teacher incompetence, role conflicts, high rate of dropout, and so on as evident in many secondary schools in Nigeria (Ezeocha 1985).

Several studies have revealed that principals generally performed effectively in administrative leadership responsibilities and are less effective in instructional leadership practices. Studies by Olachukwu (2008), Out (1984), Akpa (1990) and so on revealed that principals administrative leadership took more of their time than instructional leadership. By implication, it can be stated that teaching and learning is not their priority. This means that principals in Nigerian secondary schools are not instructionally oriented in academic and instructional activities such as curriculum development, instructional supervision, organization of staff development, provision and utilization of instructional materials, maintenance of school physical facilities, planning of institutional academic programme non-involvement in teaching and so on. In view of these issues, it is worthwhile to evaluate the principals' instructional leadership practices in Nigerian secondary schools.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The following are the objectives that guided the study.

1. To assess the principals' instructional leadership practices in Nigerian secondary schools in respect of curriculum implementation.
2. To examine the instructional leadership practices of secondary schools principals in Nigeria in respect of instructional supervision.
3. To assess the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in organizing staff development.
4. To investigate the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in the provision and utilization of instructional materials.

5. To find out the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in respect of maintenance of school physical facilities
6. To find out the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in providing motivation to teachers and students.
7. To investigate the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in respect of institutional planning of academic activities.
8. To investigate the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in delegating authority to staff and students.
9. To examine the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in communication network.

1.4 Research Questions

The study attempted to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the principals' instructional leadership practices in Nigerian secondary schools in curriculum implementation?
2. What are the principals' instructional leadership practices in Nigerian secondary schools in instructional supervision?
3. What are the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in the organization of staff development?
4. What are the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in the provision and utilization of instructional materials?
5. What are the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in respect of maintenance of school physical facilities?

6. What are the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in providing motivation to staff and students?
7. What are the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in respect of institutional planning of school programmes?
8. What are the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in delegation of authority to staff and students?
9. What are the instructional leadership practices of principals in secondary schools in Nigeria in respect of communication network?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

This study was guided by the following hypotheses.

1. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in curriculum implementation.
2. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in instructional supervision.
3. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in secondary schools in Nigeria in the organization of staff development.
4. There is no significant difference in the opinion of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials with regard to instructional leadership practices of

principals in Nigerian secondary schools in the provision and utilization of instructional materials.

5. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in the maintenance of school physical facilities.
6. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in staff and students' motivation.
7. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in secondary schools in Nigeria in planning of institutional academic programmes.
8. There is no significant difference in the opinion of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in delegation of authority to staff and students.
9. There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in communication network.

1.6 Basic Assumptions

In this study, it is assumed that:-

1. principals are instructional leaders in their schools.

2. effective educational leadership makes a significant difference in improving teaching and learning.
3. principals are academically qualified and experienced to perform their instructional duties.
4. instructional leadership skills help principals to accomplish goals in an effective fashion.
5. lack of effective and able instructional leadership is responsible for students' poor performance in examinations.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The study would help principals to become more skillful, competent and effective in the performance of their responsibility as instructional heads of their institutions.

The study would also help policy makers in the ministries of education to formulate policies that will improve the leadership position of the principals of secondary schools system.

Furthermore, it study would help teachers especially those that would be promoted to principalship position in the future so as to understand the instructional role principals are expected to play in the discharge of their duties in schools.

It would also help Ministry of Education and School Board officials in charge of promotion and posting of teachers to understand the instructional role of principals. It would assist the governments and proprietors of schools who are employers of teachers to understand the instructional role expected of principals of secondary schools.

The study, like other studies, would add to the existing pool of knowledge in education, particularly in educational Administration and planning. The results would provide vital and important information to researchers and educators.

1.8 The Scope of the Study

This study examined the instructional leadership practices of principals of secondary schools in Nigeria. The choice of the entire country was to give a fair representation of all the groups in Nigeria. The study covered secondary schools in the entire country which comprises of six geo-political zone namely, North East, North Central, North West, South East, South West and South-South. This means that only secondary schools were the focus of this study. The tertiary and primary schools do not form part of this study.

In addition, the study focuses mainly on instructional leadership practices of principals of secondary schools in Nigeria as assessed by the principals, ministry officials and teachers of these institutions.

The study also examines areas in instructional leadership practices such as curriculum implementation, instructional supervision, staff development, provision and utilization of instructional materials, motivation, maintenance of school physical facilities, planning of institutional academic programmes, delegation of authority and communication network.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines related literatures that have in whole or part dealt with the instructional leadership practices of principals of Secondary Schools in Nigeria. Specifically, the chapter examines the following sub-headings:

- i. Concept of leadership and instructional leadership
- ii. The Principals as instructional leaders or administrators in secondary schools
- iii. Objectives of secondary education in Nigeria
- iv. Curriculum Implementation
- v. Instructional supervision
- vi. Staff development
- vii. Provision and utilization of Instructional materials
- viii. School physical facilities
- ix. Motivation of staff and students
- x. Planning of institutional academic programmes
- xi. Delegation of authority
- xii. Communication network.
- xii. Empirical studies
- xiii. summary

2.2 Conceptual Framework

2.2.1 Concept of Leadership

Definition of leadership differs because perspective of scholars differ. Leadership according to Aquinas (2005) is a process of influencing an individual or group towards goal attainment. Similarly, Hanson (1991), Musaazi (1982) and Dare (2009) defined leadership as an influence directed at an individual or a group. They argued that leadership role requires attention to individuals and organization. Wikipedia (2007) viewed leadership as the process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common goal or task. It is ultimately about creating a way for making people to contribute to making something extra ordinary happen.

The above definitions are important because they place emphasis on the vision of a leader (goals or objectives) while also highlighting the necessary interaction between the leader and group members. Essentially, a leader is seen as filling the gap between subordinate desires and abilities on one hand and organizational goals and requirements on the other hand. This could be the reason why Hanson (1991) differentiated between successful and effective leadership. Successful leadership according to him, is the ability to get others to behave as the leader intended. The job gets done and the manager's needs are satisfied, but those of the others or group are ignored. This relates to Getzals and Guba's nomothetic dimension. Effective leadership on the other hand results in the manager's intention being realized as well as bringing satisfaction to the needs of the employees. This also relates to Getzals and Guba's transactional leadership dimension.

From the definitions, Hanson (1991) stated that three basic elements which seem to be emphasized in the definitions of leadership are people, process and systems. To Afolayan (1982) four words which may be regarded as operative in the definitions are group, goals, situation and influence. The researcher tends to accept Afolayan's view because a person is a leader of a particular group of people with a specific goal or set of goals in a certain situation. Leadership therefore is the ability of the leader to induce subordinates to work with confidence and zeal (Aquinas, 2005).

People working in schools or organizations need leaders who could be instrumental in guiding the efforts of groups of workers to achieve the goals of both individuals and organization. This is why Wikipedia (2007) places emphasis on the vision of the leader. Leadership requires an understanding or respect for the power dynamics between the influencer and the follower. Hunt (2004) believes that leadership is not merely a top-down process, but it can be exercised sideways, and down-up throughout an organizational hierarchy. This means that leaders and followers can change roles, depending on the direction of the influencing process. In other words, followers are not static, but play an important role in the leadership process.

According to Ukeje and Ethiametalor (1998) leadership has been identified by researchers as a crucial factor in institutional effectiveness. It is a major factor in the determination of the success and progress not only of an institution, but also of a nation. It implies taking initiatives or initiating new structure or procedures for the achievement of the stated objectives. Thus, Ukeje and Ethiametalor (1998) argued that a leader must have mission and vision. Owan (2002) also agreed by saying that leadership is quite central, and that the proper functioning of any organization depends to a very large

extent, on the ability of whoever is the head to effectively utilize both human and material resources to achieve the goals of such an organization.

It is clear from the above that leadership involves the occupation of a position in an organization such as a school where the principal is entrusted with the responsibility of coordinating and directing all others towards the achievement of the school goals. The extent to which he is able to perform these functions will not only depend on the position he occupies as the principal, but also on his personal characteristics and leadership styles he adopts.

Leadership position can be seen at different levels such as in the school where professional type of leadership which in itself requires a high degree of academic and skill acquisition (Udeazor 2004). It brings the expertise knowledge of the leader to influence the behaviours and actions of his followers. Professional leadership manifests, when the leader uses expertise knowledge to cause change in the behaviours of teachers. Leadership is also seen at the traditional setting. At this level, the legitimacy of such leadership is found in culture and tradition of the people (Udeozor 2004). The leader is obeyed because of the tradition of the people to obey their leader and respect his position and authority.

2.2.2 Leadership Qualities

The earliest studies on leadership concentrated on the trait approach which is sometimes referred to as Greatman Theory (Trawathan and Nreport 1979). The advocates of this theory view a leader as a person with well developed important personality qualities such as physical energy, weight, height and attractiveness (Afolayan

1982). They argued that leaders are born and not made. To them effective leadership qualities can not be learnt (i.e. you are either born a leader or not). However, Wayne and Miskel (2008) criticized the trait approach by saying that it fails to assign weight value to the trait so as to make it easier to identify those attributes that are more important than others and contribute more to leader effectiveness. The trait approach also underrated environmental and situational factors that affect leadership effectiveness. Wayne and Miskel (2008) stated that there is no research conducted which shows a positive relationship between physical traits and leadership effectiveness. Stogdill (1981) asserted that a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some traits because the impact of traits varies widely from situation to situation. The research conducted by Yuki (2002) revealed that possession of certain traits increases the likelihood that a leader will be effective, but it does not represent the original trait assumption that leaders are born and not made.

The view that leaders are born was rejected (Bass 1990). The critics of the traits theory are of the view that situation in which the leader finds himself determines the degree of his effectiveness. If the situation is favourable he will succeed, but if not he will fail, no matter what his personal qualities are (Wayne and Miskel 2008). Situation in this context includes the structure of the organization, the behaviour of the people in it and the organizational environment (Afolayan 1982). According to this approach, if a leader moves from one social unit to another, or else and situations change, he may become either more successful or less.

The criticisms against the situational approach brought about the interactional approach which represents a compromise between the trait and situational approaches

(Afolayan 1982). The proponents of this theory argued that some interaction between the qualities of the leader and characteristics of the situation in which leadership takes place is necessary. This means that an individual must develop personal qualities that are relevant to the characteristic activities and goals of the organized group.

Researchers have so far indicated that the only innate quality which is indispensable for effective leadership is average intelligence (Wayne and Miskel 2008). This means that scholars have not yet found any correlation between effective leadership and such trait as physical qualities. Udeozor (2004) argued that leadership qualities required can be developed through education, training and practice. To Fadipe and Oluchukwu (2009), effective leadership depends on the personality and ability of the leader. Other qualities that can be developed according to Tijani and Shehu (2007) include knowledge, purpose, communication, skills, ability to work with others, commitment, fairness and impartiality.

Musaazi (1982) observed that leaders are people with certain characteristics that especially fit them for their leadership roles. To him, leaders are people with purpose and a vision of possible accomplishment which give them the inspiration necessary for real success. He concluded by saying that leaders must have confidence, commitment and be friendly at all times. To Ethiametalor (1981) an instructional leader must have teaching experience, intelligence, scholarship, communication skills, ambition, composure and human relations.

Ezeocha (1985) stated that an effective and successful leader will have the attributes of technical skills and traits of personality. By technical skills, Ezeocha means ability to organize, delegate, motivate, fair and knowledgeable. Traits of personality

refers to friendliness, communication, tactfulness, honesty, commitment and courage. Bray in Sidhu (2002) enumerated the following as attributes required of the leader. These are sense of duty, sound judgement, sympathy, power of insight, love for work, initiative, persuasive, self-control, firmness and originality. Sidhu (2002) discussed the desired qualities as philosophy, scholarship, professional training, organizing ability, human relationship, physical and mental health and personality.

To Afolayan (1982) leadership qualities required are as follows:

(a) ability to clarify goals, (b) sense of commitment, (c) self-confidence (d) technical competence (e) capacity to work with others (f) ability to communicate (g) ability to control one's emotions. To Aquinas (2005) the leader should possess human relation skills, conceptual skills, technical skills and personal skills.

From the above, it is clear that a leader should have a dynamic personality, intellectual attainment, available disposition, unassuming temperament and knowledge of how to deal with his followers (Olu, 2009). Afolayan (1982) opined that the possession of these characteristics to such a degree will enable the leader to be flexible enough to choose a leadership style that will suit each situation. To Yuki (2002) five qualities are more important in considering effective leadership. These are self-confidence, tolerance, emotional maturity, integrity and extroversion. A leader must set goals, be a model, skillful, inspiring, gentle with vision and sound principles (Sidhu 2002). Nwachukwu (1988) stated that leaders' behaviour and leadership qualities are only a part of the factors affecting leadership in an organization. Factors such as the behaviour of members, structure of the organization, task being performed and members' expectations from the leader are important dependent variables that affect the leadership process.

2.2.3 Leadership Styles

After several years of studies, it became clear to researchers that leadership effectiveness is more complicated than to depend on only personal traits, situational and behavioural characteristics (Afolayan 1982). As a result, researchers shifted emphasis to the study of leadership styles. Musaazi (1982), Wikispedia (2007) and Dare (2009), stated that there are three basic styles of leadership. These are laissez-faire, autocratic and democratic leadership.

Laissez-Faire Leadership: Bass (1998) characterizes this type of leadership as the absence of transactions with followers. He further stated that laissez-faire leaders avoid expressing their views or taking action on important issues, fail to make decision, ignore responsibilities, provide no feedback and allow authority to remain dormant. According to Dare (2009) this leadership style is unpopular and should be discouraged. Musaazi (1982) stated that this leadership means let people do what they want. This is why he refers to it as care-free type of leadership. The leader here has no vision and has no time for group decision-making. Dare (2009) stated that this type of leadership allows members to develop their own initiatives. However, the leadership may lead to chaos and anarchy. It also creates faction within the group and leads to non-attainment of the school objectives.

Autocratic Leadership: This is also referred to as authoritarian leadership. Wikispedia (2007) stated that autocratic leadership is a type of leadership that uses fear and threats to get the job done. Under this leadership, all decision-making powers are centralized. The leader's power is derived from his status in the school. According to Afolayan (1982) this type of leadership does not trust that people will work without supervision. Such

leadership does not entertain suggestions or initiatives from the subordinates. According to Owan (2003) the leadership emphasizes the achievement of tasks at the expense of human consideration. There are always strict rules and regulations in an autocratic leadership. The pattern of communication flow is usually downward from the autocratic leader to subordinates who are expected to obey whatever is directed without hesitation (Owan, 2003). The advantage of this leadership is that it provides motivation to the leader. It also permits quick decision-making since only one person is involved in decision-making (Dare 2009). It also encourages hard work. The disadvantages of this style are that (a) it dampens staff morale (b) it does not promote good social climate. (c) It breeds hostility and enmity among members of the school. (d) The leader lives in perpetual fear and (e) it does not enhance staff cooperation and initiatives.

Democratic Leadership: Owan (2003) stated that Democratic leadership is the style in which there is a high consideration of the human factor in an organization as being important in the achievement of goals. Musaazi (1982) observed that democratic leadership is based on the assumption that leader's effectiveness is derived from the group he is leading. The leader tends to encourage staff discussion and participation in decision-making (Dare 2009). The leader delegates authority to subordinates and believes in majority opinion. Leadership here allows freedom of expression and sees subordinates as partners in progress. Decisions in democratic leadership are not unilaterally taken. This type of leadership according to Owan (2003) maintains a healthy relations with staff as the leader is always interested in their well being. This leadership style promotes greater group productivity (Musaazi, 1982). It also promotes unity and cooperation among staff. In addition, Dare (2009) stated that the leadership encourages

initiatives and desirable social behaviour among staff. The disadvantage of this style of leadership is that it delays decision-making because of the involvement of many people. The opinion of the majority may sometime be wrong.

Instead of categorizing leadership into autocratic, and democratic, some scholars indicate a variety of styles of leader behaviour. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) developed a leadership behaviour continuum in which seven behaviour patterns are identified which range from extremely democratic at one end to extremely autocratic on the other end. The continuum according to Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) relates to the degree of freedom which the subordinates are allowed to exercise and degree of authority exercised by the leader.

Getzels and Guba (1957) also provided a model for the classification of leadership style on the basis of whether a leader's main consideration is for (a) the organization or (b) the individuals in the organization. According to Getzels and Guba (1957) a leader whose main consideration is for the organization is said to be adopting nomothetic approach, and a leader whose main concern is for individuals in the organization is said to be employing idiographic style. A leader who appreciates the need to achieve organizational goals but at the same time recognizes the need to meet the requirement of the individuals is said to be employing transactional approach.

Transactional leadership: These leaders motivate followers by exchanging rewards for services rendered. According to Bass (1998), transactional leaders pursue a cost-benefit, economic exchange to meet followers' current material and psychological needs in return for contracted services rendered by the subordinates. Bass and Riggio (2006) however,

believed that enhanced effort, effectiveness and job satisfaction result when transactional leadership is augmented with transformational leadership.

In other words, the transactional leader recognizes the importance of instructional demands but tries to balance them with the aspirations of organization members.

Transformational Leadership – This type of leadership is an expansion of transactional leadership that goes beyond simple exchanges and agreements. These leaders are proactive, raise the awareness levels of followers about inspirational collective interests and help followers achieve unusual high performances outcomes (Brass and Riggio 2006). Transformational leadership has idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.

Idealized influence builds trust and respect in followers and provides the basis for accepting radical and fundamental changes in the ways individuals and organizations do their work. These leaders display conviction about important issues, exhibit high standard of ethical and moral conduct, sharing risks with followers in setting and attaining goals, consider the needs of others over their own and use power to move individuals or groups toward accomplishment of mission, vision and cause, but never for personal gain (Bass and Riggio, 2006). Followers identify with their leaders and want to emulate them. The leaders are admired, trusted and respected.

Inspirational motivation changes the expectations of group members to believe that the organization's problems can be solved (Atwater and Bass 1994). Inspirational motivation comes primarily from leader behaviours that provide meaning and challenge for followers. Leaders here energize people by projecting an attractive and optimistic future, emphasizing ambitious goals and creating idealized visions for the organization

and communicating to followers that the vision is attainable. Intellectual stimulation addresses the problem of creativity (Atwater and Bass, 1991). Transformational leaders stimulate followers to be innovative and creative by questioning old assumptions, traditions and beliefs, reframing problems and approaching old situations in new ways. Here, leaders challenge followers to think creatively, design new procedures and programmes and solve difficult problems, eliminate old ways of doing things and refrain from publicly criticizing individual members for mistakes (Bass and Avolio 1994).

Individualized consideration means that transformational leaders pay particular attention to each individual's needs for achievement and growth. The purpose of individualized consideration is to determine the needs and strength of others. (Atwater and Bass 1994). As Mentors, the leaders help followers and colleagues develop to successively higher levels of potential and take responsibilities for their own development (Avolio 1994). The leaders create new learning opportunities in a supportive climate, recognize and accept individual differences in needs and values, use two-way communication and interact with others in a personalized fashion as necessary behaviours to accomplish individualized consideration. The leader listens to individuals actively and effectively. Studies by Yuki (1999) revealed that transformational leadership can move followers to exceed expected performance. In comparison to transactional leadership, Yuki (1999) believes that transformational leadership generates greater subordinate effort, commitment and satisfaction.

In summary therefore, while the prevailing attitude of the leader (principal) should be democratic, occasion may demand some form of autocracy depending on the situation. Bass and Riggio (2006) explicitly acknowledged that there is no one best way

to lead and that situational factors can influence the effectiveness of leaders. Several studies have concluded that no leadership style is appropriate for all situations (Afolayan, 1982). Similarly, Nwachukwu (1988) observed that no one study has been declared as possessing the answer to the leadership question. According to him, each study attempts to make a contribution by breaking new grounds or refining existing studies. The question of what determines effective leadership is not completely answered. Tannenbaum and Schmidt in Nwachukwu (1988) argued that the choice of leadership style should depend on factors such as size of the organization, personality of members, degree of interaction in the organization, goal congruency, level of decision-making and the state of the system. The style of leadership to be adopted by leaders whether directive, participative or free-rein is influenced by situational factors.

2.2.4 Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership is a relatively new concept that emerged in the early 1980's which called for a shift of emphasis from principals being managers or administrators to instructional or academic leaders (Brookover and Lezotte, 1982). Instructional leadership differs from that of a school administrator or manager in a number of ways. Principals who pride themselves as administrators are too preoccupied in dealing with strictly administrative duties compared to principals who are instructional leaders. Instructional leadership role according to Wayne and Miskel (2008) involves setting clear goals, allocating resources, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans and evaluating teachers. In short, instructional leadership is the action that the principal takes or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning. According to Brookover and Lezotte (1982) the instructional leader makes instructional quality the

top priority of the school and attempts to bring that vision to realization. Instructional leadership is a significant factor in facilitating, improving and promoting the academic progress of students.

Brookover and Lezotte (1982) defined instructional leadership as the knowledge and skills principals possess to effectively support the academic programme. In other words, instructional leadership is anything principals do to improve teaching and learning by gathering evidence of student achievement that demonstrates improvement. Instructional leadership is conceived of as a blend of supervision, staff development, curriculum development and school improvement. (Smith and Andrews 1989). Sheppard (1996) and Murphy (1987) saw it as interaction between leaders and followers wherein the followers' beliefs and perceptions are viewed as important.

Instructional leadership according to Wayne and Miskel (2008) is a particular form of leadership that emphasizes the improvement of teaching and learning in the school. Instructional leadership attempts to change such school factors as curricular content, teaching methods, assessment strategies and cultural norms for academic achievement. Such leadership can come from a variety of sources including principal as instructional leader (Hallinger 2005). Based on the effective schools research of 1970, early descriptions of principals whose schools had shown marked improvement often emphasized a heroic view of their abilities and attributed the changes to the principals. As Hallinger (2005) noted that instructional leaders were commonly seen as strong and directive, culture builders, goal-oriented, both leaders and managers and people who combine expertise with charisma. Policy-makers became enamored with the idea that a path to school improvement was through principal instructional leadership and called on

the schools to prepare and hire principals to be instructional leaders. However, the demands went unanswered because, as Hallinger (2005) clarifies, the field of educational administration lacked theoretical models that described and explained how principals influence students learning.

Scholars have worked to develop useful contingency approaches for understanding instructional leadership. The contingency model developed by Steven, Bossert, Dwyer, Brian, Rowan and Lee (1982) in Wayne and Miskel (2008) hypothesized that personal and external environmental characteristics influence the management behaviours of principals, which in turn affect school climate and instructional organization. According to them, school climate and organization, shape teachers' behaviour and students' learning experiences that produce students learning. Ronald, Terry and George (1990) in Wayne and Miskel (2008) empirically tested the model and found substantial support for its basic hypothesis which stated that principals influence student achievement indirectly by creating instructional organizations in their schools through participative actions and by building school climates and cultures characterized by clearly communicated goals and high expectations for academic achievement and social behaviour.

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) advanced a model of instructional leadership, employing three dimensions. (1) Defining the schools mission – According to Hallinger and Murphy (1985) this spotlights the principal's role in working with others to ensure that the school uses clear, measurable, time-based goals for the academic progress of students. Principals must communicate the goals so that they are widely known. (2) Managing instructional programmes. This means coordinating and controlling the school

curriculum and instruction by stimulating, supervising and monitoring teaching and learning. (3) Promoting a positive school learning climate. This builds on the idea that effective schools create an academic press through high standards and expectations for students and teachers (Hallinger 2005).

In summary, the focus of instructional leadership has evolved from simple heroic conception to rather complex contingency models of leadership. Instructional leaders use their personalities, motivation for success and administrative skills to accomplish improvements by interpreting internal and external events, changing the organization and substance of work activities, and improving individual motivation and abilities, power relations and shared orientations (Wayne and Miskel 2008).

2.2.5 The Principal as an Instructional Leader or Administrator in Secondary Schools

The principal is an instructional leader or manager who leads a secondary school (U.S. Department of Labour). Principalship is one of the oldest educational administrative positions imported into this country by missionaries. The post has a firm foundation in the advanced countries of Europe and North America, long before the first secondary (C.M.S. Grammar School Lagos) was established (Udoh and Akpa, 1990). He is the chief executive responsible for managing the instructional activities of the secondary school using the resources at his disposal to ensure that secondary school goals and objectives are achieved. In other words, the principal is responsible for creating school climate and learning environment that encourage the professional development of teachers and academic performance of students. Similarly, Reitzug (1994) listed some

attributes of the principal which constitute instructional leadership to include providing staff development, encouraging risk taking, requiring justification of practices etc.

The principal is therefore considered to be a leader, counselor, guide, psychologist and a teacher of teachers. Udoh and Akpa (1990) stated that, the Nigerian secondary school principal occupies a unique position in the Nigerian educational system. According to them, his main tasks include interpreting policies, executing instructional programmes and selecting, inducting and retaining the school personnel. He ensures that students receive good instruction from their teachers and are properly cared for. He also ensures proper utilization and maintenance of all school facilities and equipment and takes part in financial policy of the school. Therefore, when the principal does his instructional duties effectively, great things happen, but when he is incompetent and ineffective in performing his duties, students are hindered from achieving their potentials. Fagbamuje (2004) stated that, the principal is essentially an organizer and implementer of plans, policies and programmes meant for specific educational objectives.

Analyzing the functions of the principal, U.S. Department of Labour (2011) asserted that principals set the academic tone and work actively with teachers to develop and maintain high curriculum standards, formulate mission statements and establish performance goals and objectives. They evaluate teachers, visit classrooms, observe teaching methods, review instructional objectives and examines learning materials (Olachukwu, 2008).

Dare (2009) enumerated the following as the functions of the principals in the secondary school:

- i. Cause things to happen and know what he wants to happen.

- ii. Exercise responsible stewardship over resources and turn them into purposeful account.
- iii. Promote effectiveness and search for continual improvement.
- iv. Be accountable for the performance of the unit he is managing and
- v. Set a climate conducive to enable people give their best.

Udoh and Akpa (1990) summarized the responsibilities of the principal as follows:

- i. To prepare annual budget of the school.
- ii. To liaise between the school and educational agencies and organizations.
- iii. To coordinate Parents-Teachers Association's activities.
- iv. To initiate and encourage innovations.
- v. To supervise the activities of all school staff and students.
- vi. To design the physical plant for the school.
- vii. To organize the curriculum and its contents.
- viii. To select the school textbooks, materials and equipment.
- ix. To determine the services to aid teaching and learning activities.
- x. To maintain effective lines of communication within the school and with outside agencies.
- xi. To maintain a high level of discipline and policy formulation governing curricular and co-curricular activities and
- xii. To report school defects either in terms of infrastructures or personnel to the appropriate authorities for rectification.

The functions of the principal as an instructional leader are many and diversified. This is because he determines the success and progress of the institution and his leadership affects the school climate and provides direction, motivation and inspiration. He is therefore, a major factor in determining the success and progress of the school. It is the principal's responsibility to guide and direct teachers and students in the process of implementing the curriculum and ensuring that facilities and equipment for teaching and learning are in order and utilized effectively (Achumine, 1998). Arikewuyo (1999) viewed the functions of instructional leaders (principals) as:

1. Providing leadership in instructional improvement
2. Providing leadership in curriculum
3. Creating environment conducive for realizing human potentials.
4. Influencing the behavior of staff and students and
5. Supervising instructional activities.

The principal does not acquire his instructional leadership simply by virtue of his title, but by positive achievement. This is why Ogunsaju (1983) pointed out that a principal can be defined by the nature of the work done and services rendered rather than according to any title. Effective principals set high academic standards for staff and students, focus on excellence and inspire all members of the school community to a shared commitment towards the realization of school objectives (Ejiofor 1985). Thus, what transpires in a school either promotes or impedes students' academic success.

The primary objective of a school is the improvement, advancement and transmission of knowledge. Therefore, the principal's most important and primary task is the improvement of instruction or teaching and learning. It is the responsibility of the

principal to promote effective teaching in the school. This is why Musaazi (1983) stated that the head teacher must be a highly competent and skilled person in such things as modern techniques of instruction. As an instructional leader, he assigns tasks and duties to his staff. For example, he assigns staff to classes and gives them teaching loads. But he has to ensure that through constant supervision that each person is performing his or her duties satisfactorily. This is why Lunenburg and Ornstein (2008) stated that supervision of instruction is the main duty of the school head which must not be delegated to any of his assistants.

To improve instruction in the school, the principal must understand his teachers and must always be prepared to work effectively with them. To do this, he should generate interpersonal interest, confidence and trust. He therefore has to respond to various requests by his teachers so as to boost their morale. He should also be exemplary to his staff by teaching some classes on regular basis.

Staff development is another area in which the principal functions. He should participate actively in providing and organizing on the job training for his staff. He should also participate in assessing and recommending staff for promotion, retention and dismissal (Musaazi 1982). Other tasks according to Osunneye (2005) include

- a. Represent individual interest of staff to appropriate authorities.
- b. Allocate teaching responsibilities.
- c. Involve teachers in decision-making concerning curriculum
- d. Motivate teachers to work hard.
- e. Supervise new and inexperienced teachers, the experienced, competent and the mature teachers constantly on the job.

- f. Work with the staff in determining school needs.
- g. Attend to staff welfare and personal problems.

The school plant or physical facilities is an important area for a school principal especially in view of the present economic predicament and the fact that adequate provision and maintenance of facilities greatly affect teaching and learning. Where the facilities are inadequate and poorly used, they retard learning in the school (Eziuzo, 2008). Anyakoha (1994) emphasized that the development of useful skills can be reinforced by the appropriate selection and utilization of learning facilities and resources. Well planned facilities do not only enhance learning process but also pave way for launching new educational programmes in schools. The principal has the duty of formulating maintenance programme that would extend the life and usefulness of school plant. The quality of education that students receive bears direct relevance to the physical facilities and atmosphere in which learning takes places.

The principal as the administrator of the school should have a good understanding of the community within which the school exists; and should establish and maintain a cordial relationship with such community. Musaazi (1982) asserted that as the chief public relation officer of the school, the principal should maintain good public relationship with the parents and community. He should maintain a close liaison with other educational institutions and employment agencies where his students are likely to work on completion.

According to Dada (1986), the functions of the school principal in relation to the community include:

- i. informing the public about the school.

- ii. establishing confidence in the school.
- iii. rallying community support for the maintenance of the education programmes.
- iv. developing awareness of the importance of education in a democracy.
- v. improving the partnership by uniting parents and teachers in meeting the educational needs of the students.
- vi. integrating the home, school and the community in improving educational opportunities for all students.
- vii. evaluating the offering of the school and the needs of the students of the community and
- viii. correcting any misunderstanding about the aims and objectives of the school.

For the principal to be successful in accomplishing his tasks, he needs to have an adequate knowledge of his instructional leadership role and should be mindful of the expectations other people in the role set hold him. This means that the principal needs to have adequate training in the area of instructional leadership to enable him function effectively.

2.2.6 Objectives of Secondary School Education in Nigeria

Secondary school education follows immediately after primary education and before tertiary education. It is also referred to as post-primary school. It is the second stage in formal education. It is an education for the adolescent years, that is, about 12 to 18 years of age.

All the functions the principal discharges daily are geared towards the fulfillment of the objectives of secondary education in Nigeria. Secondary education occupies a very

strategic position in any nation's educational system (Adesina and Ogunsaju 1984). Secondary education according to the National Policy on Education (2004) is the education children received after primary education and before the tertiary stage.

The broad goals of secondary education shall be to prepare the individual for:

- a. Useful living within the society and
- b. Higher education (NPE, 2004).

In specific term, secondary education according to NPE (2004) shall:

- a. provide all primary school leavers with the opportunity for education of 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 and commerce at sub-professional grades.
- d. develop and promote Nigerian languages, art and culture in the context of world 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 themselves, respect the views and feelings of others, respect the dignity of labour, appreciate those values specified under our broad national goals and live as good citizens.

- h. provide technical knowledge and vocational skills necessary for agricultural, industrial, commercial and economic development.

To achieve these objectives, the principal has an important role to play in order to realize the objectives.

2.3 Curriculum Implementation

The fundamental role of education is the transformation of the society through the sustenance of the societal values, norms, traditions, beliefs or the accumulated knowledge. These desirable elements of culture in the society are further built into the schools' plan of action. This plan can be referred to as the school curriculum which serves as a vehicle through which the school moves towards the achievement of the planned educational goals (Udeozor 2004). The curriculum according to Cole (2005) is used to indicate roughly a plan for the education of learners and to identify their field of study. The curriculum, as an academic plan, concerns itself with the range of subject-matter, the procedure of activities and evaluation (Ovwigho 2004). It equally follows that all planned learning outcomes for which the school is responsible form part of the school curriculum (Mkpa 1987).

Aquokogbuo (2000) defined the curriculum as all the learning experiences of students which are planned and directed by the school to attain its educational goals. This means that the curriculum is made up of all the experiences (both curricular and extra-curricular) to which students are exposed under the guidance of the school. It is the deliberate, systematic and planned attempts made by the school to change the behaviour of members of the society (Tanner and Tanner 1975).

To Tijani and Shehu (2007) curriculum involves designing or redesigning what is to be taught by whom, when, where and in what pattern. The principal's instructional practices in curriculum refers to setting goals, planning learning experiences and allocating resources (Aderounmu and Ethiametalor 1981). The task of curriculum development forms an important role of school leaders. The principal works with the supervisors from the ministry, teachers, students and parents in the selection of appropriate or desirable curricular or school activities, choice of subjects to be taught in the school, the textbooks, teaching aids and facilities, teaching methods, the methods of evaluation and ways of reporting on students' progress.

Peretomode (1991) opined that the principal's roles in curriculum development are to (a) help formulate curriculum objectives (b) determine curriculum content and organization (c) relate the desired curriculum to available time, physical facilities and personnel (d) provide materials, resources, and equipment for the instructional programme, (e) provide for supervision of instruction (f) provide for in-service education of instructional personnel.

It is also the responsibility of the principal as an instructional leader to provide co-curricular activities in his school. Sidhu (2002) opined that extra-curricular activities are now considered to be an integral part of the school programme. He argued that curricular and co-curricular activities are considered complementary and they overlap one another in the day to day routine of the school. Sidhu (2002) stated that there are categories of co-curricular activities in the secondary schools. Some of these categories are (1) Academic development in which subject clubs such as mathematics club, historical club, geographical club etc. are formed. (2) Citizenship training activities such as students'

council or parliament (3) Aesthetic activities such as drawing and painting, music, exhibition, fancy dress etc. (4) cultural development activities such as calibration of festival, visits to places of cultural importance, etc. (5) Literary activities such as debate, magazine, public speaking etc. (6) Physical development activities such as athletics, indoor games, outdoor games etc. (7) social welfare activities such as scouting, Red Cross (8) scientific activities such as science club, science quiz, visit to scientific establishments etc.

Extra-curricular activities according to Sidhu have a number of advantages and benefits such as psychological, aesthetic, recreational, social, civic, academic, physical, ethical and cultural values. For a principal to succeed, he should provide required facilities, guidance, motivation and equal opportunity for all the students in the school. In order to enable the students to draw adequate benefits from the activities, the principal should undertake responsibility of making provisions very seriously. Arrangement should be made for the introduction of a variety of activities in order to cater for the varied needs and interests of the students (Wayne and Miskel 2008). The principal should delegate staff to guide the activities of the students and proper allotment of time should be made in the schools. The students should enjoy freedom of choice and freedom to change.

The school principal is expected to show leadership in determining the instructional goals, materials and methods. He has to ensure equity in time allocation to various learning experiences (Sidhu 2002). Whenever there is a change in societal needs, the administrator leads other school personnel in re-aligning school activities to suit the

changing needs of the society. Through the curricular activities, the school head encourages tolerance, and respect (Musaazi 1982).

2.4 Instructional Supervision

Supervision is the back-bone of educational improvement (Sidhu 2002). Ethimetalor (1985) defined supervision as all efforts of designated school officials directed toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction. Ogunsaju (1983 seems to agree with the above definition by saying that supervision is principally concerned with the achievement of the appropriate instructional expectation of educational system. Similarly Musaazi (1982) defined supervision as a consciously planned programme for the improvement and consolidation of instruction. To Dare (2008) supervision means guidance, assistance, sharing of ideas to all those involved in the process of teaching and learning environment. He further stated that supervision is about helping the teacher and learners to realize their potentials, improving teaching and curriculum development.

From the above definitions, one can deduce that the definitions emphasize the following: (a) That supervision is concerned with improvement of instructional activities (b) That it aims at improving efficiency and coordination (c) that it provides assistance to teachers.

The supervisory practices of the principal according to Ezeocha (1993) is in the areas of curriculum development, organizing instruction, staff development, providing facilities and orienting new teachers.

Dare (2009) stated the rationale for school supervision as follows:

- i. To improve teaching and learning activities in the school.
- ii. To assist teachers to develop the required teaching skills.
- iii. To equip teachers with the skills of curriculum development.
- iv. To ensure that schools are run effectively and efficiently.
- v. To evaluate the conditions of teaching and learning in the school.
- vi. To ensure and sustain the link between the school and the Ministry of Education
- vii. To evaluate and improve schools for external examinations.
- viii. To carry out investigation either in respect of a petition or for school upgrading.
- ix. To ensure that schools use the curriculum developed by the Ministry of Education.
- x. To assess the adequacy of staff and facilities in the school. In other words, to assess the adequacy of human and material resources in the school, to Musaazi (1982) the purpose of supervision is to develop goals, develop programmes, control and coordinate, motivate, solve problems, develop professionals and to evaluate learning outcomes.

Olagboye (2004) enumerated the purpose of instructional supervision to include:

- i. Improve the quality of teaching and learning for the benefit of both the learners and the teachers.
- ii. Ensure that every teacher in the school is effectively performing the duties assigned to him.
- iii. Assist teachers in developing needed teaching competencies.
- iv. Assess teachers' effectiveness in classroom management.

- v. Help teachers to solve the professional problems they may encounter in their work.
- vi. Help teachers in identifying their strength and weaknesses with a view to providing relevant in-service training.
- vii. Help new teachers to have a clear understanding of the objective, role and relationship of their positions as well as the direction of their efforts in the school.
- viii. Identify those teachers who should be promoted, retained, redeployed or disengaged.

Ogunsaju (1983) and Nwaogu (1980) identified some supervisory techniques that are appropriate and useful to principals in the discharge of their supervisory role to teachers. These according to Ogunsaju (1983) and Nwaogu (1980) include (a) classroom visitation and observation, (b) workshop technique (c) Micro-teaching technique and (d) Research technique. For a principal to effectively do these need to be purposeful, in thought, skillful in motivation, creative in nature, humanistic in approach and capable of seeing beyond the level of those he has to help (Ogunsaju 1983).

Instructional supervision according to Udeozor (2004) is the improvement of teaching and learning process for the utmost benefit of the child who is regarded as the centre of education. Similarly, Mbodile (1986) perceived supervision of instruction as a service help to teachers, a process of giving and receiving help in an effort to improve instruction. To him the effort is concerned with what to teach, when it should be taught, to whom, by whom and how. He felt that instructional supervision be specifically described as that phase of school administration which focuses primarily upon the improvement of instruction. It is a process of giving and receiving help to improve

performance and to resolve problems that occur between teachers and students or activities aimed at influencing the quality of teaching and learning. Such involves the stimulation of professional growth, development of teachers, selection and revision of educational materials, objectives and methods of teaching and finally evaluation of instruction (Udeozer 2004).

Supervision of instruction may therefore involve such activities as the improvement of every phase of the educational programme that goes on in the school. (Nwachukwu 1988). It is a service help by which advice, directions and discussions are used to see that available resources such as finance, manpower and equipment are utilized in achieving the set objectives of education (Nwaogu, 1980).

Instructional supervision causes the appraisal of specific learning situations to ascertain the needs of students and the efficiency of instruction, technical service to teachers in form of instructional aids. It also involves giving specific suggestions for the improvement of instruction and assistance in students diagnosis and measurement; carrying out research for the purpose of curriculum construction and revision and for the improvement of materials, techniques and methods of instruction. Others are professional leadership and cooperation with teachers through individual and group conferences, through stimulation to further development of some programmes of in-service education as well as the efforts to persuade, enlighten and arouse in teachers a state of readiness to modify their behaviours and attitudes in line with the educational programme of the school.

Instructional supervision is a special case of teaching in which at least two persons are concerned with improvement of teaching, one of them is the teacher whose

performance is to be improved. It seeks to stimulate change by helping, advising and counseling each other as well as planning, talking and positively inter-changing with each other.

In this regard, the supervisor is not seen as educating the teachers, rather, he offers their specialized skills in helping them to educate themselves and in the process he educates himself (Udeozer 2004). This new approach may be in opposition to the traditional assumption that the methods and curriculum are fixed, while teachers are expected to accept without initiatives.

The characteristics of modern supervision of schools according to Udeozer (2004) are as follows”:-

1. It directs attention towards the fundamentals of education and orients learning and its improvement with the general aim of education.
2. The aim of supervision is the improvement of the total teaching – learning process, the total setting for learning rather than the narrow and limited aim of improving teachers’ in-service.
3. The focus is on the setting for learning not on a person or group of persons.
4. All persons are co-workers aiming at the improvement of a situation. One group is not superior to another, operating to improve the inferior group.
5. The teacher is removed from his embarrassing position as the focus of attention and the work link in the educational process. He assumes his rightful position as a co-operation member of a group concerned with the improvement of learning.

It can be stated that in the modern concept of supervision of instruction, the establishment and maintenance of satisfactory human relations among all staff members

is primary. The modern supervision seems to focus more on the roots of education and the improvement of learning. (Aderounmu and Ethiametalor 1981). This is to say that teaching-learning situation becomes its centre of concern with the supervisor and teachers working together in a very co-operative pattern to improve a given programme of education. Sidhu (2002) recommended that supervision in Nigeria should be positive, dynamic and democratically designed to improve instruction. The general concern should focus on the establishment and maintenance of positive human relation. The feeling of superior-subordinate should be discouraged.

The supervisor is an adviser to the teachers and should therefore possess transparent qualities that will make him worthy of understanding the noble responsibility. Udeozor (2004) stated that among the expectations, are academic, personal and professional qualities. Ukeje (1990) noted that the supervisor should have superior ability, scholarship, competence, keen intellectual curiosity and human skills. Nwachukwu (1988) opined that the supervisor should possess personal traits of initiative, originality, sympathy and knowledge. According to him, the nature of his roles demand that he should have high native intelligence, education, humility, friendliness, patience and sense of intuition. Ezeocha (1985) suggested that the school supervisor should acquire broad general education, knowledge of instructional materials and methods, ability to continue personal and professional growth and teaching skills.

From the above, it is clear that a supervisor of instruction should possess qualities such as humility, friendliness, respect, tolerance, professional education, intelligence, self confidence, approachable and optimistic. Adesina (1990) is of the opinion that the supervisor should show leadership, consistency, impartiality, honesty which are in line

with Betts' (1980) position that the supervisor should possess the character of drive, leadership, intelligence and personal character. This is to say that a good instructional leader should be a good supervisor of instruction. The principal of the secondary school is both a leader and supervisor of instruction. He should therefore possess the necessary qualities required of him to enable him succeed in the performance of his instructional leadership.

2.5 Staff Development

One important way of enhancing performance in teachers is by updating their knowledge and skills continually, through exposure to latest research in the areas of knowledge. Mier (1984) in support of training human resources in organizations for improved performance states:

'an improvement in the quality of human factor is therefore as essential as investment in physical capital. An advancement in knowledge and the diffusion of new ideas and objectives are necessary to improve economic backwardness and instill human abilities and motivation that are more favourable to economic advancement'.

It is important to note that workers undertake in-service training particularly to acquire additional qualification for higher social status in the society and for increased pay packet among other reasons. Whatever the motive behind the interest in training, Mier (1984) argued that it is important for school principals to encourage them. By so doing, the school organisation is reducing tension and conflicts between the school goals and the goals of the individuals within the school (Aguokogbuo 2000).

Education is an ongoing process which is constantly changing. Therefore, the educational leader must constantly keep abreast of such changes in the society. The educational leader should be at the forefront in providing educational leadership to staff with regards to the new ways of doing things, methods of teaching and changes taking place in the society. Teachers need to be current in their subject matter and in new techniques of teaching (Khanna and Lamba 2005). This can be achieved through a programme of staff development. Aderounruu and Ethiametalor (1981) asserted that a large number of the instructional personnel assigned to our schools are barely qualified both professionally and academically. Musaazi (1982) opined that one of the most effective ways to bring about curriculum change, teaching improvement and the professional growth and development of teachers is through well organized in-service programme for teachers within the education system.

Udeozor (2005) stated that staff development is a sure way of helping the staff to satisfy their needs for status, recognition, personal and professional growth. To Musaazi (1982) staff development means that provision be made by the educational authorities to improve the performance of teachers from initial employment to retirement. It is a means to an end, the end being the improvement of the quality of students' learning experiences. The purpose of staff development according to Aderounmu and Ethiametalor (1981) in school system is to accomplish the following: (1) To correct deficiencies in teachers. (2)

To help experienced teachers to develop further teaching skills. (3) To make staff members to keep abreast of current trends in their areas of specialization. (4) To upgrade their skills to meet the requirement of an administrative position.

Staff development can be used to describe the responsibility of the school principal towards the staff with the purpose of maintaining or changing the operational level of the staff in order to directly or indirectly influence the attainment of the major instructional goals of the school (Udeozor 2005). It equips staff with modern skills, knowledge and attitudes required on the job. Staff development has the tendency of impacting positively on the learners through the involvement of other people whose primary responsibility relates to teaching and learning (Adesina and Ogunsaju 1984). This is because no practitioner gets into the job as a finished product. In this light, staff development becomes imperative. Staff development programme should assist teachers to develop skills in modern visual aids, techniques of teaching, knowledge of subject matter, team work, and to develop an understanding in teachers to function effectively in the society. Musaazi (1982). Udeozor (2000) asserted that some of the means of encouraging growth may take the form of workshops, seminars, demonstration, teaching, researches, refresher courses, exchange teaching, professional writings, visits to other schools to observe teaching methods and aids, staff-meetings, post-graduate work, participation in the evaluation of school programmes.

It is the role of school principal to provide leadership to teachers and other educational workers for the purpose of improving instruction. The school administrator provides assistance to enhance the performance of the staff, stimulate professional growth and improve on the process of teaching and learning (Udeozor 2005). From assisting the staff to grow professionally, the leader equally appraises the staff to ascertain and measure the achievement of goals and set standards. This helps the leader to identify areas of weaknesses that still need assistance and feedback.

The success of staff development depends on the participation of teachers in the planning process (Musaazi, 1982). The programme must be relevant to the participants and the principals have a duty to select teachers for such programme on the basis of needs. Principals are also expected to create conducive environment for staff development. Unruh and Turner (1970) stated that staff development should be based on staff experiences and training, nature of students, population and curriculum.

Another type of staff development is orientation or induction of new staff. At one time or the other, new teachers are posted to a school unknown to them. There are so many things that the teacher does not know about the community around the school, the school itself, the student, fellow teachers, teaching materials and work procedures generally (Musaazi, 1982). Musaazi (1982) further asserted that many of the mistakes and embarrassing situation a new teacher finds himself, can be avoided through a proper orientation programme.

Aderounne and Ethiametalor (1981) defined orientation as socialization or a process whereby newly posted teachers are helped in meeting their needs for security, belonging, status, information and direction in both the job and the community. The principal should design an orientation programme in such a manner that it enables the teacher to achieve job satisfaction and also to make use of his abilities to achieve the goals of the school.

On arrival, the principal should provide him with information on conditions of employment, information on community in which the school is sited, facilities in the school, the school, teachers and students. The principal should ensure that the teaching staff are involved in the orientation so as to help in answering some of the questions.

Udeozor (2005) argued that a well organized induction course helps new teachers to settle quickly in their new place of work. It also reduces the sense of uncertainty and frustration normally experienced by new teachers. The principal should provide a follow-up to ensure that the orientation has impact on the teacher.

Ozigi (1982) stated that orientation course may take time, but it is necessary as it helps the new teacher to settle down faster. It also helps the new teachers to make fewer errors and experience greater job satisfaction (Osuala, 1984). Udeozor (2005) argued that students especially newly admitted students also need orientation programme designed to acquaint them with the aim, philosophy, activities, rules, regulations, staff and physical environment of the school. A well planned orientation programme helps the new students to settle down quickly and face the challenges of their new school life (Udeozor, 2005).

Training may be used to directly increase the job skills of an individual or group of individuals by teaching them how to perform their tasks more effectively. The principal should ensure that teachers regularly go for refresher courses, seminars and workshops. The training helps teachers to be up-to-date and meet with modern methods of teaching (Lipham and Hoeh 1974). However, Travers (1973) argued that when determining training needs, the principal should ensure that there is a problem in terms of the level or type of performance and that training can be of value in correcting such a situation. This means that staff development should be determined based on the deficiencies observed in staff.

2.6 Provision and Utilization of Instructional Materials

It is no longer news that different people learn through different sense organs. While some learn best through hearing, and others learn best through sight, most would learn best when sight and hearing are involved. Indeed, learning would be most effective when all the senses are involved (ears, eyes, nose, mouth and tongue). Effective teaching and learning depend to a large extent on the use of instructional materials. Teaching is about educating learners and for the learners to be educated, they must acquire knowledge, skills and understanding. Olagboye (2004) lamented that though one of the avowed goals of government as stated in Section 9 (88) of the National Policy on Education (1988) is to develop and promote effective use of innovative materials in schools, the reality on ground is that this is one of the most neglected areas of the educational provision to the school system.

Instructional materials according to Olagboye (2004) refer to all the items that can help the teacher to accomplish the teaching tasks. These items according to him include audio-visual materials, chalk, paper, textbooks, workbooks and globes. Gerlach (1980) stated that there are six broad categories of instructional materials, which include;

1. Still pictures which include photographic prints, sketches, cartoons, charts, graphs, maps, etc.
2. Audio visual materials which include phonograph records, audio-tapes etc.
3. Motion pictures which are sometimes called movie or film
4. Television which is an electronic system of transmitting still and moving images with accompanying sound through space.

5. Real objects, simulation and models which include people, actual objects or events, models, specimens.
6. Programmed and computer assisted programmed instruction. In programmed instruction, information is presented usually in small steps and the presentation is controlled. In computer assisted instruction, the computer presents nearly all the instructions and records students' responses.

The above categories of the instructional materials show that there are various and numerous materials that teachers can use in teaching their lessons for better understanding. However, Nnoli and Sulaiman (2000) suggested a number of factors to be considered in the selection of learning materials to be used in the class. These include (a) instructional objectives, (b) availability of media, (c) age level, interest and background of learners, (d) teacher's capacity, (e) cost of the material and (f) technical quality of the teacher that will use the instructional materials.

Principals of schools should ensure that teachers utilize the materials in their lessons to help students understand the subject-matter. He should also ensure that teachers are trained properly on how to operate and use some of the materials that require technical know-how. In addition, he should guide the teachers to use the materials judiciously and also guard against over utilization and underutilization of material resources.

Instructional materials are very vital in the achievement of educational objectives. Nnoli and Sulaiman (2000) enumerated the following as the purposes of instructional materials.

1. Instructional materials increase learning effectiveness
2. The use of appropriate motion pictures, objects and events can concretize learners' experiences and this makes learning real and immediate.
3. It helps to individualize instruction through the use of programmed instruction.
4. The use of relevant materials help in motivating learners. In other words, it arouses the learners' interest to pay attention.
5. It helps to provide experiences that may not otherwise be available to learners.
6. The use of drama enhances better understanding or mastery of events and concepts.

Olagboye (2004) stated that instructional resources are materials which facilitate and render more effectively, the teaching-learning process in educational institutions. He further stated that it is sad and instructive to note that the development of instructional materials is the most neglected area of educational provision to the school system. Nnoli and Sulaiman (2000) observed that for any instructional material to be used in a lesson by the teacher, it should address adequately what students need to learn and should also help students to understand the lesson faster and better. In other words, the teaching material should facilitate learning of students.

Instructional materials are relevant objects and instruments that can be used by the teacher to promote his teaching for learners to learn meaningfully (Maduewese 2008). He further stated that presently, due to ignorance, laziness and incompetence, among teachers, a lot of them are unable to utilize the various materials at their disposal. Okon (2006) observed that instructional materials help the students to retain learned materials and information in their brain. It also provides a feedback of learning experiences on

future needs. According to Okon (2006) shortage of instructional materials limits teacher and learners' accessibility to appropriate learning experiences. This in turn impedes meaningful and mastery of learning materials. In many schools according to Nnoli and Sulaiman (2000) materials are in acute supply for teachers to use. Scarcity of educational materials is partly responsible for the situation that prevails today, where learners are programmed right from the start without the capacity to visualize in concrete terms the concepts learnt and as such are unable to do anything practically. Nnoli and Sulaiman (2000) argued that the issue of quality does not stop on setting the curriculum but also on improving the conditions under which the students both in and outside the classroom are made to learn.

Effective teaching and learning has a close relationship with the materials available to the teacher (Tahir 2006). Instructional materials refer to all the materials that can help the teacher to accomplish the teaching tasks (Gerlach 1980).

The school materials could be purchased by the Ministry of Education and supplied to schools or could be purchased by principals (Udeozor, 2004). Distribution must reflect the principles of need, equity and utilization.

The principal should ensure that the staff utilize the instructional materials in their lessons. He should supervise the teachers to ensure that teaching aids are used during lessons. He should also ensure that teachers are trained on how to operate some of the instructional materials. The principal should also encourage the teachers to produce some simple instructional materials to be used in their lessons. A timetable should be made for the use of some materials that are inadequate to avoid monopoly in their use.

2.7 Maintenance of School Physical Facilities

School buildings and furniture provide the physical environment for learning. The essence of education is learning. Teachers, textbooks, educational technology, physical facilities and administration are all means to expand and accelerate learning. Physical facilities are essential resources that are required for the effective operation and maintenance of standard in the institutions of learning. School facilities also known as the school plant are important elements needed for the attainment of educational goals and objectives. Sidhu (2002) defined physical facilities as the material provisions of the school which include school compound, buildings, playground, library, laboratories, classrooms, furniture, equipment, hostels, common rooms, canteen etc. According to Fagbomiye (2000), school plant or physical facilities include the site, the buildings and other infrastructures. He further stated that it embraces permanent and semi-permanent structures which include items such as machines, laboratory and its facilities, equipment, the chalk board and even tools. School plant according to Ndu (1987) is the site where the school programmes and activities take place or the environment where the school curriculum is implemented. They are the physical expression of the school programme and activities.

The main physical facilities in secondary schools according to Olagboye (1998) include the following:

1. Equipment such as laboratory equipment, workshop equipment, sporting equipments, teaching aids, typewriters, photocopiers, computers, etc.
2. Permanent and semi-permanent facilities such as classrooms, workshops, hostels, staff-quarters, Assembly Halls, administrative blocks, libraries, laboratories, etc.

3. Furniture such as desks, tables, chairs, beds, etc.
4. Books such as textbooks, stationery etc.
5. Vehicles
6. Electrical facilities such as meters, fans, generating sets, air conditioners, and other electrical fittings.
7. Water supply such as tap water, wells, water tanks etc.

The purpose of school plant according to Fagbamiye (2000) is to lay sound foundation for educational structure in order to achieve educational goals. The school plant helps to protect students and teachers from the sun, rain, heat and cold. It enhances the comfort, safety of students and teachers, thereby increasing their performances. According to Adesina (1980) the quality of instruction is enhanced by the school plant. He further stated that the quality of education that students receive bears direct relevance to the availability or lack of physical facilities and overall atmosphere in which learning takes place. Fagbamiye (2000) observed that, in order to enhance higher productivity in schools, good and adequate buildings, laboratories, instructional aids, library, furniture and qualified teachers should be provided.

The maintenance of these facilities and equipment is an important aspect of the school administration. According to Olagboye (1998) maintenance is any work carried out on any component of the school physical facilities with a view to keeping them in their original conditions. To Ndu (1987) maintenance means keeping of school buildings and equipment is as near as their original state. He further defined school facilities maintenance as the activities connected with keeping of the buildings, equipment and

grounds of the school in such conditions of completeness and efficiency, through repairs and replacement, that the physical appearance will remain as original.

Ndu (1997) stated that several factors are responsible for the depreciation of physical facilities and equipment in outlook. These include, constant usage, effects of weather, age and carelessness, or negligence. Therefore, apart from maintaining the school plant through repairs and replacement, cleaners should be employed to sweep the compound, trim the flowers and wash the toilets regularly. The principal should also ensure that students help in keeping their environment clean by sweeping their classes, hostels, cutting the grass around their hostels and fields.

The principal should emphasise the need for clean environment to staff and students. Ndu (1992) stated that the maintenance of clean environment reflects on our personal cleanliness. This means that if the surroundings are dirty, there is a positive correlation between the dirty environment and our personal cleanliness. He further stated that the general appearance of a school is one of the major criteria by which students, teachers, and the society at large assess the school. School plant maintenance is therefore, the repairs and up-keep of the school equipment in order that efficient services can be rendered. Plant maintenance is imperative so that the school plant can be kept very close to the state of originality. Maintenance of school plant helps to reduce the rate of repairs or breakdown of school equipments. This therefore calls for regular maintenance of school plant. Maintenance should therefore be carried out all the year round. To ensure effective maintenance, the principal should orient staff and students on the importance of taking care of school property.

The principal should schedule periods for supervision of the usages made by the facilities to reduce reckless damages or waste. It is disheartening to observe broken chairs or tables littered around the school premises. This is probably why Moja (2000) observed that infrastructure and facilities remain inadequate for coping with a system that is growing at a rapid rate. He further observed that the school environment is not conducive to learning due to the physical conditions of most schools.

Fadipe (1997) suggested methods to be employed by principals in maintaining school plant. These include (1) psychological build up of school members (teachers and students) to imbibe the spirit of handling school property with care. (2) Periodic inspection where the principal is expected to regularly inspect facilities to detect and repair minor problems promptly. (3) Committee system, by which the principal forms committees to take charge of identifying damages and effecting repairs. (4) Community participation approach in which members of the community especially PTA members are involved in production and maintenance. (5) Financing maintenance costs internally, where the principal raises funds internally through donations, rentals, sales of produce, launching, endowment funds, etc. to generate funds for regular maintenance and replacement of school physical facilities.

The school administrator is expected to cultivate maintenance and repair culture. Udeozor (2004) stated that most Nigerians lack the habit of maintenance. Buildings, degenerating, facilities or equipment are left to finally decay. Maintenance of school facilities creates pleasant and conducive physical environment that promotes teaching and learning, safeguards the huge financial investment and provides adequate facilities as may be required in the school. Vickery (1984) and Fobis (1885) stated that there are

various maintenance schedules left for the principal. The first is the schedule of no maintenance which happens where the cost of maintenance is almost as high as procuring a new facility. The second is emergency maintenance which manifests in emergency bases when there is no plan for maintenance at all. The third according to them is the adhocry maintenance which occurs when small amount of money is provided in the budget for use by the higher authority. The fourth schedule is the preventive maintenance which is preplanned and executed. Maintenance of facilities calls for regular sweeping, cleaning, servicing, replacing broken parts (Udeozer 2004). This means that the principal should delegate staff and students to be in charge of sanitation in his school. He should also be supervising them to ensure pleasant, conducive and supportive environment for teaching and learning.

Researches by King and Marans (1979), Fuller (1990), Varghese (1995), Cash (1994) and Lackney (1994) revealed that physical facilities are fundamentally important factors in both school attendance and achievement. Research also conducted by HEP with the cooperation of the Ministry of Education and Culture in Zimbabwe revealed that all things being equal, students could not be expected to learn effectively if the classroom did not have fundamentally items such as a blackboard, sitting, and writing tables for all students and basic books and teaching aids (Murimba, 1995).

Other researchers also conducted investigations provided empirical evidence to support the theory that in developing countries, low level of learning among children can be partly attributed to poor and inadequate facilities in schools (Heyneman, 1980). An investigation conducted in Nigeria (Unriwick and Jonaidu 1983) formed the conclusion that facilities like buildings, classrooms, students' desks and so on determine the

organization of teaching and learning activities and these factors do influence learners' achievement. Research in India indicates that the existence of school desks, and buildings are important if a school is going to be a success (Vaghese 1995), Beynon (1997) stated that while school buildings, and furniture do not teach, soundly built, well-maintained and adequately furnished and equipped buildings have a profoundly positive effect on both participation and achievement.

From the above it is clear that physical facilities are vital to the achievement of educational objectives. Adewoyin (1991) in Beynon (1997) stated that instructional facilities (1) increase learning effectiveness, (2) concretize learner's experiences and make learning real and immediate, (3) help to individualize instruction, (4) help in motivating learners and in getting their attention, (5) enhance better understanding and mastery of events and concepts. The principal as the head has the responsibility of keeping instructional facilities in good condition at all times. According to Olagboye (1998), the school head must through close supervision of relevant personnel ensure that (1) all equipment are serviced, repaired, overhauled or replaced with new ones, (2) no school property is misused or converted into private property, (3) no component of the school facilities is illegally commercialized.

The principal should realize that the school belongs to the community and the community exists for the survival of the school (Udeozor 2004). Therefore, there should be an open door policy towards community use of school facilities such as classroom, sports field, and so on. However, it should be noted that some of the facilities are very fragile in nature and they need protection from the sun light, rainfall, vandalisation, theft, damages, trespass, fire outbreak and distortion in case of school records. The school

head has the task of ensuring adequate security against destruction or illegal removal. (Udeozor 2004). Members of the school community should be educated to handle school materials with care. This is why Fadipe (1997) observed that once respect for school property has been internalized, the major battle in plant maintenance procedure would have been won. However, the school head should provide basic materials that would support this strategy. For example, dustbins should be provided in strategic places and in offices and classrooms to prevent careless dumping of refuse in the school compound.

The most obvious and generally agreed link between environment and learning is the need for a basic level of physical comfort so as to permit learners to concentrate on their studies. The head should ensure that the school compound, classrooms and surroundings are made attractive and conducive to facilitate learning. The head should ensure planting of flowers and trees to beautify the school compound.

2.8 Motivation of Staff and Students

Motivation is the driving force that energises a worker to show more commitment to work and to improve his performance. This is in form of incentives such as increased salary, transport and recreational facilities, free medical services, regular and prompt payment of salaries and provision of all necessary school facilities and equipment which will reduce frequent strike actions (Gage 197). Thus, teachers must be seen as capable of self-direction, capable of assuming responsibilities and be seen as capable of being creative, having worth and dignity and possessing potentials for growth in ability (Nwankwo 1982). Therefore, principals should encourage teachers to see teaching as satisfying.

Motivation is the result of the interaction of the individual and the situation. Motivation according to Robbins (2005) is the process that accounts for an individual's intensity, direction and persistence of effort toward attaining a goal. Afolayan (1982) also defines the word as willingness to expend energy to achieve a goal or reward. It is the urge to do more than what is specifically required in a particular situation. Peretomode (1991) defined motivation as the degree of readiness of an organism to pursue some designated goal. He further stated that it is the process of influencing or stimulating a person to take action that will accomplish desired goal. To Aquinas (2005), it is the will to work. Cole (2005) defined motivation as the term used to describe those processes by which people seek to satisfy the basic need or drives, perceived needs and personal goals which trigger human behaviour.

From the definitions above, it is clear that motivation is a term that is difficult to define. Peretomode (1991) made a similar point when he stated that motivation often receives no precise conceptual designations, and implicit and explicit meaning of the term commonly differ. The difficulty in defining the concept has been attributed to the fact that the term has no fixed meaning in contemporary psychology.

Motivation is of two types namely positive and negative motivation. Positive motivation can also be referred to as incentive motivation or motivation based on reward. Positive motivation according to Aquinas (2005) involves the possibility of increased motive satisfaction and that it is a process of attempting to influence others to do your will through possibility of gaining a reward. The receipt of awards due to recognition and praise for work well done are some of the incentives that can lead to good team spirit at work. Positive motivation includes:

- a. Praise and credit for work well done
- b. Wages and salaries
- c. Appreciation
- d. A sincere interest in subordinates as individuals
- e. Delegation of duty and responsibility.

Negative motivation or fear motivation is based on force or fear. Here, fear causes a person to act in a certain way because the consequences. However, the imposition of frequent punishment may result into frustration among those punished. It may also create hostile state of mind and unfavourable attitude to the job. It should therefore be used with caution whenever it becomes necessary for managers to use it.

Dare (2009) identified the following as functions of motivation in schools. (1) Motivation energises and sustains behaviour. (2) Behaviour is selective if one is motivated. (3) It makes staff to voluntarily continue to perform their work well. (4) Motivation promotes a sense of belonging among the workers. It makes workers to feel that the enterprise belongs to them. (5) It is the best remedy for resistance to changes.

Since people started work, employers have been concerned with how to obtain maximum service from their employees. This made them to formulate ideas on how to identify the motivational stimuli to which workers will react most favourably. As organizations are becoming more complex, these thoughts are becoming more complex, but more systematic and defined (Cole, 2005). Theories of motivation are built on the different ways man has been perceived.

The earliest systematic thought on motivation form part of the scientific management arrangement advocated by Fredrick Taylor, a French engineer. (Musaazi,

1982). This theory is some times referred to as traditional management model or Taylorism (Peretomode 1991). The theory is based on a philosophy which conceptualizes a worker as an economic man. Here, the worker is regarded as a person who works only for money and who would labour harder for higher pay and work less for less monetary rewards. The exponents made efficiency their watch word. (Afolayan 1982). Though, the scientific management theory was usually associated with industry, and business, its application was evident in teaching in form of payment by results' during missionary period and presently in private schools. However, this theory was criticized for ignoring the human side of the enterprise (Musaazi 1982). The psychological needs are sometimes more important than the economic needs of the workers.

The weaknesses of the scientific approach brought about human relations approach. The advocates (Elton Mayo) argued that human factors have motivational strength for workers than monetary reward and physical conditions. (Afolayan 1982). According to this theory, meaningful interaction among workers, communication within the members of the organization and good relations between the worker and his boss are particularly emphasized as ingredients of human relations (Nwachukwu, 1988). Hawthorn Research in human relations movement carried out by Elton Mayo and his associates, discovered that the development of social groups like friendship cliques with their code of behaviour was very important in the functioning of any organization (Olagboye 2004). The study revealed that interpersonal relationships more than working conditions motivate staff. Since then, the informal structure of complex organization has been receiving attention from organization scholars and management practitioners. The

next motivational theory is that of Maslow's need theory. The need hierarchy theory of motivation is associated with Abraham Maslow (Peretomode 1991). Maslow (1954) postulates that

1. All human beings have basic needs in common.
2. At any given moment, a person is always motivated by what he perceives as his greatest needs. This means that needs are arranged according to hierarchy of importance from the basic needs to the high complex type.
3. The strength of each need will vary from one person to another depending on differences in personality. This implies that once a need is satisfied, it no longer serves as a motivator. Maslow classifies these needs into five, namely – physiological needs, safety, social, recognition and self-actualization (Nagbolaye 2004). Maslow (1954) views these human needs as forming a hierarchy with physiological needs at the base followed by safety, social, recognition and self-actualization at the highest level of all. According to Ezeocha (1985) at any given time, a need category predominates over others and a person tends to work to satisfy it. Maslow separated the five needs into higher and lower orders. Physiological and safety needs were described as lower order while social, esteem and self-actualization as higher order needs (Robbins 2005). Robbins further argued that with the popularity of the theory, research has not yet validated the theory because Maslow has not provided empirical work to support his theory.

Another motivational theory is theory X and Y of Douglas McGregor (Olagboye, 2004). McGregor (1960) proposed two theories – X and Y which aimed at providing a framework for the proper management of people to achieve organizational goals. Under theory X assumption, man is viewed as naturally lazy, unambitious and capable of being motivated only by threats, punishment and material rewards. Theory Y assumption conceptualizes man as capable of liking and enjoying work as much as play, if given the right atmosphere, capable of being self-directed and of being motivated without necessity of imposing external sanctions. A leader who bases his views on theory X tends to structure the organization in a rigid way, and then closely controls and supervises the staff. He instills in their minds, fear of punishment, or a denial of rewards.

Under theory Y, the leader makes wise use of participation, encourages staff to accept responsibilities and develop self-control. McGregor (1960) believes that the continuous use of theory X prevents the leader from discovering and utilizing the best potentials of the average workers. He recommended the ideas in theory Y, basing his arguments on the theories of human motivation and satisfaction proposed by Maslow and other theories.

Herzberg and his associates (1959) developed the two factor theory of motivation. The two factors are referred to by various names. These are dissatisfier – satisfier, hygiene motivator or two factor theory. Like Maslow, Herzberg recognizes that people have needs which actually motivate them. (Robbins, 2005). But he does not subscribe the idea that all human needs actually motivate. He asserts that some do but some do not. (Afolayan, 1982). To Herzberg (1959) those needs which relate to job context or environmental conditions of the job which one is performing are in the first group.

Included in the group are salary, organizational policy, fringe benefit, supervision as well as working conditions in general. He labels them as hygiene factors, in that they relate to the physical and mental health of workers (Cole, 2005). He also refers to them as dissatisfiers with the explanation that if these conditions are not present in a healthy state in an organization, a worker becomes dissatisfied. He however, emphasized that the proper restoration of these conditions will not lead to extra expenditure of efforts on the part of workers because hygiene factors are not motivators.

The needs that really motivate according to Herzberg (1959) are those factors that relate to job content or what the employee does at work. Those factors which he names motivators include sense of achievement, recognition for job well done, challenging work, assigned responsibility, advancement and professional growth. When Herzberg framework is compared with Maslow's model, it will be seen that physiological, security and social needs clearly correspond to hygiene factors while esteem, and self-actualization can be classified as motivators (Nwachukwu, 1988).

Another interesting theory of motivation is Management by Objectives (MBO) which is also referred to as Goal setting theory (Robbins 2005). It was Drucker who in 1954 acted as catalyst to the idea of Management by Objectives (MBO) by emphasizing that objectives are needed in every area where performance and results directly and virtually affect the survival and prosperity of the organization (Aggarwal 2008). It was originally proposed as a means of using goals to motivate people rather than control them. MBO's appeal lies with the emphasis on converting overall organizational goals into specific objectives for units and individual members (Nwankwo 1980). Gareth, Jones and Jennifer (2006) defined M.B.O. as a goal setting process in which a manager

and each of his or her subordinates negotiate specific goals and objectives for the subordinate to achieve and then periodically evaluate the extent to which the subordinate is achieving those goals. In other words, M.B.O. is a process whereby both the superior and subordinate workers in an organization jointly make work plans by identifying common goals and defining each individual's major areas of responsibility in term of the results expected of the enterprise (Nwankwo, 1981). A school principal who adopts MBO must draw up objectives for the school to pursue for a term or a year. Such objectives must be influenced by the environment in which the schools are cited and by the facilities available (Hacket 1979). However, the difficulty of this theory is that there is often the difficulty of the quantification of the outcomes or products of education because the process involved in the assessment can be long, unrealistic and vigorous.

From the theories discussed on motivation, all the theories agree that people or employees have certain needs which they desire to fulfill and that people will be motivated to put in their best in situations, which these needs have a promise of being fulfilled. The needs are also not of the same intensity with every one, but an individual's personality determines how he perceives the seriousness of a need (Afolayan, 1981). The discussion also revealed that no single motivational strategy has been identified to be effective for every body or even for someone at all times and situations. From the theories therefore, some people regard intrinsic and extrinsic factors as motivators, while some others argue that only intrinsic forces do actually motivate (Nwachukwu 1988). The principal as an instructional leader has the role of helping, assisting and recommending staff for promotion as ways of motivating them. He has the role of helping them out of personal problems or troubles.

The most effective means of helping teachers in their jobs is to make their work environment stimulating by motivating them in various ways (Ethiametalor 1985) while the principal might be unable to influence salaries and other fringe benefits for teachers, he could remove the frustrations teachers encounter in school by recognizing individual contributions and praise individuals for good work done. Teachers derive a great deal of satisfaction from work accomplishment and motivating and stimulating work atmosphere would certainly enhance the achievement of all grades of workers. To motivate teachers, the principal's supervisory approach must emphasise assistance rather than criticism and he must ensure that his supervisory practices in no way detract from the professional dignity of teachers.

2.9 Institutional Planning of Academic Programmes

Planning is the first and perhaps the most important role of school administrator. It is essential to the success of every human organization and every human endeavour. The school head needs to plan for the smooth and effective teaching and learning in the school. Planning means to project, forecast, design or chart out a course of action (Ejiogu 1990). It involves the scheduling and scheming of the actions and the expected achievement. With planning, the administrator is able to prepare for and predict future events. It involves the development of strategies as well as procedures for their effective realization. Planning focuses on mapping out and classification of goals and programmes. It leads to the establishment of activities and resources necessary for achieving them (Nwachukwu 1988). The performance of other key administrative functions depends largely on planning.

Any problem or error created at the planning stage can hardly be corrected or solved at the subsequent stages. Planning enjoins growth, continuity and development. According to Udeozor (2004) sometimes mistakes emerge from the planner's ignorance, lack of expertise, non-consideration of time factor or even lack of adequate and reliable data. In summary, planning implies determination of what should be done in advance so as to achieve some particular goals, when and where the action should take place as well as who should do it.

Institutional planning of programmes according to Sidhu (2002) is the academic plan for the institution as a unit so that its targets are defined in the plan, its time-bound progress is determined, the rate of progress per unit of time is also determined, and the commitments are made in the plan which regulate and accelerate its working. It is a scheme for the efficient running, steady growth, balanced expansion and priority-wise progress of an institution. It is a programme of development, instructional work, co-curricular activities, etc. as prepared by educational institutions on the basis of its felt needs and the resources available or likely to be available with a view to bringing improvement in the school and its practices.

According to Udeozor (2004), institutional planning has the tendency of clearly identifying the goals of school, clarifying actions for achieving the goals, rationally economizing very scarce educational resources (human and materials) and providing basis for evaluating actions. Institutional planning could be daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly or yearly. In which ever way, planning is done, the school administrator finds himself in definition of school objectives, planning and scheduling the physical structures, setting out school programmes and activities, planning the resources available,

overseeing financial planning, assigning tasks to school personnel and setting out the school time-table for easy regulation of activities and programmes (Sidhu, 2002).

The most central issue in educational planning is the fact that resources that are available for education and indeed for the successful execution of any human endeavour whatsoever, are very limited. Consequently, activities directed at their use need to be carefully and rationally designed in order to avoid wastage and maximize the benefits that will accrue from such use. According to Aquinas (2005) planning is unique in the sense that it establishes the objectives for the group effort and lays down steps to accomplish them before the manager proceeds to perform other functions. It is a statement of objectives to be achieved by certain means in the future. Thus, the purposes or objectives of institutional planning are predicated according to Olagboye (2004) on the following:

- i. The establishment of institutional goals and objectives and activities for achieving them.
- ii. The rational allocation of scarce resources required for the institution to satisfy as far as possible, the various competing demands.
- iii. The determination of space, personnel and materials required to achieve school goals.
- iv. The harmonization of interests and demands of stakeholders (students, parents, ministry, governments, institutions of learning etc) with those of the society in terms of need, capacity and constraints.
- v. Channeling the efforts and activities of the staff toward the achievement of set school goals.

- vi. Avoidance of resource wastage in the institution.
- vii. Enhancement of institutional growth and development.

Sidhu (2002) states the following as the characteristics of institutional planning.

- 1. It is need-based and not expenditure-based.
- 2. It attaches more importance to the existing material and human resources.
- 3. It is prepared by the local talents. In other words, it is a cooperative venture of the principal, staff and students.
- 4. It is result-oriented.
- 5. It is specific for an institution.
- 6. It motivates staff and students.
- 7. Institutional planning eliminates wastage.
- 8. The plan is prospective.
- 9. It is flexible and continuously developing.

In institutional planning, the principal focuses attention on academic programmes, extra-curricular activities, utilization of available resources, school services such as the library, laboratory, guidance, etc. discipline, teaching-learning aids, professional growth of teachers and other academic activities. These are expected to be the main focus of the principal as an institutional planner (Olagboye, 2004).

To prepare and implement the institutional plan, the following steps according to Sidhu (2002) should be followed by the principal.

- 1. **Analysis of the present situation:** Here, the principal is expected to analyse the existing situation of school programmes. He should determine, whether the school buildings, curriculum, syllabus, school calendar, time-table, grouping,

daily schedule, furniture, equipment, staff, laboratory facilities, library facilities, are ready and adequate. He should also determine whether admission procedure and examination systems used require changes. The principal who is expected to work with the staff may form committees to help in analyzing the school situation.

2. **Survey of the resources:** After analysis of the existing situation according to Sidhu (2002) a survey of the existing resources has to be made. Facts and figures regarding students enrolment, staff, buildings, equipment, books, examination results etc. should be tabulated for ready reference. Resources available in the school community, or ministry should be surveyed and examined by the principal. The survey of the resources gives the institution an idea of the resources, their utilization in the past and their utilization in the present situation (Udeozer 2004). Places of educational, scientific, geographical, historical, social and general interest in the locality should invariably be visited by the principal, teachers and students. Retired teachers, military personnel, doctors may be requested to deliver lectures to the students, PTA and teachers. Appeal may also be made to well to do parents to give help to the school in various ways.
3. **Preparation of improvement programmes:** In the light of survey of the existing situation, survey of the felt needs and survey of the resources available, the principal may draw a priority-wise list of improvement programmes. Thorough and sufficient discussions may be held before the plan is finalized. Each improvement needs to be defined in terms of (i) justification for the school (ii) difficulties, limitations and delimitations (iii) the involvement of school

population (total or partial), (iv) procedures to be adopted (v) financial implications and (vi) evaluation and follow-up (Sidhu 2002). The improvement programmes may take the form of projects and action research activities. Each project and action research, investigation must have some broad objectives and some specific objectives. For example, projects can be undertaken for school improvement in the areas of additional accommodation, petty repairs, electrification, provision of drinking water, toilets, school magazine, school calendar, study habits, etc. Action research investigation can also be undertaken in areas like bad handwriting, bad spellings, irregular home work, human relations, indiscipline, truancy, special programme, etc.

4. **Implementation of the plan:** Here the plan has to be executed according to the resources available and the procedure, outlined. The execution will be done by all the members of the school community. Here there will be a division of labour according to the suitability and choice of individuals. The principal can form various committees to carry out various projects.
5. **Evaluation of the plan:** The principal is expected to assess the plan during implementation to find out areas of weaknesses. Assessment should be quantitatively and qualitatively done to see whether the set objectives have been achieved or not. Evaluation will be made in terms of the extent of contribution of creative ideas in planning, resourcefulness shown in implementation, the number of people involved, full and partial achievements and difficulties experienced (Udeozor, 2004). The principal should recognize the good work done by different individuals at different levels towards the success of a plan.

The principal needs to assign teaching tasks to teachers. This, he does in consultations with the vice-principal, heads of departments and teachers concerned. Books and materials for teaching will have to be provided by the principal. He determines the books and materials needed by consulting with the heads of departments who in turn will consult with the teachers in their various departments and by taking a look at the approved syllabi for the prescribed and recommended books. The compilation of books and materials needed is best plan before the end of the school session, so that, at the beginning of another school year, the materials are ready and work can begin without any delay (Adeina and Ogunsaju 1984).

The principal has to make plans for the storage and the use, including a requisitioning procedure and inventory for occasional checks. Coordinating the use of rooms, courses, materials, time and teachers is a big responsibility of the principal. This is referred to according to Adesina and Ogunsaju (1984) as time-tabling or time-scheduling. This helps to avoid clashes with other teachers over time, room and students. Planning is important here because it prevents waste of human and material resources in an institution.

2.10 Delegation of Authority in Schools

Musaazi (1982) defined delegation as the process of dividing up total work and giving part of it to subordinates. It involves giving part of the work to subordinates and the necessary authority and control mechanism to carry out the work. Nwachukwu (1988) defined delegation of authority as the organizational process that permits the transfer of authority from a superior to a subordinate. Authority is the power to make

decisions which guide the action of another (Musaazi 1982). It is a relationship between two individuals, one superior and the other subordinate. Delegation of authority empowers a subordinate to make commitments, use resources and take action in relation to duties assigned to him.

No organisation can function without delegation (Nwachukwu 1988). The division of an organisation into units (departments) involves delegation. Delegation originates from the fact that one person alone cannot successfully discharge all the responsibilities in an organisation. In essence, delegation of authority means that a subordinate has the power to make decisions and to act within explicit limits without checking with superiors (Nwachukwu 1988). In other words, delegated authority enables the superior to share responsibility with his subordinates. As our educational organizations grow in size and complexity, delegation of authority and responsibility becomes increasingly important. Delegating authority includes assigning duties and responsibilities to those whom the principal expects to aid him in doing the work of the school. It therefore involves granting the authority to act in such a way as to fulfil those responsibilities (Musaazi 1982). The distribution of authority is a deliberate plan in which the principal makes his authority effective and influential through full utilization of the talents of his staff. Ovwigho (2004) argued that unless the principal undertakes this deliberate and planned distribution of authority to his subordinates, he discovers soon that his own tasks are becoming unmanageable and that he is losing effectiveness.

The most important benefit of delegation according to Musaazi (1982) is that it reduces the workload of the senior executive and enables him to devote more time to more important matters concerning the school. By delegating work to the specialists who

possess the detailed knowledge for realistic decision-making, tasks are performed quickly and efficiently (Ovwigho 2004). The school principal maintains his control to ensure that the objectives of the school are being fulfilled. These controls include periodic reports, special reports, informal meeting, personal visits and so on (Musaazi 1982). He further stated that delegation (a) enables real decentralization by increasing the levels at which decisions are made. (b) It is an important factor for a school in developing its staff (c) it helps in job enlargement i.e. enlarging the scope of responsibilities (d) it helps in avoiding autocrats within the school organisation and (e) it reduces indispensability in school system because it is easy for the next person in line to take the vacant chair.

For delegation to be effective, Adesina (1984) suggested that (a) the principal should fully understand the capacity of the subordinates to whom he is delegating (b) he must always see delegation as a dynamic and continuing process, which needs to be reviewed from time to time as the school grows and teachers develop. (c) Objectives to be achieved should be understood by the teachers and their duties and functions are clearly defined (d) At the beginning, the superior should be prepared for certain errors in the decisions made by the subordinates. (e) Sufficient freedom of action should be given to the subordinates, not only for the purpose of effective delegation, but also for his growth. (f) Staff should be judiciously selected. (g) Principal must have built-in checks to ensure that delegated tasks are being carried out.

For a principal to succeed, or to overcome barriers to delegation, Nwachukwu (1988) outlined the following guidelines for principals: (1) Learn to plan ahead (2) Build confidence in staff through training, recognition and counseling (3) Develop control system that will point out impending problems (4) Be willing to take chance on

subordinates (5) Force subordinates to make decisions while giving them help when needed (6) Do not be overly critical when subordinates make mistakes (7) Let subordinates know what is to be done and the results that are expected. (8) Supply subordinates with adequate resources to fulfill their responsibilities. (9) Provide adequate incentives so that staff are willing to accept increased delegation. (10) Develop an organizational structure that provides for personnel growth and challenge.

Delegation is not a simple task and requires considerable thought on the part of the principal. Adesina (1984) identified certain principles which have been found useful in the assignment of teachers. These include;

- a. Assigning teachers those subjects for which they are reasonably prepared.
- b. Assigning the best teachers to those classes needing the greatest help, such as beginning classes, examination classes, slow classes and troublesome but brilliant classes.
- c. Assigning teachers to the age levels they can best work with and
- d. Giving consideration to what may be considered an equitable teaching load.

A principal who refuses to delegate frustrates his subordinates as he denies them the intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction derived from accomplishing a task (Nwachukwu 1988). Delegation helps in training employees to assume responsibility and learn to be accountable for assigned tasks. However, delegation does not relieve a principal of his original responsibility. In other words, when a task has been delegated to a subordinate, it does not follow that the delegator has nothing to do with the task he has assigned or is not answerable to his own superior for what he delegates. The delegator can never shed his answerability or accountability.

2.11 Effective Communication in Schools

Communication pervades organizations because most organizational processes require communication to solve problems and accomplish school goals. Peretomode (1991) states

‘Communication is the ingredient which makes organisation possible. It is the vehicle through which the basic leadership functions are carried out. School heads direct, coordinate, plan and control through communication. Hardly an action is taken in any organisation without communication leading to it’.

Peretomade (1991) further stated that communication serves four purposes. These are (1) to influence the performance of organizational members – to motivate, direct, instruct and evaluate. (2) To clarify and express feelings (3) To serve as an information input or exchange (4) to control.

Udeozor (2005) defined communication as the transmission of ideas, feelings, insights, facts, attitudes or intents to others with the aim of influencing their behaviours. To Aquinas (2005) communication is the process of passing information and understanding from one person to another. Dare (2009), Musaazi (1982), Ovwigho (2004) and Afolayan (1952) defined it as the transfer of information and understanding from one person to another. Such information may be ideas, attitudes, thoughts, opinions, facts or feelings. Communication is effective when as a result of it, there is a successful transfer of the information, meaning and understanding from the sender to the receiver. It is incomplete, until the receiver has responded to the message sent.

According to Udeozor (2005), communication is more than ordinary talk, but rather, an attempt by the individuals involved to share their own feelings, purposes, and

knowledge, and to understand the feelings, purposes and knowledge of others. It is a fundamental element of leadership. It is the act of passing relevant information to the person who needs to know or who is in a position to use that information because it affects his work. (Ovwigbo 2004).

In every organizational set up, communication is an indispensable management tool. Wherever it is practiced, it involves the transfer of ideas from the sender to the receiver (Nwachukwu 1988). Any act of conveying useful information from one person to the other implies communication. In generic term, communication is the means by which we get other people to understand us (Ojiogu 1990). It is a purposeful exchange of ideas, opinions or information. It connotes the sharing of an orientation towards a set of information signs. The performance of all other functions of the school administrator such as planning, organizing, directing, controlling and coordinating depends on effective system of communication. Effective communication generates organizational climate, while a broken down communication ignites mutual distrust, suspicion, resentment, gossips, insecurity and fear. (Udeozor, 2004).

Research indicated that poor communication is probably the most frequently cited source of interpersonal conflict (Robbins 2005). He further stated that because individuals spend 70% of their working hours communicating (writing, reading, speaking, listening) it seems reasonable to conclude that one of the most inhibiting forces to successful group performance is a lack of effective communication. According to Aquinas (2005) no group can exist without communication. This means that it is only through transmitting meaning from one person to another that information and ideas can be conveyed. Robbin (2005) argued that it is more than merely imparting meaning, but it

must also be understood. His opinion was that communication must include the transference and the understanding of meaning. Ovwigho (2004) stated that an idea, no matter how great, is useless until it is transmitted and understood by others. Effective communication would exist when a thought or an idea is transmitted so that the mental picture perceived by the receiver is exactly the same as that envisioned by the sender.

When there is effective communication, organizational goals, programmes, rules, regulations and activities are easily carried out. Udeozor (2005) stated that a good communication pattern affects the attitudes, morale and productivity of subordinates very positively. Robbins (2005) opined that failure of any leader to communicate leads to friction between workers or subsystems with organizational failure as the resultant effects. Similarly Udeozor (2005) argued that any administrator who wishes to avoid a disappointing situation, conflicts or disorder must have to communicate as it is the epitome of effective administration. This means that communication is the life-blood of every organisation as well as a major leadership function. It is a social process for reduction of chaos, uncertainty and agitations (Robbins 2005). It serves as a unifying mechanism between various inter-dependent parts. It is also a positive and reliable tool for achieving organizational goals (Udeozor 2005).

The school system is a peculiar organisation. All its ramifications are teachers, non-teaching staff, students, parents, alumni associations and the wider society. The principal as a leader finds himself in a peculiar position where he has to interact or socially relate with human beings (Aquinas 2005). The only available tool is effective communication. This will enable him identify what the school and community need for him and what he should deliver to them. More importantly, according to Udeozor (2005)

effective communication makes it possible for him to detect instructional disorders as well as available solution to any internal problem that might arise, leading to healthy school social environment.

Contextually, effective communication should relate information on areas such as the duties and responsibilities of the subordinates, conditions of work (salaries, allowances, security issues, promotion opportunities or general staff welfare matters) future plans of the organisation or failures recorded against the organisation, transmission of skills (like in school supervision and inspection), a query or written interrogation regarding negligence of duty or commendation for good performance (Afolayan 1982).

While Robbins (2005) stated that communication serves four major functions such as control, motivation, emotional expression and information, Udeozor (2005) was of the opinion that communication serves two main functions of providing a vehicle by which a plan of action is coordinated towards the implementation of a common goal and providing means by which members of an organisation can be motivated to execute the plans of the organisation willingly and enthusiastically. Communication is a process that takes place between at least two people – the communicator and the communicatee or sender and receiver (Aquinas 2005, Ovwigho 2004 and Afolayan 1982). The communicator sends out the message and the method of sending message is the medium or channel through which the message is transmitted (Ovwigho 2004).

The channels or medium of communication may be through oral, written, signs and symbols, demonstration, electronics through the use of telephone, radio, internet, telex, television and e-mail (Afolayan 1982). Udeozor (2005) stated that communication in every organisation is upwards, downwards or vertical and horizontal. Upwards

communication occurs when subordinates (teachers) communicate to superior (principal). It may reflect the achievement or progress of subordinates, uncompleted work requiring superior assistance, suggestions for improvement or a notice on how a subordinate feels on the job. A downward or vertical communication happens when a superior relates information, ideas or feelings to the subordinate. (Ovwhigho 2004). Horizontal communication occurs between organizations, departments, schools or individuals.

Communication can be perceived as formal and informal (Musaazi, 1982). A formal communication according to Udeozor (2005) follows a hierarchical arrangement of positions, power and authority as they exist within the organisation. The informal communication originates from 'grapevine' which is based on personal and social relationships between organizational members. The informal communication is not deliberately established but arises spontaneously among members (Ukeje 1992). According to Aquinas (2005) the failure of the formal communication leads to the establishment of informal communication channels.

In the school the principal communicates with members of the school and the outsiders. According to Ovwhigho (2004) and Afolayan (1982), he communicates using school assembly, Bulletin Board, letters or memoranda, staff meetings, sign posts, suggestion box and through school rule and regulations. With these channels in the school, Udeozor (2005) argued that obstacles can distort messages in an institution resulting in misunderstanding, grievances, conflict, low morale, and disruption of operation. According to Ovwhigho (2004) communication barriers can originate either from the message sender or from the decoder. Udeozor (2005) and Ovwhigho outlined the following as barriers to effective communication. These are distortion of message,

superior-subordinate relationship, overloading of information, scheduling of information filtering, physical constraints, use of strange language, inattention, wrong choice of media, ignorance and environmental stimuli such as noise, heat or cold.

For any principal to communicate effectively with members of school community, he has to develop good listening ability, avoid premature assumptions, use common language and appropriate media, feedback be sought, and message should be clear and precise (Udeozer, 2005). Obi (2002) added other similar strategies recommended by American Management Association for effective communication such as clarity of ideas before communicating, carefully examining purpose of communication, understanding the physical and human environment, consulting others to obtain their views in planning communication, carefully considering the context of the message, communicating what is valued by the receiver, giving a follow-up to the messages that are of short and long run importance, making action congruent with communication and developing good listening habits.

The principal should therefore keep all communication channels open and every information be sent properly, accurately, and timely. If this is ensured, most communication barriers will be eliminated and effective as well as good communication system put in place. The principal should also be sensitive to others' feelings so as to avoid the use of words that do stereo-type, intimidate and insult individuals (Robbins 2005). This means that the principal as an instructional leader should be sensitive in the use of semantics especially to people of different cultural backgrounds. The success of the principal as a leader in the school system depends largely on how effective he communicates to member of the school system.

The school head spends most of his time communicating with people orally. For instance, he makes school announcements in the assembly, he talks to members of staff individually and collectively in staff meetings. He also talks to students over important matters. This means that the school head must be an effective speaker and should develop the habit of listening. He should also use different channels or media that are effective to enable school members get information. Communication is a dynamic process. It is an indispensable process in schools because it is the means by which decisions are made and implemented. The effective and efficient accomplishment of education goals and objectives depends very much upon effective communication with a variety of people, including teachers, students, parents and central office personnel (Paretomode 1991).

2.12 Empirical Studies

Olachukwu (2008) conducted a study on the administrative practices of principals in secondary schools in Anambra State. Three questions were raised on the principals' effectiveness on staff personnel, students' administration and school-community relationship. The result of the study revealed that the principals generally performed effectively in the areas of students' administration and school-community relationship practices. However, in the area of staff personnel administration, the study revealed that principals were less effective in staff coordination, stimulation and staff training. The study is relevant, though focused only on administrative practices and limited to only Anambra State.

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) in America advanced a model of instructional leadership employing three dimensions

1. Defining the school mission (goals)
2. Managing the instructional program (coordinating and controlling)
3. Promoting a positive school learning climate (conducive atmosphere).

To measure the dimensions of the conceptual model, they developed the principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS). The questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate the frequency with which the principal engages in behaviours associated with the three dimensions of instructional leadership. The findings suggested that principals' instructional leadership behaviours influence the situational factor of academic press, which in turn is directly related to students' achievement. In other words, the study revealed that principals influenced students' achievement indirectly by creating instructional organizations in their schools through participative actions and by building school climates and cultures characterized by clearly communicated goals and high expectations for academic achievement and social behaviours.

Similarly, study by Otu (1984) on Role Perception of Principals in Kwara State, indicated that the principals' office work took most of their time than instructional leadership. Otu (1984) revealed that principals of secondary schools in Kwara State were more of administrative managers than instructional leaders. By implication, it can be stated that teaching and learning was not their priority. This provides an insight into the ways principals perform their instructional roles.

Udey, Ebuara, Ekpoh and Edet (2009) conducted a study on Management and Administration of Nigerian Education System in Southern Nigerian tertiary institutions.

Three research hypotheses were formulated which are: (1) There is no significant influence of leadership status on the management and administration of Nigerian education. (2) The level of management and administration of Nigerian education system does not significantly depend on funding. (3) The management and administration of Nigerian education system is not significantly of high standard. The findings revealed that:

1. Leadership status in managing education system is significantly of a very low status.
2. The level of management of education system is significantly dependent on funding.
3. There is a significant influence of management and administration of Nigerian education on the standard of education.

Nakpodia (2010) also conducted a study on the influence of community on the administration of secondary schools in Delta State of Nigeria. The study was designed to find out

1. The influence of communication on the administration of secondary schools in terms of school location in the state.
2. The extent to which communication affects the administration of secondary schools in terms of sex in the state and
3. The extent to which communication affects the administration of secondary schools in terms of experiences. The questionnaire was administered on principals and teachers in the state and the results revealed that:

1. Communication affects the administration of secondary schools in Delta State in terms of school location.
2. That sex is a factor that influences communication on administration of secondary schools in Delta State.
3. Experience in communication is a factor for effective performance in the administration of secondary schools.

In another study carried out by Akpa (1990) in Nigeria, where principals were asked to rank their responsibilities in order of priority. The responsibilities were ranked in this order by them – staff and student management, liaison officer, coordinating and financial management. The study found out that academic and instructional activities including curriculum development, teaching and instructional supervision were treated with less vigour. This indicates that principals in Nigerian secondary schools do not have regard for instructional activities. This also indicates the level of ignorance of some principals in their instructional leadership practices. In view of the above, the study is set to investigate the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools.

2.13 Summary

This chapter reviewed related literature in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals of secondary schools in Nigeria. The chapter looked at some related concepts such as leadership and instructional leadership. In other words, the chapter identified some instructional roles of the principals in Nigerian Secondary schools that contribute to effective teaching and learning of students. The conceptual

frame work attempted to provide some concept such as leadership and instructional leadership for better understanding of the title.

It also reviewed other relevant areas such as curriculum implementation, instructional supervision, staff development, provision and utilization of instructional materials, school physical facilities, staff and students' motivation, institutional planning of academic programmes, delegation of authority and communication network. The related literature was revealed in reviewed in relation to instructional leadership roles played by principals in Nigerian secondary schools. In addition, relevant empirical studies were also reviewed to acquaint the researcher with the areas covered in the studies.

The instructional leadership practices of principals were discussed with the aim of evaluating or assessing the effectiveness and performance of principals in Nigerian secondary schools .

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the methodology and procedures used in the study. The main focus of the chapter includes, the research design, the population of the study, sample and sampling techniques, instrumentation, validation of the instrument, pilot study, administration of the instrument, and method of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

Research design according to Yalams and Ndomi (2000) is a specification for the general approach adopted for the research. Kothari (2009) stated that decisions regarding what, where, when, how much, by what means concerning a research study constitute a research design. The research design therefore, is the plan, structure and strategy of investigation, which guide the collection and analysis of data in a piece of research (Olomolaiye 1986). This is why Nwadinigwe (2002) described it as the vehicle that transports the researcher from the state of ignorance to a state of knowledge.

For this study, the Survey method of design was used, since the problem being investigated was on the evaluation of instructional leadership practices of principals of Secondary Schools in Nigeria. Olayiwola (2007) defined survey research design as a research method that describes a given state of affairs at a particular time. Since the study is descriptive in nature, the survey approach was used in the collection of data in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools. This type of survey method of research investigates a target population because it is

appropriate when the total population can not be accessed to allow information to be gathered on a representative sample from which inferences are made on the whole population.

3.3 The Population

According to Jen (2002) population is the people or objects that the researcher is studying or has studied. In other words, it is the total number of persons, which the research study draws its data. (Yalams and Ndomi, 2000). Folarin (1993) observed that the population of any given study refers to virtually all the subjects of the research. Similarly, Ogunniyi (1994) argued that a population is an arbitrarily defined group in which a statistician happens to be interested in, due to its unique properties. Esan and Okafor (1995) described population as the aggregate of all the units in a target universe.

In this study, the population was made up of the entire (18338) secondary schools in the country (National Bureau of Statistics 2008). Also included were the teachers employed in the secondary schools. At the time of this study, there were 199,163 teachers in secondary schools in Nigeria (National Bureau of Statistics 2008). Others included 18,338 principals and all ministry officials in the Inspectorate Department that are responsible for school inspection. From the above, it is clear that the study has three (3) different sets of population from which information was sought in table 3.1 as can be seen.

Table 3.1: Population of Respondents and Sample Size

	Name of Respondent	Population	Sample Size
1	Principals	18,338	144
2	Teachers	199,163	960
3	Ministry officials	96	96
	Total	217,597	1,200

Source: National Bureau of Statistics, 2008

Considering the nature of the target population, it is clear that it is too large to handle or manage for this study. Therefore, a sample was found more appropriate.

3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques

A portion of the population which is studied with a view to generalizing the findings there from to the entire population is referred to as the sample (Anaekwe 2002). Olomolaiye (1986) argued that in almost all instances in educational research, it is virtually impossible to study a whole population. Therefore, portions of population are usually studied. A portion of a population selected for study is referred to as a sample and the method of selecting a sample from larger population is referred to as sampling. Samples are therefore subgroups drawn from the population (Ofo, 1994).

For this study, the stratified random sampling technique was used. Jen (2002) observed that stratified sampling is applied where the population is made up of smaller homogenous groups, which need to be represented in the study. He further stated that in stratified random sampling, the population is divided into two or more sub-groups (strata) which are known to possess special characteristics or features relating to the phenomena being studied.

Apart from stratified sampling, simple random sampling was also applied to give every state a chance of being selected. Olayiwola (2007) defined simple random sampling as a process in which participants or individuals are chosen in such a way that everybody has equal chance of being selected and each choice is independent of any other choice. This means that in simple random sampling, everybody has the probability of being selected and the selection of an individual does not affect the selection of another. This was done through raffle draw or by means of a table of random numbers. Raffle draw was used for this study.

The researcher decided to select and study twelve (12) states out of thirty-six (36) states in the country. This is in line with the recommendation of Roscoe (1969) in Maicibi (2000) that 30% of total population can be used as a sample for study. To select the twelve (12) states, thirty-six (36) states were grouped into six (6) geo-political zones so as to have a fair representation of the entire population. The zones and the states are reflected in table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Geo-Political Zones and Their States

Geo-Political Zone	States
North-East	Adamawa, Bauchi, Taraba, Borno, Gombe, Yobe
North-Central	Kwara, Benue, Plateau, Niger, Nasarawa, Kogi
North-West	Kano, Kaduna, Zamfara, Jigawa, Kebbi, Katsina, Sokoto
South-East	Imo, Anambra, Abia, Enugu, Ebonyi
South-South	Rivers, Cross-River, Akwa-Ibom, Delta, Edo, Bayelsa
South-West	Lagos, Ondo, Oyo, Ogun, Osun, Ekiti

The names of the states in each zone were written on pieces of papers, folded and mixed together. The folded papers from each zone were kept separately in a container, after which six people representing the six zones were asked to pick two pieces of papers each. The pieces of papers picked were opened or unfolded and the following states representing their geo-political zones were picked for the study.

Table 3.3: Sample states selected in each zone for the study

Geo-Political Zones		Sample States
1	North-East	Gombe, Adamawa
2	North-Central	Benue, Kwara
3	North-West	Kano, Kaduna
4	South-East	Enugu, Anambra
5	South-South	Akwa-Ibom, Bayelsa
6	South-West	Lagos, Ogun

A total of twelve secondary schools were selected from each of the twelve states for the study. In all, one hundred and forty four (144) secondary schools were selected for the study. In each state picked copies of questionnaire were distributed to the principals, ministry officials and teachers. This means that in each selected state, twelve (12) principals, eight (8) ministry of education officials and eighty (80) teachers were involved in the study. In all, one hundred and forty-four (144) principals, ninety six (96) ministry officials and nine hundred and sixty (960) teachers were given questionnaire to fill. The total respondents for this study was one thousand, two hundred (1,200).

For determining the sample size of the population of all the subjects, Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) Table for determining sample size was used for all groups of respondents (principals, teachers and ministry officials). Thus, by Krejcie and Morgan's table, any population up to 1,000,000 and above 384. is suitable for sample size. In the light of this, the sample size for principals respondents is therefore 144, while the sample size of teachers is 960 and the sample size for ministry of education officials is 96. In addition, Nwana (1982) argued that there is no fixed and inviolate rule regarding the size of the sample. To him no fixed percentage and number is ideal. Rather, it is the circumstances of the study situations that determine what number or what percentage of the population should be studied. Based on this, the researcher decided to involve one thousand, two hundred (1,200) respondents in the twelve states for this study.

3.5 Instrumentation

Kerlinger (1973) stated that the techniques of data collection provide vital information on how a researcher obtains the needed details on which the results and conclusions from the study are based. The main instrument that was used for data collection was the structured questionnaire. In a structured questionnaire according to Jen (2002) the respondents are restricted to some response options or required to select from list of suggested responses that best suit the respondents. The questionnaire for this study was designed based on the objectives, research questions and the hypotheses. The questionnaire was used to gather information necessary for the test of the hypotheses raised in chapter one. In addition to the questionnaire, observation was also used to confirm some of the information obtained from the questionnaire. Observation according

to Nworgu (1991) involves watching people, events, situation or phenomenon and obtaining first hand information relating to particular aspect of such phenomena.

The same questionnaire was used for all categories of respondents (principals, teachers and ministry officials). The questionnaire was divided into ten sections with the belief that the information gathered would be quite adequate for the purpose of the study. The sections were made up of Likert five point scale for the determination of the extent to which the respondents evaluated principals' leadership practices in instruction. The items were scaled as follows:

Strongly Agree (SA)	= 5 score
Agree (A)	= 4 score
Undecided (U)	= 3 score
Disagree (D)	= 2 score
Strongly Disagree (SD)	= 1 score

The beginning of the questionnaire was an introduction and an appeal to respondents.

3.6 Validation of Research Instrument

The validity of the major instrument which is the questionnaire was carried out at the initial stage by submitting it to the thesis supervisors who made necessary inputs in order to make it better. After the supervisors had approved the questionnaire, experts were contacted for some inputs also. Therefore, the approval of the supervisors and that of the experts was seen as confirming the content validity of the research instrument. The method of instrument validity has been recommended by Kerlinger (1973) that the

contents of instrument should be subjected to experts' vetting so as to make it valid and reliable.

3.7 Pilot Study

The pilot study was administered to ascertain the reliability coefficient of the instrument.

The purpose of the pilot study was to practically

- a. validate the instrument especially the suitability of the instrument for teachers, principals and Ministry of Education officials.
- b. to acquaint the researcher with the procedure involved in the administration, collection and analysis of data.
- c. to determine the reliability, adequacy and consistency in the questions or statements and the opinions of the subjects.

In order to establish the content validity of the instrument used, a pilot study is necessary (Afolabi 1991). In view of this, a pilot study was conducted using ten principals, five ministry officials and sixty teachers selected from Taraba State. The copies of the questionnaire were administered and collected on the same spot.

To ensure the reliability of the research instrument for this study, data collected from the pilot study was statistically analysed for the purpose of reliability coefficient. The Gultman Option of the split-half was used. A reliability coefficient of alpha level of 0.899 was obtained. This reliability coefficient was considered reliable for the internal consistency of the instrument. This according to Spregel and Stevens (1999) an instrument is considered reliable if it lies between 0 and 1 (one) and that the closer the

calculated reliability coefficient is to one, the more reliable is the instrument. This is in line with Akuezulo's (1993) suggestion that a correlation that is close to 1 (one) is high. Therefore, the instrument is reliable and valid for use as an instrument for data collection.

3.8 Administration of the Instrument

The researcher through the help of six research assistants carried out the administration of the questionnaire. The Assistants were employed to help in the administration and collection of the questionnaire in the selected states and schools. The researcher trained the six research assistants thoroughly before they administered the questionnaire in various states under study.

3.10 Methods of Data Analysis

The statistic that was employed to test the null hypotheses was the parametric statistic of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the critical level of significance was 0.05 level of significance to determine whether or not the responses of the subjects on the variables were related or different. The choice of ANOVA was appropriate as prominent statisticians like Borg and Gall (1983), Smith (1970) are of the view that it is useful for determining whether or not the groups differ significantly among themselves in their opinions.

Other statistical measurements used to present the data included Scheffe's post-hoc test, frequency distribution, mean computation and percentages.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to find out the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools. For this reason, the opinions of principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials were sought. This chapter therefore deals with the presentation of data analysis for the study. As mentioned earlier, structured questionnaire was designed and administered to principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in twelve sample states of the six geo-political zones of Nigeria. To achieve this, the data collected were statistically analysed and the results were presented and discussed according to the questions and hypotheses in chapter one of the study.

4.1.1 Rate of Return of Questionnaire

Though the detailed presentation, analysis and discussion of data was presented , raw data administered is hereby presented to determine the total number of questionnaire administered and the rate of return after administration.

Table 4.1.1: Rate of Return of Questionnaire by States and Groups

S/N	Name of State	Principals			Teachers			Ministry of Educ. Officials		
		No. Administered	No. Returned	Percentage Returned	No. Administered	No. Returned	Percentage Returned	No. Administered	No. Returned	Percentage Returned
1	Adamawa	12	12	100	80	73	91	8	7	88
2	Gombe	12	9	75	80	57	71	8	5	63
3	Benue	12	12	100	80	64	80	8	4	50
4	Kwara	12	11	92	80	54	68	8	6	75
5	Kano	12	10	83	80	61	76	8	4	50
6	Kaduna	12	11	92	80	53	66	8	5	63
7	Enugu	12	10	83	80	52	65	8	6	75
8	Anambra	12	11	92	80	68	85	8	4	50
9	Akwa-Ibom	12	10	83	80	60	75	8	5	63
10	Bayelsa	12	9	75	80	59	74	8	4	50
11	Lagos	12	8	67	80	58	73	8	5	63
12	Ogun	12	7	58	80	61	76	8	5	63
	Total	144	120	83	960	720	75	96	60	63

There were 1,200 copies of the questionnaire that were sent out to the field for administration. The figure was based on the number of respondents in the twelve sampled states in the six geo-political zones of Nigeria.

As can be seen from the table, 4.1.1 copies of the questionnaire were sent to principals to be answered in the twelve sample states of the six geo-political zones of the country. In each sampled state, 12 copies of questionnaire were sent out to the principals. Of the twelve copies administered in each of the twelve states, Adamawa filled and returned all (12) copies, representing 100 percent, Gombe 9 copies representing 75 percent, Benue 12 copies representing 100 percent, Kwara 11 copies representing 92 percent, Kano 10 copies representing 83 percent, Kaduna 11 copies representing 92 percent, Enugu 10 copies representing 83 percent, Anambra 11 copies representing 92 percent, Akwa-Ibom 10 copies representing 83 percent, Bayelsa 9 copies representing 75 percent, Lagos 8 copies representing 67 percent, and Ogun seven percent representing 58 percent. A total of 120 copies of completed questionnaires representing 83 percent were returned.

As for teachers in all the twelve states, a total of 960 copies of questionnaire were supposed to be answered. Only 720 copies representing 75 percent were actually answered and returned as can be seen in the table.

Out of 96 copies of the questionnaire administered to the Ministry of Education officials in the twelve sample states, only 60 copies representing 63 percent of the questionnaires were answered and returned.

On the whole, the rate of return shows that the highest number of respondents in the three groups were from Adamawa State. The result also shows that principals rate of

return of the completed questionnaire (83 percent) was the highest of the three groups of respondents while Ministry of Education officials (63 percent) returned the lowest number. This could be attributed to the fact that in most secondary schools visited, the principals were the first to be consulted to organize those that would fill the questionnaire. The ministry officials had the lowest number perhaps due to their tight schedules. On the whole, no group of respondents returned less than 60 percent of completed questionnaire.

4.2 Presentation and Discussion of Bio-Data

All data collected in this section were tabulated using frequencies and percentages

4.2.1 Proprietorship]Ownership

The table bellow shows the number of respondents in each establishment. This means that the subjects were grouped based on whether they were employees of federal, state or private institutions.

Table 4.2.1 Frequency Distribution of respondents by proprietor/school ownership

Ownership	Frequency	Percentage
Federal Government	144	16.0
State Government	507	56.3
Private	249	27.7
Total	900	100.0

Source: Data Bank.

Table 4.2.1 reveals the distribution of respondents by school ownership. From the above table 144(16.0%) were staff of Federal Government Secondary Schools or Federal Ministry Officials, 507 (56.3%) were State Government Teachers or State Ministry Officials and 249 (27.7%) were private staff of secondary schools. This implies that majority of the respondents were staff of the State Government Secondary Schools. This is because state governments had more secondary schools than federal and private individuals.

4.2.2 Gender

The table below categorizes respondents on gender. It indicates the number of males and females that were involved in the study.

4.2.2 Frequency Distribution of respondents by gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	612	68.0
Female	288	32.0
Total	900	100.0

Source: Data Bank.

Table 4.2.2 shows that the respondents were made up of 612 (68.0%) males and 288(32.0%) were females. This means that more male respondents filled the questionnaire than females. In other words, majority of respondents were males. This is so because there were more males in each of the three categories of respondents. However, the table reveals that both sexes were represented in the study.

4.2.3 Status of Respondents

The table shows the number of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials that were used for this study..

Table 4.2.3 Frequency Distribution of respondents by status

Status	Frequency	Percentage
Principals	120	13.3
Teachers	720	80.0
Ministry officials	60	6.7
Total	900	100.0

Source: Data Bank.

Table 4.2.3 reveals that 120 (13.3%) out of 900 respondents were principals, 720(80.0%) were teachers and the remaining 60(6.7%) were ministry officials. This implies that majority of the respondents were teachers since they formed the majority group in secondary schools in Nigeria.

4.2.4 Years of experience

The table shows the length of time or period respondents had served in teaching profession.

Table 4.2.4: Frequency Distribution of respondents by years of experiences

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1-4 years	173	19.2
5-10 years	277	30.8
11-20 years	128	14.2
21 and above	322	35.8
Total	900	100.0

Source: Data Bank.

The table above shows the analysis of the respondents in respect to the length of time they had served in teaching profession. Out of the 900 questionnaire distributed, 173(19.2%) of the respondents were between 1-4 years of experience, 277(30.8%) were between 5-10 years of experience, 128(14.2%) were between 11-20 years of experiences and 322 (35.8%) were over 20 years of experience. It is clear from the above that most of the respondents had 21 years and above experience in teaching. It also implies that majority of the respondents were experienced teachers in teaching profession and it could be assumed that the respondents must have a fairly balanced information about instructional leadership practices of principals.

4.2.5 Highest qualification

4.2.6 This shows the highest qualification of each respondent in order to ascertain the calibre or quality of subjects used in the study as presented below in Table 4.2.5.

Table 4.2.5 Frequency Distribution of respondents by highest qualification

Qualifications	Frequency	Percentage
NCE, Diploma	223	24.8
B.Ed, BSc, B. Tech, B.A, BAEd	668	74.2
M.Ed/MSc, MA	8	0.9
Ph.D	-	-
Others	1	0.1
Total	900	100.0

Table 4.2.5 above reveals that majority of the respondents were degree holders with various areas of specializations. This was followed by NCE and diploma holders.

However, no respondent had a Ph.D. The above table also shows that most of the respondents were matured people who were expected to objectively fill the questionnaire.

4.3 Analysis of Responses

This section presents the analysis and discussion of data related to the issues raised in chapter one. In other words, this section analysed the responses of the three categories of respondents using frequency tables and simple percentages. The responses of the respondents were based on the 114 items identified. The items were grouped into nine (9) categories. Items 1-13 were grouped under instructional leadership practices of Nigerian principals on curriculum activities. Items 14-26 fell under instructional supervisory practices of principals, while items 27-39 sought to establish how effectively principals of secondary schools in Nigeria provided staff development. Items 40-51 desired to find out whether or not principals provided and utilized teaching materials to the benefit of learners. Items 52-64 sought to find out how effectively principals maintained school physical facilities. Other groups include items 65-78 which found out the instructional leadership practices of principals on staff and students' motivation, items 79-91 which sought to find out how adequately, principals performed in institutional planning of academic programmes, items 92-102 on delegation of authority and items 103-114 was on instructional leadership practices of principals in communication network.

To explore and achieve the findings on the various instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools, the researcher collected and analysed the responses of the respondents as presented in the various tables.

However, for the purpose of this study, strongly agree and agree were merged while strongly disagree and disagree were also merged. This means that strongly agree and agree have the same strength and strongly disagree and disagree also have the same strength in the presentation of the tables.

Table 4.3.1: Opinions of Respondents on the evaluation of instructional leadership practices of principals in curriculum implementation in Nigerian secondary schools

S/N	Item statement	Category of Resp.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Have demonstrated knowledge of curricular issues in various subject areas.	Principal	14	11.7	77	64.2	13	10.8	9	7.5	7	5.8
		Teacher	86	11.9	485	67.4	43	6.0	47	6.5	59	8.2
		Min. officials	7	11.7	41	68.2	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7
2	Make curriculum available to teachers in all subjects.	Principal	-	-	97	80.8	7	5.8	8	6.7	8	6.7
		Teacher	-	-	613	85.1	12	1.7	47	6.5	48	6.7
		Min. officials	-	-	52	86.6	-	-	4	6.7	4	6.7
3	Assist teachers in the implementation of the curriculum	Principal	8	6.7	80	66.7	19	15.8	11	9.2	2	1.7
		Teacher	40	5.6	490	68.1	69	9.5	118	16.4	3	0.4
		Min. officials	3	5.0	42	70.0	5	8.3	10	16.7	-	-
4	Ensure that the choice of learning experiences is based on the environment in which the school is sited.	Principal	14	11.7	7	5.8	13	10.8	9	7.5	77	64.2
		Teacher	86	11.9	43	6.0	47	6.5	59	8.2	485	67.4
		Min. officials	7	11.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	41	68.2
5	Assign curriculum duty to V.P. because they are occupied with office administration.	Principal	-	-	97	80.7	7	5.8	8	6.7	8	6.7
		Teacher	10	1.4	604	83.9	12	1.7	47	6.5	47	6.5
		Min. officials	-	-	52	86.7	-	-	4	6.7	4	6.7
6	Interpret government policies on curriculum development.	Principal	8	6.7	79	65.8	19	15.8	12	10.0	2	1.7
		Teacher	40	5.6	491	68.2	69	9.5	118	16.4	2	0.3
		Min. officials	3	5.0	42	70.0	10	16.7	5	8.3	-	-
7	Ensure purchase of school materials based on the curriculum	Principal	14	11.7	7	5.8	13	10.8	9	7.5	77	64.2
		Teacher	86	11.9	43	6.0	47	6.5	59	8.2	485	67.4
		Min. officials	7	11.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	41	68.3
8	Assist teachers in the breakdown of the curriculum into syllabus and scheme.	Principal	-	-	97	80.8	7	5.8	8	6.7	8	6.7
		Teacher	-	-	613	85.1	12	1.7	47	6.5	48	6.7
		Min. officials	-	-	52	86.7	-	-	4	6.7	4	6.7

9	Regularly supervise the implementation of the school curriculum	Principal Teacher Min. officials	8 40 3	6.7 5.6 5.0	80 490 42	66.6 68.1 70.0	19 69 5	15.8 9.6 8.3	11 118 10	9.2 16.3 16.7	2 3 -	1.7 0.4 -
10	Do not work with teachers in the selection of experiences in the curriculum.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	14 86 7	11.7 11.9 11.7	7 43 4	5.8 6.0 6.7	13 59 4	10.8 8.2 6.7	9 47 4	7.5 6.5 6.7	77 485 41	64.2 67.3 68.2
11	Curriculum implementation is their priority in the school.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	7 38 4	5.8 5.3 6.7	82 480 40	68.4 66.7 66.6	19 71 9	15.8 9.9 15.0	12 115 7	10.0 16.0 11.7	- 16 -	- 2.1 -
12	Organize and encourage co-curricular activities such as debate, sports, clubs, etc.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	14 84 7	11.7 11.7 11.7	8 47 4	6.6 6.5 6.7	8 46 4	6.7 6.4 6.7	8 43 4	6.7 6.0 6.7	52 500 41	68.3 69.4 68.2
13	Ensure that students are always guided in subject selection.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	- - -	- - -	104 634 52	86.6 88.0 86.6	- - -	- - -	8 43 4	6.7 6.0 6.7	8 43 4	6.7 6.0 6.7

On whether or not principals of secondary schools in Nigeria had demonstrated knowledge of curricular issues in various subject areas, there was a general agreement on the statement by majority of respondents. This was revealed by principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials with 75.7 percent, 79.1 percent and 80.0 percent respectively. However, the view was not shared by few principals, teachers and ministry officials with 13.5 percent, 14.7 percent and 13.4 percent respectively. A further negligible percentage of respondents were undecided. The consensus opinion reveals that principals in Nigerian secondary schools had demonstrated knowledge of curricular issues in their schools.

Item 2 revealed that principals always ensured that school curriculum was made available to all staff. Responses of the three categories of respondents were in harmony. This agreement was revealed by 80.8 percent, 85.1 percent and 86.6 percent of principals, students and ministry officials respectively. Only a negligible percent of the respondents had either contrary view or were undecided.

Item 3 which sought the opinion of respondents on whether or not principals assisted staff in the implementation of school curriculum revealed that assistance was rendered to teachers in the course of implementing the school curriculum. Majority of the principals (73.4%), teachers (73.7%), ministry officials (75.0%) revealed that principals provided assistance to enable teachers function effectively in delivering their lessons. However, few percentage of respondents revealed that the assistance provided was not adequate enough to enable teachers excel in teaching.

Item 4 revealed that the choice of learning experiences or curriculum was not based on the environment in which the school was sited. This could be attributed to the

fact that choice of learning experiences is in most cases based on what examination bodies (WAEC, NECO, etc.) wanted schools to learn and not what the community or culture desires. The majority of the three groups of respondents (principals with 71.7%, teachers with 75.6% and ministry officials with 74.9% revealed that the principals had no choice, but to implement what examination bodies wanted as learning experiences. However, a negligible number of the respondents either agreed that principals ensured choice of learning experiences or were undecided.

Majority of respondents in item 5 indicated that curriculum duty was assigned to the vice-principals because of the principals' administrative responsibilities in the office as revealed by the principals with 80.7%, teachers with 85.3%, and Ministry Officials with 86.7%. The result shows that majority of principals were more of school administrators rather than school instructional leaders.

In item 6, majority of the respondents as revealed by the principals with 72.5%, teachers with 73.8% and ministry officials with 75.0% showed that principals interpreted government policies on curriculum development. However, on whether or not the principals ensured purchase of school materials based on the curriculum, majority of the respondents (principals with 71.7%, teachers with 75.6% and ministry officials with 75.0%) revealed that most principals had no hand in the purchase of learning materials. This could be attributed to the fact that most principals had no running cost from their proprietors to enable them purchase relevant learning materials based on curriculum. This means that purchase of materials was in most cases centrally done. The principals therefore had little or no inputs when school materials were to be purchased or supplied.

The stance taken by majority of the respondents on item 8 shows that most principals in Nigerian secondary schools assisted teachers in the breakdown of the curriculum into syllabus and scheme of work. This was revealed by 80.8 percent of principals, 85.1 percent of teachers and 86.7 percent of ministry officials. Very negligible percent of principals, teachers and ministry officials did not share the opinion.

Majority of respondents in item 9 were of the opinion that principals regularly supervised the implementation of the school curriculum. This was revealed by 73.4 percent of principals, 73.7 percent of teachers and 75.0 percent of ministry officials. Only a few of the respondents either disagreed or were undecided.

From the responses in item 10, 71.7 percent of principals, 73.9 percent of teachers and 74.9 percent of ministry officials did not agree with the statement that principals did not work with teachers in selecting learning experiences in the curriculum. This implies that majority of the respondents were of the view that principals worked with teachers to select learning experiences. Very insignificant percent of the respondents showed a contrary view or were undecided.

Item 11 stated that curriculum implementation was the principals' priority. The result of the responses showed that 74.1 percent of principals, 72.0 percent of teachers and 73.4 of ministry officials agreed with the statement while 25.9 of principals, 25.9 percent of teachers and 26.6 percent of Ministry officials did not uphold the statement. This could be attributed to the fact that some principals delegated curriculum activities to their vice-principals and heads of departments.

Majority of respondents in item 12 disagreed with the statement that principals organized and encouraged extra-curricular activities such as debate, sports, clubs and so

on. The result of the responses showed that 74.9 percent of principals, 75.4 percent and 75.0 percent disagreed with the statement, while a negligible few of the respondents upheld the statement. This could be attributed to the emphasis on cognitive domain in our secondary schools at the detriment of other domains (psychomotor and affective). In addition, since most secondary schools operate deboarding system, it is difficult for principals to encourage and organize extra-curricular activities in their schools because of time factor.

Item 13 which stated that principals ensured that students were always guided in subject selection had positive consensus in the opinions of the respondents. This was confirmed by 86.6 percent of principals, 88.1 percent of teachers and 86.7 percent of ministry officials.

Table 4.3.2: Opinions of Respondents on the Evaluation of Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Instructional Supervision

S/N	Item statement	Category of Resp.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
14	Regularly check teachers lesson notes to offer advice where necessary.	Principal	14	11.7	82	68.3	8	6.7	8	6.7	8	6.7	3.7166
		Teacher	84	11.7	500	69.4	46	6.4	43	6.0	47	6.4	3.7375
		Min. officials	7	4.7	41	68.3	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.7166
15	Regularly evaluate the teachers instructional methods and make correction without being judgemental.	Principal	14	11.7	82	68.3	8	6.7	8	6.7	8	6.7	3.7166
		Teacher	84	11.7	500	69.5	46	6.4	43	6.0	47	6.4	3.7375
		Min. officials	7	11.7	41	68.2	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.7166
16	Regard teachers as co-workers	Principal	-	-	104	86.6	8	6.7	8	6.7	-	-	3.7333
		Teacher	-	-	634	88.0	-	-	43	6.0	43	6.0	3.70138
		Min. officials	-	-	52	86.6	-	-	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.6666
17	Supportive of classroom concerns of teachers.	Principal	7	5.8	82	68.4	19	15.8	12	10.0	-	-	3.7000
		Teacher	39	5.4	490	68.1	118	16.4	73	10.1	-	-	3.6875
		Min. officials	4	6.7	40	66.6	9	15.0	7	11.7	-	-	3.6833
18	Encourage innovations and creativity of teachers.	Principal	14	11.7	82	68.2	8	6.7	8	6.7	8	6.7	3.1333
		Teacher	84	11.7	500	69.4	46	6.5	43	6.0	47	6.4	3.7375
		Min. officials	7	11.7	41	68.2	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.9166
19	Regularly visit classes to observe teachers teaching.	Principal	-	-	104	86.7	-	-	8	6.7	8	6.7	3.6666
		Teacher	-	-	634	88.1	-	-	43	6.0	43	6.0	3.7013
		Min. officials	-	-	52	86.6	-	-	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.6666
20	Check classroom attendance of teachers and students regularly.	Principal	7	5.8	82	68.3	19	15.8	12	10.0	-	-	3.7000
		Teacher	39	5.4	490	68.1	73	10.1	118	16.4	-	-	3.6250
		Min. officials	4	6.7	40	66.7	9	15.0	7	11.7	-	-	3.6833
21	Teach at least a class in the school.	Principal	14	11.7	8	6.7	8	6.7	8	6.7	82	68.2	1.8667
		Teacher	84	11.7	47	6.5	46	6.4	43	6.0	500	69.4	1.8500
		Min. officials	7	11.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	41	68.2	1.8667

22	Need training in instructional leadership.	Principal	-	-	104	86.6	-	-	8	6.7	8	6.7	3.5333
		Teacher	-	-	634	88.0	-	-	43	6.0	43	6.0	3.7013
		Min. officials	-	-	52	86.6	-	-	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.6666
23	Create tension and stress on teachers that are visited in the class	Principal	7	5.8	82	68.3	19	15.8	12	10.0	-	-	3.7000
		Teacher	39	5.4	490	68.1	73	10.1	118	16.4	-	-	3.6875
		Min. officials	4	6.7	40	66.6	9	15.0	7	11.7	-	-	3.6833
24	Purchase educational magazines and newspapers for their school.	Principal	14	11.7	7	5.8	13	10.8	9	7.5	77	64.2	1.9333
		Teacher	84	11.7	61	8.5	45	6.2	46	6.4	485	67.4	1.8833
		Min. officials	7	11.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	4	6.7	41	68.2	1.8667
25	Interact freely with teachers.	Principal	15	12.5	25	20.8	8	6.7	12	10.0	60	50.0	2.3583
		Teacher	90	12.4	181	25.1	47	6.5	77	10.6	325	67.4	2.4916
		Min. officials	7	11.7	10	16.7	3	5.0	6	10.0	34	56.7	2.1666
26	Are too proud of themselves.	Principal	1	0.8	23	19.2	9	7.5	77	64.2	10	8.3	2.4000
		Teacher	8	1.1	142	19.7	59	8.2	432	60.0	79	11.0	2.4000
		Min. officials	-	-	7	11.7	5	8.3	44	73.3	4	6.7	2.2500

This section deals with the opinions of the three groups of respondents on the instructional practices of Nigerian principals on instructional supervision. The section covers statements items 14 to 26 as shown in table 4.3.2.

Item 14 which stated that principals checked teachers' lesson notes and offered advice where necessary was accepted by the majority of the respondents as 80.0 percent of principals, 81.1 of teachers, and 80.0 of ministry officials agreed with the statement. However, 13.4 percent of principals, 12.4 percent of teachers and 13.4 percent of ministry officials did not agree with the statement while 6.7 percent of principals, 6.4 percent of teachers and 6.7 percent of ministry officials were undecided.

Furthermore, regular evaluation of teachers' instructional methods and making of corrections without being judgemental as stated in item 15 was also accepted by majority as the responsibility of the principals. This was confirmed by 80.0 percent of principals, 81.1 percent of teachers and 80.0 percent of ministry officials. A negligible percentage of the respondents shared either a contrary view or were undecided.

Majority of the respondents in item 16 held the view that principals regarded teachers as co-workers. This was revealed by 86.7 percent of principals, 88.1 percent of teachers and 86.6 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percentage of respondents did not agree with the statement or were undecided. This means that principals did not show superiority complex during supervision.

The high consensus in item 17 amongst the three groups of respondents on the supportive nature of the principals on classroom concerns of teachers was glaringly depicted by 74.1 percent of principals, 73.5 percent of teachers and 73.3 percent of

ministry officials. This general consensus implies that principals supported teachers in delivering their lessons.

In item 18, majority of the principals, teachers and ministry officials with 80.0 percent, 75.4 percent and 74.9 percent respectively agreed with the statement that principals encouraged innovations and creativity of teachers. A negligible percentage of the three respondents either disagreed or were undecided.

Item 19 attempted to find out the opinions of respondents on how regularly principals visited teachers in their classes to observe teaching. Majority of the three groups of respondents agreed that principals regularly visited teachers in their classes to observe their teaching. This was confirmed by 86.7 percent of principals, 88.1 percent of teachers and 86.7 percent of ministry officials. However, a negligible number of the three groups of respondents shared negative views.

As to whether or not principals check staff and students attendance regularly in item 20, 74.1 percent of principals, 73.5 percent of teachers and 73.4 percent of ministry officials agreed with the statement. This implies that most principals in Nigerian secondary schools checked to ensure the presence of teachers and students in their schools.

Item 21 attempted to find out whether or not principals teach at least a class. Majority of the three categories of respondents disagreed with the statement. This was confirmed by 75.0 percent of principals, 75.4 of teachers and 74.9 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible number shared a contrary view or were undecided. This explains the administrative load principals had in their schools that could not allow them

to teach some classes. This shows that majority of the principals were administrative heads and not instructional or academic heads.

Majority of the three categories of respondents in item 22 agreed that principals in Nigerian secondary schools required training in instructional leadership to enable them perform more effectively. This opinion was shared by 86.7 percent of principals, 88.1 percent of teachers and 86.7 percent of ministry officials. This implies that principals require training periodically to enable them cope with the instructional leadership practices especially in this era of science and technology. Very negligible percent in each group of respondents either did not agree.

Item 23 sought to find out the feelings of teachers during observations. From the result, 73.4 percent of the principals, 74.1 percent of teachers and 73.4 percent of ministry officials accepted that principals' classroom visitation created tension and stress on teachers. This implies that majority of teachers became tensed whenever principals entered their classes to observe their lessons. This could be attributed to lack of confidence by the teachers in the subject-matters taught.

The opinions of the three groups of respondents in item 24 on the purchase of educational magazines and newspapers by the principals showed that 71.7 percent of principals, 73.8 percent of teachers and 75.0 percent of ministry officials disagreed with the statement. This could be attributed to lack of funds in Nigerian secondary schools to enable principals purchase relevant educational materials.

On whether or not principals interacted freely with teachers in item 25, majority of the respondents in the three groups disagreed with the statements. From the result, 60.0 percent of principals, 78.0 percent of teachers and 66.7 percent of ministry officials

were of the view that principals did not interact freely with teachers. This could be due to the fact that principals wanted to be firm and strict in the performance of their duties to minimize being toyed around and being disrespected.

Majority of the respondents in item 26 revealed that principals were not too proud of themselves. This was revealed by 71.7 percent of principals, 68.2 percent of teachers and 81.6 percent of ministry officials. Only a few negligible respondents in the three groups either shared a contrary view or were undecided. This implies that majority of the principals were considerate in their dealings with teachers.

Table 4.3.3: Opinions of Respondents on the Evaluation of Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Organisation of Staff Development

S/N	Item statement	Category of Resp.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
27	Take definite steps to aid teachers professional growth.	Principal	25	20.8	60	50.0	8	6.7	12	10.0	15	12.5	3.5666
		Teacher	93	12.9	66	9.9	77	10.7	160	22.2	324	45.0	2.2277
		Min. officials	7	11.7	34	56.6	10	16.7	6	10.0	3	5.0	3.6000
28	Conduct demonstration lessons for teachers with deficiencies regularly.	Principal	10	8.3	77	64.2	16	13.3	9	7.5	8	6.7	3.6000
		Teacher	51	7.1	428	59.4	49	6.8	147	20.7	45	6.0	3.4166
		Min. officials	8	13.3	45	75.0	4	6.7	2	3.3	1	1.7	3.9500
29	Regularly invite experts in various fields to up-date staff knowledge and skills in their subject areas.	Principal	15	12.5	8	6.7	25	20.8	12	10.0	60	50.0	2.2166
		Teacher	90	12.5	109	15.1	71	10.7	159	21.3	291	40.4	1.8597
		Min. officials	12	20.0	12	20.0	6	10.0	4	6.7	26	43.3	2.4166
30	Appoint the experienced teachers to assist the inexperienced ones.	Principal	-	-	79	65.8	23	19.2	9	7.5	9	7.5	3.4333
		Teacher	15	2.1	401	55.7	132	18.3	62	8.6	110	15.3	3.2069
		Min. officials	5	8.3	36	60.0	11	18.3	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.5666
31	Attend professional meetings.	Principal	48	40.0	37	30.8	13	10.8	11	9.2	11	9.2	3.8333
		Teacher	59	8.3	343	47.6	55	7.6	160	22.2	103	14.3	2.9930
		Min. officials	8	13.3	45	75.0	4	6.7	2	3.3	1	1.7	3.9500
32	Write professional papers regularly.	Principal	5	4.2	23	19.2	11	9.2	54	45.0	27	22.5	2.3750
		Teacher	72	10.0	123	17.1	73	10.1	212	29.4	240	33.3	2.4097
		Min. officials	12	20.0	12	20.0	6	10.0	26	43.3	4	6.7	3.0333
33	Organize orientation courses for newly posted teachers and newly admitted students.	Principal	8	6.7	60	50.0	8	6.7	35	29.2	9	7.5	3.3916
		Teacher	51	7.1	443	61.5	58	8.1	102	14.2	66	9.1	3.4319
		Min. officials	8	13.3	41	68.3	7	11.7	4	6.7	-	-	3.8833
34	Are always abreast of new changes in education.	Principal	36	30.0	30	25.0	27	22.5	13	10.8	14	11.7	3.5083
		Teacher	78	10.8	119	16.5	58	8.1	102	14.2	363	50.4	2.3986
		Min. officials	6	10.0	36	60.0	3	5.0	4	6.7	11	18.3	3.3666

35	Regularly sponsor teachers to attend workshops or seminars.	Principal	27	22.5	23	19.2	11	9.2	54	45.0	5	4.1	3.1083
		Teacher	18	2.5	30	4.2	55	7.6	499	61.3	118	16.4	2.7638
		Min. officials	14	23.3	9	15.0	3	5.0	31	51.7	3	5.0	2.6666
36	Introduce modern methods of teaching to teachers.	Principal	35	29.2	60	50.0	8	6.7	8	6.7	9	7.4	3.8666
		Teacher	38	5.0	437	60.7	55	7.6	177	24.6	13	2.1	3.4333
		Min. officials	4	6.7	44	73.3	7	11.7	5	8.3	-	-	3.7833
37	Recommend staff for further training.	Principal	36	30.0	30	25.5	13	10.8	27	22.5	14	11.2	3.3916
		Teacher	94	13.1	129	17.8	58	8.1	76	10.6	363	50.4	1.7708
		Min. officials	6	10.0	4	6.7	3	5.0	36	60.0	11	18.3	2.3000
38	Have financial resources to organize any staff development in the school.	Principal	5	4.2	23	19.2	11	9.2	54	45.0	27	22.4	2.6756
		Teacher	88	12.2	65	9.0	55	7.6	133	18.5	379	52.6	2.0972
		Min. officials	4	6.7	2	3.3	3	5.0	49	81.7	2	3.3	2.2500
39	Teachers count on them as resource of information on current trends.	Principal	35	29.2	60	50.0	8	6.7	8	6.7	9	7.4	3.8833
		Teacher	28	3.9	425	59.0	101	14.0	53	7.4	113	15.7	3.2805
		Min. officials	-	-	43	71.6	9	15.0	4	6.7	4	6.7	3.5166

The first item in table 4.4.3 stated that principals take definite steps to aid teachers' professional growth in their schools. The results showed that 70.8 percent of principals and 48.3 percent of ministry of education officials were in agreement with the statement, while 67.2 percent of teachers were in disagreement or showed contrary opinion that principals of Nigerian secondary schools did not take definite steps to improve the professional growth of teachers. This means that while principals and ministry officials agreed with the item, teachers showed negative opinions. However, 22.5 percent of principals and 15.0 percent of ministry officials showed disagreement while 22.8 percent of teachers upheld the statement. The different opinions suggest that principals and ministry of education officials seemed to show solidarity and support for each other. Since the teachers who are beneficiaries disagreed with the statement, perhaps the other two groups agreed with the statement as a way of cover up. Principals therefore have a lot to do to ensure the professional growth of teachers in their various schools.

In item 28, it is safe to say that principals conducted demonstration lessons for teachers with deficiencies. This was confirmed by 72.5 percent of principals, 85.3 percent of ministry of education officials and 85.3 percent of teachers. The general consensus here is that principals helped teachers who had deficiencies in teaching their lessons by conducting demonstration lessons. Only a negligible percentage of the three groups of respondents shared either a contrary opinion or were neutral.

The opinion of the majority respondents in item 29 on invitation of experts to update teachers' knowledge disagreed with the statement as 60 percent of principals, 61.7 percent of teachers and 50.0 percent of ministry of education officials were on the

negative side. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents either upheld the statement or were undecided. The general disagreement could be attributed to the fact that most secondary schools faced financial problems and the invitation of experts could require funds for at least transport, entertainment and arrangement. Based on this and other factors, principals would find it difficult to invite experts to go to their schools to update their teachers.

Majority of the three groups of respondents in item 30 accepted that principals appointed experienced staff to assist the inexperienced ones. This was revealed by 65.8, 57.8 and 68.3 percent of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials respectively. The general consensus suggests that principals respected experience. The result also showed that there were cases of principals not minding those with experience.

In item 31, majority of the three groups of respondents upheld the statement which stated that principals attended professional meetings. This was confirmed by 70.8 percent of principals, 55.9 percent of teachers and 88.3 percent of ministry of education officials. Only 18.4 percent of principals, 36.5 percent of teachers and 5.0 percent of ministry officials were in disagreement with the statement. A negligible percentage of respondents were undecided.

Item 32 which stated that principals write professional papers regularly was generally disagreed by respondents as revealed by 67.5 percent of principals, 62.7 percent of teachers and 50.0 percent of ministry officials. This implies that majority of the principals in Nigerian secondary schools were yet to form the habit of writing professional papers that would update the knowledge of teachers. Perhaps the administrative responsibilities took most of their time.

Majority of the respondents in item 33 generally agreed that principals organized orientation courses for newly posted teachers and newly admitted students. This was revealed by 56.7 percent of principals, 68.6 percent of teachers and 81.6 percent of ministry of education officials. The general consensus could be attributed to the quality of staff and students found in Nigerian secondary schools. The orientation was necessary to enable new comers settle very fast for academic work.

Item 34 sought to find out whether or not principals were abreast of new changes in education. The result showed that while 55.0 percent of principals and 70.0 percent of ministry officials were in agreement with the statement, 61.0 percent of teachers were in disagreement. This means that while majority of the principals and ministry of education officials upheld the item, majority of teachers were on the contrary side. However, minority of the respondents that disagreed among the principals and ministry officials could probably be those from rural areas who had no access to all kinds of media regarding changes in education. From the results, 22.5 percent of principals, and 25.0k percent of ministry of education officials disagreed with the statement while 38.5 percent of teachers upheld the item.

Sponsorship by principals to enable teachers attend workshops, seminars and conferences was a difficult thing to be done by principals in Nigerian secondary schools. This was revealed in item 35 by 49.2 percent of principals, 77.7 percent of teachers and 56.7 percent of ministry of education officials. This general disagreement by respondents could probably be attributed to poor funding in Nigerian secondary schools and the inability of principals to generate funds for their day to day activities in their schools. They therefore depended on their proprietors for sponsorship.

Majority of the three groups of respondents in item 36 accepted that principals introduced modern methods of teaching to teachers as shown by 79.2 percent, 65.7 percent and 80.00 percent of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials respectively. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents either disagreed or were neutral. The general consensus could be attributed to the changes in technology which required principals to introduce modern methods of teaching which could correspond with technological changes. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents either disagreed or were undecided.

Item 37 stated that principals recommended staff for further training. The responses revealed that 61.0 percent of teachers and 70.0 percent of ministry of education officials disagreed with the statement while 55.5 percent of principals upheld the statement. This implies that while majority of the principals were in agreement with the statement, majority of the teachers and ministry of education officials were in disagreement. The differences in opinions could be attributed to the fact that further training in most secondary schools in Nigeria were centrally controlled and the principals had little or no influence on those applying for further training. This is similar to the findings of Di-bor (1984) when she discovered that principals had no power because they were not involved in selection and recommending staff for further training and designing curriculum.

Majority of the respondents in item 38 as revealed by 67.5 percent, 71.1 percent and 85.0 percent of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials respectively disagreed with the statement that principals have funds to organize staff development. Majority of the respondents opposed to the statement while 28.4 percent of principals,

21.2 percent of teachers and 10.0 percent of ministry officials upheld the item. The general consensus was that principals had no adequate fund to plan and organize staff development in their schools. The few percentage of the respondents revealed that some principals had enough funds to organize staff development.

Item 39 stated that teachers counted on their principals as resource of information on current trends. This item has a general consensus as revealed by 79.2 percent of principals, 62.9 percent of teachers and 71.7 percent of ministry of education officials. The minority of the respondents disagreed that the principals' resourcefulness was not adequate and feasible. This was revealed by 14.4 percent of principals, 23.1 percent of teachers and 13.4 percent of ministry of education officials. Only a negligible percentage of respondents were undecided.

Table 4.3.4: Opinion of Respondents on the Evaluation of instructional leadership practices of principals in the provision of instructional materials

S/N	Items statements	Category of respondents	Responses									
			Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
40	Regularly purchase teaching materials for teachers to use in their classes.	Principals	36	30.0	30	25.0	5	4.2	13	10.8	36	30.0
		Teachers	44	6.1	352	48.9	60	8.3	188	26.1	76	10.6
		MOE officials	4	6.7	44	73.3	7	11.7	5	8.3	-	-
41	Work with teachers to make teaching aids available.	Principals	9	7.5	62	51.7	19	15.8	10	8.3	20	16.7
		Teachers	79	11.0	142	19.7	69	9.6	161	22.3	269	37.4
		MOE officials	3	5.0	23	38.3	15	25.0	3	5.0	16	26.7
42	Encourage teachers to improve teaching materials in their subject areas.	Principals	14	11.7	51	42.5	11	9.2	9	7.5	35	29.3
		Teachers	30	4.2	378	52.5	84	11.7	60	8.3	168	23.3
		MOE officials	3	5.0	25	41.7	11	18.3	4	6.7	17	28.3
43	Ensure that teachers regularly use teaching aids in their lessons.	Principals	6	5.0	72	60.0	3	2.5	9	7.5	30	25.0
		Teachers	39	5.4	365	50.7	51	7.1	229	31.8	36	5.0
		MOE officials	1	1.7	31	51.6	3	5.0	24	40.0	1	1.7
44	Ensure proper storage of teaching materials.	Principals	4	3.3	60	50.0	9	7.5	44	36.7	3	2.5
		Teachers	85	11.8	180	25.0	69	9.6	119	16.5	267	37.1
		MOE officials	5	8.3	30	50.0	3	5.0	6	10.0	16	26.7
45	Keep up-to-date records of	Principals	14	11.7	51	42.5	11	9.1	9	7.5	35	29.2

	teaching materials.	Teachers	58	8.1	240	33.3	97	13.5	59	8.2	266	36.9
		MOE officials	2	3.3	40	66.7	2	3.3	1	1.7	15	25.0
46	Ensure that teaching aids used in the class are relevant to the topics.	Principals	18	15.0	75	62.5	9	7.5	9	7.5	9	7.5
		Teachers	49	6.8	246	34.2	50	6.9	250	34.7	125	17.4
		MOE officials	1	1.7	31	51.6	3	5.0	24	40.0	1	1.7
47	Prepare time-table for the usage of teaching materials by teachers.	Principals	6	5.0	72	60.0	3	2.5	9	7.5	30	25.0
		Teachers	61	8.5	197	27.4	69	9.6	228	31.7	165	22.8
		MOE officials	5	8.3	30	50.0	3	5.0	6	10.0	16	26.7
48	Regularly supervise the usages of materials to avoid over and under utilization.	Principals	4	3.5	60	50.0	9	7.5	44	36.7	3	2.3
		Teachers	59	8.2	242	33.6	137	19.0	72	10.0	210	29.2
		MOE officials	3	5.0	25	41.7	11	18.3	4	6.7	17	28.3
49	Ensure regular servicing and repairs of the materials.	Principals	14	11.7	35	29.1	11	9.2	9	7.5	51	42.5
		Teachers	37	5.1	292	40.6	189	26.3	58	8.0	144	20.0
		MOE officials	1	1.7	31	51.6	3	5.0	24	40.0	1	1.7
50	Are not bothered about the use of teaching materials during lessons.	Principals	6	5.0	3	2.5	9	7.5	72	60.0	30	25.0
		Teachers	51	7.1	287	39.9	55	7.6	211	29.3	116	16.1
		MOE officials	4	6.7	29	48.3	5	8.3	3	5.0	19	31.7
51	Train teachers on how to operate some of the teaching materials.	Principals	4	2.3	60	50.0	9	7.5	44	36.7	3	2.5
		Teachers	74	10.3	251	34.9	70	9.7	131	18.2	194	26.9
		MOE officials	4	6.7	28	46.6	7	11.7	5	8.3	16	26.7

From table 4.3.4, the first item stated that principals regularly purchase teaching materials for teachers to use in their classes. The result of item 40, revealed that majority of the three groups of respondents upheld the statement as confirmed by 55.0 percent of principals, 55.0 percent of teachers and 80.0 percent of ministry officials. This implies that the meager resources available to the principals were used in purchasing learning materials for their schools.

While majority of the principals and ministry officials in item 41 accepted that principals worked with teachers to make teaching aids available, majority of the teachers shared a contrary view. This was revealed by 59.2 percent of principals and 43.3 percent of ministry officials who were in agreement with the statement. However, 46.7 percent of the teachers disagreed with the statement. This implies that the positive responses could be due to the need for principals to protect their image. This further reveals that principals had not been adequately working with teachers to ensure availability of teaching aids.

Majority of the three groups of respondents in item 42 upheld that principals encouraged teachers to improvise teaching materials in their subject areas. This was revealed by 54.2 percent of principals, 57.2 percent of teachers and 46.7 percent of ministry officials. The few respondents in the three groups who shared contrary views as revealed by 36.7 percent of principals, 31.6 percent of teachers and 35.0 percent of ministry officials showed that the encouragement provided to teachers was inadequate.

Item 43 revealed that majority of the three groups of respondents showed positive responses to the statement. This was revealed by principals, teachers and ministry officials with 65.0 percent, 56.1 percent and 53.4 percent respectively. The result of the

few respondents revealed that the pressure mounted on teachers to use teaching aids in their lessons was not adequate. This was revealed by 32.5 percent, 36.8 percent and 41.7 percent of principals, teachers, and ministry officials respectively. A negligible percent of the respondents were undecided.

Majority of the principals and ministry officials in item 44 upheld the statement that principals ensured proper storage of teaching materials. This position was not accepted by teachers who shared negative responses of 53.6 percent. This implies that while majority of the principals and ministry officials were in agreement with the statement, majority of teachers were in disagreement. This means that there were still indications of poor storage system of teaching materials in secondary schools in Nigeria.

Opinions of principals and ministry officials in item 45 with 54.2 and 70.0 respectively revealed that majority of these two groups of respondents agreed that principals kept up-to-date records of teaching materials. Majority of teachers (45.0 percent) shared contrary views with those of principals and ministry officials. From the result, it is clear that the principals and ministry officials were only protecting themselves. It implies that record keeping by principals was not properly done.

Only the principals and ministry officials in item 46 with 77.5 percent and 52.4 percent respectively agreed that principals ensured relevance of teaching aids to students and topics, but teachers with 52.1 percent shared negative opinions. This could imply that the positive responses were given by principals and ministry officials as cover-up, since the teachers were the ones using the teaching aids.

Item 47 stated that principals prepared time-table to enable teachers had access to the teaching aids while majority of principals and ministry officials with 65.0 percent and

58.3 percent respectively upheld the statement, teachers who were expected to use the time-table disagreed with the statement.

Whether or not principals in item 48 regularly supervised the usage of teaching materials to avoid over and under utilization, majority of the three groups of respondents upheld the statement. This was revealed by 53.3 percent of principals, 41.8 percent of teachers and 46.7 percent of ministry officials. Only 39.0 percent of principals, 39.2 percent of teachers and 35.0 percent of ministry officials did not agree that principals regularly supervised the usage of teaching materials to avoid over and under utilization. This could probably be due to delegation of authority which made some principals to neglect their supervisory responsibility.

In item 49, majority of ministry officials (53.4 percent) upheld the statement while majority of the principals and teachers with 48.0 percent and 60.6 percent respectively disagreed with the statement. This implies that regular servicing and repairs of the materials was not adequately done probably due to poor maintenance culture in our schools. The ministry officials agreed with the statement because each time they wanted to visit schools, principals' tried to keep most things in good order to impress them. It could also be due to poor financial position of principals.

While majority of principals with 85.0 percent in item 50 disagreed with the statement which stated that principals were not bothered about the use of teaching materials, teachers with 47.0 percent and ministry officials with 55.0 percent accepted the statement. The differences in opinions between principals and the other two groups indicated the poor maintenance culture and lack of adequate supervision by the principals.

Majority of the three groups of respondents in item 51 accepted that principals ensured training of teachers on how to operate some of the teaching materials. This was revealed by principals, teachers and ministry officials with 52.3 percent, 45.2 percent and 53.3 percent respectively. A few respondents in the three groups showed that the training of teachers on how to operate teaching materials was not a routine practice by principals. This was confirmed by 39.2 percent of principals, 45.1 percent of teachers and 35.0 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents were undecided.

Table 4.3.5: Opinion of Respondents on the Evaluation of instructional leadership practices of principals in the maintenance of physical facilities

S/N	Items statements	Category of respondents	Responses									
			Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
52	Plan and organize how to use physical facilities that are not adequate (e.g. classrooms, laboratories, etc.).	Principals	14	11.7	51	42.5	11	19.2	9	7.5	35	29.1
		Teachers	47	6.5	265	36.8	125	17.4	59	8.2	224	31.1
		MOE officials	44	73.3	11	18.4	-	-	2	3.3	3	5.0
53	Promptly carry out minor repairs of school facilities.	Principals	6	5.0	72	60.0	3	2.5	9	7.5	30	25.0
		Teachers	35	4.9	309	42.9	257	35.7	51	7.1	68	9.4
		MOE officials	44	73.3	2	3.3	1	1.7	1	1.7	12	20.0
54	Provide security for school facilities.	Principals	4	3.3	60	50.0	9	7.5	44	36.7	3	2.5
		Teachers	156	21.7	248	34.4	71	9.9	68	9.4	177	24.6
		MOE officials	42	70.0	-	-	1	1.7	16	26.6	1	1.7
55	Regularly supervise the cleanliness of school environment.	Principals	13	10.8	51	42.6	13	10.8	34	28.3	9	7.5
		Teachers	46	6.4	269	37.4	118	16.4	59	8.2	228	31.6
		MOE officials	43	71.7	12	20.0	3	5.0	2	3.3	-	-
56	Encourage planting of trees and flowers to beautify the school compound.	Principals	29	24.1	53	44.2	14	11.7	16	13.3	8	6.7
		Teachers	70	9.7	277	38.5	129	17.9	55	7.6	189	26.3
		MOE officials	30	50.0	13	21.7	5	8.3	7	11.7	5	8.3
57	Facilities available are in bad shape.	Principals	6	5.0	28	23.3	12	10.0	51	42.6	23	19.1
		Teachers	61	8.5	219	30.4	93	12.9	68	9.4	279	38.8
		MOE officials	5	8.3	22	36.7	3	5.0	5	8.3	25	41.7
58	Good maintenance culture of school facilities is not practiced	Principals	10	8.3	61	50.8	9	7.5	28	23.4	12	10.0
		Teachers	48	6.7	436	60.5	57	7.9	128	17.8	51	7.1
		MOE officials	1	1.7	34	56.7	17	28.3	5	8.3	3	5.0
59	School facilities are periodically serviced and repaired	Principals	15	12.5	29	24.2	14	11.7	28	23.3	34	28.3
		Teachers	91	12.6	134	18.6	86	11.9	349	48.5	60	8.4

		MOE officials	10	16.7	5	8.3	5	8.3	5	8.3	35	58.4
60	School facilities available are inadequate and dilapidated.	Principals	6	5.0	51	42.5	28	23.3	12	10.0	23	19.2
		Teachers	22	3.1	473	65.7	49	6.8	54	7.5	122	16.9
		MOE officials	-	-	36	60.0	16	26.6	4	6.7	4	6.7
61	Appoint staff to take charge of school facilities and equipment.	Principals	10	8.3	61	50.8	9	7.5	28	23.4	12	10.0
		Teachers	42	5.8	419	58.2	55	7.6	179	24.9	25	3.5
		MOE officials	2	3.3	51	85.0	4	6.7	3	5.0	-	-
62	Replace damaged facilities with new ones.	Principals	15	12.5	29	24.2	14	11.7	28	23.3	34	28.3
		Teachers	91	12.6	134	18.6	86	11.9	349	48.5	60	8.4
		MOE officials	8	13.3	20	33.3	4	6.7	4	6.7	24	40.0
63	Regularly request community to purchase and repair school facilities.	Principals	5	4.2	53	44.2	12	10.0	28	23.3	22	18.3
		Teachers	79	11.0	358	49.7	79	11.0	54	7.5	150	20.8
		MOE officials	8	13.3	20	33.3	4	6.7	4	6.7	24	40.0
64	Maintain school climate that is conducive to teaching and learning.	Principals	35	29.2	66	55.0	9	7.5	-	-	10	8.3
		Teachers	6	0.8	520	72.3	65	9.0	55	7.6	74	10.3
		MOE officials	-	-	36	60.0	16	26.7	4	6.7	4	6.6

The first item in table 4.2.5 revealed that majority of the three groups of respondents upheld that principals planned and organized how to use physical facilities that were not adequate like classrooms, laboratories, field etc. This means that majority of the respondents agreed that principals planned time table to ensure access to the inadequate facilities in the schools. This was revealed by principals, teachers and ministry officials with 54.2 percent, 42.3 percent and 84.6 percent of ministry officials.

Item 53 sought to find out how promptly principals carried out minor repairs of schools physical facilities. Majority of the three groups of respondents had a consensus on this item. This was revealed by 65.0 percent principals, 47.8 percent of teachers and 76.6 percent of ministry officials. This implies that there was a general concur by the three groups on this item. However, few respondents either shared contrary views or were undecided.

From the opinions of the three groups of respondents, on item 54, majority of the three groups of respondents agreed that adequate security was provided for the school facilities by principals. This was revealed by 53.3 percent of principals, 55.1 percent of teachers and 70.0 percent of ministry officials. Only 37.2 percent of principals, 34.0 percent of teachers, and 28.4 percent of ministry officials showed disagreement with the statements. Only a few respondents claimed ignorance.

A cursory glance at the opinions of the three groups of respondents in item 55 majority revealed that 53.4 percent of principals 43.8 percent of teachers and 91.7 percent of ministry officials agreed that principals regularly supervised the cleanliness of school environment. Only 35.8 percent of principals, 39.8 percent of teachers and 3.3 percent of

ministry officials did not accept the statement, while 10.8 percent, 16.4 percent and 5.0 percent of ministry officials were ignorant.

Majority of the three groups of respondents in item 56 admitted that principals encouraged planting of trees and flowers to beautify their schools. This was revealed by 68.4 percent of principals and 43.8 percent of teachers and 71.7 percent of ministry officials. Only 20.0 percent of principals, 33.9 percent of teachers and 20.0 ministry officials were not in support of the statement.

It was agreed by 28.3 percent of principals, 38.9 percent of teachers and 45.0 percent of ministry officials that facilities available were in bad shape. However, 61.8 percent of principals, 48.2 percent of teachers and 49.0 percent of ministry officials had a contrary view to the statement raised in item 57. It is clear from the result that school facilities were in bad shape in many secondary schools in Nigeria as revealed by the responses.

On maintenance culture in item 58 as a way of renewing facilities, there was a general consensus in the opinions of the respondents that good maintenance culture was not practiced. This was revealed by 59.1 percent of principals, 67.2 percent of teachers and 58.4 percent of ministry officials. This could probably be due to lack of funds and training of principals in plant planning and maintenance. Only 33.3 percent of principals, 24.1percent of teachers and 13.3 percent of ministry officials disagreed with the view. The view of the majority which showed consensus suggested that good maintenance culture was lacking in secondary schools. A negligible percentage of respondents were undecided.

It was revealed in item 59 by 51.6 percent of principals, 56.9 percent of teachers and 66.6 percent of ministry officials that school facilities were not periodically serviced and repaired. However, 36.7 percent of principals, 31.2 percent of teachers and 25.0 percent of ministry officials upheld the statement that school facilities were periodically serviced and repaired. The general consensus revealed that school facilities were not well taken care of especially when the facilities required major repairs and servicing.

Majority of the respondents in the three groups in item 60 agreed with the statement that school facilities available are inadequate and dilapidated. This was revealed by 47.5 percent of principals, 68.8 percent of teachers and 60.0 percent of ministry officials upheld the statement. Only 29.2 percent of principals 24.4 percent of teachers and 13.4 percent of ministry officials expressed contrary opinion and a negligible percentage were ignorant. However, it is clear from the result that school facilities were inadequate and dilapidated.

There was agreement in the opinions among the three groups of respondents that principals appointed staff to take charge of school facilities and equipment in item 61. This was confirmed by 59.1 percent of principals, 64.6 percent of teachers and 88.3 percent of ministry officials. While only 33.3 percent of principals, 28.4 percent of teachers and 5.0 percent of ministry officials, shared a contrary view, very negligible percentage of respondents were undecided. This implies that in most secondary schools, principals appointed staff to be in charge of school facilities.

Item 62 sought to find out whether or not damaged facilities were usually changed. The result revealed that 51.6 percent of principals, 56.8 percent of teachers and 46.7 percent of the ministry officials disagreed with the statement while 36.7 percent of

principals, 31.2 percent of teachers and 46.6 percent of ministry officials accepted that damaged facilities were changed with new ones.

As for the opinions on regular request of the community to purchase and repair school facilities in item 63, 48.4 percent of principals, 60.7 percent of teachers and 46.6 percent of ministry officials agreed with the statement, while 41.6 percent of principals, 27.5 percent of teachers and 46.7 percent of ministry officials did not agree that principals regularly request community to purchase and repair school facilities. The general result above indicates that regular request was absent.

Opinions of the three categories of respondents were in harmony on the opinion raised in item 64 which stated that principals maintained conducive climate in their schools. This agreement was revealed by 84.2 percent of principals, 73.1 percent of teachers and 60.0 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percent of respondents had contrary view on the statement or were ignorant.

Table 4.3.6: Opinion of Respondents on the Evaluation of instructional leadership practices of principals in staff and students' motivation

S/No	Items statements	Category of respondents	Responses									
			Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
65	Ensure regular payment of salaries to their staff.	Principals	54	45.0	30	25.0	6	5.0	14	11.7	16	13.3
		Teachers	93	12.9	163	22.6	37	5.1	78	10.8	349	48.6
		MOE officials	8	13.3	14	23.3	4	6.7	7	11.7	27	45.0
66	Represent staff interest to the appropriate authority regularly.	Principals	-	-	72	60.0	28	23.4	10	8.3	10	8.3
		Teachers	-	-	456	63.3	149	20.7	57	7.9	58	8.1
		MOE officials	-	-	37	61.7	12	20.0	6	10.0	5	8.3
67	Involve teachers in decision making.	Principals	10	8.3	81	67.5	14	11.7	7	5.8	8	6.7
		Teachers	58	8.1	481	66.8	93	12.4	44	6.1	44	6.1
		MOE officials	4	6.7	41	68.3	8	13.3	4	6.7	3	5.0
68	Adequately cater for staff and students welfare.	Principals	54	45.0	30	25.0	6	5.0	14	11.7	16	13.3
		Teachers	93	12.9	163	22.1	36	5.1	78	10.8	350	48.6
		MOE officials	8	13.3	14	23.3	3	5.0	8	13.3	27	45.0
69	Request for qualified teachers.	Principals	28	23.3	72	60.0	28	23.3	10	8.3	10	8.3
		Teachers	-	-	456	63.4	150	20.8	57	7.9	57	7.9
		MOE officials	-	-	37	61.7	13	21.7	5	8.3	5	8.3
70	Praise and honor hard-working staff and students.	Principals	10	8.3	81	67.6	7	5.7	14	11.7	8	6.7
		Teachers	58	8.1	481	66.8	44	6.1	93	12.9	44	6.1
		MOE officials	4	6.7	41	68.3	8	13.3	4	6.7	3	5.0
71	Know their staff by names.	Principals	16	13.3	54	45.0	6	5.0	30	25.0	14	11.7
		Teachers	93	12.9	163	22.7	38	5.0	350	48.6	78	10.8
		MOE officials	9	15.0	14	23.3	3	5.0	7	11.7	27	45.0
72	Regularly recommend staff of promotions	Principals	-	-	72	60.0	28	23.4	10	8.3	10	8.3
		Teachers	-	-	456	63.4	150	20.8	57	7.9	57	7.9

		MOE officials	-	-	37	61.7	13	21.7	5	8.3	5	8.3
73	Provide loans to teachers to solve some minor problems.	Principals	10	8.3	81	67.5	14	11.7	7	5.8	8	6.7
		Teachers	58	8.1	93	12.9	44	6.1	481	66.8	44	6.1
		MOE officials	4	6.7	41	68.3	8	13.3	4	6.7	3	5.0
74	Assist in finding accommodation for teachers.	Principals	54	45.0	30	25.0	6	5.0	16	13.3	14	11.7
		Teachers	350	48.7	163	10.8	36	5.0	93	12.9	78	22.6
		MOE officials	8	13.3	27	45.0	5	8.3	6	10.0	14	23.4
75	Provide necessary teaching materials to teachers.	Principals	6	5.0	92	76.6	14	11.7	8	6.7	-	-
		Teachers	36	5.0	546	75.8	87	12.1	51	7.1	-	-
		MOE officials	3	5.0	46	76.6	7	11.7	4	6.7	-	-
76	Work with teachers in diagnosing students learning difficulties.	Principals	19	15.8	71	59.3	10	8.3	10	8.3	10	8.3
		Teachers	116	16.1	57	7.9	57	7.9	57	7.9	433	60.2
		MOE officials	9	15.1	5	8.3	5	8.3	5	8.3	36	60.0
77	Are welcoming and approachable at all times.	Principals	-		100	83.4	-	-	10	8.3	10	8.3
		Teachers	-		604	83.8	-	-	58	8.1	58	8.1
		MOE officials	-		50	83.4	-	-	5	8.3	5	8.3
78	Sympathise with staff and students with problems	Principals	6	5.0	92	76.7	14	11.6	8	6.7	-	-
		Teachers	36	5.0	545	75.7	51	7.1	87	12.1	1	0.1
		MOE officials	3	5.0	45	75.0	7	11.6	4	6.7	1	1.7

Item 65 sought to find out whether or not principals ensured regular payment of salaries to their staff. The result revealed a divergent opinions by the three groups of respondents as 70.0 percent principals agreed while 59.3 percent of teachers and 57.2 percent of ministry of education officials were in disagreement with the statement. However, 25.0 percent of principals disagreed while 29.2 percent of teachers and 36.6 percent of ministry officials upheld that principals ensured regular payment of salaries to teachers. A very negligible percent of respondents were undecided. The disagreement by the majority of teachers and ministry officials suggested that principals did not control salaries since they were being paid centrally especially with the current e-payment. Therefore principals could not influence any payment of salaries in their schools.

There was a general consensus in the opinions of the three groups of respondents in item 66 that principals represented staff interest to appropriate authorities regularly. This was revealed by principals, teachers and ministry officials with 60.0 percent, 63.3 percent and 66.7 percent respectively. Only 16.6 percent of principals, 16.0 percent of teachers and 18.3 of ministry officials shared a contrary view while 23.3 percent of principals, 20.7 percent of teachers and 20.0 percent of ministry officials were undecided.

Item 67 which states that principals involve teachers in decision-making revealed high congruity in the opinions of principals with 75.8 percent, teachers with 74.9 percent and ministry officials with 75.0 percent. However, very small percentage of respondents revealed the opposite view.

Responses on item 68 revealed divergent opinions of the three categories of respondents with 70.0 percent of principals agreeing while 59.4 percent of teachers and 58.3 percent of ministry officials disagreeing. Only 25.0 percent of principals disagreed

while 35.5 percent of teachers and 26.6 percent of ministry officials agreed with the opinion. Majority of principals upheld that principals adequately catered for staff and students welfare while majority of teachers and ministry officials disagreed with the statement.

The opinions of the majority of principals on item 69 accounting for 83.3 percent, teachers 63.4 percent and ministry officials 61.7 were in absolute concord that principals request for qualified teachers in various subjects. A small percentage of the respondents maintained that principals did not make any request for qualified teachers.

Item 70 which sought to find out whether or not principals praised and honoured hardworking staff and students, majority of the three categories of respondents accepted the statement. This was revealed by 75.8 percent of principals, 74.9 percent of teachers and 75.0 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percentage of the three respondents either shared a contrary view or were undecided.

Responses on item 71 revealed that while majority of the principals maintained that they did know their staff by their names, majority of the teachers and ministry officials took a contrary stand. This was revealed by 58.3 percent of principals, while 59.4 percent of teachers and 56.7 percent of ministry officials were in disagreement. However, while 35.5 percent of teachers and 38.3 percent of ministry officials claimed that principals knew their staff by their names 36.7 percent of principals disagreed with the item. Lack of knowing names gradually leads to low morale of teachers and this affects their output in schools.

Promotion is an important motivational factor in every organization. Therefore, item 72 sought to find out whether or not principals recommend their staff for

promotions. From the result, majority opinions of the three groups of respondents upheld that principals regularly recommend staff for promotions. This was shown by 60.0 percent of principals, 63.4 percent of teachers and 61.7 percent of ministry officials.

Majority of the principals and ministry officials in item 73 upheld that principals provided loans to their staff to solve minor problems. This was revealed by 75.8 percent of principals and 74.9 percent of ministry officials. However, majority of teachers (72.9) on the other hand indicated a contrary opinion. However, 12.5 percent of principals and 11.7 percent of ministry officials were of the opinion that loans were not provided to teachers to solve some of their minor problems. It is clear from the result that loans provided to teachers to motivate them to put more efforts in their teaching was rare.

Item 74 which sought to find out whether or not, principals assist teachers in finding accommodation, majority of the three groups of respondents accepted the statements. This was confirmed by 70.0 percent of principals, 59.4 percent of teachers and 58.0 percent of ministry officials. However, 25.0 percent of principals, 35.5 percent of teachers and 36.6 percent of ministry officials did not agree with the statement. Although majority of the respondents agreed with the item, the assistance rendered to find accommodation was not provided to all newly posted staff.

From the opinions of the three categories of respondents, in item 75, it could be concluded that principals provided necessary teaching materials to their teachers. This was revealed by 81.7 percent of principals, 80.8 percent of teachers and 81.7 percent of ministry officials. However, very negligible percentage of respondents shared a contrary opinion.

Item 76 which stated that principals work with teachers in diagnosing students' learning difficulties, 75.0 percent of principals accepted the statement while 68.0 percent of teachers and 68.3 percent of ministry officials did not support the view. Very negligible percentage of the teachers and ministry officials accepted the statement while very few principals disagreed with the item. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents showed neutral position.

From the submissions of the three groups of respondents on item 77, there was a general consensus on the statement that principals were welcoming and approachable at all times. This was revealed by 83.3 percent of the principals, 83.9 percent of teachers and 83.3 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents shared a contrary opinion.

Majority of the three categories of respondents upheld that principals sympathized with staff and students who had problems. This was confirmed by 81.7 percent of principals, 80.7 percent of teachers and 80.0 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percentage of respondents either shared a contrary opinion or were maintained a neutral position.

Table 4.3.7: Opinions of Respondents on the Evaluation of instructional leadership practices of principals in institutional planning academic programmes in Nigerian secondary schools

S/N	Items statements	Category of respondents	Responses									
			Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
79	Ensure that academic activities are planned before the school opens.	Principals	19	15.8	74	61.7	9	7.5	9	7.5	9	7.5
		Teachers	54	7.5	96	13.3	61	8.5	423	58.8	86	11.9
		MOE officials	3	5.0	46	76.7	7	11.6	4	6.7	-	-
80	Participate in planning institutional programmes with teachers.	Principals	-	-	101	84.2	-	-	9	7.5	10	8.3
		Teachers	80	11.1	155	21.5	40	5.6	51	7.1	394	54.7
		MOE officials	5	8.3	19	31.7	2	3.3	2	3.3	32	53.4
81	Ensure that school time table is ready before the beginning of each term.	Principals	6	5.0	90	75.0	15	12.5	9	7.5	-	-
		Teachers	88	12.2	137	19.0	59	8.2	52	7.2	384	53.4
		MOE officials	5	8.3	19	31.7	2	3.3	2	3.3	32	53.4
82	Check to ensure availability of schemes, textbooks and other academic materials.	Principals	19	15.8	74	61.7	9	7.5	9	7.5	9	7.5
		Teachers	19	2.6	515	71.3	10	1.4	51	7.1	125	17.6
		MOE officials	-	-	39	65.0	16	26.7	2	3.3	3	5.0
83	Ensure that all school subjects feature on the time-table.	Principals	-	-	101	84.2	-	-	9	7.5	10	8.3
		Teachers	35	4.9	4.3	57.4	61	8.4	201	27.9	10	1.4
		MOE officials	3	5.0	46	76.7	7	11.6	4	6.7	-	-
84	Distribute teachers to various classes and subjects.	Principals	6	5.0	90	75.0	15	12.5	9	7.5	-	-
		Teachers	88	12.2	137	19.0	59	8.2	384	53.3	52	7.3
		MOE officials	5	8.3	19	31.7	2	3.3	2	3.3	32	53.4
85	Hold meetings to prepare for the term.	Principals	19	15.8	74	61.7	9	7.5	9	7.5	9	7.5
		Teachers	19	2.6	513	71.3	10	1.4	51	7.1	127	17.6
		MOE officials	-	-	39	65.0	16	26.7	2	3.3	3	5.0
86	Distribute the necessary materials before the opening day.	Principals	-	-	101	84.2	-	-	9	7.5	10	8.3
		Teachers	35	4.9	413	57.4	61	8.5	201	27.8	10	1.4
		MOE officials	3	5.0	46	76.6	7	11.7	4	6.7	-	-

87	Assign responsibilities to staff and students before resumption.	Principals Teachers MOE officials	6 88 5	5.0 12.2 8.3	90 137 19	75.0 19.0 31.7	15 59 2	12.5 8.3 3.3	9 384 2	7.5 53.3 3.3	- 52 32	- 7.2 53.4
88	Ensure that students are grouped based on the grouping system in the school.	Principals Teachers MOE officials	17 17 -	14.2 2.4 -	72 519 39	60.0 72.1 65.0	7 7 16	5.8 1.0 26.7	15 126 2	12.5 17.4 3.3	9 51 3	7.5 7.1 5.0
89	Calendar of events for both curricular and co-curricular activities are prepared and made available to teachers before the opening day.	Principals Teachers MOE officials	46 53 3	38.3 7.4 5.0	32 426 46	26.7 59.2 70.7	11 68 7	9.3 9.4 11.6	15 117 4	12.4 16.2 6.7	16 56 -	13.3 7.8 -
90	Evaluate past performances of staff and students.	Principals Teachers MOE officials	35 79 18	29.2 10.9 30.0	161 110 14	50.8 15.5 23.4	3 65 3	2.5 9.0 5.0	9 398 2	7.5 55.2 3.3	12 68 23	10.0 9.4 38.3
91	Interpret policies and information from the government regarding curriculum implementation.	Principals Teachers MOE officials	13 97 8	10.8 13.5 13.3	72 133 20	60.0 18.5 33.4	14 83 9	11.7 11.5 15.0	9 161 5	7.5 22.4 8.3	12 246 18	10.0 34.1 30.0

Item 79 sought to find out whether or not principals ensured that academic activities were planned before the school opens. There were divergent opinions by the three categories of the respondents as 77.7 percent of principals, 70.7 and 81.7 percent of ministry officials accepted the statement, while 70.7 percent of teachers disagreed that academic planning was not done before the opening day.

Item 80 revealed a divergent stance in the opinions of the three groups of respondents. While principals and teacher with 84.2 percent and 92.6 percent respectively upheld the statement, 56.6 percent of ministry officials did not accept the statement that principals participated in planning instructional programmes with teachers.

Item 81 also showed a divergent opinions of the three groups of respondents. While principals with 80.0 percent agreed that principals ensured that time table was ready before the beginning of each term, teachers with 60.6 percent and ministry officials with 56.6 percent disagreed with the statement. This implies that principals were not always concerned about school time table or ensured its planning when the school opened.

There was a general agreement with the statement that principals ensured the availability of schemes, textbooks and other academic materials. The general agreement with the statement was confirmed by 77.5 percent of principals, 72.9 percent of teachers and 65.0 percent of ministry officials. A very negligible percentage of respondents either did not share with the statement or were undecided.

Item 83 revealed that majority of the respondents accepted that principals ensured that all school subjects featured on the school time table. This was confirmed by 84.2 percent of principals, 62.3 percent of teachers and 81.7 percent of ministry officials. This

implies that principals monitored the planning of time table to ensure that all subjects in the school featured.

There was no general consensus by the three categories of respondents on item 84. While 80.0 percent of principals accepted that principals distributed teachers to various classes and subjects, 60.5 percent teachers and 56.6 percent of ministry officials did not agree with the statement. The disagreement could probably be due to the fact that most principals delegated this responsibility to their deputies and heads of departments.

From the opinions of the groups of respondents on item 85, it could be concluded that the three groups of respondents had divergent views on the statement. While 80.0 percent of principals showed positive responses 60.5 percent of teachers and 65.6 percent of ministry officials were in disagreement with the statement. This implies that majority of the principals upheld the statement that principals held regular meetings to prepare for the terms while majority of teachers and ministry officials shared a contrary opinion. From the result, meetings to prepare for terms were not regular as claimed by principals.

Responses on item 86 revealed high congruity in the opinions of the principals with 84.2 percent, teachers with 62.3 percent and ministry officials with 81.7 percent. This means that majority of the three categories of respondents accepted that principals distributed the necessary materials before the opening day.

The three categories of respondents had divergent opinions on item 87 which stated that principals assigned responsibilities to staff and students before resumption. While majority of principals upheld the statement, majority of teachers and ministry officials disagreed with the item. This was revealed by agreement of principals with 80.0

percent and disagreement of teachers and ministry officials with 60.5 percent and 56.6 percent respectively.

In item 88, all the three groups of respondents accepted that the principals ensured grouping of students based on the grouping system of their schools. This was revealed by 74.2 percent of principals, 74.5 percent of teachers and 65.0 percent of ministry officials. However, a few negligible percent of the three respondents either shared a contrary opinion or were undecided.

There was a general agreement by majority of the three groups of respondents in item 89, which stated that principals prepared calendar of events for both curricular and extra-curricular activities which were made available to teachers. This was confirmed by 65.0 percent by principals, 66.6 percent of teachers and 75.7 percent of ministry officials. This means that there was a general consensus of the three categories of respondents on the statement.

There was no consensus between the three categories of respondents in item 90 because while majority of principals and ministry officials with 80.0 percent and 53.3 percent respectively agreed that principals evaluated past performance of staff and students, teachers with 64.7 percent disagreed with the item. This means that evaluation of past performance by the principals was not all that effective since those involved claimed not to know anything about it.

There was also a divergent opinion by the three respondents in item 91 which stated that principals interpreted policies from government regarding curricular implementation. While majority of the principals with 70.0 percent and ministry officials with 46.6 percent accepted the statement, teachers with 56.6 percent maintained a

negative opinion on the item. This implies that not all the principals interpreted government policies regarding curricular implementation to their teachers.

Table 4.3.8: Opinions of Respondents on the Evaluation of instructional leadership practices of Principals in Delegation of Authority in Nigerian secondary schools

S/N	Item statement	Category of Resp.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
92	Do not trust their staff.	Principal	3	2.5	35	29.2	9	7.5	61	50.8	12	10.0
		Teacher	14	1.9	182	25.3	62	8.6	390	54.2	72	10.0
		Min. officials	1	1.7	15	25.0	5	8.3	33	55.0	6	10.0
93	Only few trusted staff are overloaded with responsibilities.	Principal	13	10.8	9	7.5	14	11.7	72	60.0	12	10.0
		Teacher	72	10.0	46	6.4	78	10.8	459	63.8	65	9.0
		Min. officials	5	8.3	5	8.3	7	11.7	38	63.4	5	8.3
94	Appoint staff to positions on competence.	Principal	45	38.3	32	26.7	11	9.2	16	13.3	15	12.5
		Teacher	97	13.5	289	40.1	61	8.5	183	25.4	90	12.5
		Min. officials	8	13.3	24	40.0	5	8.3	8	13.4	15	25.0
95	Assign responsibilities without commensurate authority.	Principal	-	-	35	29.2	9	7.5	66	55.0	10	8.3
		Teacher	-	-	182	25.3	62	8.6	415	57.6	61	8.5
		Min. officials	7	11.7	8	13.4	5	8.3	35	58.3	5	8.3
96	Appoint staff to position without tenure of office.	Principal	16	13.3	6	5.0	13	10.8	29	24.2	55	46.7
		Teacher	97	13.5	168	23.3	36	5.0	336	46.7	83	11.5
		Min. officials	8	13.3	14	23.3	3	5.0	7	11.7	28	46.7

97	Appoint staff to position without consulting their vice-principals and heads of departments.	Principal	-	-	28	23.3	9	7.5	75	60.8	10	8.4
		Teacher	-	-	149	20.7	62	8.6	448	62.2	61	8.5
		Min. officials	-	-	12	20.1	5	8.3	38	63.3	5	8.3
98	Do not supervise those assigned responsibilities.	Principal	6	5.0	16	13.3	13	10.8	29	24.2	56	46.7
		Teacher	97	13.5	36	5.0	83	11.5	168	23.3	336	46.7
		Min. officials	8	13.3	3	5.0	7	11.7	14	23.3	28	46.7
99	Evaluate performance of various duties performed.	Principal	-	-	73	60.8	28	23.3	9	7.5	10	8.4
		Teacher	-	-	448	62.2	149	20.7	62	8.6	61	8.5
		Min. officials	-	-	38	63.4	12	20.0	5	8.3	5	8.3
100	Share responsibilities among all the staff of the school equally.	Principal	11	9.2	79	65.8	14	11.6	8	6.7	8	6.7
		Teacher	61	8.4	495	68.8	43	6.0	78	10.8	43	6.0
		Min. officials	4	6.7	41	65.3	8	13.3	4	6.7	3	5.0
101	Assign challenging responsibilities to staff.	Principal	56	46.7	29	24.5	6	5.0	16	13.3	13	10.5
		Teacher	338	46.7	168	23.3	36	5.0	97	13.5	83	11.5
		Min. officials	28	46.7	14	23.3	3	5.0	8	13.3	7	11.7
102	Abilities and interests are not considered in delegated.	Principal	-	-	28	23.4	9	7.5	73	60.8	10	8.3
		Teacher	-	-	149	20.7	62	8.6	448	62.2	61	8.5
		Min. officials	-	-	12	20.0	5	8.3	38	63.4	5	8.3

Item 92 which stated that principals do not trust their staff revealed that majority of the three groups of respondents did not agree with the item. This was confirmed by 60.8 percent of principals, 64.2 percent of teachers and 65.0 percent of ministry officials. However, 31.7 percent of principals, 27.2 percent of teachers and 26.7 percent of ministry officials shared a contrary view. Though majority of the respondents disagreed with the statement, mistrust was exhibited by some principals in their schools as revealed by minority opinion. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents were undecided or ignorant.

There was a general consensus by the three categories of respondents in item 93, which sought to find out whether or not principals overload a few staff with responsibilities. Responses by the respondents revealed that 70.0 percent of the principals, 73.3 percent of teachers and 71.6 percent of the ministry officials disagreed with the statement while 17.5 percent of principals, 15.4 percent of teachers and 16.6 percent of ministry officials agreed with it. Very negligible percentage of respondents were undecided. This means that responsibilities were shared equally among staff.

The opinions of the majority of respondents in item 94 on appointment of staff to positions on competence showed that staff were appointed to different positions on competence. This was revealed by 65.0 percent of principals, 53.6 percent of teachers and 53.3 percent of ministry officials. Only 25.8 percent of principals, 57.9 percent of teachers and 38.3 percent of ministry officials upheld the item. This implies that principals of Nigerian secondary schools used competence in staff appointment.

Majority of the three categories of respondents in item 95 disagreed with the statement that principals assigned responsibilities without commensurate authority. This

was revealed by 63.3 percent of principals, 66.1 percent of teachers, and 66.6 percent of ministry officials. Only 29.2 percent of principals, 25.3 percent of teachers and 13.3 percent of ministry officials upheld the item, while 7.5 percent of principals, 8.6 percent of teachers and 8.3 percent of ministry officials were undecided. The above shows that commensurate authority was given to delegated positions, though not in all cases.

The respondents in item 96 showed a general disagreement to the statement which says that principals appointed staff to positions without tenure of office. This was revealed by 70.9 percent of principals, 58.2 percent of teachers and 58.4 percent of ministry officials. However, 18.3 percent of principals, 36.9 percent of teachers and 36.6 percent of ministry officials. This implies that there were cases of appointments without tenure of office by some principals.

Item 97 sought to find out whether or not principals appointed staff to positions without consultations with their vice and heads of departments. The response revealed a general disagreement of the three categories of respondents. This was confirmed by 69.1 percent principals, 70.7 percent teachers and 71.6 percent ministry officials. This implies that principals of secondary schools in Nigeria made appointment of teachers through consultations with the relevant heads. Only very negligible percentage of respondents either agreed with the item or were undecided.

Item 98 which stated that principals do not supervise those assigned responsibilities was not accepted by majority of the three respondents. This was confirmed by 70.9 percent of principals, 70.0 percent of teachers and 70.9 percent of ministry officials. This means that majority of the respondents were of the view that principals supervised those assigned responsibilities in their schools.

In item 99, there was a general consensus of the three groups of respondents that principals evaluated performance of various duties performed. This was revealed by 60.8 percent of principals, 62.2 percent of teachers and 63.3 percent of ministry officials. Only a few negligible percentage of the respondents either disagreed with the statement or were undecided.

Majority of the three categories of respondents in item 100 upheld that principals shared responsibilities among all the staff of the school equally. This was confirmed by 75.0 percent of the principals, 77.2 percent of teachers and 72.0 percent of ministry officials. Only very negligible number of the respondents either disagreed with the statement or were undecided.

Item 101 sought to find out whether or not the principals assigned challenging responsibilities to their teachers. From the result, majority of the respondents up held the statement. This was confirmed by 71.2 percent of principals, 70.0 percent of teachers and 70.0 percent of ministry officials. However, 24.1 percent of principals, 25.0 percent of teachers and 25.0 percent of the ministry officials showed a contrary opinion. Although, majority of the respondents were of the opinion that responsibilities shared were challenging, a reasonable percentage of the respondents were of the opinion that not all responsibilities were challenging.

Majority of the respondents in item 102 showed a disagreement with the statement that abilities and interests were not considered in delegation by the principals. This disagreement with the item was revealed by 69.1 percent of principals, 70.7 percent of teachers and 63.3 percent of ministry officials. Only 23.3 percent of principals, 20.7 percent of teachers and 20.0 percent of ministry officials upheld that abilities and interest

were not considered in delegation by principals and a negligible number of respondents were undecided.

Table 4.3.9: Opinions of Respondents on the Evaluation of Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Communication Networks

S/N	Item statement	Category of Resp.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
103	Information is passed to staff and students through rumours only.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	11 61 4	9.1 8.5 6.7	8 43 4	6.7 6.0 6.7	14 43 8	11.7 6.0 13.3	79 78 41	65.8 10.8 68.3	8 495 3	6.7 68.7 5.0
104	Information is passed during morning assembly only.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	16 97 8	13.3 13.5 13.3	6 168 14	5.0 23.3 23.3	13 36 3	10.8 5.0 5.0	29 336 7	24.2 46.7 11.7	56 83 28	46.7 11.5 46.7
105	Principals are too busy to meet with their staff regularly.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	6 40 3	5.0 5.6 5.0	9 94 4	7.5 13.1 6.7	15 54 7	12.5 7.5 11.7	90 532 46	75.0 73.8 76.6	- - -	- - -
106	They take decisions alone without involving the staff.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	19 108 9	15.8 15.0 15.0	9 54 5	7.5 7.5 8.3	9 54 5	7.5 7.5 8.3	9 54 4	7.5 7.5 8.4	74 450 36	61.7 62.5 60.0
107	Meet with prefects frequently to discuss students problems.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	- - -	- - -	101 608 51	84.2 84.4 85.0	- - -	- - -	9 54 4	7.5 7.5 8.3	10 58 4	8.3 8.1 6.7
108	Threaten staff during discussion.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	6 40 3	5.0 5.6 5.0	9 94 4	7.5 13.1 6.7	15 54 7	12.5 7.5 11.7	90 532 46	75.0 73.8 76.6	- - -	- - -
109	Encourage staff and students to express their opinions.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	19 108 9	15.8 15.0 15.0	74 450 36	61.7 62.5 60.0	9 54 5	7.5 7.5 8.3	9 54 4	7.5 7.5 8.4	9 54 5	7.5 7.5 8.3
110	Prefer circular to meetings.	Principal Teacher Min. officials	19 108 9	15.8 15.0 15.0	9 54 5	7.5 7.5 8.4	9 54 5	7.5 7.5 8.3	9 54 5	7.5 7.5 8.3	74 450 36	61.7 62.5 60.0

111	Entertain complaints from staff and students at all times.	Principal	6	5.0	90	75.0	15	12.5	9	7.5	-	-
		Teacher	40	5.6	532	73.9	54	7.5	94	13.1	-	-
		Min. officials	3	5.0	46	76.7	7	11.6	4	6.7	-	-
112	Refer cases to relevant officers in the school always.	Principal	6	5.0	90	75.0	15	12.5	9	7.5	-	-
		Teacher	40	5.6	532	73.9	54	7.5	54	13.0	-	-
		Min. officials	3	5.0	46	76.6	7	11.7	4	6.7	-	-
113	Principals use many channels to communicate to staff and students.	Principal	19	15.8	74	61.7	9	7.5	9	7.5	9	7.5
		Teacher	108	15.0	450	62.5	54	7.5	54	7.5	54	7.5
		Min. officials	9	15.0	36	60.0	5	8.3	5	8.3	5	8.4
114	Communicate government policies to staff.	Principal	-	-	101	84.2	-	-	9	7.5	10	8.3
		Teacher	-	-	608	84.4	-	-	54	7.5	58	8.1
		Min. officials	-	-	47	78.4	5	8.3	5	8.3	3	5.0

Item 103 which stated that information is passed to staff and students through rumours only was not upheld by majority of the respondents. This was revealed by 72.5 percent of principals, 79.6 percent of teachers and 73.3 ministry officials. Very negligible percentage of respondents either shared a contrary view or were undecided. This means that information was passed to staff and students through other channels.

Majority of respondents in item 104 showed disagreement with the statement that information is passed during morning assembly only. This general disagreement of the majority respondents to the statement was confirmed by 70.9 percent of principals, 58.2 percent of teachers and 58.4 percent of ministry officials. Only 18.3 percent of principals, 36.8 percent of teachers and 36.6 percent of ministry officials agreed with the statement. The results revealed that information was passed to staff and students through other channels such as bulletin board, letters, circulars, staff meetings, sign posts, etc.

There was a general agreement on item 105 which stated that principals are too busy to meet with their staff regularly to discuss students' progress. This was revealed by 80.0 percent of principals, 79.5 percent of teachers and 81.7 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percentage of respondents shared a contrary opinion. The result showed that principals had other commitment that would not allow them to regularly meet with the staff to discuss students' progress.

Item 106 which stated that principals take unilateral decisions without involving their staff was not accepted by majority of the three groups of respondents. This was revealed by 69.2 percent of principals, 70.0 percent of teachers, and 68.3 percent of ministry officials. Only 23.3 percent of principals, 22.5 percent of teachers and 23.3 percent of ministry officials shared a contrary opinion and a very few were undecided.

From the opinions of the three groups of respondents on item 107, it could be concluded that principals met with prefects frequently to discuss students' academic problems. This positive conclusion was drawn by the general consensus of 84.2 percent of principals, 84.4 percent of teachers and 85.0 percent of ministry officials. Only 15.3 percent of principals, 15.6 percent of teachers and 15.0 percent of ministry officials did not agree with the statement.

Majority of the three groups of respondents in item 108 disagreed with the statement that principals threatened staff during discussions. The general disagreement was revealed by 75.0 percent of principals, 73.9 percent of teachers and 76.7 percent of ministry officials. Only a negligible percentage of the respondents showed a contrary position or were undecided.

There was a general consensus among the three groups of respondents on item 109 which stated that principals encouraged staff and students to express their opinions. This general consensus was confirmed by 77.5 percent of principals, 77.5 percent of teachers, and 75.0 percent of ministry officials. However, 15.0 percent of principals, 15.0 percent of teachers and 16.6 percent of ministry officials showed disagreement and a negligible percentage of respondents were undecided.

Item 110 which stated that principals preferred circulars to meetings was not accepted by the majority of the three groups of respondents. The disagreement was confirmed by 69.2 percent of principals, 70.0 percent of teachers and 68.3 percent of ministry officials. However, 23.3 percent of principals, 22.5 percent of teachers and 23.3 percent of ministry officials accepted the opinion. This implies that the principals considered both meetings and circulars as important channels in communication.

The opinions of the three categories of respondents were in complete harmony in item 111, on the issue of entertaining complaints from staff and students at all times. The general consensus was confirmed by 80.0 percent of principals, 79.5 percent of teachers and 81.7 percent of ministry officials. However, a negligible percentage of the three groups of respondents showed negative opinion or were undecided.

There was a high congruence in the opinions of the respondents on item 112 which stated that principals refer cases to relevant officers in the school always. The general agreement with the item was revealed by 80.0 percent of principals, 79.5 percent of teachers and 81.7 percent of ministry officials. Very negligible percentage of respondents shared a contrary view or were undecided.

Majority of the three groups of respondents upheld the statement that principals communicated government policies to staff. This was confirmed by 77.5 percent of principals, 77.5 percent of teachers and 75.5 percent of ministry officials. Only 15.0 percent of principals, 15.0 percent of teachers and 16.6 percent of ministry officials disagreed with the item. This implies that principals communicated government policies to their staff.

There was a general consensus among the three groups of respondents in item 114, which stated that principals meet with staff regularly to discuss students' academic programmes. This general consensus was revealed by 84.2 percent of principals, 84.4 percent of teachers and 85.0 percent of ministry officials. However, only few negligible percentage of the respondents shared a contrary opinion.

4.4 Hypotheses Testing

Nine hypotheses were formulated and tested for this study. The hypotheses were based on data collected on the items related to the evaluation of instructional leadership practices of principals on the administration of Nigerian secondary schools. The testing was on all the items related to principals' instructional leadership practices such as curriculum development, instructional supervision, staff development, provision and utilization of instructional materials, motivation, institutional planning of academic activities, maintenance of physical facilities, delegation of authority and communication network.

The hypotheses were tested by the use of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 percent level of significance. Scheffe's Post-Hoc test was employed to ascertain the extent of the significant differences in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in relation to issues raised in the questionnaire. By this, when the probability value was lower than the level of significance set for the study, the hypothesis was rejected, but when the probability value was higher than the level of significance, the hypothesis was accepted. However, where the hypothesis was rejected, Scheffe's Post-Hoc test was employed to determine the differences in the respondents' opinions.

4.4.1 Null Hypothesis I

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation in Nigerian secondary schools. Items one (1) to thirteen

(13) in the questionnaire are related to this hypothesis. Respondents' opinions in respect of those items were collected, analysed and presented in Table 4.4.1.

Table 4.4.1: summary of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in curriculum implementation

Variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	2.109	2	1.055	.594	2.60	.553
Within groups	1593.019	897	1.776			
Total	1595.129	899				

From 4.4.1 above, the computed probability is 0.553 and this is higher than the P-value of 0.05 set for this study. In other words, the calculated F ratio value of 0.594 is less than the critical value of 2.60 while the calculated p value of 0.553 is greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H₀) was therefore accepted. It could be concluded that there were no significant differences in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation. The consensus in opinions by the principals, teachers and ministry of education officials could be attributed to the fact that most secondary schools emphasized cognitive development of the students at the expense of other domains to attract more students in their schools. The general consensus among the respondents could also be attributed to the fact that teachers were showing solidarity to their chief executive to cover them up.

4.4.2 Null Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in instructional supervision in Nigerian secondary schools. The responses of respondents on item 14 to 26 were collected and analysed to find out the instructional leadership practices of principals in instructional supervision. A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was employed to find out the instructional leadership practices of principals as can be seen in table 4.4.2.

Table 4.4.2: Summary of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in instructional supervision

Variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	11.803	2	5.902	.669	2.60	.512
Within groups	7906.957	897	8.815			
Total	7918.760	899				

According to the One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics above there is no significant difference among principals, teachers and ministry officials in their opinions on the principals' instructional leadership practices in instructional supervision. This is because the calculated Sig (P) value of .512 is greater than the 0.05 level of tolerance, while the calculated F ratio value of .669 is less than the F critical value of 2.60. Therefore, the null hypothesis is hereby retained. Based on this result, one could conclude that there was no significant difference in the opinions of the principals,

teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of principals' role in instructional supervision. The general consensus among the respondents could perhaps be attributed to the natural tendency of the respondents not to offend each other or expose principals' weaknesses to the public. This is because many principals devoted more time to administrative duties than instructional responsibilities. Furthermore, the poor results of secondary school examinations could be attributed to poor supervision by the principals, who were expected to be at the fore-front in instructional leadership. Therefore, principals need to pay more attention to supervisory duties more than any other responsibility in their schools if performance of students were to be improved in Nigerian secondary education.

4.4.3 Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials with regard to the evaluation of principals' instructional leadership practices in staff development. Items 27 to 39 of the questionnaire were used to enquire the differences of respondents' opinions on the instructional role of principals in staff development. To test the hypothesis, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used and the results were presented in Table 4.4.3 below.

Table 4.3.3(a): Summary of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on instructional leadership practices of principals in staff development

Variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	69.445	2	34.722	5.010	2.60	.007
Within groups	6217.288	897	6.931			
Total	6286.732	899				

The results of the above Analysis of Variance statistic in table 4.4.3 above showed that significant difference existed among principals, teachers and ministry officials in their opinions on the principals' instructional leadership practices in staff development. This is because the calculated Sig (P) value of 0.007 is less than the 0.05 level; while the calculated F ratio of 5.010 is greater than the 2.60 F critical value. Here the null hypothesis was hereby rejected. It is therefore be concluded that significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents regarding the principals' involvement in staff development. To further examine the differences in the opinions of the three groups of respondents, on the impact of instructional leadership practices of principals in staff development, Scheffe's Post-Hoc test was adopted and the results of the test are presented in Table 4.4.3(b).

Table 4.4.3(b) Summary of One Way Analysis of Variance on principals' instructional leadership practices in staff development

(I) Status	(J) Status	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Principal	Teacher	.41250	.25959	.112
	Ministry official	1.31667 *	.41267	.002
Teacher	Principal	-.41250	.25959	.112
	Ministry official	.90417 *	.35376	.011
Ministry official	Principal	-1.31667 *	.41627	.002
	Teacher	-.90417 *	.35376	.011

** The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

It is evident from the Scheffe's Post-Hoc test that differences existed in the opinions of the three groups of respondents on principals' instructional leadership practices in staff development. Details of the multiple comparison Post Hoc test in table 4.4.3(b) above revealed that principals significantly differ from ministry officials while ministry officials significantly differ from either principals or teachers in their perception of principals' instructional leadership practices in staff development. The differences could be attributed to the differences in experience by the groups of respondents. The differences in their opinions may perhaps be attributed to low level of commitment by principals to staff development. Adequate attention to this area needs to be paid by Nigerian secondary schools principals, so as to improve quality of instruction in their schools.

4.4.4 Null Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of instructional materials in Nigerian secondary schools. Data collected on the responses of respondents pertaining this hypothesis were obtained from items 40 to 51 of the questionnaire. To test the hypothesis, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was employed and differences of respondents' opinions were summarized as contained in Table 4.4.4.

Table 4.4.4(a):Summary of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in the provision and utilization of instructional materials in Nigerian secondary schools

Variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	301.196	2	150.598	11.491	2.60	.000
Within groups	11755.667	897	13.106			
Total	12056.862	899				

An understanding of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics revealed significant differences among principals, teachers and ministry officials on the principals' instructional leadership practices in provision and utilization of teaching materials. This is because the calculated Sig (P) value of 0.000 is less than the 0.05 level of tolerance; while the calculated F ratio value of 11.491 is greater than the 2.60 F critical value. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. With this value, it could be concluded that there were significant differences in the opinions of the three categories of respondents

pertaining to principals' instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of instructional materials in Nigerian secondary schools. To find out the degree of differences in the opinions of respondents, on the effectiveness of principals in the provision and utilization of instructional materials Scheffe's Post-Hoc test was carried out and the results of the test are presented in table 4.4.4(b).

Table 4.4.4(b) Summary of Scheffe's Post Hoc test on principals instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of teaching materials

(I) Status	(J) Status	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Principal	Teacher	1.08333*	.35695	.002
	Ministry official	0.86667	.57240	.180
Teacher	Principal	-1.83333*	.35695	.002
	Ministry official	1.95000 *	.48644	.000
Ministry official	Principal	.86667	.57240	.130
	Teacher	1.95000 *	.48644	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The multiple comparison Post Hoc test in table 4.4.4(b) above revealed that some level of significant differences existed among the respondents opinions in respect of the principals' instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of teaching materials. Significant difference existed between principals' perception and ministry officials. Teachers' opinion was significantly different from either principals or ministry officials' on the provision and utilization of teaching materials. From the table above, it is clear that differences existed in the opinions of the three groups of respondents on the

evaluation of principals' instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of instructional materials in Nigerian secondary schools. It could be concluded from the Post-Hoc test that the provision and utilization of instructional materials by principals were not adequately done by Nigerian principals of secondary schools. From the mean scores of the groups, it is evident that significant differences existed in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials. Hence, the need for principals to provide and utilize instructional materials in order to improve quality instruction in secondary schools.

4.4.5 Null Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of the principals' instructional leadership practices in the maintenance of physical facilities in Nigerian secondary schools. This hypothesis relates to items 52 to 64 which were used to find out the differences of respondents' opinions on the role played by principals of Nigerian secondary schools in maintenance of physical facilities. Thus, to test the hypothesis, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed and the results are presented in Table 4.4.5.

Table 4.4.5: Summary of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in the maintenance of physical facilities in Nigerian secondary schools

Variations	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	91.978	2	45.989	.544	2.60	.580
Within groups	75779.471	897	84.481			
Total	75871.449	899				

The outcome of table 4.3.6 showed that there is no significant difference among principals, teachers and ministry officials in their opinions on principals' instructional leadership practices in maintaining school physical facilities. This is because the alculated F ratio value of 0.544 is smaller than the F critical value of 2.60, while the calculated Sig (P) value of 0.580 is greater than the 0.05 level of tolerance showing that there is no significant difference among the three categories of respondents. Hence the null hypothesis was hereby retained.

From the result, one could conclude that there was no significant difference in the opinions of the three groups of respondents in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in the maintenance of school physical facilities. This consensus in opinions seemed to suggest that school physical facilities play an important role in attracting students' attention and promoting teaching and learning in schools.

4.4.6 Null Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials in respect of the principals' instructional leadership practices in staff and students' motivation in Nigerian secondary schools. Responses of respondents related to items 65 to 78 of the questionnaire were collected and analysed to ascertain the degree of agreement of the respondents' opinions regarding the involvement of principals staff and students motivation in Nigerian secondary schools. A One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was used to find out the extent of differences in the opinions of respondents. This was recorded and presented as shown in Table 4.4.6.

Table 4.4.6(a):Summary of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in staff and students motivation

Variations	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	56.111	2	28.056	7.144	2.60	.001
Within groups	3522.411	897	3.927			
Total	3878.582	899				

According to the One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistic in table 4.4.6(a) significant difference existed among principals, teachers and ministry officials in their opinions on principals' instructional leadership practices in staff and students' motivation. This is because the calculated F ratio of 7.144 is greater than the 2.60 F critical value while the calculated Sig (P) value of .001 is less than the 0.05 level of tolerance. Consequently, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected. This means that there

were differences in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials regarding promoting staff and students' motivation by the principals. One can therefore conclude that significant differences existed in the opinions of respondents regarding motivation. To examine the extent of differences in the opinions of the three groups of respondents on the role played by the principals, Scheffe's Post-Hoc test was employed to ascertain the degree of differences in opinions as presented in Table 4.4.5(b).

Table 4.4.6(b):Summary of Scheffe's Post-Hoc test on the instructional leadership practices of principals in promoting staff and students' motivation in Nigerian secondary schools

(I) Status	(J) Status	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Principal	Teacher	.42083*	.19539	.032
	Ministry official	1.18333*	.31333	.000
Teacher	Principal	.42083*	.19539	.032
	Ministry official	.72650*	.26628	.004
Ministry official	Principal	-1.18333*	.31333	.000
	Teacher	.72650*	.26628	.004

* The mean is significant at the 0.05 level.

From the outcome of the Multiple Comparison (Post Hoc) test above, the respondents (principals, teachers and ministry officials) significantly differ in their opinions on principals' instructional leadership practices in staff and students' motivation. For instance principals differ significantly from either teachers or ministry officials and vice versa on their perception on the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in motivating staff and students. It is clear from the Post-Hoc test

that significant differences existed in the opinions of the three groups of respondents on promoting staff and students' motivation by principals of Nigerian secondary schools. The result showed the unconformity of teachers with other two groups. Majority of teachers submitted that motivation was not adequately promoted by principals. There was reason to believe that staff performed without adequate motivation. Therefore, motivation should be a primary issue to the principals being the representatives of proprietors. The result suggests that motivation which encourages hard work and respect within school community members was not properly and adequately demonstrated by principals of Nigerian secondary schools.

4.4.7 Null Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in planning of institutional academic programmes in Nigerian secondary schools. The data related to principals' role in planning institutional programmes as contained in items 79 to 91 of the questionnaire were used. The responses of the respondents were collected and analysed to find out the consensus in the opinions of the respondents pertaining to principals' role in institutional planning of academic programmes. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical technique was applied to record the result of differences in opinions of the three groups of respondents as presented in table 4.4.7.

Table 4.4.7(a):Summary of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in institutional planning of academic programme in Nigerian secondary schools

Variations	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	34452.380	2	17226.190	11.582	2.60	.000
Within groups	1303.743	897	1453.448			
Total	1338.195	899				

The results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistic in table 4.4.7(a) revealed significant differences among principals, teachers and ministry officials in their opinion on principals' instructional leadership practices in school planning of academic programme by the principal. The reason being that the calculated F ratio value of 11.582 is greater than the 2.60 critical F value, while the calculated Sig (P) value of 0.000 is less than the 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence null hypothesis is hereby rejected. This means that there were significant differences in the opinions of the three groups of respondents pertaining the impact of instructional leadership practices of principals in institutional planning of academic programmes in Nigerian secondary schools. To determine the extent of the differences of the three groups of respondents regarding the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in institutional planning of academic programmes in Nigerian secondary schools, Scheffe's Post Hoc Test was employed and the outcome of the result is presented in table 4.4.7(b).

Table 4.4.7(b): Summary of Scheffe's Post Hoc test on principals' instructional leadership practices in school planning of academic programme

(I) Status	(J) Status	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Principal	Teacher	-1.29306	3.75909	.231
	Ministry official	23.63333 *	6.02795	.000
Teacher	Principal	1.29306	3.75909	.791
	Ministry official	24.92639 *	5.12277	.000
Ministry official	Principal	-23.63333 *	5.02790	.000
	Teacher	-24.92639 *	.12777	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The level of significant difference is displayed by table 4.4.7(b) in the multiple comparison test.

The table showed that the opinions of principals differ significantly with that of ministry officials. Teachers too significantly differ from ministry officials in their opinion on the principals' instructional leadership practices in school planning of academic programme. From the analysis of the Post-Hoc test, it could be noted that there were significant differences in the degree of agreement of respondents' opinions as regards the role played by the principals in institutional planning of academic programmes in Nigerian secondary schools. The mean differences of principals and teachers seemed to show significant differences. This could be attributed to the fact that since the principals had been directly involved in the planning of academic programmes, they have the tendency to believe that institutional planning of academic programmes

were well planned. In view of this reasoning, it is paramount that principals in Nigerian secondary schools should face the reality and ensure that academic activities are well planned before the beginning of each term or year. However, the disparity in the opinions of the three groups of respondents perhaps suggests that principals were not performing in this aspect of their instructional roles as expected.

4.4.8 Null Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in delegation of authority to staff and students in Nigerian secondary schools. Items 92 to 102 on the questionnaire are related to this hypothesis. The opinions of the three groups of respondents were collected, analysed and presented as can be seen in table 4.4.8. To test the hypothesis, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was employed to find out the differences in the opinions among the three categories of respondents. This was recorded and presented as shown in table 4.4.8.

Table 4.3.8 Summary of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the instructional leadership practices of principals in delegation of authority in Nigerian secondary schools

Variations	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	81.621	2	40.811	.546	2.60	.580
Within groups	67057.561	897	74.758			
Total	67139.18	899				

The outcome of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics in table 4.4.8 showed that there is no significant difference among principals, teachers and ministry officials in their opinions on the principals' instructional leadership practices in delegation of authority.

The reason being that the calculated Sig(P) value of .580 is greater than the 0.05 level of tolerance, while calculated F ratio value of .546 is less than the 2.60 F critical value. Hence null hypothesis is hereby retained. This means that there was no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in delegation of authority in Nigerian secondary schools. This also implies that there was no significant difference in the opinions of the three groups of respondents in respect of items 92 to 102. The consensus in opinions seemed to suggest that delegation is a crucial part of any organisational success. This is attributed to the fact that the success of principals in instructional leadership is dependent on how well they delegate their staff to various instructional positions in their schools. The more principals delegate responsibilities to their staff, the more successful they become in instructional leadership. The general consensus on this issue suggests that proper delegation was still needed in many secondary schools in Nigeria.

4.4.9 Null Hypothesis 9

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals in communication network. Items 103 to 114 of the questionnaire were used to

enquire the differences of respondents' opinions on the principals' effectiveness in communication network. Thus, to test the hypothesis, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed and the results are presented in Table 4.4.9 below.

Table 4.4.9: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the principals' instructional leadership practices in effective communication network

Variations	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F ratio	F critical	Sig (P)
Between groups	7.336	2	3.668	1.081	2.60	.332
Within groups	1660.886	897	1.852			
Total	1668.222	899				

The outcome of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics in table 4.4.9 above showed that there is no significant difference among principals, teachers and ministry officials in their opinions on the principals' instructional leadership practices in effective communication network. This is because the ANOVA calculated Sig (P) value of .332 is greater than the 0.05 level of tolerance, while the calculated F ratio value of 1.081 is less than the F critical value of 2.60. Therefore the null hypothesis is hereby accepted. This consensus in opinions among the three groups of respondents seemed to suggest that communication is very crucial and is the life-wire of every organization. Since no organisation could succeed without proper and well organized communication, it was reasonable that the three groups showed general consensus. The consensus also showed that communication needed to be organized in secondary schools to enable schools achieve their goals. Without proper and well organized communication networks in

schools, no meaningful learning would take place. Hence, there is need to improve communication network especially with the introduction of communication technology.

4.4.10 Summary of Hypotheses Testing

The nine hypotheses tested using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 level of significance are hereby summarised in table 4.4.10 as computed in tables 4.4.1 to 4.4.9.

Table 4.4.10: Summary of Hypotheses Testing

S/N	Hypothesis statement	Statistical test used	Result	Level of significance	Conclusion
1	There is no significant difference in the opinion of stakeholders in respect of instructional leadership practices of principals' in curriculum implementation in Nigerian secondary schools	ANOVA	F ratio is 0.594 and computed F probability is 0.553	0.05	The hypothesis was accepted to mean that no significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.
2	There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in instructional supervision in Nigerian secondary schools.	ANOVA	F ratio is 0.669 and computed F probability is 0.512	0.05	The hypothesis was accepted to mean that no significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.
3	There is no significant difference in the opinions of stakeholders in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in staff development.	ANOVA and Scheffe's Post-Hoc test	F ratio is 5.010 and F probability is 0.007	0.05	The hypothesis was rejected to mean that significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.
4	There is no significant difference in the opinions of stakeholders in respect of principal's instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of instructional materials in Nigerian secondary schools.	ANOVA and Scheffe's Post-Hoc test	F ratio is 11.491 and probability is 0.000	0.05	The hypothesis was rejected to mean that significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.
5	There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in the maintenance of physical facilities in Nigerian secondary schools.	ANOVA	F ratio is 0.544 and F probability is 0.580	0.05	The hypothesis was accepted to mean that no significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.

6	There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in staff and students' motivation in Nigerian secondary schools.	ANOVA and Scheffe's Post-Hoc test	F ratio is 7.144 and F computed probability is 0.001	0.05	The hypothesis was rejected to mean that significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.
7	There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in institutional planning of Academic programmes in Nigerian secondary schools.	ANOVA and Scheffe's Post-Hoc test	F ratio is 11.582 and F computed probability is 0.000	0.05	The hypothesis was rejected to mean that significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.
8	There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in delegation of authority in Nigerian secondary schools.	ANOVA	F ratio is 0.546 and F computed probability is 0.580	0.05	The hypothesis was accepted to mean that no significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.
9	There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in communication network in Nigerian secondary schools.	ANOVA	F ratio is 1.081 and F computed probability is 0.332	0.05	The hypothesis was accepted to mean that no significant difference existed in the opinions of respondents.

From the summary in table 4.5.10, it was observed that hypotheses 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 were retained while hypotheses 3, 4, 5 and 7 were rejected. This means that there were no significant differences in the opinions of principals, teachers and ministry of education officials as observed in hypotheses 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9. The hypotheses in this category were accepted to mean that no significant differences were observed in the opinions of respondents. However, significant differences were observed in the opinions of respondents in hypotheses 3, 4, 6 and 7. This implies that the hypotheses in this category (3, 4, 5 and 7) were rejected to mean that significant differences existed in the opinions of the respondents. This means that while respondents showed no significant difference in opinions in hypotheses 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9, respondents had divergent opinions in hypotheses 3, 4, 5 and 7.

With these results the hypotheses can finally be interpreted as follows:

1. There were no significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation in Nigerian secondary schools.
2. There were no significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in instructional supervision in Nigerian secondary schools.
3. There were significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in staff development in Nigerian secondary schools.

4. There were significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of school instructional materials in Nigerian secondary schools.
5. There were no significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in the maintenance of school physical facilities in Nigerian secondary schools.
6. There were significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in staff and students' motivation in Nigerian secondary schools.
7. There were significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in the planning of institutional academic programmes in Nigerian secondary schools.
8. There were no significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in delegation of authority.
9. There were no significant differences in the opinions of the principals, teachers and Ministry of Education officials in respect of the impact of principals' instructional leadership practices in communication network in Nigerian secondary schools.

4.5 Summary of major findings

The research was arranged to analyze and discuss in details, the data collected on the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools. The respondents used for the study were principals, teachers and ministry of education officials. Descriptive and inferential statistical measurements were used for this chapter. Frequency and percentages were also used to give a general description of the data obtained. A One Way-Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical method was employed to determine the opinions of the three categories of respondents on the issues raised in the study. Out of the nine hypotheses, five were retained while four were rejected. The four rejected hypotheses were subjected to Scheffe's post-hoc test to ascertain the extent of significant differences in the opinions of the respondents. Finally, findings were discussed and summary of the tests of the hypotheses were also provided as summarized below:

- i The study revealed that the principals' instructional leadership performance in curriculum implementation was adequate though not based on the local environment but the co-curricular activities such as sports, debate, clubs, and societies were not adequately given attention.
- ii The study also found that principals of Nigerian secondary schools showed high level of instructional leadership responsibility in instructional supervision. This means that they were adequately engaged in supervising instruction.
- iii The study also revealed that principals did not adequately involve teachers in several staff development programmes in their schools such as workshop,

seminars, refresher courses, demonstration, symposia and so on probably due to inexperience and poor financial positions of secondary schools in Nigeria.

- iv From the findings, it was found that principals showed low level of instructional leadership responsibility in the provision and utilization of school instructional materials. School instructional materials such maps, textbooks laboratory materials and so on were not adequately provided and utilized in schools. This might be due to poor financial position of the schools.
- v The study revealed that principals in Nigerian secondary schools showed high level of instructional leadership role in the maintenance of school physical facilities which are meant to encourage teaching and learning.
- vi Motivation of staff and students was not adequately handled by principals to boost the morale of teachers and students probably because of inexperience as reported by UNESCO and Federal Ministry of Education in 2000 and 2005 respectively,
- vii Planning and distribution of institutional academic programmes such as time-table, meetings to group students and to plan other human and material resources available in the school were not adequately given attention
- viii Principals performed adequately in delegating staff and students to responsibilities based on certain criteria such as experience, competence, interest and fairness.
- ix Principals adequately communicated to members of the school community using various channels such as bulletin board, memos, circulars, letters, staff meetings and other appropriate media for clarity and understanding of messages.

In a nutshell, principals showed high level of instructional leadership responsibility in curriculum implementation, instructional supervision, maintenance of school physical facilities, delegation of authority and communication network, but were inadequate in staff development, provision and utilization of instructional materials, motivation and planning of institutional programmes.

4.6 Discussions of Findings

This section presents discussion on the findings of the study with respect to instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools. The nine hypotheses were derived from curriculum activities, instructional supervision, staff development, provision and utilization of instructional materials, maintenance of physical facilities, staff and students motivation, institutional planning of academic programmes, delegation of authority and communication network.

The hypothesis which sought the opinions of respondents regarding the instructional leadership practices of principals of Nigerian secondary schools in curriculum implementation revealed that majority of the respondents agreed that the principals were involved in implementing curriculum activities in their schools. From the results of hypothesis one, it was clear that no significant differences existed in the opinions of the three groups of respondents on the principals' instructional leadership practices in curriculum implementation. This means that principals' performance in curriculum implementation was adequate. This is in line with the opinion of Udeozor (2004) that the fundamental role of education is the transformation of the society through the sustenance of the societal values, norms, traditions, beliefs and accumulated

knowledge which are built in school curriculum. It is also in line with Sergiovanni (1996) who stated that knowledge about teaching and learning and ability to share these insights with teachers is a key fact in good principalship. The general consensus of the respondents could be attributed to the fact that secondary schools in Nigeria emphasized cognitive or academic activities more than anything else. It was therefore implied by the respondents that the principals should make academic services available and adequate in Nigerian secondary schools. The findings also revealed that curriculum implementation was not based on the environments where schools were sited, but that most schools were teaching and learning what examinations bodies wanted to enable their students pass external examinations. This explains the reason why extra-curricular activities such as sports, debate, clubs and so on are no longer emphasized in Nigerian secondary schools.

Analysis of hypothesis two which solicited the opinions of respondents on the instructional leadership practices of principals in instructional supervision in Nigerian secondary schools, revealed that there were no significant differences that existed in the opinions of the three groups of respondents. Majority of the respondents reached a consensus that principals were adequately involved in instructional supervision of their schools. This confirms the position of Dare (2008) that supervision is guidance, assistance, and sharing of ideas to those involved in the process of teaching and learning environment. He further stated that supervision is about helping the teachers and learners to realize their potentials, and improving teaching and curriculum development. However, the findings also revealed that principals required continuous training in instructional leadership to enable them become more effective. It was also discovered that many principals were not leading by example in instructional leadership since the

study found that many of them withdrew from teaching completely probably because of administrative responsibilities. As instructional supervisors, they are expected to be models in teaching so as to encourage other teachers.

The analysis of hypothesis three which solicited the responses of the three groups of respondents in respect of principals' instructional leadership practices in the organization of staff development in Nigerian secondary schools indicated significant differences in the opinions of respondents. This means that significant differences existed in the opinions of the respondents with regards to the principals' instructional leadership practices in organizing staff development. The study revealed that principals were not adequately involved in the organization of staff development in Nigerian secondary schools. This does not agree with Sheppard (1996) who laid much emphasis on the promotion of teachers' professional development, which he saw as the most influential instructional leadership behaviour. However, inspite of the differences, it was discovered that principals were involved in staff development of various types. For instance, they were involved in staff orientation, demonstration lessons, recommendation of staff for further training, and professional growth etc. Despite the differences, opinions of most respondents revealed that principals had no financial capability of sponsoring teachers to attend workshops, seminars and so on, to update knowledge and skills of their staff. The poor financial positions of the principals also might limit them from inviting experts in various fields to organize refresher courses for teachers.

Opinions of the three groups of respondents were significantly different on the involvement of principals in the provision and utilization of school instructional materials in Nigerian secondary schools. Although the opinions of principals and ministry of

education officials seemed to agree that instructional materials were well stored and maintained, it is correct to conclude that the opinions of the teachers which disagreed with the fact that good storage system for the materials was lacking should override since the services were in their favour. The study also revealed that principals had poor record keeping of school materials. While the principals and ministry of education officials maintained that principals kept up to date records of teaching materials, the teachers who used the materials did not agree with the two groups of respondents. The ministry of education officials supported the principals probably because principals usually put things in order before they were invited to visit schools. Most differences were found in the opinions of principals and teachers. This means that principals did not perform adequately in their instructional leadership practices in the provision and utilization of school instructional materials. In other words, the study revealed that school materials were not adequately provided and utilized by the principals in Nigerian secondary schools. This confirms the assertion of Olagboye (2004) that it is sad and instructive to note that the development of instructional materials is the most neglected area of educational provision to the school system.

Hypothesis five which sought the opinions of respondents regarding the principals' instructional leadership practices in the maintenance of school physical facilities in Nigerian secondary schools revealed that no significant differences existed in the opinions of the three groups of respondents. The analysis indicated a general consensus in the opinions of the respondents. This agrees with Fagbamiye (2000) who stated that school physical facilities enhance comfort, safety of teachers and students ,thereby increasing their performances. The study revealed that principals of Nigerian

secondary schools adequately performed in providing security for the facilities, appointing staff to be in charge, request community to assist in repairs and purchase, beautifying school compounds and surrounding, providing minor repairs and supervising the usage of the facilities. This implies that principals performed adequately in the maintenance of school physical facilities in Nigerian secondary schools. However, the study also revealed that maintenance culture was not practiced in most secondary schools. The findings also revealed that major repairs and services of school physical facilities were hardly effected, perhaps due to poor financial positions of the principals. Egwu (2009) reported that the physical state of facilities in secondary schools in Nigeria are very poor ,with floors and buildings full of holes .

Opinions of the three groups of respondents in hypothesis six regarding the instructional leadership practices of principals in staff and students' motivation in Nigerian secondary schools revealed that there were significant differences in the opinions of the three groups of respondents. For instance, the findings revealed that while principals maintained that they assisted in ensuring prompt payment of salaries to staff, the teachers and ministry of education officials had a contrary view. The differences in opinions were between the principals and other groups of respondents. This means that certain information was provided by principals as cover-up or to protect their image, because salaries are paid centrally in most schools without any one influencing the payment. This implies that principals did not perform in this aspect as expected. This is contrary from the view of Afolayan (1981) who stated that employees have certain needs which they desire to be fulfilled and that they will be motivated to put in their best in situations which these needs have a promise of being fulfilled .But Akpa

(1998) confirms that most secondary schools are poorly staffed due to lack of motivation which will retain qualified teachers . In addition, Udor and Akpa (1998) stated that the issue of brain drain is prevalent in secondary schools because most people use teaching as a stepping stone to greener pasture, where well qualified principals and teachers immediately leave the office and classrooms when opportunities for them exist, leaving poorly trained, unqualified and unmotivated teachers and weak leadership in the schools. However, majority of the respondents in the three groups agreed that principals recommended staff for promotion, involved them in decision-making, protected their interest before other people, requested for qualified teachers and were always accommodating and approachable. Since the principals determined the direction and quality of output, they have to motivate staff and students to ensure effective and quality outputs in the school system.

Hypothesis seven demanded the opinions of respondents on the instructional leadership practices of principals in institutional planning of academic programmes. It was discovered that significant differences existed in the opinions of the three groups of respondents. The results revealed significant differences in the opinions of the three groups of respondents on principals' involvement in institutional planning of schools programmes in Nigerian secondary schools. This is to say that principals of Nigerian secondary schools did not effectively perform in planning of instructional academic programmes of their schools. This does not agree with the view of Sidhu (2002) who stated that planning is important because it prevents waste of human and material resources in institutions. Despite the differences, majority of the respondents revealed that principals planned academic activities before the open day. It was also discovered

that principals tried to make textbooks, schemes of work and other academic materials available to staff before schools opened. Grouping of students were also done before the schools opened. However, the results revealed that there were delays sometimes by the principals in planning school programmes, time-table, meetings, evaluation of past performance and so on. Most of the differences were observed in the opinions of principals who tried to protect their seats and other groups of respondents.

Hypothesis eight solicited the opinions of respondents on the principals' instructional leadership practices in delegation of authority to staff and students. . The analysis of the hypothesis revealed that there were no significant differences in the opinions of the three categories of respondents with regards to the principals' instructional practices in delegation of authority in Nigerian secondary schools. The results revealed that principals performed adequately in the areas of appointment of staff and students, basing appointments on competence, experiences and in consultations with the relevant staff or heads of departments and vice principals. This is in line with Ovwigho (2004) who argued that unless the principal undertakes a deliberate and planned distribution of authority to his subordinates, his own tasks are becoming unmanageable and that he is losing effectiveness. The findings also revealed that principals supervised regularly, those assigned responsibilities to ensure effective performance.

In hypothesis nine, the opinions of respondents on the instructional leadership practices of principals in communication network in Nigerian secondary schools, indicated general agreement in the opinions of the respondents. The findings revealed that there were no significant differences in the opinions of the three groups of respondents. The study further revealed that principals used different channels of

communication such as circulars, meetings, bulletins, morning assemblies, electronic and so on. This is to say that principals performed effectively in communication network in Nigerian secondary schools. This agrees with Robbins (2005) who opined that failure of any leader to communicate leads to friction between workers or subsystem with organizational failure as the resultant effects. He further stated that communication serves as a unifying mechanism between various inter-dependent parts. This is so because without communication, no effective teaching and learning would take place.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The study was set to evaluate instructional leadership practices of principals in the administration of Nigerian secondary schools. The study examined the instructional leadership practices of principals in Nigerian secondary schools in areas such as curriculum implementation, instructional supervision, staff development, provision and utilization of school instructional materials, maintenance of school physical facilities, staff and students' motivation, planning of school academic programmes, delegation of authority and communication network. It administered a total of 1,200 questionnaires comprising of 144 principals, 960 teachers and 96 ministry of education officials. However, during the process of administering the questionnaires to various sampled states, only 900 questionnaires comprising of 120 principals, 720 teachers and 60 ministry of education officials. The respondents were drawn from the twelve (12) sampled states that represented the six geo-political zones of the country.

The study which is made up of five chapters has chapter one as the introductory chapter, chapter two deals with a review of related literature, chapter three discusses research methodology, chapter four analyses the data collected for the study and chapter five gives a summary, conclusion and recommendations based on the findings of the study. The methods used for data collection was questionnaire. A set of questionnaire was used for the three groups of respondents (principals, teachers and ministry of education officials).

The data collected were analyzed and tested using mainly descriptive analysis. The One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the nine hypotheses in order to establish the significant differences between the opinions of the respondents. However, the acceptance of five hypotheses tested does not in any way prove lack of any divergent opinion. The rejection of the other four hypotheses simply indicates that the objections raised against the said hypotheses were significantly enough. It should, however, be noted that the objection or agreement does not mean lack of agreement or disagreement on the views of some certain issues as raised in the study. The hypotheses that were rejected were further analysed to find the extent of significant differences in the opinions of the respondents using Scheffe's Post-Hoc test. Important to note were the nine hypotheses formulated to give a sense of direction in the study. Out of the nine hypotheses, five were accepted, while four were rejected. Based on the findings of the study, the following summaries were made:

5.1.1 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Curriculum Implementation

- i. Curriculum was always made available to staff for use in implementing school programmes .
- ii. Principals assisted staff in the course of implementing the school curriculum activities.
- iii. The choice of learning experiences in the curriculum was not based on local environments of the schools, but on need of examination bodies such as WAEC, NECO, etc.
- iv Vice-Principals shouldered the responsibility of curriculum duty.

- v Government policies on curriculum implementation were interpreted to teachers.
- vi. Principals had no hand in the purchase of learning materials relevant to the curriculum because it was centrally controlled.
- vii Principals supervised the implementation of curriculum regularly through classroom visitation.
- viii Extra-curricular activities were not encouraged in secondary schools because of the emphasis of society on cognitive achievement and deboarding of most secondary schools in the country.
- ix Students were always guided in subject selection based on their interest and performance.

5.1.2 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Instructional Supervision

- i Principals checked teachers lesson notes and offered advice where necessary.
- ii. Principals regularly evaluated teachers' instructional methods.
- iii. Principals talked with teachers as colleagues.
- iv Classroom teachers were supported by principals.
- v Principals encouraged innovations and creativity of teachers.
- vi. Principals checked staff and students' attendance regularly.
- vii Principals did not teach on regular basis.
- viii The study revealed that principals required training in instructional leadership to make them more effective.
- ix Classroom visitation and observation created stress and tension among teachers.

- x. Principals were not purchasing education materials such as newspapers, magazines, textbooks etc. for their schools.

5.1.3 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Respect of Organization of Staff Development

- i. Principals conducted demonstration lessons for teachers with deficiencies.
- ii. Experts in various fields were not invited to schools to update teachers knowledge and skills probably due to poor financial positions of secondary schools.
- iii. Principals appointed experienced teachers to assist inexperienced ones.
- iv Principals attended professional meetings.
- v They did not form the habit of writing professional papers.
- vi. Orientation courses were regularly organized for newly posted teachers and newly admitted students.
- vii Principals were not adequately abreast of new changes in education.
- viii Sponsorship by principals to enable teachers attend workshops, seminars, conferences etc. was not adequately done by principals.
- ix Recommendation of staff for further education was done centrally and not by principals.
- x. Principals had no adequate authority to discharge their responsibilities as instructional heads.

5.1.4 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Respect of Provision and Utilization of Instructional Materials

- i Principals regularly purchased teaching materials such as chalk, dusters, maps, books etc for teachers to use in their lessons.

- ii. Principals did not adequately work with teachers to improvise teaching aids for their schools.
- iii. Principals encouraged teachers to use teaching aids in their lessons.
- iv. Poor storage system of teaching materials was practiced by principals.
- v. Record-keeping of school materials was a problem in secondary schools.
- vi. Principals did not adequately ensure relevance of teaching aids to topics taught in classes.
- vii. Time table was not always prepared to ensure access to the inadequate teaching materials.
- viii. Regular servicing and repairs of teaching materials were adequately done.
- ix. Principals ensured training of staff on how to operate some of the teaching materials.

5.1.5 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Respect of Maintenance of School Physical Facilities

- i. Principals planned and organized how to use school physical facilities .ii
- Minor repairs of physical facilities were effected by principals.
- iii. Principals supervised the cleanliness of school compound and ensured planting of trees and flowers.
- iv. School facilities available were inadequate and in bad shape.
- v. Good maintenance culture was not adequately practiced due to poor financial positions of principals.

5.1.6 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Respect of Staff and Students' Motivation

- i. Principals had no influence in the payment of salaries because they were paid centrally.
- ii. Principals involved staff in decision-making
- iii. Principals did not adequately cater for staff welfare
- iv Principals requested for qualified teachers in various subject areas.
- v Teachers who distinguished themselves were honoured and praised by the principals.
- vi. Principals did not adequately know their staff by names.
- vii Principals recommended staff for promotion.
- viii Soft loans were not always given to teachers to solve minor problems.
- ix Principals provided needed teaching materials for teachers.
- x. Principals did not adequately work with teachers in diagnosing students' learning difficulties.
- xi. Principals were approachable and welcoming.

5.1.7 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Respect of Institutional Planning of Academic Programmes

- i Academic programmes were sometimes not planned before resumption date.
- ii. Principals did not adequately participate in planning academic programmes with teachers.
- iii. School time-table was sometimes planned late
- iv Principals ensured availability of relevant materials before the opening day.

- v Principals ensured that all school subjects featured on the time-table.
- vi. Distribution of teachers to classes was inadequately done.
- vii Holding of meetings with teachers was inadequate.
- viii Instructional materials were distributed to teachers before resumption.
- ix Students were grouped based on the grouping system of the schools.
- x. Calendars of events were usually prepared.
- xi. Evaluation of students' past performances was not adequately done by principals.

5.1.8 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Respect of Delegation of Authority

- i Principals shared responsibility equally among staff and students.
- ii. Appointment of staff to positions was based on experience and competence.
- iii. Staff were given authority to discharge their duties freely.
- iv Appointment of staff and students was based on consultations with relevant staff.
- v Principals regularly supervised those assigned responsibilities.
- vi. Abilities and interests were considered in appointment of staff to positions.

5.1.9 Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Respect of Communication Network

- i. Principals used many channels such as oral when communicating during assembly or meetings, written such as memos, circulars, bulletins etc and electronics such as telephone, internet and so on to communicate to teachers.
- ii. Principals entertained complaints from staff.
- iii. Complaints were referred to relevant personnel in the school.

- iv Government policies were regularly communicated to staff during meetings and through circulars.
- v. Staff were involved in decision making.
- vi. Many principals ensured feedback on information passed to avoid misunderstanding.

5.2 Conclusions

- i. From the analyses and results of the findings, it could be concluded that principal's instructional leadership performance in curriculum implementation was adequate but inadequate in co-curricular activities such as debate, sports clubs and societies.
- ii. Principals in Nigerian secondary schools played significant role in instructional supervision but require training in instructional leadership to enable them handle instructional supervision effectively.
- iii. It was also observed that the organization of staff development by principals to improve teachers' skills and knowledge in their various subject areas was not adequate enough to enhance their performance.
- iv. Many Principals withdrew completely from teaching probably because of administrative responsibilities.
- v. Instructional materials were inadequately provided to teachers to enhance their performance in teaching and learning and proper record keeping and storage system of these materials were lacking.

- vi. Principals' instructional leadership practices in respect of maintenance of school physical facilities were generally adequate, but it was found that good maintenance culture was not practiced by many principals. This might be responsible for dilapidated structure in many secondary schools.
- vii. Motivation of staff and students by principals was not adequate enough to boost their morale and enhance their productivity and efficiency.
- viii. Planning of school programmes was some times delayed and this could be one of the reasons for students' poor attendance at the beginning of each term or session.
- ix. Delegation of authority by principals in Nigerian secondary schools was adequately performed.
- x. Performance in communication network in their schools was adequate, since it is the vehicle through which the basic instructional leadership functions are carried out in schools.

5.3 Recommendations

The principals as instructional leaders are charged with the responsibility of promoting quality of instruction in their institutions. Their instructional leadership practices are paramount if the objectives of secondary education are to be meaningfully translated into reality. In the light of this and on the basis of the findings highlighted earlier, the researcher wishes at this juncture, to make the following recommendations.

- i. The curriculum of teacher education at all levels should incorporate instructional leadership courses and supervision so that future school heads would be efficient in performing their instructional responsibilities. In addition, principals should get

firm grip of the school curriculum in order to be able to offer useful advice and assistance to the teachers, since one can only give what he or she has.

- ii. Principals should always supervise teachers in their classes and their supervision should not aim at fault-finding or witch-hunting, but should aim at improving the quality of instruction and learning situations. Where a teacher is found wanting, the principal should discuss with him in confidence and suggest areas where improvement could be made.
- iii. Educational tours should be arranged regularly for principals to enable them visit good schools in some states to learn from the experiences and practices of others.
- iv. There is need to establish more centres for principals and senior teachers to equip them with instructional leadership skills and knowledge. This will help to acquaint them with the instructional procedures and practices in their schools.
- v. Workshops, seminars, orientation, in-service and refresher courses should be regularly organized by the principals to update their teachers' skills. Experts within and outside should be invited to serve as resource persons. In other words, principals should regularly engage teachers in several staff development programmes to constantly update their knowledge and skills.
- vi. Extra-curricular activities such as debate, sports, clubs and societies should be encouraged to enable students participate in various school activities.
- vii. Principals should keep abreast of new changes and development in education in order to introduce them to their staff.
- viii. Principals should develop various motivational techniques such as praise, involving staff in decision making, delegation, operating open door policy and so

on so as to boost the morale of staff to do their best in teaching. This means that principals should create a conducive learning environment that would encourage efficient performance in their schools.

- ix. Instructional teaching materials should be provided to teachers to encourage them and should ensure that they are well kept and utilized for the promotion of teaching and learning.
- x. School physical facilities should be regularly maintained to attract and encourage regular attendance and enhance teaching and learning in schools. A well planned Time-Table should be maintained to give access to all members of school to use scarce physical facilities available in the school.
- xi. Principals should ensure planning and distribution of human and material resources available in the school before resumption to avoid delays in implementing school programmes and poor attendance by staff and students at the beginning of each term or session.
- xii. Principals should delegate authority to teachers and students based on certain criteria such as competence, experience, interest, fairness and consultation with relevant personnel in schools to avoid unhealthy conflict among staff and students.
- xiii. Principals should use various communication channels and methods when communicating to individuals or group so as to remove any communication gap or barrier that would affect teaching and learning in the school.
- xiv. Principals should engage in generating sources of revenue to augment what they have to enable them solve some of the problems that may affect instructional

activities such as organizing staff development programmes, purchasing of instructional materials and general repairs in the school. This could be done by soliciting assistance from non-governmental organizations, donor agencies, alumni and so on.

- xv. Principals should teach on regular basis so as to encourage, stimulate and develop interest in teaching and learning in other staff and students .In other words, principals should model lessons for teachers.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study and the fact that the study did not cover all aspects, the following suggestions were made for further studies in the following areas.

- i. The impact of school physical facilities and equipment in the promotion of teaching and learning.
- ii. Assessment of Instructional leadership Practices of Headmasters in Primary schools.
- iii. Impact of students services on academic performance in secondary schools.

REFERENCES

- Achebe C. (1983), *The Trouble with Nigeria*, Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Achumine, R.N. (1998) *Further Issues in School Administration*, Owerri M.Cajec Publications.
- Aderounmu O.W. and Ethiametalor E.T. (1981) *An Introduction to the Administration of Schools in Nigeria*, Ibadan, Evans Brothers Ltd.
- Adesina S. (1990). *Educational Management*, Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Adesina S. and Ogunsaju S. (1984). *Secondary Education in Nigeria*, Ile-Ife, University of Ife Press.
- Afolabi, M. (1991). *Introduction to Research for Writing Proposals, Projects and Theses*, Zaria, Alpha Publishers.
- Afolayan T.A.F. (1982) *Principalship: Introduction to the Study of Administration of Post-Primary Institutions in Nigeria*, Zaria, Institute of Education, A.B.U. Press.
- Aggarwal J.C. (2008) *Development and Planning of Modern Education*, (ninth Ed) Delhi, Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.
- Aguokogbuo C.N. (2000) *Curriculum Development and Implementation for Africa*, Nsukka, Mike Social Press.
- Akpa G.O. (1990) *What Principals do to enhance quality*, Jos, Ehindero (Nig) Ltd.
- Akubue A.U. (1991). *Classroom Organisation and Management*, Ibadan, Wisdom Publishers Ltd.
- Akuezulo E.O. (2003). *Research and Statistics in Education and Social Sciences*. Abba, Nuel Centi Publishers Press Ltd.
- Ali A. (1996) *Fundamentals of Research in Education*, Awka Meks Publishers (Nig).
- Anaekwe M.C. (2002). *Basic Research Methods and Statistics in Education and Social Sciences*, Enugu, Auto-Century Publishing Company Ltd.
- Anyakoha, E.U. (1994) Development and Utilization of Facilities for Home Economics Education Programme in Nigerian Schools and Colleges for Manpower Development: *Nigerian Journal of Vocational Education*, Vol. 1.
- Aquinas P.G. (2005) *Principles of Management Foundations and Realities*, New Delhi, Amol Publications PVT Ltd.

- Arikewuyo M.O. (1999) Training Primary School Head Teachers through the Distance Learning Programme, *Journal of Distance Education Vol 3, No 1*, Abia State University.
- Atwater D.C. and Bass B.M. (1994), *Transformational Leadership in Teams*, Stanford, JAI Press.
- Avolio B.J. (1994). *The Alliance of Total Quality and the Full Range of Leadership*, New York, Grune and Stratton.
- Bass B.M. (1990) *Handbook of Leadership*, New York, Free Press.
- Bass B.M. (1999), *Transformational Leadership*, Industrial Military and Educational Impact, Mahwah, Lawrence Association.
- Bass B.M. and Avolio B.J. (1994) *Improving Organisational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*, Thousand Oaks, Saga Publications.
- Bass B.M. and Riggio R.E. (2006), *Transformational Leadership* (2nd Ed) Mahwah, NJ Erlbaum.
- Betts P.W. (1980) *Supervisory Studies*, London, MacDonald and Evans Ltd.
- Beynon J. (1997) *Physical Facilities for Education: What Planners Need to Know*, Paris UNESCO.
- Borg, W.R. and Gall, M.D. (1971) *Educational Research: An Introduction*, New York Dowid Mckey Company Inc.
- Brookover W.B. and Lezotte I. (1982) *Creating Effective Schools*, Holmes Beach, FL Learning Publication.
- Cash C.S. (1994), *The Relationship between Building Condition and Student Achievement and Behaviour*. Thouand Oaks, Saga Publications.
- Castetter W.B. (1971). *Administering the School Personnel Program*, New York, the Macmillan Company.
- Castetter W.B. (1971). *The Personnel Function in Educational Administration*, New York, Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Cole Gerald (2005). *Management Theory and Practice* London, International Padstow Cornwall.
- Dare M.O. (2009), *Theories and Concepts of Educational Administration, Planning and Supervision for Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria*, Kano Afomat Print.

- Data, A. (1986). *Education and Society: A Sociology of African Education*, London, Mac-Millan Publishers.
- Di-Ibor M.G.A. (1985) A Study of the Dynamics of Principalship in Nigerian Secondary Schools, Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, ABU Zaria.
- Drucker P. (1954). *The Practice of Management*, New York, Harper.
- Durosaro D.O. (1981) *School Plant and Administrative Effectiveness in some Selected Secondary Schools in Oyo State*, M.Ed Dissertation, University of Ibadan.
- Ejiofor P. (1985), *Making Our Organisations Perform*, Enugu Government Press.
- Ejiogu A.M. (1990). *Educational Management: A System Approach*, Lagos, Lantern Books Ltd.
- Esan E.O. and Okafor R.O. (1995), *Basic Statistics Methods*, Lagos, Behunu Press.
- Ethiametalor E.T. (1981) *Implementation of the National Policy on Education*, Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, Benin, Accra AAU.
- Ethiametalor. E.T. (1985). *Strategies in the Management of Education*, Ibadan, Evans Brothers Ltd.
- Ezeocha P.A. (1985). *School Management and Supervision* Owerri, New African Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Eziuzo G.O. (2008) Administrative Practices in Secondary Schools in Anambra State: Strategies for Improvement, *Nigerian Journal of Teacher Education and Teaching*, Vol 4 No 2, July, 2008.
- Fadipe J.O. (1997) Statistical Needs for Effective Educational Administration and Planning in Nigeria: *Studies in Educational Planning and Administration* (SEPA) Vol. 1 No. 1 September, 1997.
- Fadipe J.O. and Oluchukwu (2009), *Educational Planning and Administration in Nigeria*, NEPA, Ibadan, Daily Graphics Ltd.
- Fagbamiye, E.O. (2004), *Education and Productivity in Nigeria*, Ilorin, Haytee Press.
- Federal Ministry of Education (2005) *Nigeria Education Sector Diagnosis, A Condensed Version*, Abuja, Federal Government Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Policy on Education*, Lagos, Federal Government Press.

- Folarin G.O. (1993). Evaluation of the Concept and Manifestation of Spirit Baptism in Selected Pentecostal Denominations of Oyo State, A Ph.D Dissertation Presented to Post-graduate School, A.B.U., Zaria.
- Forbis, K.J. (1985) *School Business Administration*, New York, the Ronald Press Co.
- Fox, D.J. (1969). *The Research Process in Education*. New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Fuller B. (1990) *What Investments Raise Achievement in the Third World*: New York, Greenwood Press.
- Gage N.L. (1971) *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Chicago, Rand McNally Company.
- Gareth, R. Jones A., and Jennifer M. (2006). *Contemporary Management*, George, McGraw-Hill.
- Gay L.R. (1987). *Educational Research: Competences for Analysis and Application*, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merrill Publishing Company.
- Gerlach V.S. (1980) *Teaching Media* (2nd Ed), New York Cliffs Prentice-Hall.
- Getzels J.W. and Guba E.G. (1957) *Social Behaviour and Administrative Process*, New York, Harper and Row.
- Hackett P. (1979). *Success in Management Personnel*, London, John Murray.
- Hale L.E. (2007) *Preparing School Principals: A National Perspective on Policy and Programme Innovations*, Washington DC, Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Hallinger P. and Murphy J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Leadership Behaviour of Principals, *Elementary School Journal* Vol 86; No 2.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). *Instructional Leadership and the School Principal*, in Hoy W.K. and Cecil G.M. (2008) *Educational Administration*, (eight ed) Boston McGraw-Hill.
- Hanson E.M. (1991), *Educational Administration and Organisational Behaviour*, London, Allyn and Bacon.
- Herzberg F. (1959) *The Motivation to Work* (2nd Ed), New York, John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Heyneman S. (1980) *Evaluation of Human Capital in Malawi*, Washington D.C; The World Bank.

- Hughes M.G. (1970) *Secondary School Administration*, Oxford, Pargamon Press Ltd.
- Humble J.W. (1968). *Management by Objectives*, New York, Industrial and Educational Research Foundation.
- Hunt, R.C. (2004) *Industrial Management: A Guide to Technology and Their Applications*, London, Huldrinson and Co Publication.
- Ipaye J.B. (1982) *Guidance and Counselling: Functions of the Extended Family in Nigeria*, National Conference of Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association, Victoria, Canada, June 1982.
- Isidienu I. (2001) *Maintaining Discipline among Students*, Nigerian Journal of Educational Management, Vol. 4. No. 1.
- Jackson P.B., Logsdon J.D. and Wiegman (1973). *The Principalship: New Perspectives*, New Jersey, Englewood Cliffs.
- Jen S.U. (2004) *Fundamentals of Research Methodology*, Yola Paraclete Publishers.
- Kerlinger F.N. (1973) *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Khanna S.O., Lamba T.P., Saxena V.R. and Murthy V. (2005) *Educational Administration, Planning, Supervision and Financing*, Delhi, Doaba House.
- King J. and Marans R.W. (1979). *The Physical Environment and the Learning Process*, Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Kitari M. and Westhuizen V. (1997), Problems facing Beginning Principals in Developing Countries, *International Journal of Educational Development* Vol 17, No. 3.
- Kothari C.R. (2009). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, 2nd eds. India, New Age International Publishers.
- Krejcie R and Morgan W. (1990). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities, *A Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 30, No. 1.
- Lackney J (1994). *Educational Facilities: The Impact and Role of the Physical Environment on School Teaching, Learning and Educational Outcomes*, Milwaukee, University of Wisconsin.
- Likert Rensis (1961) *New Patterns of Management*, Tokyo, McGraw-Hill.

- Lipham J.M. and Hoeh J.A. (1974) *The Principalship: Foundations and Functions*, New York, Harper and Row Publishers.
- Lunenburg, C. F. and Ornstein C. A. (2008) *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices*, USA Wadsworth.
- Maduewesi B.U. (2008) Reform in Teacher Education Industry. *Nigerian Journal of Teacher Education and Teaching* Vol. 4, No. 2.
- Maicibi N.A. (2000). An Investigation into Decision-Making and Communication Process in Polytechnics in Northern Nigeria. Ph.D Thesis, A.B.U., Zaria.
- Maslow A. (1954). *The Theory of Hierarchy of Needs Concept*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Mc-Gregor D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York, McGraw-Hill Company.
- Mier G.M. (1984) *Leading Issues in Economic Development*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Mkpa M.A. (1987) *Curriculum Development and Implementation*, Oweri, Jotan Publishers Ltd.
- Moja T. (2000) *Nigeria Education Sector Analysis an Analytical Synthesis of Performance and Main Issues*, New York, Nig.
- Mulkeen A., Chapman D.W., Delaeghere J.G. and Leu E. (2007) *Recruiting, Retaining and Retraining Secondary School Teachers and Principals in the Sahara Africa*, Washington D.C., World Bank.
- Murimba S. (1995). The Analysis of Educational Research Data and Policy Development; *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol 23, No 4.
- Murphy J (1987) Rethinking the Foudation of Leadership Preparation ; Insight from School efforts' The Bulletin of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration vol 6 (1) p6.
- Musaazi J.C.S. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration*, London, Macmillan Press.
- National Bureau of Statistics, Annual Abstract of Statistics, 2008.
- National Bureau of Statistics, Annual Abstract of Statistics, 2009.

- Ndu A.N. (1987) Improving the Performance of Nigerian Worker, *Business and Education Research*, Vol 1 No. 1.
- Ndu, A.N. (1991). *Personnel Policy and Teaching Effectiveness*, Onitsha Orient Publishers.
- Nnabuo P.O.M. (1997) *Supervision and Productivity in Secondary Schools Education System*, Owerri, Kiet-Ken Computers Ltd.
- Nnoli O. and Sulaiman (2000) *Reassessing the Future of Education in Nigeria*, Abuja Education Tax Fund.
- Nosiri C. (1976). *The perception of Roles and Responsibilities of Secondary Schools Principal*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Nwachukwu C.C. (1988). *Management: Theory and Practice*, Onitsha, African FEP Publishers Ltd.
- Nwadinigwe I.P. (2002). *Fundamentals of Research Methods and Statistics*, Ibadan, Sibon Books Ltd.
- Nwana O.C. (1982). *Introduction to Educational Research for Student-Teachers*, Ibadan, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Nwankwo I.J. (1981). *Educational Planning: Theory and Methods in Nigeria*, Pakistan, Izbarsons.
- Nwankwo J.I. (1982). *Input-Output Analysis in Nigerian Secondary School System*, Lagos; Educational Review, Vol. 12, No. 1.
- Nwaogu J.I. (1980) *A Guide for Effective Supervision of Instruction in Nigerian Schools*, Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Nworgu, B.G. (1991). *Educational Research: Basic Issues and Methodology*, Ibadan Wisdom Publishing Ltd.
- Obeameta J. (1984), *Secondary School Headship in the Nigerian Context*, Ile-Ife, University of Ife Press.
- Obi E. (2002) The Importance of Effective Communication in Nigerian Schools, *Journal of Business and Education Research*, Vol. 3 No. 4.
- Obilade, S.O. (1986), The Peter Principle and Administrative Effectiveness in the Nigerian Educational System. *African Journal of Educational Management* No. 1 Vol 1, pp. 2-9.

- Ofo J.E. (2005). *Research Methods and Statistics in Education and Social Sciences*, Lagos, Joja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd.
- Oghuvbu, E.P. (2005), Evaluation of Principals' Administrative Effectiveness in Delta State Secondary Schools, *West African Journal of Educational Research (WAJER)*, Calabar, No. 5, Vol. 2 Pp. 28-40.
- Ogunneye S. (2005). *Good principal, Good School*, Ibadan Y-Books.
- Ogunniyi M.B. (1994). *Educational Research in the Social Sciences*, Ibadan, University Press.
- Ogunsaju S. (1983) *Educational Supervision: Perspectives and Practices in Nigeria*, Ile-Ife, University Press.
- Ojelabi A. (1981) *A Guide to School Management*, Ibadan, Valuta Educational Publishers.
- Okon S.E. (2006). *Guidance and Counselling for Schools*, Zaria, Institute of Education Press.
- Olachukwu (2008) Assessment of Administrative Practices of Principals in Anambra State: *Nigerian Journal of Teacher Education and Teaching* Vol. 4, No. 2 July 2008.
- Olafe I.A. (2010) *Research Writing for Academic Growth*, Zaria, ABU Press Limited.
- Olagboye A.A. (2004) *Introduction to Educational Management in Nigeria*, Ibadan, Daily Graphics Nig. Ltd.
- Olomolaiye F. (1986). *Research Methods and Statistics*, Jos Fab Anich (Nig) Ltd.
- Oloyiwola A.O. (2007), *Procedures in Educational Research*, Kaduna Kingo (Nig) Ltd.
- Olu Aina (2009) *Assessment and Contemporary Issues in Education*, Ile-Ife, OAU Press Ltd.
- Osuala E.C. (1984) *Office Management in Nigeria*, Aba, Educational Publications (Nig) Ltd.
- Osuala E.C. (2005). *Introduction to Research Methodology*, Enugu, Cheston Agency Ltd.
- Otu D.O. (1984) Role Perception of Principals in Kwara State of Nigeria, Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, A.B.U. Zaria.
- Ovwigbo M.Y. (2004) *Fundamentals of Effective Management of Organisations in Nigeria*, Benin, Justice and Jeco Press.

- Ovwigbo Y.M. (2008). *Practical Guide to Management of Organisations in Nigeria*, Benin City, Justice Jeco Press Ltd.
- Owan A.E. (2003). *A Handbook of Educational Foundations*, Jos, Saniez Print.
- Oyedeji N.B. and Fasasi Y.A. (2006) *Dynamics of Educational Leadership*, Ibadan, Codat Publication.
- Oyekan (2000) *Foundations of Teacher-Education* Ibadan, Ben Quality Prints.
- Ozigi A.O. (1982). *A Handbook on School Administration and Management*, Ibadan, Macmillan (Nig) Ltd.
- Peretomode V.F. (1991) *Educational Administration, Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspectives*, Lagos, Joja Press Ltd.
- Reitzug U. C (1994) 'A case Study of empowering Principals' Behaviour'. American Educational Research Journal Vol 31(2) 283-307.
- Robbins S.P. (2005) *Organizational Behaviour*, New Delhi, Prentice-Hall.
- Robbins, S.P. (2005) *Structure and Designs of Organizations*, Englewood Cliff, Prentice Hall.
- Sergiovanni T.J.(1996) *Leadership for the school House; How is it important? Why is it different?* San Francisca, Jossey-BASS.
- Sheppard B (1906)' Exploring the Transformational Nature of Instructional Leadership'.The Aberto Journal of Educational Research vol 42(4) 323-344.
- Shertzer B. and Stone S.C. (1976). *Fundamentals of Guidance*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.
- Sidhu K.S. (2002). *School Organisation and Administration*, New Delhi, Storing Publishers, Private Ltd.
- Smith, G.M. (1970). *A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education*, New York, Holt-Rinehart and Winton Inc.
- Smith W and Andrews R(1989) *Instructional Leadership ; How Principals make a difference?* Alexandria ,U.S.A
- Spregel, A. and Stevens, G. (1999). *Applied Multi-varied Statistics for Social Science*, U.S.A. Eribaum.
- Stogdill R. (1981) *Handbook of Leadership*, New York, The Free Press.

- Tannenbaum R. and Schmidt W. (1958) How to Choose a Leadership Pattern, in *Harvard Business Review*, Vol XXIV, March 1958.
- Tanner D. and Tanner L.N. (1975). *Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice*, London, Macmillan Company.
- Taylor F.W. (1947) *Scientific Management*, New York, Harper and Row.
- Tijani A.K. and Shehu S. (2007). *An Introduction to Educational Organisations, Administration, Planning and Supervision*, Zaria, Nasif Prints.
- Togneri W. (2003). *Beyond Island of Excellence: What Districts can do to improve Instruction and Achievements in all schools*, Washington D.C. First Alliance.
- Travers R.M.W. (1973) *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Chicago, Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Trawatha R.L. and Newport M.G. (1979), *Management: Function and Behaviour*, Texas, Business Publications.
- Udeozor R.K. (2004). *Educational Administration: Perspective and Practical Implications*, Nima, Rex Charles and Patrick Ltd.
- Udoh S.U. and Akpa G.O. (1990). *Educational Administration in Nigeria: Theory and Practice*, Nigeria, Ichejum Publication.
- Udey, F.U.; Ebuara, V.O.; Ekpoh, U.I and Edit, A.O. (2009) *Management and Administration: Perspectives and Practice Implications*, Nimo Anambra, Rex Charles and Practice Ltd.
- Ukeje B.O. (1990) *Educational Administration*, Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.
- Ukeje B.O. (1991), The Education of Teachers for a New Social Order, *The Nigerian Teacher Journal* Vol 1 No 1 NCCE.
- Ukeje B.O. and Ethiametalor E.T. (1998) *Crisis in Nigerian Education*, Nsugbe, Eze Denco.
- Ukeje, B.O. (1984), *Foundations of Education*, Benin, Ethiope Publishing Corporation.
- Unachukwu G.O. (1997) *Human Relations and School Administration*, Awka, Meks Publishers Ltd.
- UNESCO (2000) *The State of Education in Nigeria*, Abuja, Excellence Systems Limited.

- Unruh A. and Turner H. (1970). *Supervision for Change and Innovation*, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company.
- Urwick J. and Jonaidu S. (1983). The Effects of School Physical Facilities on the Processes of Education: A Quantitative Study of Nigerian Primary Schools. In *International Journal of Educational Development* Vol II, No. 1.
- U.S. Department of Labour (2011) *Occupational Outlook Handbook: Educational Administrator*. New York, Macmillan Publishers.
- Verghese N.V. (1995). School Facilities and Learner Achievement towards a Methodology of Analyzing School Facilities in India. In *Journal of Perspectives in Education* (India) Vol II, No. 2. April.
- Vickery D.J. (1984) *Designing Secondary Schools for Comfort*, Training Materials in Educational Planning, Administration and Facilities, Paris. UNESCO.
- Wayne K.H. and Miskel C.G. (2008) *Educational Administration, Theory, Research and Practice*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia (2007), *Leadership*.
- Wong, K. and Ng, H. (2003). On Hong-Kong: The Making of Secondary School Principals, *Journal of International Studies in Educational Administration*. No. 31 Vol 2 pp. 35-53.
- Yalams, S.M. and Ndomi B.M. (2000) Research Project, Writing and Supervision, Bauchi, *League of Researchers in Nigeria* (LRN).
- Yuki G.A. (1999). An Evaluation of Conceptual Weaknesses in Transformational and Charismatic Leadership Theories, *A Journal of Leadership* Vol 10 No 2.
- Yuki G.A. (2002). *Leadership in Organisations* (5th ed) Upper Saddle River, NJ Prentice-Hall.

APPENDIX A

Department of Educational
Foundations and Curriculum,
Faculty of Education,
Ahmadu Bello University,
Zaria.
11th July 2011.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES OF PRINCIPALS IN NIGERIAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Dear Respondent,

I am a post-graduate student (Ph.D) of the Department of Educational Foundations and Curriculum, A.B.U., Zaria, currently undertaking a research on the topic, “Evaluation of Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals in Nigerian Secondary Schools”. I wish to request your kind assistance by filling this questionnaire as honestly as possible.

Your response will be treated as confidential and will be used strictly for the purpose of the research only.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Signed

Dubi, Njidda Ensley

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: Bio-Data or Personal Information

Instruction: Please, tick or write where applicable

1. Proprietor: Federal Government [] State Government []
Private []
2. Gender: Male [] Female []
3. Status: Principal [] Teacher [] Ministry Official []
4. Years of Teaching Experience
1 – 4 years [], 5 – 10 years [], 11-20 years []
21 years and above []
5. Highest qualification
Diploma in Education [], NCE [], PGDE [] Bed [],
BSc Ed [], B.Tech Ed [], BA Ed [] M.Ed []
Ph.D [], Others (specify) _____

Please, tick in the appropriate column that best suits your assessment of the principals using the following: (Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD))

SECTION B: Curriculum Implementation

The Principal		SA	A	U	D	SD
1	Demonstrates knowledge of curricular issues in various subject areas.					
2	Makes curriculum available to teachers in all subjects.					
3	Assists teachers in the implementation of the curriculum.					
4	Ensures that the choice of learning experiences is based on the environment in which the school is cited					

5	Assigns curriculum duty to vice-principal because they are occupied with office administration.					
6	Interprets government policies on curriculum development.					
7	Ensures purchase of school materials based on the curriculum.					
8	Assists teachers in the breakdown of the curriculum into syllabus and scheme.					
9	Regularly supervises the implementation of the school curriculum.					
10	Does not work with teachers in the selection of experiences in the curriculum.					
11	Curriculum implementation is his priority in the school.					
12	Organizes and encourages co-curricular activities such as debate, sports, clubs, etc.					
13	Ensures that students are always guided in subject selection.					

SECTION C: Instructional Supervision

		SA	A	U	D	SD
14	Regularly checks teachers' lesson notes and offers advise where necessary.					
15	Regularly evaluates the teachers' instructional methods and makes correction without being judgemental.					
16	Regards teachers as co-workers					
17	Is supportive of classroom concerns of teachers					
18	Encourages innovations and creativity of teachers.					

19	Regularly visits classes to observe teachers teaching.					
20	Checks classroom attendance of teachers and students regularly.					
21	Teaches at least a class in the school.					
22	Needs training in instructional leadership.					
23	Creates tension and stress on teachers that are visited in the class.					
24	Purchases educational magazines and newspapers for their school.					
25	Interacts freely with teachers.					
26	Is too proud of himself.					

SECTION D: Staff Development

		SA	A	U	D	SD
27	Takes definite steps to aid teachers' professional growth.					
28	Conducts demonstration lessons for teachers with deficiencies regularly.					
29	Regularly invites experts in various fields to update staff knowledge and skills in their subject areas.					
30	Appoints the experienced teachers to assist the inexperienced ones.					
31	Attends professional meetings					
32	Writes professional papers regularly					
33	Organizes orientation courses for newly posted teachers and newly admitted students.					
34	Is always abreast of new changes in education.					
35	Regularly sponsors teachers to attend workshops or seminars.					

36	Introduces modern methods of teaching to teachers.					
37	Recommends staff for further training.					
38	Has financial resources to organize any staff development in the school.					
39	Teachers count on him as resource of information on current trends.					

SECTION E: Provision and Utilization of Teaching Materials

		SA	A	U	D	SD
40	Regularly purchases teaching materials for teachers to use in their classes.					
41	Works with teachers to make teaching aids available.					
42	Encourages teachers to improvise teaching materials in their subject areas.					
43	Ensures that teachers regularly use teaching aids in their lessons.					
44	Ensures proper storage of teaching materials.					
45	Keeps up-to-date records of teaching materials.					
46	Ensures that teaching aids used in the class are relevant to the topics.					
47	Prepares time-table for the usage of teaching materials by teachers.					
48	Regularly supervises the usage of teaching materials to avoid over and under utilization.					
49	Ensures regular servicing and repairs of the materials.					
50	Is not bothered about the use of teaching materials during lessons.					
51	Trains teachers on how to operate some of the teaching materials.					

SECTION F: Maintenance of School Physical Facilities

		SA	A	U	D	SD
52	Plans and organizes how to use physical facilities that are not adequate (e.g. classrooms, laboratories, etc.)					
53	Promptly carries out minor repairs of school facilities.					
54	Provides security for school facilities.					
55	Regularly supervises the cleanliness of school environment.					
56	Encourages planting of trees and flowers to beautify the school compound.					
57	Facilities available are in bad shape.					
58	Good maintenance culture of school facilities is not practiced.					
59	School facilities are periodically serviced and repaired.					
60	School facilities available are inadequate and dilapidated					
61	Appoints staff to take charge of school facilities and equipment.					
62	Replaces damaged facilities with new ones.					
63	Regularly requests community to purchase and repair school facilities.					
64	Maintains school climate that is conducive to teaching and learning.					

SECTION G: Motivation of Staff and Students

		SA	A	U	D	SD
65	Ensures regular payment of salaries to their staff					
66	Represent staff interest to the appropriate authority regularly.					
67	Involves teachers in decision-making.					
68	Adequately caters for staff and students' welfare.					
69	Requests for qualified teachers					
70	Praises and honours hard-working staff and students.					
71	Knows their staff by names					
72	Regularly recommends staff for promotion.					
73	Provides loans to teachers to solve some minor problems.					
74	Assists in finding accommodation for teachers.					
75	Provides necessary teaching materials to teachers.					
76	Works with teachers in diagnosing students' learning difficulties.					
77	Is welcoming and approachable at all times					
78	Sympathises with staff and students with problems.					

SECTION H: School Planning of Academic Programmes

	SA	A	U	D	SD
--	----	---	---	---	----

79	Ensures that academic activities are planned before the school opens.					
80	Participates in planning instructional programmes with teachers.					
81	Ensures that school time-table is ready before the beginning of each term.					
82	Checks to ensure availability of schemes, textbooks and other academic materials.					
83	Ensures that all school subjects feature on the time-table.					
84	Distributes teachers to various classes and subjects.					
85	Holds meetings to prepare for the term.					
86	Distributes the necessary materials before the opening day.					
87	Assigns responsibilities to staff and students before resumption.					
88	Ensures that students are grouped based on the grouping system in the school.					
89	Prepares calendar of events for both curricular and co-curricular activities and made available to teachers before the opening day.					
90	Evaluates past performances of staff and students.					
91	Interprets policies and information from the government regarding curriculum implementation.					

SECTION I: Delegation of Authority

		SA	A	U	D	SD
92	Does not trust their staff.					
93	Only few trusted staff are overloaded with					

	responsibilities.					
94	Appoints staff to positions on competence.					
95	Assigns responsibilities without commensurate authority.					
96	Appoints staff to position without tenure of office.					
97	Appoints staff to position without consulting their vice-principals and heads of departments.					
98	Does not supervise those assigned responsibilities.					
99	Evaluates performance of various duties performed.					
100	Shares responsibilities among all the staff of the school equally.					
101	Assigns challenging responsibilities to staff.					
102	Abilities and interests are not considered in delegation.					

SECTION J: Effective Communication Network

		SA	A	U	D	SD
103	Information is passed to staff and students through rumours only					
104	Information is passed during Morning Assembly only.					
105	Is too busy to meet with his staff regularly to discuss students' progress.					
106	Takes decisions alone without involving the staff.					
107	Meets with prefects frequently to discuss students' academic problems.					
108	Threatens staff during discussion					
109	Encourages staff and students to express their opinions					
110	Prefers circulars to meetings					

111	Entertains complaints from staff and students at all times.					
112	Refers cases to relevant officers in the school always.					
113	Communicates government policies to staff					
114	Meets regularly with staff to discuss students' academic programmes.					