

The Correlation between Instructional Leadership Capacity of School Principals and Academic Performance of Students in Secondary Schools in South East Nigeria

Iro Stephen Uwakwe

Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka
E-mail of the corresponding author: Iro.uwakwe@unn.edu.ng

Abstract

The correlation between Instructional leadership Capacity of school principals and the academic performance students was carried out to address the continued poor performance of secondary school students in certification examinations in South East Nigeria. It adopted descriptive survey research design. A sample of 162 principals and 1077 teachers were selected through multi stage sampling technique. Questionnaire was used to elicit information from respondents.

Major findings of the study showed that school principals' instructional leadership capacities positively influence the academic performance of students in examinations and they need capacity building in instructional leadership capacities used in the study. Based on the findings government should organize capacity building program to upgrade the instructional leadership capacities of school principals.

Keywords: School principals; Instructional Leadership capacity; capacity building of principals; Students academic performance

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study

Globally, education is one of the most crucial instruments for achieving national development and in all countries of the world it is seen as the corner stone of development. One major step in the achievement of these goals is the enrolment of students into secondary school education where they are exposed to experiences necessary to achieve these objectives. It's broad goals of preparing students for useful living in the society and for higher education have made it imperative that it should, among others, inspire its students with the desire for self-improvement and achievement of excellence; raise a generation of people who can think for themselves, respect the views and feelings of others. The quality of education students receive largely determine the extent these objectives are achieved and their academic performance in examinations.

Academic performance of students in examinations according to Odubuker (2004) is defined as the quality and quantity of knowledge, skills, techniques, positive attitude, behaviour and philosophy that students acquire. At the end of each topic, term, year or education cycle, the students are assessed and their academic performance after evaluation are expressed by marks and grades obtained in the test or examination. The pattern of grading students in the Senior Secondary School Certificate (SSC) examinations in Nigeria is such that the distinction grade is being represented by A1 to B3. The credit grade is represented by C4 to C6. The ordinary pass grade is represented by D7 and E8 while the failure grade is represented by F9. According to JAMB report (2007), distinction and credit grades are the only requisite grades for admissions into Nigerian universities and candidates must have at least credits in five subjects including English Language in order to qualify for admission. In this study, good performance of secondary schools students in examinations therefore means obtaining quality grades such as distinction and credit grades in certification examinations.

Although many scholars have attributed the poor academic performance to many factors such as work environment, the administrative effectiveness of the school principals and personal traits of the students (Adeyemi, 2007), teachers inadequate knowledge in their various subjects, inadequacy of professionally qualified teachers and insufficient facilities in schools (Obanya, 2010) and lack of personal confidence and emotional instability on part of students (Adesina, 2009). Whatever is the reason, the opinion of these experts indicates that the school and its management have positive correlation with the academic achievement of the

students. The school principal who is the administrative head of school has a lot of roles to play in the academic achievement of the students (Seashore, Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom & Anderson, 2010).

According to the Federal Republic Nigeria (2013), the principal is the administrative head of secondary school and key person in ensuring the school objectives are achieved. According to Lumenburg (2010) he/she decides what is going to be done, who is going to do it and when it is going to be done and takes decisions daily that affect the lives of students and the tone of the school. As the school's instructional leader, he/she plans, organizes and coordinates school's instructional activities (Litman, 2012), identify and translate instructional goals to action, observe the teachers in class during instructional delivery to evaluate the teacher's mastery of the content and method of lesson delivery (Olagboye, 2004), monitors the use of teaching aids, techniques of asking questions, evaluation techniques, and manner of involving students in active learning (Ayeni, 2012) and create conducive learning environment and class control in such a way that things work smoothly and effectively to promote instruction and conducive environment for teaching and learning to take place (Arongi & Ogbadu, 2010). Marzano and Waters (2009) stated that clear instructional goals, effective instructional leadership and support to teachers, and supervision significantly influence student academic achievement.

Instructional leadership is therefore an indispensable tool in the hands of school principals to positively influence student achievement. Cheng (2003) stated that instructional leadership refers to the activities school principals take or delegate to others to promote effective teaching and learning in schools. The roles of principal as an instructional leader includes improving teaching and learning; developing supervisory strategies; executing strategies for improvement; maintaining the school system; improving curriculum and library materials; evaluating students' progress and time tabling (Okumbe, 2003), supervision of instruction to stimulate, help, advise, assist and guide teachers in better understanding and more effective performance of their instructional roles (Ogagwu, 2004) and to direct, guide and make sure principles, rules, regulations and prescribed methods are effectively carried out and met (Peretomode, 2004). The aims are to give instructions, offer inspiration, build teamwork and ensure that meaningful teaching and learning is taking place in all the classes and that the teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach (Whalley, 2011). Effective instructional leadership improves the skills of teachers which in turn improves students' academic performance, improves the incompetent teachers' methods of teaching and help teachers identify instructional problems and solve them (Nworgu, 2006).

However, many researchers have expressed concern about the way school principals perform their instructional leadership duties. Research efforts has shown that school principals are inefficient in the performance of their instructional leadership responsibilities resulting in declining staff performance, students' academic performance and the culture of the school (FRN, 2009), pay little or no attention to their instructional leadership responsibilities due to ignorance or lack of capacity to promote effective teaching and learning, identify and translate instructional goals to action (Arikewuyo, 2009) and unable to observe the teacher in class during instructional delivery to evaluate the teacher's mastery of the content, method of lesson delivery, the use of teaching aids, techniques of asking questions, evaluation techniques, manner of involving students in active learning (Gupton, 2003) and students tend to perform below expectation in topics where teachers found difficult to teach (Adenipekun, 2007). Their inability or failure to perform these instructional leadership tasks effectively and efficiently affect teaching and learning processes in schools which inturn cause the rising poor performance of students in external examinations (Ugwu, 2011) and mass illiteracy, high rate of school drop-out, high rate of out of school children, low students' academic achievements, among others and these are indicators that a need gap exists in the capacity of the school principals to effectively perform their instructional leadership functions professionally (Aguba, 2009).

The poor performance of school principals in instructional leadership was caused by poor training and appointment of principals into Nigeria secondary schools. It is obvious that principals who were appointed to manage the schools are incompetent and lacked the required instructional leadership capacities to effectively supervise teachers lesson plan to ensure clarity and appropriateness of the learner behavioural objectives, relevance and adequacy of the lesson notes; selection of appropriate teaching aids; selection of appropriate evaluation techniques and lesson presentation (Afolabi & Loto, 2008) and monitor classroom management; ensure effective instruction within the school by checking schemes of work, coordinating with the Ministry of Education for supply of textbooks, chalk, among others (Owojori & Asaolu, 2010). Therefore, school principals need additional training to acquire the required instructional leadership capacities to effectively to set goals for their schools, give instructional support to teachers and students; design and implement curriculum; build teacher

professionalism and problem solving skills; among others (Williams & Szal, 2011). Student performance is enhanced when school principals maintain a safe and orderly environment, improve teaching methods, demonstrate strong instructional leadership role, have high expectations for student achievement and have a clear mission (Waters & Marzano, 2006) and demonstrate effective instructional capacities and strategies to support teachers and maintain a smoothly run school (Pepper, 2010).

It is not clear if government agencies have developed and made available the required instructional leadership capacities necessary to guide the performance of school principals in instructional leadership to effectively improve student academic achievement. The absence of the performance guide could result in school principals not aware of the required core capacities they are expected to possess to effectively carry out their instructional leadership responsibilities creditably and in a professional manner. Capacity is high priority issue for many people concerned with quality of secondary school education these days. It is set of skills, knowledge, crafts, and abilities, which are essential resources for job performance and improvement (Fullan, 2008), strategies and abilities for performing a task (Bootar, 2014), it is clearly identified knowledge and skills that the user has mastered and able to demonstrate within a given time-frame (Lambert, 2005) and it is a dynamic attribute reflected in the school principals ability to plan, organize, coordinate, decide, communicate, guide, supervise, direct, manage and control actions and activities of people at work in schools (Adebanjo, 2012). Capacity in this study is the school principals' skills, knowledge, behaviours, strategies, and abilities to help teachers improve their instruction in secondary school in South East Nigeria. Ordinarily, school principals should effectively perform their instructional leadership responsibilities creditably if they possessed the right instructional leadership capacities

The performance of school principals in the required instructional leadership capacities appears to be a significant factor in the effectiveness of teaching and learning activities that go on in every school and indeed the academic performance of students in examinations. Besides, in Nigeria, there is little or no information on the instructional leadership capacities of school principals required to effectively improve the academic performance of secondary schools students in south East Nigeria. Also, there is little or no information on the capacity building needs of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities necessary for them to perform their instructional leadership tasks to the expected level and the correlation between the school principals instructional leadership capacity and students academic performance in examinations in secondary schools. Therefore, the researcher is set to investigate the correlation of instructional leadership capacity and the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Over the years, there have been comments in the mass media on the fallen standard of education and poor quality of secondary school products in Nigeria and in South Eastern States in particular. Statistics from available JSSCE and WAEC results and research findings show that students have been performing poorly in these external examinations. Research effort has shown that the problem was caused by poor training and appointment of school principals into Nigerian secondary schools. School principals do not have the required instructional leadership capacities as a result of poor training and the way they are appointed/promoted from among senior classroom teachers. Such an appointment/promotion into the highest office, takes the principal from a position where he/she is competent to a position where he/she is incompetent and such places the school instructional processes on the hands of technically unqualified personnel. The principal who is appointed in this way does face difficult challenges because of wide range of instructional leadership roles he/she does not have capacity to perform. Research evidence has shown that their instructional leadership capacities are grossly insufficient to cope with the myriads of instructional leadership roles. The result is that the academic climate and culture of most schools is not conducive for effective teaching and learning.. Incidences of role conflict among teachers, duplication of functions, lateness and absenteeism and general lack of direction in task performance by secondary school principals have also been observed in secondary school in South East Nigeria. These problems result to wastages in the use of human and material resources, poor learning outcomes and products quality.

Another problem is that the quality of academic training, qualifications, and their capacity in instructional leadership varies. The principals learn the art of school leadership through different methods. It is not clear if Government agencies have not developed and made available the required instructional leadership capacities to guide the performance of school principals in instructional leadership. The absence of the performance guide

could result to school principals not aware of the required core capacities they are expected to possess to effectively carry out their instructional leadership responsibilities creditably and in a professional manner. Because of these gaps, this study investigated the instructional leadership capacities required by school principals to improve the academic performance of secondary school students and the current capacity and capacity building needs of school principals in instructional leadership that could be utilized to build their capacities to the expected level. The determination of the correlation between school principal instructional leadership capacity and the academic performance of secondary school students in South Eastern states of Nigeria is the problem this research intends to solve.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The study determined the correlation of instructional leadership capacity of school principals and the academic performance of secondary school students in South Eastern states of Nigeria Specifically, the study achieved the following objectives:

1. Determined the instructional leadership capacities required by school principals to improve the academic performance of secondary school students.
2. Determined the current capacity of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities required to improve the academic performance of students.
3. Determined the capacity building needs of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities required to improve the academic performance of students in examinations.
4. Determined the correlation of instructional leadership capacity of school principals and the academic performance secondary school students in South East Nigeria.

1.3 Significance of Study

The findings of the study will be of great benefit to the following group of persons: educational planners and administrators, school principals, teachers, students, parents and the society at large.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the instructional leadership capacities required by school principals to improve the performance of students in examinations?
2. What are the current capacities of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities required to improve the performance of students in examinations?
3. What are the capacity building needs of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities required to improve the performance students in examinations?
4. What are the correlation between the instructional leadership capacities of school principals and the academic performance secondary school students in South East Nigeria?

Method

2.1 Research design

The study used descriptive survey research design. The design was appropriate because a group of people or item is studied by collecting and analysing data from only a few people considered representative of the entire group (Nworgu, 2006).

2.2 Population of the study

This study was carried out in South East, Nigeria comprising five states of Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo state. These states are mainly Igbo speaking areas of Nigeria. The major occupation of the people from these states are trading and farming. The people are industrious and love education. The choice of this zone for this study was informed by the noticeable indicators of ineffective instructional leadership capacity practices of school principals in secondary schools manifesting in poor performance of students in internal and external examinations, decrease in male enrolment and high rate school dropout. Most of these lapses are attributable to principals' lack of capacity in instructional leadership which negatively affects the instructional capacity of teachers. If the required capacities needed by school principals for effective service delivery are identified and their capacity needs addressed, it will address this situation and sustain the people's interest in education.

The population of the study comprised all the principals and teachers in public secondary schools in South East, Nigeria. Based on 2014 statistical data from the Federal Ministry Education (appendix C), the population was 11, 028 consisting of 1497 principals and 9531 teachers in the South East geopolitical zone. The distribution of principals in the states is stated as follows Abia-231, Anambra-339, Ebonyi-186, Enugu-285 and Imo-456 making a total of 1497 principals while that of teachers is Abia-1638, Anambra-2950, Ebonyi-707, Enugu-1724, and Imo-2512 making a total of 9531 (Federal Ministry of Education Statistics Unit, 2010-2014) (appendix D).

2.3 Sample of the study

The sample of the study was 162 principals and 1076 teachers drawn from the three states of Anambra, Ebonyi and Enugu, South-East, Nigeria. Multi stage, proportionate and random sampling technique was used to select the sample for the study. In the first stage, three states were purposively sampled from the South-east geopolitical zone. The next stage used proportionate sampling technique (20%) to obtain the sample size of 162 principals and 1076 teachers from the three states of Anambra, Ebonyi and Enugu. In the third stage purposive sampling technique was used to select three education zones from each of the sampled three states of Anambra, Ebonyi and Enugu states namely Aguata, Awka, Onitsha for Anambra State; Abakiliki, Afikpo, Onueke for Ebonyi State; and Enugu, Nsukka and Obollo afor education zones for Enugu State respectively. Finally simple random sampling technique, involving balloting without replacement, was used to sample the schools from each state used in the study. The 162 principals and 1076 teachers making a total of 1238 respondents were chosen. The percentage is considered adequate because Mkpa (1997) advocated that when the study population runs into several thousands, a sample of 5 to 30 percent is ideal. 20% is within the range of the author's suggestion and 20% is what the researcher could manage conveniently.

2.4 Instruments for data collection

The Principals' Instructional leadership Capacity Needs Assessment Questionnaire" (PCNAQ) and Students Academic Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ) developed by the researcher from related literature were utilized to collect data for the study. The instrument was divided into two parts, Part 1 and part 2. Part 1 was used to collect information on the personal data of the respondents while Part 2 contains two clusters structured according to the questionnaire. Part 2 was grouped into two clusters A, and B. Cluster A has 16 items, which deals on capacities in instructional leadership capacity and Cluster B has 9 items, which elicits information on the Extent of correlation of Instructional leadership capacities and academic performance of students in examinations..

Cluster A in part 2 has two response categories of required and performance. The required category has four response rating scale options as follows: Highly Required (HR) = 4points, Averagely Required (AR) = 3points, Slightly Required (SR) = 2points and Not Required (NR) = 1point and the performance category also has four response rating scale options as follows: High Performance (HP) = 4points, Average Performance (AP) = 3points, Low Performance (LP) = 2points and No Performance (NP) = 1point.

Cluster B in part 2 has also four response rating scale options as follows: Very Great Extent (VGE) = 4points, Great Extent (GE) = 3points, Low Extent (LE) = 2points and No Extent (NE) = 1point.

2.5 Validation of instrument

The questionnaire was face validated by five research experts, two in the department of Educational Foundations, two in the department of Arts Education and one in Measurement and Evaluation, all from the Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The experts were requested to review and criticize the various items on the instrument in terms of their relevance, appropriateness of language and response patterns as they relate to the study. Their criticisms, suggestions and modifications were incorporated into the relevant items that gave the instrument its final structure and content.

2.6 Reliability of the instrument

Cronbach Alpha method was used to compute the internal consistency reliability of the instrument. The data used for computing the reliability indices were obtained from the questionnaire instrument administered on a random sample of thirty (30) principals and fifty (50) teachers drawn from selected public secondary schools from Edo state. Edo state is outside the area of the study. It was merely used in this study to help establish reliability for the instruments. The researcher recorded the scores of the test for data analysis.

Cronbach alpha formula was used to compute the reliability. The use of Cronbach Alpha method was informed by the fact that the items were polychotomous items like ones developed for this study. The internal consistency, reliability coefficient obtained for the each category of the clusters A and B are indicated as follows: cluster A: Category A = 0.80 and Category B = 0.76 and cluster B = 0.85. The high reliability index indicated that the instrument was reliable.

2.7 Method of data collection

The researcher employed the services of nine research assistants to help administer the instrument by hand to the principals and teachers in the nine education zones at one assistant per zone. The research assistants were students of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka from each of the sampled state. They were instructed on how to distribute and collect back copies of the questionnaires from the respondents in the randomly selected public secondary schools selected from three selected zones of each state used as sample for the study. This method enabled the researcher to record high rate of return of the questionnaire.

2.8 Method of data analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data collected for the study. The mean of any item obtained in this study is interpreted by the use of limits of real numbers. In taking decision on the mean values, the real limit of numbers was used as follows; 3.5 to 4.00 highly Required/performed/Very Great extent; 2.50 to 3.49 averagely required/performed/Great Extent; 1.5 to 2.49 slightly required/low performance/Low Extent; and 0.5 to 1.49 not required/performed/No Extent. The standard deviation was used to determine the closeness or otherwise of the opinion of the respondents from the mean and from one another. Any item with a standard deviation of 1.96 or below indicated that the respondents were close to the mean and therefore valid. Any item with a standard deviation of 1.96 or above indicated that the items were not close to the mean and therefore the item was not valid.

The tool used for data analysis was Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 17.0. The data collected from the respondents were analyzed using mean and Need Gap Index (NGI) was used to answer the research questions 3. The Need Gap Index (NGI) was determined as follows:

- a. The arithmetic Mean of the required category (\bar{X}_r) was calculated for each item
- b. The arithmetic mean of the performance category (\bar{X}_p) was also calculated for each item
- c. The Need Gap Index (NGI) was determined by finding the difference between the arithmetic means of required and performance categories for each item. That is Need Gap Index = $\bar{X}_r - \bar{X}_p$ (Olaitan & Ndoni, 2004). The Need Gap index value indicates whether capacity building is needed or not.

3.0 Results

3.1 Research Question 1

What are the instructional leadership capacities required by school principals for the academic performance of secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria?

The data for answering research question one were presented in table 1.

Table 1: Mean Ratings of the Responses of the School Principals and Teachers on the Instructional Leadership Capacities Required by School Principals for the academic performance secondary school students in examinations.

N = 1228 (162 principals and 1066 teachers).

S/N	Required Capacities in instructional leadership	Principals N = 162		Decision	Teachers N = 1066		Decision
		\bar{X}_p	SD		\bar{X}_t	SD	
1	Assigns teachers with ideas and suggestions that engender effective instructional delivery.	3.74	.35	HR	3.70	.68	HR
2	Assigns teachers to classes according to area of specialization.	3.70	.64	HR	3.66	.54	HR
3	Assigns teachers to classes where they will be most effective.	3.78	.55	HR	3.74	.62	HR
4	Reassigns teachers from time to time depending on need.	3.74	.60	HR	3.70	.38	HR
5	Provides teaching aids and ensuring that they are used.	3.86	.36	HR	3.82	.54	HR
6	Ensures that students are placed in classes where they will maximally benefit.	3.64	.75	HR	3.60	.76	HR
7	Ensures that meaningfully learning is taking place in all the classes.	3.90	.34	HR	3.86	.36	HR
8	Ensures that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach.	3.90	.34	HR	3.82	.54	HR
9	Ensures that teachers teach in a manner that students understand and enjoy their lessons.	3.86	.36	HR	3.82	.54	HR
10	Inspect teacher notes of lessons periodically.	3.50	.77	HR	3.42	.68	AR
11	Observes teachers during class delivery.	3.74	.60	HR	3.70	.64	HR
12	Examine students work to determine quality and quantity of exercises given to them.	3.90	.35	HR	3.86	.36	HR
13	Enforces punctuality to ensure effective learning.	3.74	.62	HR	3.70	.68	HR
14	Enforces regularity to ensure meaningful learning.	3.74	.62	HR	3.70	.68	HR
15	Supervises teachers to ensure discipline and general good behaviour.	3.44	.68	AR	3.40	.60	AR
16	Monitors teachers manner of dressing, talking and relating.	3.80	.36	HR	3.76	.52	HR

key:

\bar{X}_p = Mean responses of school principals, \bar{X}_t = Mean responses of teachers,

\bar{X}_T = Mean responses of both principals and teachers, SD = Standard deviation from the Mean

Decision: HR = Highly Required, AR = Averagely Required

Data in Table 1 revealed that the mean responses of principals on 15 out of the 16 capacities required by school principals in instructional leadership for the academic performance of secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria ranged from 3.50 to 3.90 and one item 3.44 while mean responses of teachers on 14 out of the 16 capacity items required by school principals in instructional leadership for the academic performance of secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria ranged from 3.60 to 3.86 and 2 out of the 16 items 3.40 and 3.42 respectively.

This indicated that school principals in South East, Nigeria think that 15 out of the 16 capacity items were highly required and one item was averagely required in instructional leadership for the academic performance of secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria while teachers were of the opinion that 14 out of the 16 items were highly required and 2 items were averagely required in instructional leadership for the academic performance of secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria .

The sixteen (16) capacity items in instructional leadership for principals and teachers had their standard deviation range from 0.36 to 0.77. This indicated that the respondents were homogenous, not far from the mean and from one another in their responses. This added values to the reliability of the means.

3.2 Research Question 2

What are the performances of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities required for the academic performance secondary school students in examinations in south East, Nigeria

The data for answering research question two were presented in table 2.

Table 2: Mean Ratings of the Scores of Principals and Teachers on the Performance of School Principals in Instructional Leadership Capacities required to enhance the performance of Secondary Schools students in examinations.

S/N	Capacity in instructional leadership management	Principals N = 162		Teachers N = 1066		Decision	Decision
		\bar{X}_p	SD	\bar{X}_t	SD		
1	Assigns teachers with ideas and suggestions that engender effective instructional delivery.	1.90	.71	SP	1.86	.68	SP
	Assigns teachers to classes according to area of specialization.	2.21	.86	SP	2.19	.76	SP
3	Assigns teachers to classes where they will be most effective.	2.00	.94	SP	1.96	.72	SP
4	Reassigns teachers from time to time depending on need.	1.80	.61	SP	1.76	.84	SP
5	Provides teaching aids and ensuring that they are used.	2.04	.91	SP	2.00	.81	SP
6	Ensures that students are placed in classes where they will maximally benefit.	1.80	.61	SP	1.76	.84	SP
7	Ensures that meaningfully learning is taking place in all the classes.	1.68	.62	SP	1.64	.62	SP
8	Ensures that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach.	1.70	.64	SP	1.66	.66	SP
9	Ensures that teachers teach in a manner that students understand and enjoy their lessons.	1.90	.71	SP	1.82	.58	SP
10	Inspect teacher notes of lessons periodically.	2.70	.56	AP	2.66	.69	AP
11	Observes teachers during class delivery.	1.80	.61	SP	1.76	.81	SP
12	Examine students work to determine quality and quantity of exercises given to them.	1.68	.52	SP	1.60	.62	SP
13	Enforces punctuality to ensure effective learning.	2.21	.86	SP	2.19	.72	SP
14	Enforces regularity to ensure meaningful learning.	2.04	.95	SP	2.00	.80	SP
15	Supervises teachers to ensure discipline and general good behaviour.	2.48	.57	SP	2.44	.69	SP
16	Monitors teachers manner of dressing, talking and relating.	1.78	.86	SP	1.70	.64	SP

key: \bar{X}_p = Mean rating of principals, \bar{X}_t = Mean rating of teachers, SD = standard deviation

Decision: AP = Average Performance, SP = Slight Performance and PP = Poor Performance

Data in Table 2 revealed that the mean responses of principals on the performance of school principals on 15 out of the 16 capacities required by school principals in instructional leadership for the academic

performance secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria ranged from 1.68 to 2.48 and one item 2.70 while mean responses of teachers on the performance of school principals on 15 out of the 16 capacity items required by school principals in instructional for the academic performance secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria ranged from 1.60 to 2.44 and one item 2.66.

This indicated that school principals and teachers in South East, Nigeria are of the opinion that the performance of school principals on 15 out of the 16 capacity items were slight capacity on 15 items and average capacity on one item in instructional leadership capacities required for the academic performance secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria.

The sixteen (16) capacity items in instructional leadership for principals and teachers had their standard deviation range from 0.52 to 0.86. This indicated that the respondents were homogenous, not far from the mean and from one another in their responses. This added values to the reliability of the means.

3.3 Research Question 3

Table 3: What are the capacity building needs of school principals in instructional leadership capacities required for the academic performance of secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria?

The data for answering research question three were presented in table 3.

Table 3: Need Gap Analysis of the Mean Ratings of the Responses of the School Principals and Teachers on the Capacity Buildings Needs of School Principals in Instructional leadership capacities required for the academic performance of secondary school students in examination in South East Nigeria.

N = 1228 (162 principals and 1066 teachers).		Need Gap value			
S/N	Capacity in instructional leadership	\bar{X}_r	\bar{X}_p	$\bar{X}_r - \bar{X}_p$	Decision
1	Assigns teachers with ideas and suggestions that will engender effective instructional delivery.	3.72	1.88	1.84	CBN
2	Assigns teachers to classes according to area of specializations	3.68	2.20	1.48	CBN
3	Assigns teachers to classes where they will be most effective.	3.76	1.98	1.78	CBN
4	Reassigns teachers from time to time depending on need.	3.72	1.78	1.94	CBN
5	Provides teaching aids and ensuring that they are used.	3.84	2.02	1.82	CBN
6	Ensures that students are placed in classes where they will maximally benefit.	3.62	1.78	1.84	CBN
7	Ensures that meaningfully learning is taking place in all the classes.	3.88	1.66	2.20	CBN
8	Ensures that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach.	3.86	1.68	2.18	CBN
9	Ensures that teachers teach in a manner that the student understand and enjoy their lessons.	3.84	1.86	1.98	CBN
10	Inspect teachers' notes of lessons periodically.	3.46	2.68	0.72	CBN
11	Observes teachers during class delivery.	3.72	1.78	1.94	CBN
12	Examines students work to determine the quality and quantity of exercises given to them.	3.88	1.64	2.24	CBN
13	Enforces punctuality to ensure effective learning.	3.72	2.20	1.52	CBN
14	Enforces regularity to ensure meaningful learning.	3.72	2.04	1.68	CBN
15	Supervises teachers to ensure discipline and general good behaviour.	3.42	2.46	0.96	CBN
16	Monitors teachers manner of dressing, talking and relating.	3.78	1.74	2.04	CBN

Key: CBN = Capacity Building Needed, \bar{X}_r = Mean of the required capacity
 \bar{X}_p = Mean current capacity/performance, NG = Need Gap index

The data in table 3 revealed that all the 16 capacity items in instructional leadership had their need gap index with grand NGI ranged from 0.72 to 2.24 and were positive. This indicated that the school principals need capacity building in all the 16 capacity items in instructional leadership required for the academic performance of students in examinations in secondary schools South-East, Nigeria.

3.4 Research Question 4

Table 4: To what extent do instructional leadership capacities of school principals affect academic performance of secondary school students in South East secondary schools in Nigeria?

The data for answering research question four were presented in table 4.1 and 4.2 respectively.

Table 4.1: Mean Ratings of the scores of responses of the School Principals and Teachers on the extent instructional leadership Capacities of School Principals affect academic performance of secondary school students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria.

N = 1228 (162 principals and 1066 teachers).

S/N	Capacities in instructional leadership and its affect on academic performance of students in examinations	Principals N = 162		Teachers N = 1066		Decision	\bar{X}_t	SD	Decision
		\bar{X}_p	SD	\bar{X}_t	SD				
1	Assigns teachers with ideas and suggestions that engender effective instructional delivery.	2.00	.94	1.96	.72	LE	1.96	.72	LE
2	Assigns teachers to classes according to area of specialization.	2.21	.86	2.19	.78	LE	2.19	.78	LE
3	Assigns teachers to classes where they will be most effective.	1.80	.61	1.76	.84	LE	1.76	.84	LE
4	Reassigns teachers from time to time depending on need.	2.04	.90	2.00	.80	LE	2.00	.80	LE
5	Provides teaching aids and ensuring that they are used.	2.14	.94	2.10	.59	LE	2.10	.59	LE
6	Ensures that students are placed in classes where they will maximally benefit.	2.68	.69	2.64	.45	GE	2.64	.45	GE
7	Ensures that meaningfully learning is taking place in all the classes.	2.28	.93	2.22	.59	LE	2.22	.59	LE
8	Ensures that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach.	2.98	.72	2.70	.80	GE	2.70	.80	GE
9	Ensures that teachers teach in a manner that students understand and enjoy their lessons.	3.10	.34	3.06	.36	GE	3.06	.36	GE
10	Inspect teacher notes of lessons periodically.	2.28	.94	2.20	.45	LE	2.20	.45	LE
11	Observes teachers during class delivery.	2.10	.56	2.06	.52	LE	2.06	.52	LE
12	Examine students work to determine quality and quantity of exercises given to them.	3.10	.68	2.96	.65	GE	2.96	.65	GE
13	Enforces punctuality to ensure effective learning.	2.54	.69	2.40	.68	GE	2.40	.68	LE
14	Enforces regularity to ensure meaningful learning.	2.88	.94	2.84	.60	GE	2.84	.60	GE
15	Supervises teachers to ensure discipline and general good behaviour.	1.68	.62	1.64	.62	LE	1.64	.62	LE
16	Monitors teachers manner of dressing, talking and relating.	1.74	.86	1.70	.68	LE	1.70	.68	LE

key:

\bar{X}_p = Mean responses of school principals, \bar{X}_t = Mean responses of teachers,

SD = Standard deviation from the Mean

Decision: GE = Great Extent, LE = Low extent

Data in Table 4.1 revealed that the mean responses of principals on 10 out of the 16 capacities items on the extent instructional leadership capacities of school principals affect academic performance of secondary school students in examinations in south East Nigeria ranged from 1.68 to 2.28 and their mean responses on 6 capacity items ranged from 2.54 to 3.10 while mean responses of teachers on 11 out of the 16 capacity items ranged from 1.64 to 2.40 and in 5 out of the 16 capacity items their mean responses ranged from 2.64 and 3.06.

This indicated that school principals in South East, Nigeria think that 10 out of the 16 instructional leadership capacities affect the academic performance secondary school student in secondary schools to a low extent and 6 instructional leadership capacities to great extent affect the academic performance of secondary school students while teachers were of the opinion 11 out of the 16 capacity items to a low extent affect the academic performance students while 5 capacities to a great extent affect the academic performance of students.

The sixteen (16) capacity items in instructional leadership for principals and teachers had their standard deviation range from 0.36 to 0.77. This indicated that the respondents were homogenous, not far from the mean and from one another in their responses. This added values to the reliability of the means

Table 4.2: Correlation Analysis showing the relationship between responses of the School Principals and Teachers on the instructional leadership Capacities of School Principals and its affect on the academic performance of secondary school students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria

N = 1228 (162 principals and 1066 teachers).

S/N	Required Capacities in instructional leadership management	Σx	Σy	Σx^2	Σy^2	Σxy	r	Dec
1	Assigns teachers with ideas and suggestions that engender effective instructional delivery.	2228	3456	4228	9912	6456	1	significant
2	Assigns teachers to classes according to area of specialization.	2956	3056	7412	7912	7368	0.038	significant
3	Assigns teachers to classes where they will be most effective.	2228	3474	4128	10452	6528	0.97	significant
4	Reassigns teachers from time to time depending on need.	2028	2128	3628	3928	3628	0.439	significant
5	Provides teaching aids and ensuring that they are used.	2506	2328	5162	4528	4784	0.448	significant
6	Ensures that students are placed in classes where they will maximally benefit.	2128	2656	3928	5912	4712	0.545	significant
7	Ensures that meaningfully learning is taking place in all the classes.	2446	2459	4882	4927	4903	0.92	Significant
8	Ensures that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach.	2469	3656	4977	10912	7368	0.922	significant
9	Ensures that teachers teach in a manner that students understand and enjoy their lessons.	2278	4378	3460	9952	6488	0.395	significant
10	Inspect teacher notes of lessons periodically.	2506	2328	5162	4528	4784	0.448	significant
11	Observes teachers during class delivery.	2128	2656	3928	5912	4712	0.55	significant
12	Examine students work to determine quality and quantity of exercises given to them.	2446	2459	4882	4927	4903	0.92	significant
13	Enforces punctuality to ensure effective learning.	2469	3656	4977	10912	7368	0.922	significant
14	Enforces regularity to ensure meaningful learning.	2446	2459	4882	4927	4903	0.92	significant
15	Supervises teachers to ensure discipline and general good behaviour.	2956	3056	7412	7912	7368	0.042	significant
16	Monitors teachers manner of dressing, talking and relating.	2278	4378	3460	9952	6488	0.395	significant

KEY:

X stands for principals and teachers ratings on instructional leadership capacities of school principals in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria.

Y stands for principals and teachers ratings on the extent instructional leadership capacities of school principals affect academic performance of secondary school students

$\sum xy$ = sum of products of X and Y. That is, multiply the corresponding values of X and Y and sum these products.

$\sum x$ and $\sum y$ are sums of the X and Y scores respectively.

$\sum x^2$ = Sum of all the squared X scores.

$\sum y^2$ = Sum of all the squared Y scores.

$(\sum x)^2$ = Sum of all X scores, this sum squared.

$(\sum y)^2$ = Sum of all Y scores, this sum squared.

Data presented in table 4.2 shows the result size of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis (r) on the relationship between the instructional leadership capacities and the academic performance of secondary school students in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria in 2 out of 16 capacity items are 0.038 and 0.042 respectively while the size of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) for 7 out of 16 capacity items ranged from 0.395 to 0.55 and the size of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) for 7 out of 16 capacity items ranged from 0.92 to +1.

The value of 0.0395 and 0.042 is low indicating low relationships exist between instructional leadership capacities in items 2 and 15 respectively. The r values of 0.395 to 0.55 are moderate, therefore, it indicates that moderate relationships exist between instructional leadership capacities in items 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11 and 16 and academic performance of students in examinations while the values of r for items 1, 3, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 14 ranged from 0.92 to +1 indicating that the magnitude of the relationship in the 7 capacity items are high. This shows that high relationships exist between the instructional leadership capacities in items 1, 3, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 14 and academic performance of students in examinations in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria.

The positive sign of the correlation coefficients in all the values show the instructional leadership capacities are positively related to the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria.

3.5 Major Findings

The following findings emerged from the study based on the research questions.

1. School Principals and Teachers agree that School Principals in secondary schools in South East Nigeria highly require instructional leadership capacities for the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria.
2. It was found out from the respondents that School Principals and Teachers agree that the current capacity of school principals or the performance of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities for the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria were slight capacity or low performance.
3. It was found out from the respondents that School Principals and Teachers agree that School Principals needed capacity building in instructional leadership capacities for the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria.
4. It was found out from the respondents that School Principals and Teachers agree that instructional leadership capacities of the school principals to a great extent affect the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria.
5. It was found out from the respondents that School Principals and Teachers agree that the instructional leadership capacities of the school principals are positively related to the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria.

4.0 Discussion

The findings of this study were discussed in line with the following sub-headings as contained in the purposes of the study and research questions.

4.1 Instructional leadership capacities required for the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria:

The result of the study indicated that instructional leadership capacities were highly required for the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria especially in areas of how to assign teachers with ideas and suggestions for effective instructional delivery, provision of teaching aids and ensure that they are used, supervision of teachers to ensure discipline, good behaviour and ensure that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach, among others.

The findings of the study are in conformity with the views Oredein (2006) who did a survey study on indicators of effective principals instructional leadership in Edo state. He found out that school principals require the following instructional leadership competencies: principals' ability to monitor teachers' curriculum implementation, lesson planning and delivery. The findings are in agreement with the findings of Muozoba (2005) who identified the following instructional leadership competencies are required by principals: effective time table planning, guiding teachers to select what to teach, providing instructional materials and ensuring effective time table planning.

The findings are also in conformity with the views of Blase and Blase (2000) who identified seven principal behaviours or capacities in instructional leadership required to provide curricular direction, inspiration, motivation, mentorship and instructional support to achieve the goals of the school as follows: making suggestions, giving feedback, modelling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities and giving praise for effective teaching. The findings of the study agree with the view of Hoy and Miskel (2005) that school principals' instructional leadership capacities are essential factors for schools' principals' effectiveness to support teachers achieve effective instructional delivery, solve problems and implement decisions that help students learn.

4.2 Performance of school principals in the instructional leadership capacities required for academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria

The study found out that school principals perform poorly in the instructional leadership capacities required for the academic performance of students in secondary schools especially in the areas of the capacity to assigns teachers to classes where they will be most effective and with ideas and suggestions that will engender effective instructional delivery, identify staff and students needs, determination of standard teaching load, among others.

The results of this study agreed with the findings of Ugwu (2007) who concluded that school principals perform poorly in providing for the needs of teachers and do not motivate teachers good enough to take their work seriously. He found out that teachers do not attend classes regularly, do not mark and return students' assignment books to students on time, not use teaching aids, among others. It agreed with the findings of the present study that principals lack capacity to ensure that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach and this negatively impact on the academic performance of students.

The findings of this study agree with view of Arikewuyo (2009) who observed that many principals lack supervision and instructional leadership skills to help teachers be more knowledgeable in their field. Poor performance of school principals is due to inadequate capacity especially in teaching and pedagogy capacities and observational skills in supervising school activities. He concluded that principals were incompetent in instructional supervision because they lacked supervisory competencies. The findings of the study are in conformity with views of Oni (2009) who stated that principals lack modern pedagogical and instructional skills and were instead characterised by routine out-dated practices.

4.3 Capacity building needs of School Principals in instructional leadership for the academic performance of students in Secondary Schools in South East Nigeria

The result of the study on the capacity building needs of school principals in instructional leadership (table 3) indicated that school principals needed capacity building in all the instructional leadership capacities for the academic performance of students in secondary schools. The instructional leadership capacities school principals need capacity building are how to: assign teachers to classes according to area of specialization and where they will be most effective, reassign teachers from time to time depending on need, provide teaching aids and ensuring that they are used, ensure that students are placed in classes where they will maximally benefit, ensure that meaningful learning is taking place in all the classes, ensure that teachers are teaching what they are supposed to teach, ensure that teachers teach in a manner that the student understand and enjoy their lessons, among others.

The findings of the study are in conformity with the findings of Adasu (2009) in a study on competency improvement needs of instructors in teaching soil conservation tillage practice to students in schools of agriculture in Kogi State. The author found out that instructors needed improvement in 25 competencies in soil conservation tillage practices. They recommended that the instructors required improvement before they can be effective in teaching student soil conservation tillage operation to current standard.

This is also in line with UBEC document (2007) who stated that effective instructional leadership depends on how well teachers are guided to translate curriculum materials into meaningful classroom experiences. It is also in line Muozoba (2005) views that school principals' need capacity building in instructional leadership especially in ensuring that teachers are teaching what they are employed to teach. The views of the above authors help to increase the reliability of the findings on the capacity building needs of school principals in instructional leadership management for the effective implementation of the UBE programme.

5.0 Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussions of the study, the following conclusions were made:

Principals of secondary schools in South East Nigeria highly require capacity building in instructional leadership. The required instructional leadership capacities will enhance the school principals instructional job performance and support to teachers to achieve effective teaching and learning in secondary schools.

In South East Nigeria, both Principals and Teachers agreed that incidences of instructional leadership capacity deficiencies were observed. Principals are deficient in majority of the capacities required in instructional leadership based on performance need gap analysis of the study. The capacity deficiencies are likely to have negative effects on the academic performance of secondary school students, the situation if not addressed, will result to continued poor performance of students in internal and external examination in secondary schools.

The study determined the correlation between the instructional leadership capacities and the academic performance of students in public secondary schools in South East Nigeria. The study found out the instructional leadership capacities are positively related to the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East, Nigeria. The instructional leadership capacities have a significant positive relationship with the academic performance of students in secondary schools in South East Nigeria. Therefore improvement in the instructional leadership capacities of the school principals will greatly improve the academic performance of students in internal and external examinations in secondary schools in South East Nigeria.

5.1 Educational implications of the study

The findings of the study have some educational implications for principals of secondary schools, people and governments of Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, Abia and Imo and her agencies in charge of school administration.

If the findings of the study on the capacities required by school principals in instructional leadership to enhance academic performance of students in examinations in secondary schools in South East Nigeria are made available to principals, they could utilize it to improve their capacities for instructional effectiveness. The principals could also become aware of their deficiencies in areas of instructional leadership and so make themselves available for re-training programmes through workshop or in-service training in Universities in order to update their knowledge and equip themselves professionally and technically to effectively perform their instructional duties.

There will be general hindrance on educational development in Nigeria with particular reference to the South Eastern States if capacity building needs of school principals for effective instructional delivery is not taken seriously. This is because secondary education is the foundation upon which other levels are built. Besides, capacity building of the school principal will improve them professionally, academically and technically. If the State governments of the five eastern states through their School administrators can organize capacity building programme for the improvement of the capacities of the school principals, there will be improvement in the instructional leadership performance of the school principals which in turn will improve their instructional effectiveness and support to teachers and the academic performance of teachers.

5.2 Limitations of the Study

The outcome of this study was entirely on the opinion of the secondary school principals and teachers in the South-East States. It would have been necessary to include the opinion of others like supervisors of secondary schools in the South-East, Nigeria who were once principals and were usually affected in one way or the other by the instructional leadership competencies of principals. In this way, the supervisors will be able to give their opinion on the capacities they think principals should require, their capacity building needs for improved academic performance of students in examinations.

It would have been necessary to also include the opinion of secondary school students who are the direct beneficiary of the instructional leadership practices and capacities of the school principals. In this way, the students will give their opinion on the capacities they think principals should require and their capacity building needs for improved academic performance of students. In this way, the information given by the principals and teachers should have been more properly verified.

REFERENCES

- Adasu, D. K. (2009). Correlates of effective principalship in Dekina education zone of Kogi State. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University (ABU).
- Adebanjo, M. A. (2012). Impact assessment of primary education project II on primary schools enrichment in South West, Nigeria. A paper presented during the seventh regional conference on higher globalized world, organized by HERPNET, at University of Ibadan, Nigeria. September 17 – 21
- Adenipekun, O. (2007). Tertiary institutions must be funded. Vanguard News January 16, 2007
- Adeyemi, T O. (2009). The effective management of primary schools in Ekiti state, Nigeria; An analytical assessment. Educational Research and Review vol. 4 (2), pp. 048-056, February 2009. Available online at <http://www.academicjournals.org/ERR>
- Adeyemi, T.O. (2012), Renovation and renewal of basic education in Nigeria since independence. Ibadan Nigeria
- Afolabi, F. O. & Loto, A. R (2008). The head teachers and quality control in primary education through effective intra school supervision in Nigeria. Journal of Teachers Perspectives, 3(2), 4 - 15

- Aguba, C. R (2009). Educational administration and management; Issues and perspectives, Enugu Ton and Tons PDS
- Aitken, Judith E. (2002). The Professional leadership of secondary schools education review office: no. 4 New Zealand winter.
- Ajayi, I. A (2007). Issues in school management. Lagos: Bolabay publications..
- Aluede, (2006). Universal basic education in Nigeria; matters arising. Total publishers ltd, Owerri.
- Arikewuyo, M. O (2004). “Democracy and university education in Nigeria: some consideration, higher education management and policy”, *Journal of the organization for economic co-operation and development*, 16: 121-134.
- Arikewuyo, M.O (2008). “University management and staff unions in Nigeria: Issues and challenges”, *SA-eDUC Journal*, Vol 3, No 1, pp 15-20.
- Arikewuyo, M. Olalekan (2009). Professional training of secondary school principals in Nigeria: A neglected area in the educational system. *Florid journal of educational administration and policy*; Summer 2009, vol. 2, issue 2.
- Arongi, F, E & Ogbadu, E (2010). Major causes of decline in quality of education in Nigeria from administrative perspective: A case study of Dekina local Government Area. *Journal of Canadian Social Sciences*. 6(3), 40 – 55.
- Asiabaka, I. P. (2006). The need for effective facility management in schools in Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Educational Foundations, Imo state University, Owerri.
- Ayeni, J.A. (2012). Achieving quality and standards in the management of Nigerian secondary schools; Policy goals, current practice, trends, challenges and opportunities. *International journal of research studies in management*, 1(2),37-45. Dio; 10.5861/ijrsm.2012.xli2.46. retrieved September 10, 2014.
- Barbara, W. (2011). Six important management skills for successful leadership. <http://enzine.Articlescom/?expert-Barbarawhite>. Retrieved June 2014
- Blasé, J & Blasé, J. (2004). Empowering teachers (2nd ed). California; Corwin press.
- Botar, E. M. (2014). Perceived administrative tasks as determinants of job performance by indigenous football coaches in FCT, Abuja. Unpublished master of education degree, Department of Health and Physical Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Bush, T. (2008). From management to leadership, Semantic or meaningful change? *Educational management administration & leadership*, 36(2), 271 – 288.
- Bush, T. (2008). Leadership and management development in education. Los Angeles: Sage publications.
- Chapman, J.D. (2005). Recruitment, retention, and development of school principal. Paris: France. The international institute for educational planning.
- Cheng, Y. C.(2003). School Leadership and three waves of educational reforms; *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 33, no. 3 November.
- Dareh, S. (2002). What it means to be a principal: Your guide to leadership. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic publishers.
- Devita, Christene M. (2007). Common elements of highly effective school principal training and development programme. The Wallace foundation school leadership study, Stanford University.

- DuBrin, A. I. (2012). *Essentials of management*. Mason, OH; Cengage South Western
- Dufour, R. (2002). The Learning – centered principal. *Educational Leadership* 59 (8), 12 - 15
- Federal Ministry of Education, (2005). *Nigeria education, sector diagnosis Education Sector Analysis Unit*.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2013) *National policy on education (5th ed.)*. Abuja: NERDC press
- Federal Ministry of Education (2009). *Education sector situation analysis, “ Draft 4”*. Abuja. NERCD Press.
- Fullan, M. (2008), *The six secrets of change*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons
- Glickman, C. D (2010). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A developmental approach, (5th ed)*. Toronto Alkyn and Brown
- Fullan, M., Hill, P., & Crevola, C., (2006). *Breakthrough*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gupton, S. L. (2003). *The instructional leadership toolbox; A handbook for improving practice*. California; Corwin. Retrieved august 12, 2012.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable Leadership*. San Francisco, CA : Jossey Bass.
- Harris, B. (2002). A Strategy for identifying the professional development needs of teachers. A report from New South Wales. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 26, 25—47.
- Hoy & Miskel (2005). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (7th ed.)*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Huber, S.G., & Pashiardis, P. (2008). *The recruitment and selection of school leaders*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- Igwe, S. O. (2007). The Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme in Nigeria. Challenges and Prospects in Fagbaniye, E. O, Babalola, J. B, Fabumni, M and Ayeni, A. O. (Eds), *Management of Primary and Secondary Education in Nigeria*. Ibadan: NAEAP
- Khan, H. (2004). Better school management in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan: The role of head teacher. In M. Kandasamay & L.Blaton (Eds.), *School Principals: Core actors in educational improvement, an analysis of seven Asian countries (pp.59-113)*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Kelley, P., Thornton, S. & Daugherty, W. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, 126(1), 17-25.
- Lahua-Ako, (2001). *The instructional leadership behavior of Paupa. New Guinea high school principals*. Lagos; Machmillian Nigerian publishers Ltd
- Lambert, L. (2005). What Does Leadership Capacity Really Mean? *Journal of staff Development* spring.
- Lee, D.M. (2008). *Essential skills for potential school administrators: A case of one Saskatchewan urban school division*. (Unpublished Master’s Thesis). University of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan.
- Litman, T (2012). *Planning principles and practices*. <http://www.vtppi.org/access> pdf. Date accessed May 4, 2017.
- Lumenburg, F. C. (2010). The principal and the school. What do principals do? *National forum of educational administration and supervision journal*, 2012

MacBeath, J., Oduro, G., & Waterhouse, J., (2004). *Distributed Leadership in Action: Full Report*. Retrieved December 12, 2011 from Cambridge University, National College for School Leadership. Web site: <http://www.nsl.org.uk>.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology*. (2nd ed) Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.

Mestry, R., & Grobler, B. R. (2004). The training and development of principals to manage schools effectively using the competence approach: *Education for Change*. 7 (2) 126 - 146.

Martin-Kniep, G., (2004). *Developing learning communities through teacher expertise*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Mouzoba, E. F. (2005). Administrative competency needs of principals for UBE administration at JSS level in FCT Abuja. Unpublished M.ED Thesis. Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Nakpodia, E. O. (2010). Teachers' disciplinary approaches to students' discipline problem in Nigerian secondary schools. <http://www.academicjournal.o-a/ingol/pdf2010/nakpodiapdf>.

National Association of Elementary School Principals, (2001). *Leading learning communities; Standards for what principals should know and be able to do*. Alexandria, Virginia.

Nkado, N. C. (2010). Capacity building needs of secondary school principals in human resource management in Borno state. Unpublished Ph. D thesis, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.