

## **TEACHERS PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE OF SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC AND RURAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN EBONYI STATE, NIGERIA**

**Dr. Aloysius A. Orogwu**<sup>1</sup>  
**Ugo Ibiam**<sup>2</sup>

Department of Educational Foundations<sup>1&2</sup>  
Ebonyi state college of Education

**Nwode Ngozi N**<sup>3</sup>

Department of Primary Educations<sup>3</sup>  
Ebonyi State College of Education

---

### **Abstract**

This study was designed to examine principals' performance of supervision of instructions in public secondary schools of Ebonyi State. To achieve the purpose of the study four specific objectives and one hypothesis were posed to verify the study. Data were collected from a sample of 604 out of 1640 teachers randomly selected by stratified technique across urban and rural schools under study. A structured questionnaire was the instrument used for data collection. Data were analyzed using mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) scores, standard (SD) and t-test statistics. Results indicated that a significant positive difference exist between urban and rural teachers in principals' performance of supervisory functions on classroom supervision of instruction, monitoring students' achievement, provision and maintenance of instructional materials, and supporting continuous staff development. Based on the findings it was recommended among others that the school principals as an instructional leader should give internal supervision in order to improve curriculum implementation and reduce incidence of students' involvement in examination malpractices.

---

### **Introduction**

In any secondary school environment there must be a principal who occupies a high status position by virtue of his/her appointment as the school head. The vitality of the school lies under his/her functional leadership traits. He/she should be capable of stimulating the teachings and students to achieve the institutional goals and objectives.

The principal as an institutional leader has the primary functions of exhibiting effective instructional leadership functions for the improvement of diversified curriculum, quality of instructional programme for effective attainment of set school goals. Litchfield (2003) identifies management of curriculum and instruction, supervising classroom instruction, monitoring and evaluating students' progress and achievement, promoting and enhancing learning climate,

establishing and supporting continuous staff development and procuring instructional materials for teaching and learning as major supervisory functions of secondary schools principals in the state. Apart from instructional supervisory functions, the school principal performs, some administrative duties. He/she is faced with extremely difficult challenges emanating from the school, immediate community and Ministry of Education. It is therefore unfortunate that instructional supervisory function recognized as cardinal role of the school principal could be lost sight in the midst of variety of roles. In this vein Weller (2010) remarked that school principals devote more time attending to visitors more than supervising instructions. Therefore, interference of administrative functions seems an appendage to instructional supervisory function of the school principals in achieving instructional objectives of the schools. Again school location affects the quality and thoroughness of instruction. School locations has far reaching effect on the provision of instructional materials and even distribution of amenities between urban and rural schools (Stronge, 2013). In all educations institutions, teachers are regarded as indispensable instrument because they have many roles to play in the effective realization of education objectives. Donaldson (2014) reflected the importance of the teachers in giving complementary assistance to principals' function when he described teachers as the fulcrum on which the curriculum revolves. Therefore, any school principal that does not care for the welfare of his/her teachers is bound to lower the working morale of his/her teachers and the tone of the school.

From the foregoing, the growing demand, from stakeholders of education, education reform agenda and the general public seek to ask, what are the solutions to examination malpractices, students' riot, high rate of indiscipline among students in Nigerian secondary schools? The answers to this question may be attributed to apparent laxity within the school administration and lack of supervision of instruction. This study therefore, attempts to determine the level of school principal's performance in supervision of instruction in public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The success of any level of education is hinged on the quality, regular and continuous supervision of instruction of the education system. The problem of ineffective supervision especially internal supervision by the school principals in public secondary schools is a phenomenon that has not been given much attention it deserves. Principals generally seem to spend more of their official hours on routine administrative functions to the detriment of effective instructional supervision process and programmes of the school. Little seem to have been done by Ministry of Education, Government and parents to arrest the situation. Public outcry, reports and comments in print and electronic media alleging fallen standard of education in public secondary education seem to reveal in part that supervision is probably not effectively carried out by school heads in Ebonyi State.

The situation create doubts as to weather the school principals fully carry out

effective instructional supervision in their schools. Consequent upon this, students performance have remained at a lower level in senior secondary school certificate (SSCE) and JAMB Examination. This study therefore, sought to establish instructional supervision functions of the school principals. It was assumed that ineffective supervision of instruction by school principals seems to effect the realization of educational objective in Ebonyi State.

### **Research Objectives**

The purpose of this work to:

1. Determine principals' performance in supervision of classroom instructions.
2. Examine principals' performance in monitoring students achievement
3. Determine principals' performance in provision and maintenance of instructional materials.
4. Ascertain principals' level of performance in establishing and supporting continuous staf

### **Hypothesis**

There is no significant difference between the mean rating responses of urban and rural teachers on internal supervision of schools by the school principals.

### **Methodology and Procedure**

This study is a descriptive survey conducted in Ebonyi Central Education Zone of the state. The study is delimited to 142 public secondary schools within the education zone. The population of the study were all the teachers in the education zone numbering 640 teachers. A stratified sampling technique was used to select 605 teachers. This ensure true representative of urban (304) rural (301) teachers. The instrument for data collection was a questionnaire titled 'Principals' Performance of Supervision of Instruction in secondary schools in Central Education Zone of Ebonyi State (PPSSSCEZBS). The questionnaire was constructed on the basis of the research questions on. Experts in the Department of Educational Foundations and Measurement and Evaluation duely validated the instrument. The data generated from the trial testing of the instrument was used to compute the reliability. A reliability co-efficient of 0.80 was obtained using Combach Alpha formula for internal consistency of the items. The data collected were analyzed using mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) score, standard deviation (SD) and t-test statistics. The hypothesis was at 0.05 level of significance.

### **Results**

The results are presented below according to the hypothesis formulated.

### **Research Hypotheses**

**Ho: 1** There is no significance difference between the mean response of urban and rural secondary school teachers on internal supervision of schools by school principals.

**Ho: 2** There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of urban and rural secondary school teachers on principals' performance in monitoring students

==== Teachers Perception of Principal Performance of Supervision ====

achievements

**Ho: 3** There is no significant difference between the mean rating of urban and rural secondary school teachers on principals performance in the provision and maintenance of instructional materials.

**Ho: 4** There is no significant difference between the mean response of urban and rural secondary school teachers on principals performance in establishing and supporting staff development  
the results of the data analyzed are shown below:

**Table 1: T-test analysis of urban and rural schools on principals' supervision of classroom instructions**

S/N	Item	Location	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	t.cd	t-crit	dec	
1	Principals meet regularly with teachers to discuss instructional improvement.	Urban	304	3.39	.81		9.80	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	301	2.88	.77					
2	Monitors lesson plan and lesson notes to ensure quality of standard.	Urban	304	3.28	.68		8.04	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	301	2.82	.77					
3	Delegate vice principals to visit classes during lesson periods.	Urban	304	3.40	.49		8.03	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	301	2.88	.77					
4	Instruct vice principals to inspect student's notes to ensure scheme coverage.	Urban	304	3.47	.53		6.03	14.29	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	2.80	.63					
5	Use incentives and rewards to encourage teachers' input.	Urban	301	2.09	.75		2.67	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	304	3.36	.64					
6	Use appropriate supervisory techniques to improve teaching and learning	Urban	304	3.36	.49		8.40	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	301	2.94	.76					
7	Often meet with students to discuss instructional problems	Urban	304	3.30	.55		10.24	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	301	2.80	.69					
8	Encourage teachers to utilize supervision suggestions	Urban	301	3.28	.88		9.01	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	304	2.74	.53					
9	Observes classroom instruction to ensure curriculum coverage.	Urban	304	3.04	.50		13.33	1.96	Reject	
		Rural	301	3.01	.74					

As presented in table 1, the calculated t-value for each items 1 to 9 is greater than t-critical value of 1.96. Since the t-calculated is greater than t-critical, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that a significant difference existed between urban and rural secondary school teachers on principals' supervision of classroom instruction in Ebonyi State.

**Table 2. t-test Analysis of urban and rural secondary schools teachers on principals' performance in monitoring students' achievement.**

Item	Location	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	t.cd	t-crit	dec
1. to establish criterion for students' assessment.	Urban	301	23.53	.58		3.67	1.96	Reject
	Rural	301	23.53	.58				
2. objectives criterion to assess students	Urban	301	2.67	.73		3.59	1.96	Reject
	Rural	301	2.67	.73				

**Table 2: Continue**

12	Display high expectation for students' academic performance	Urban	304	3.50	.44	603	1.80	1.96	Rej	
		Rural	301	3.52	.59					
13	Maintains accurate and effective record keeping of continuous assessment.	Urban	304	1.72	.60					
		Rural	301	1.83	.58					2.29
14	Address teachers' inefficiency to enhance students' achievement	Urban	301	3.52	.56			3.69	1.96	Rej
		Rural	304	3.29	.99					
15	Principals display leadership role and support to students discipline	Urban	304	3.54	.53				1.96	Rej
		Rural	301	3.51	.56					

*Significant at 0.05 level*

In Table 2, calculated t for items 10, 11, 13 and 14 are all greater than the table t of 1.96. Therefore the null hypothesis stood rejected. This means that there is significant difference in the mean rating of teachers on principals' performance in monitoring students' achievement in urban and rural schools in the state. On the other hand, the calculated t for each item 12 and 15 is less than t-critical value, the null hypothesis is accepted. This implies that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of teachers in principals' performance in monitoring of students achievements in urban and rural secondary school in the state.

**Table 3.**  
**t-test analysis of Urban and Rural secondary school teachers on principals performance in the provision and maintenance of instructional materials.**

S/N	Item	Location	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	t.cd	t-crit	dec	
16	Principals collect lists of instructions materials needed in school by discussing with teacher	Urban	304	1.72	.49			9.69	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	1.34	.46					
17	Distributes instructional materials and ensures that each teacher got enough	Urban	304	3.87	.33			10.74	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	3.70	.46					
18	Provides writing materials to ensure that teachers prepare their lesson plans.	Urban	304	1.89	.46	603		11.30	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	1.26	.49					
19	Provides modern instructional materials such as ICT to improve teaching/learning	Urban	304	2.53	.55			.85	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	2.48	.69					
20	Pay prompt attention to maintenance of instructional materials	Urban	301	1.88	.63			1.13	1.96	Reject
		Rural	304	1.89	.90					

==== Teachers Perception of Principal Performance of Supervision ====

In table 3, the calculated t for items 16, 17 and 18 are greater than t-critical value of 1.96. Since the t-calculated for the items are greater item t-critical the null was rejected. The conclusion is that a significant positive difference existed. Items 19 and 20 had t-calculated less than t-critical, the null hypothesis was accepted. This implies that there is no significant difference in the urban and rural schools in the provision and maintenance of instructional materials.

**Table 4**  
**t-test Analysis of Urban and Rural secondary school teachers on principals' performance in establishing and supporting staff Development.**

S/N	Item	Location	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	t.cd	t-crit	dec
21	Principals encourage teachers to go for in-service training	Urban	304	2.51	.50		4.69	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	2.70	4.9				
22	Sponsors teachers for seminars and workshops	Urban	304	1.79	.79		.30	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	1.68	.78				
23	Organizes in house conference and seminars on important situation	Urban	304	1.68	.78		2.00	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	1.81	.80				
24	Approves study leave for teachers to acquire relevant qualification in education	Urban	304	3.49	.57		1.26	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	3.49	.54				
25	Assign duties and responsibilities to teachers based on professional capabilities	Urban	301	3.42	.73		2.36	1.96	Reject
		Rural	304	3.29	.72				
26	Recommend teachers who have completed their in service training for promotion	Urban	304	3.47	.56		4.32	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	3.26	.63				
27	Encourage teachers in put in scheduling their development programme	Urban	304	1.56	.59		.10.56	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	2.13	.73				
28	Seek out information in order to help teachers grow and improve as professionals	Urban	304	1.52	.54		1.39	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	1.93	.64				
29	Recognizes the need to support teachers develop professionally	Urban	304	2.24	.49		.6.68	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	2.51	.50				
30	Direct the activities of teachers towards professional development	Urban	304	1.64	.68		.9.62	1.96	Reject
		Rural	301	2.19	.76				

*Significant at 0.05 level*

In the table 4, the calculated t for each item 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 is higher than table t of 1.96. Since the t-calculated value is greater than the table value, the null hypothesis is therefore rejected. That shows that is a significant difference between the mean response of urban and rural teachers on principals performance in establishing support for staff development. Whereas, items 22 and 24 the t-calculated value is less than t-table value, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is no significant difference in principals' performance in

establishing and supporting staff development in urban and rural schools in the state.

### **Discussion**

Hypothesis 1, stated that there is no significant difference between the mean rating of urban and rural teachers on internal supervision of schools by principals in Ebonyi central education zone. The result of the data shown in table 1 reveals that all the items on principals' supervisory function in classroom instruction based on location were greater than t-critical value of 1.96. Since the calculated t. values were greater than the t-critical value, the null hypothesis 1 was rejected. This means that a significant positive difference existed in the mean rating of teachers in urban and rural secondary schools in principals' classroom supervision. The difference could be attributed to principals' supervisory dispositions. The urban principals could be busier with other administrative functions, having less or no time to visit the classroom. The rural principals on their side might be confronted with rural challenges at the detriment of supervising classroom instruction. This finding is consistent with the finding of Whiltakers (2010), Hanghey and Mac Elion (2011) and Weller (2014), who maintained that instructional supervision was a fundamental component of instructional leadership of the principal and viewed his role as imperative to improve instruction. If schools are to achieve set educational objectives, the principals should not allow other daily activities to interfere with the classroom supervision functions in view of the facts that the operations of school enterprise lies with classroom environment all other activities are supportive as the school principal is considered first and foremost internal school supervisor.

In table 2, the result showed that the t-calculated of four (4) out of six (6) on supervisory functions of principals in respect to monitoring students achievement were greater than the t-critical value of 1.96, the null hypothesis was rejected. Where the school principals and teachers refuse to cooperate with each other to establish criterion for students assessment it will affect students' achievement. Again, poor and inadequate record keeping as a result of nonchalant attitude and behavior of teachers and school management to effectively monitor students' assessments, the situation is likely going to affect their final assessment results. On the other hand, the result of the data analyzed showed two (2) out of six (6) items in monitoring students' assessments had t-calculated less than t-critical. The null hypothesis was accepted. This means that principals irrespective of location monitor students achievements with respect to display of high expectations and lending of leadership support to students. The finding is in accord with Fulan, (2010), Fulan and Hargreaves (2012) and Brooker (2011) who observed that the effective school principals with higher expectation is more focused on students' achievements. The finding of these study also revealed that principals cannot alone supervise and maintain accurate record keeping, address poor attitude and behavior of teachers without immediate assistants of his subordinates since students are the centre of educational process. More importantly, all attitude towards their academic achievements should be fully monitored. Principals should as much as possible make use of their vice principals (academic and administration) and Dean of studies to effectively monitor students achievement.

Result of the study in table 3 showed that the t-calculated of all the items in respect to principals supervisory functions in the provision and maintenance of instructional materials with regard to school location were greater than t-critical, the null hypothesis was rejected. Reasons that could be adduced to this finding may included uneven distribution of school amenities between urban and rural schools, special attention not given by government to provide adequate fund and modern instructional materials ICT inclusive. Aduwa and Ede, (2010) noted that teaching and learning required appropriate enabling environment which provides basic infrastructure and teaching/learning materials are necessary for educational challenges of the twenty-first century. Therefore no meaningful teaching and learning can take place under a situation of scarce and inadequate instructional materials.

In table 4, the result showed that 8 out of 10 of principals' performance in establishing and supporting staff development in respect to location, the t-calculated were greater than t-critical value of 1.96, the null hypothesis was rejected. The finding implies that there is a significant difference in the mean rating of teachers in principals' performance in establishing and supporting staff development with respect to school location. The remaining two functions were accepted with t-calculated value less than t-critical of 1.96. The significant differences could be related to laxity of the school administrator/management and therefore the extent of goal achievement tends to be less. The school heads should strive to reverse this situation because teachers are regarded as fulcrum on which the curriculum revolves and no school can function effective without the teachers. School principal should strive to encourage teachers' development potentially for better discharge of duties.

The findings of this study suggest that where the school principal fails to carry out effective supervision of classroom instruction because of some administrative problems, teaching and learning and curriculum implementation will be affected. Therefore school principals irrespective of school location should endeavour to carry out effective supervision of classroom instruction, monitor and support staff development through seminars and conferences, which will in turn foster teaching and learning and improve curriculum implementation. This might improve student academic achievement and standard of education.

### **Recommendation s**

Arising from the findings of the study and the discussion made, the following recommendations are made.

1. The school principal as an instructional leader should give internal supervision of instruction its right place in the school. Adequate and effective supervision will not only improve curriculum implementation but will reduce incidence of students' involvement in examination malpractices.
2. School principals should be encouraged to combine administrative functions with classroom instructional duties in order to foster effective

teaching and learning process using appropriate strategies of supervision of delegation of duties.

3. The Ministry of Education should constantly organize workshop, conference and seminars where instructional supervisory roles and staff development will be discussed. Workshop and seminars should be made compulsory for principals and teachers as to highlight the importance of each to the education system.
4. Government at both Federal and State levels should provide more funds to schools as to enable principals to provide and maintain available instructional materials for effective teaching and learning.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the findings and discussion the following conclusions are drawn from the study.

A significant positive difference existed between urban and rural secondary school principals in classroom supervision of instruction as a result of principals' supervisory disposition.

A significant difference was established between urban and rural secondary schools in monitoring students' assessment/achievement.

A significant positive difference was found between urban and rural principals in the provision and maintenance of instructional materials. Poor funding and uneven distribution of available instructional materials constitute a problem.

There is a significant difference in most of the supervisory functions of school principals based on staff development with particular reference to school location.

### **References**

- Aduwa, O. & Ede, O.S. (2010). Assessment of the provisions of the Educational services under the UBE, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 13(3) 31-40.
- Brooker, W. B. & Lezzottes, L. (2011) *Creating effective schools* Hollowness Beach: FL Learning Publications.
- Donaldson, G.A. (2014) *Learning to Lead: The dynamics of the high school principalship*. Westport, CT: Green Wood Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2004) *National Policy on Education*, Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Fullan, M. (2011). *The new meaning of educational change*, New York: Teacher college Press.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, T.H. (2012). *What worth fighting in your school*. New York: Teacher Colleges Press.

==== *Teachers Perception of Principal Performance of Supervision* ====

- Hanghey, M. & MacClion, L. (1998). Principals as instructional supervisors. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 38 (2), 105-119.
- Litchfield D.J. (2010). If you want me to be an instructional leader, just tell me what an instructional does. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(1), 202-205.
- Strogne, J.H. (2006). A position in transition. *National Association of School Principals*, 67 (5) 32-33.
- Weller, F.C. (2010) Project Success: Outstanding Principals speaks out. *The Clearing House*, 67 (34), 52-54.
- Whitlaker, B. (2013) Instructional leadership and principal visibility. *The Clearing House*, 70, 23-25.