The Impact of Principal Leadership Styles on Instructional Supervision of Secondary Schools in Oyo North Senatorial District, Oyo State, Nigeria

Monsuru Babatunde Muraina[1]
Muraina Kamilu Olanrewaju[2]

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of principal leadership styles on instructional supervision of secondary schools in Oyo North Senatorial district Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. Descriptive research design of ex-post-facto was used in the study. Four hundred twenty (420) respondents were selected from twenty (20) secondary schools (i.e, 400 teachers and 20 principals). The respondents were measured with relevant self developed questionnaire and the data obtained was analyzed using the linear regression statistical analysis of the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). Three research Questions were raised and answered in the study. The result showed that there was significant effect of democratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision ($Df (1, 98) = 45.44$, $P<0.05$), there was significant effect of autocratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision ($Df (1, 98) = 27.60$, $P<0.05$) and there was significant effect of laissez-faire leadership style on principals' instructional supervision ($Df (1, 98) = 87.45$, $P<0.05$). In view of these findings, the study stressed and advocated that the school principals should ensure effective and efficient leadership styles in the giving of instructions to the teachers and students.

Suggested Citation:

Nijerya'nın Oyo Bölgesi Orta Dereceli Okullarında Görev Yapan Müdürlerin Liderlik Tarzının Öğretimsel Denetimleri Üzerindeki Etkisi

Monsuru Babatunde Muraina[1]
Muraina Kamilu Olanrewaju[2]

Özet:

Bu çalışmanın amacı Nijerya'nın Oyo bölgesindeki ortaokulların öğretimsel denetiminin müdürün liderlik stilinden etkilenip etkilenmediğini ortaya koymaktır. Çalışma tanımlayıcı araştırma deseni kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada 20 okuldan 400 öğretmen ve 20 müdürden yanıtlar alınmıştır. Araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen anket ile veri toplanmış ve lineer regresyonla analiz edilmiştir. Üç soruya yanıt aranmıştır. Sonuçlara göre, demokratik, otokratik ve serbest bırakıcı liderlik stilleri müdürün öğretimsel denetimi üzerinde anlamlı bir etkide bulunmaktadır. Bulgulara göre müdürler etkili bir liderlik göstermek suretiyle okuldaki öğretimi olumluya dönüştürebilirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretimsel denetim, Müdür liderlik stilleri, Otokratik liderlik, demokratik liderlik, Serbest bırakıcı liderlik

Önerilen Atıf:

Muraina, M. B. & Olanrewaju, M. K. (2016). Nijerya'nın Oyo Bölgesi Orta Dereceli Okullarında Görev Yapan Müdürlerin Liderlik Tarzının Öğretimsel Denetimleri Üzerindeki Etkisi, E-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 7(2), 76-90. **DOI:**10.19160/e-ijer.31285

GENIŞLETILMIŞ ÖZET

Problem:

Bir müdürün denetim tarzı genellikle müdür ve öğretmen arasındaki etkileşimi etkiler. Sergiovanni ve Starratt (1988)'a göre müdürün öğretmen hakkındaki değer ve duyguları, liderlik stili, öz güveni onun denetim stilini etkilemektedir. Bu tarz ilgili bağlam ve taraflara bağlı olarak da değişebilir. Müdür ve öğretmen, işbirlikli yaklaşımı kapsamında, müdürün dolaylı öğretmenin doğrudan aktif olduğu bir plan dahilinde birlikte çalışabilirler. Öğretmen denetlenmediği zaman, okulda öğretim etkinliği tehlikeye girmektedir. Bunlar öğretmenlerin bazılarının iş performansı ile öğrencilerin akademik başarılarının zayıflamasına yol açmaktadır. İşte bu çalışmanın amacı Nijerya'nın Oyo bölgesindeki orta dereceli okullarda müdür tarafından gerçekleştirilen öğretimsel denetiminin müdürün liderlik stilinden etkilenip etkilenmediğini ortaya koymaktır. Çalışmanın yanıt aradığı temel soru: "Okul müdürünün otokratik, demokratik ve serbest bırakıcı liderlik tarzları müdürün gerçekleştirdiği öğretimsel denetimi etkilemekte midir?" şeklinde ifade edilebilir.

Yöntem:

Çalışma tanımlayıcı araştırma deseni kullanılmıştır. Kerlinger (2012)'e göre bu desen bağımsız değişkenlerin bağımlı değişkenler üzerindeki etkilerinin araştırmılmasında kullanılabilir bir desendir. Araştırmanın evreni Oyo'daki özel ve devlet okullarının tümüdür. Örneklemi ise 20 okuldan 400 öğretmen ve 20 müdür olmak üzere 420 yanıtlayıcıdır. Bu oran evrenin %75'ne tekabül etmektedir. Veriler, araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen "Öğretimsel Denetim üzerinde Müdürün Liderlik Tarzının Etkisi Anketi" isimli bir öz değerlendirme anketi ile toplanmıştır. Anket A ve B bölümü şeklinde iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. A bölümünde yanıtlayıcıların demografik özellikleri saptayan ve B bölümünde ise liderlik stillerinin denetim üzerindeki etkisini ölçen maddeler bulunmaktadır. Araştırmacı geçerlilik için alanyazın ve uzman bilgilerine başvurmuş güvenirlik için de Cronbach Alpha'ya bakmıştır. Anketin güvenirliği 0.78 olarak bulunmuştur. Veriler okul yönetimlerinden alınan destekle aynı gün içinde anketlerin cevaplanmasıyla toplanmıştır. Toplana verilere lineer regresyonla analiz edilmiştir.

Bulgular:

Araştırma sonucunda elde edilen bulgulara göre müdürün öğretimsel denetimini en fazla etkileyen liderlik tarzı "demokratik liderlik"olarak (Df (1, 98) = 45.44, P<0.05, bulunmuştur. Onun sonrasında "otokratik liderlik" stilinin de müdürün öğretimsel denetimini etkilediği (Df (1, 98) = 27.60, P<0.05) tespiti yapılmıştır. Diğer yandan en sonra olmak üzere" serbest bırakıcı liderlik" biçeminin (stilinin, tarzının) de (Df (1, 98) = 87.45, P<0.05) müdürün öğretimsel denetimini etkilediği ortaya çıkmıştır.

Sonuç ve Öneriler:

Bulgulara göre müdürler etkili bir liderlik göstermek suretiyle okuldaki öğretimi olumluya dönüştürebilirler. Bunun için müdürlerin bu konuda eğitimden geçirilmelerine ve okul çalışanlarının da bu süreçte yardımcı olabilecek özellikte olmalarına ihtiyaç olduğu açıktır.

INTRODUCTION

Educational Management involves efficient management of available resources, for conducive learning condition and motivation of teachers, and supervision of instruction so as to stimulate and improve the professional growth of teachers. Principals of schools are a visible entity in secondary school system providing active support to teachers. However, the responsibility of monitoring the behaviour of teachers, in relation to their designed teaching responsibility has not been pursued vigorously (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). The general feeling is that principals are not responding to their instructional task.

Currently, most principals neglected their duty as educational supervisors but concentrated on managing and administering schools, instead. This objective could not possibly be achieved unless the principals systematically supervise and make it a top priority to do so. For example an art graduate principals trying to observe a science teacher. Researchers have discerned a number of school leadership patterns or styles, which include: exploitive authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participative. In exploitive authoritative style, the leader has low concern for people and uses such methods as threats and punishments to achieve conformance. When an authoritative leader becomes concerned for people, a benevolent authoritative leader emerges.

The leader now uses rewards to encourage appropriate performance and listens more to concerns, although what he/she hears is often limited to what subordinates think that the leader wants to hear. In consultative style, the leader is making genuine efforts to listen carefully to ideas; nevertheless, major decisions are still largely centrally made. At the participative level, the leader engages people in decision-making; people across the organization are psychologically closer and work well together at all levels. Another set of school leadership styles was coined by Burns (1978) transactional leadership and laissez faire leadership styles. These two styles have dominated scholarly debate as the major conceptual models of school leadership since the early 1980s (Hallinger, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003). Along with passive/avoidant leadership, transactional and transformational leadership form a new paradigm for understanding both the lower and higher order efforts of leadership styles. This paradigm builds on earlier sets of autocratic versus democratic or directive versus participative leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Wan (2003) stressed that supervision is one of the management function and one of the most important component in curriculum process. Mohd (1998) explained that teaching supervision has been an important aspect in school management and administration. Its purpose is to improve teaching and learning quality among teachers and thus improving the overall quality of teaching in schools. Nevertheless, the principals faced some hindrances.

These problems stemmed up not only from the teachers side but also from the principals themselves. Some of the principals were reluctant to observe on the pretext that they did not receive any instruction from the Ministry of Education

through the National Union of Teaching Profession (NUTP). The NUTP is of the opinion that teachers are professionals, therefore they have the liberty to carry out their duty and are not supposed to be observed and guided all the time. Teachers and principals agreed that supervision will erode teachers' credibility and students' confidence in those teachers. Furthermore the practice will in the long run tarnish the teachers' image in the students' eyes. Moreover, teachers are sceptical of principals' ability and qualification and objectivity in teaching supervision. At the end of the day, the concerned teachers are vulnerable to principals' indiscriminate comments and personal judgment. Mohd (2008) stated that normally principals are very busy due to tight schedule for attending meeting and briefing at department, district and national levels. Some principals delegated the supervision responsibility to senior assistants. Hence, many problems crops up and much of the problems surrounding the area of study are still unexplained.

In essence then, the educational supervisors assist the school by providing opportunities for the ability and talents of individuals to make their contribution. It is within the school organization, that teachers can experience success in teaching, show respect for fellow professionals as a sense of belonging, experience a sense of being needed, take advantage of the opportunity to cooperate, utilize the chance to grow and develop personally and professionally, and creating a conducive environment that is manifested in his being productive on essential work. Andrew and Soder (2008), after studying the relationship between principal leadership and instructional supervision, found that principals do have an effect on academic performance of students, especially low-achieving students. After conducting a meta-analysis of 69 studies involving 2,802 schools over more than three decades of research on the effects that leadership practices had on student achievement, Waters, Marzano, & McNulty (2005) found a substantial relationship between leadership and instructional supervision. Based on the aforementioned research, there appears to be a connection between successful schools and effective school leadership.

Research confirms that effective leadership by school principals' increases instructional supervision and that successful schools have a clear sense of direction and are supported by principals who are effective instructional leaders (Hessel & Holloway, 2002; DeFranco & Golden, 2003; Marzano, 2003; Waters, Marzano, & McNultry, 2003). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) (2002) provides a framework that can guide a principal in creating a school environment in which all students can be successful. ISLLC was formed in 1994 in United Kingdom and is made up of many of the major stake holders in educational leadership, which include 30 states and numerous professional associations. ISLLC set out to create a framework that would redefine school leadership and provide strategies for improving educational leadership. ISLLC examined three areas when developing the standards.

Researchers have examined gender and transformational leadership from a variety of perspectives. Carless (2008) and Druskat (2010) suggested that transformational leadership may be a more feminine style of leading, but Komives (1991) found no significant differences between female and male managers' self-ratings of

transformational leadership traits, except for intellectual stimulation, an area in which men rated themselves significantly higher than women did. Men attributed their use of power and direct styles to transformational leadership, whereas women attributed their use of relational styles to transformational leadership (Komives, 1991). Hackman, Furniss, Hills and Paterson (1992) found a significant, positive correlation between perceived gender characteristics and some transformational leader behaviors.

The general assumption is that the presence or absence of effective school leaders, positive school climates, and positive attitudes of teachers can, directly or indirectly, influence school performance and student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Kruger, Witziers, & Sleegers, 2007; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004; Witziers, Bosker, & Kruger, 2003). While the equation of effective school leadership and improved school performance appears to be relatively simple and straightforward in theory, in practice it is complex and unpredictable. Cotton (2003) argues that while it is evident that a fundamental connection between the principal's leadership style and school performance in terms of student achievement exists, research on this relationship begins and ends with that concept. Harris (2004) and Storey (2004) add that although the leadership field is replete with often largely descriptive studies of effective leadership, these studies have rarely tracked or explored, with sufficient rigor, the relationship between leadership and school performance.

Harris (2004) states that we do not know, for example, exactly what forms of leadership result in (high performing) schools, across different school contexts, and in different types of schools. We do not know what particular combination of experience, training, and professional development most benefits leaders wishing to improve their schools. Of most concern is the fact that we have very few studies that have explored the relationship between leadership and instructional supervision in any depth. The correlational nature of the research evidence that does exist inevitably masks the exact patterning and nature of the relationship between leadership and enhanced student learning.

Robbins & DeCenzo 2001) concur that the laissez-faire leader generally allows employees complete freedom to decide and complete work in whatever way they deem fit, while this leader provides material for use and answers questions. The laissez-faire leadership style calls for a minimum of direction and control from the leader and maximum freedom of the workers. All authority is given to the employees and they must determine goals, make decisions and resolve problems on their own. It is not an absence of leadership but lack of leadership control. It is a free rein style. The laissez-faire leadership style has several advantages. First, as the leader believes in faith and trust, individuals become more responsible. They are motivated to work and have maximum freedom of activity. It is non-interference in the affairs of others style of leadership. This style is used when workers are able to analyse the situation and determine what needs to be done and how to do it.

Allais (1995) explains that team leadership style deal with the condition in which a leader integrates concern for production with concern for people at a high level.

Team-work is emphasized and it is goal-oriented. It also strives for high quality by means of participative management, people involvement and conflict resolution. Schilbach as cited by Allais (1995) indicates that the democratic style is most likely to be successful, but it is clear that different leadership styles will be effective in different situations. Grossman & Ross (1991) and Allais (1995) see dictatorship as a style in which a leader retains as much power and decision making authority as possible. A dictator is autocratic. He neither consults people nor allows them to make an input. He expects people to obey his orders without even giving an explanation. A dictator makes people work under the motivation environment of structured set or rewards and punishment (Northwest Leadership 2002). However, the dictatorship leadership style has advantages and disadvantages. The first advantage of the dictatorship leadership style is that it can be used where there is pressure of time. In times of crises or emergencies, decision-making is faster when only one person is involved in the process. In situations like these, there is limited time to consult people and call for their participation to make decisions. Second, the dictatorship leadership style is appropriate when the leader is training others who are new and untrained at the job to make decisions. New or untrained workers usually do not know which procedure to follow. The leader is a coach. He is competent and the employees are motivated to learn new skills. The leader closely supervises the new employees, leading through detailed orders and instructions (Northwest Leadership 2002).

Principal's role as an instructional leader in effective schools has been discussed by scholars for more than 40 years. Since Bridges' conceptualization of the "instructional leadership" in 1967, educational leadership scholars have tried to show the relationship between instructional leadership and effective schools (Edmonds, 2009; Bossert, 2012). These studies suggested that strong instructional leadership from the principal was a hallmark of effective urban elementary schools in the USA (Hallinger, 2010). According to Lezotte (1991), effective schools have some correlates including clear school mission, high expectations for success, instructional leadership, opportunity to learn and time on task, safe and orderly environment, positive home-school relations, and frequent monitoring of student progress. Despite such suggestion, factors of the effective instructional leadership had not been clearly defined until scholars revealed the basic dimensions of the instructional leadership (Blumberg & Greenfield 1980; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985; Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

A principal's supervisory style often affects the interaction between the principal and the teacher. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) note that a principal's values, feelings about the competency of the teacher, leadership style, and self - confidence in uncertain situations help to determine his or her supervisory style for a given situation. That style can change depending on the context and parties involved. The teacher and principal work together to create a plan when the principal uses a collaborative approach, when a principal uses a nondirective approach, the teacher determines how to proceed. When principal do not supervise teacher, the teaching

effectiveness in the school tend to be jeopardized. As such, these lead to the poor job performance on the part of the teachers and invariably influence significantly the academic success of the students. This study therefore intends to examine the impact of principal leadership styles on instructional supervision of secondary schools in Oyo North Senatorial District Area of Oyo State, Nigeria.

Research Questions

1. What is the significant effect of autocratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision?

2. What is significant effect of democratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision?

3. What is significant effect of laissez-faire leadership style on principals' instructional supervision?

METHOD

Research Design

The study adopted descriptive research design of the ex-post facto type. An ex-post facto research according to Kerlinger (2012) may be defined as that research in which the independent variables have already been secured and in which the research starts with the observation of the dependent variables.

Population

The population for the study comprises of all secondary school teachers and principals in public and private schools in Oyo North Senatorial district Area of Oyo State, Nigeria.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

The research covered 75% of secondary schools in the Local Government which is 20 (twenty) secondary schools. On the whole, simple random sampling technique was adopted to select approximately twenty (20) teachers and one principal from each school. Total numbers of teachers picked were 400 (four hundred) and that of principals were twenty, making a total of four hundred and twenty (420) respondents. These consist of both male and female.

Research Instrument

In an attempt to measure the impact of the leadership styles of principal on instructional supervision in selected secondary schools in Ibadan metropolis, the researcher used a self developed questionnaires tagged "The impact of the leadership styles of principal on instructional supervision Questionnaire" (TILSPISQ). The instrument consists of two sections: section A and B. The section A measure the demographical data of respondents while the section B of the instrument consist

items to measure leadership styles of principal on instructional supervision. The instrument consisted of twenty five (25) items anchored on four likert points Scale of Strongly Agree(SA), Agree(A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). The items seek information on the relationship or otherwise between principals' leadership styles and instructional supervision in secondary schools.

Validity of Instrument

For content and face validity of the instrument that was designed for the study, the researcher gave the instruments to experts in the field of educational management and experts in the area of research and statistics. Their corrections and comments were incorporated into the final copy before the instrument was finally administered. Also, after the factor analysis of the instrument, some items that were considered too difficult or otherwise were removed and replaced with new ones.

Reliability of Instrument

After content and face validity of the instruments, twenty copies of the instruments (TILSPISQ) were administered in order to test them for reliability. The cronbach's alpha analysis yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.78 which was considered adequate for the research.

Data Collection and Analysis

The instrument was administered to the respondents on the day approved by the school authorities for the exercise. The researcher was assisted by the teachers in administration and collection of the instruments. In each of selected schools, the administration and collection of instruments was done on the same day of administration. On the whole data collection lasted for three weeks. The data collected from the respondents through questionnaire was analysed using linear regression analysis statistical tools of SPSS software.

FINDINGS

Research Questions

Research Question One: What is the significant effect of autocratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision?

Table 1. *Regression Analysis on principals' instructional supervision Data*

R = .425; R^2 = .181; Adjusted R^2 = .182					
Standard error of estimate= 4.820					
Analysis of variance					
	Sum of square (SS)	DF	Mean square	F	Sig
Regression	501.88	1	501.88		
Residual	2277.12	398	23.24	27.60	.000
Total	2779.00	399			

The table 1 above showed that there was significant effect of autocratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision. A simple linear regression was calculated to determine the impact of autocratic leadership style on the instructional supervision. A significant regression equation was found Df (1, 98) = 27.60, P<0.05). An R2 of .181 indicated that 18.1% of the variation differences in autocratic style of leadership. Thus autocratic leadership style significantly impacts instructional supervision by principals. This finding is in line with the finding of Grossman & Ross (1991) and Allais (1995) who see dictatorship as a style in which a leader retains as much power and decision making authority as possible. A dictator is autocratic. He neither consults people nor allows them to make an input. He expects people to obey his orders without even giving an explanation. A dictator makes people work under the motivation environment of structured set or rewards and punishment (Northwest Leadership 2002). However, the dictatorship leadership style has advantages and disadvantages. The first advantage of the dictatorship leadership style is that it can be used where there is pressure of time. In times of crises or emergencies, decision-making is faster when only one person is involved in the process. In situations like these, there is limited time to consult people and call for their participation to make decisions. Second, the dictatorship leadership style is appropriate when the leader is training others who are new and untrained at the job to make decisions. New or untrained workers usually do not know which procedure to follow. The leader is a coach. He is competent and the employees are motivated to learn new skills. The leader closely supervises the new employees, leading through detailed orders and instructions (Northwest Leadership 2002).

Research Question Two: What is the significant effect of democratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision?

Table 2. *Regression Analysis on principals' instructional supervision Data*

R = .550; R^2 = .315; Adjusted R^2 = .307					
Standard error of estimate= 4.43					
Analysis of variance					
	Sum of square (SS)	DF	Mean square	F	Sig
Regression	853.51	1	853.51	45.44	.000
Residual	1925.49	398	19.65		
Total	2779.00	399			

The table 2 above revealed that there was significant effect of democratic leadership style on principals' instructional supervision. A simple linear regression was calculated to determine the impact of democratic leadership style on the instructional supervision. A significant regression equation was found Df (1, 98) = 45.44, P<0.05). An R2 of .307 indicated that 30.7% of the variation differences in autocratic style of leadership. Thus democratic leadership style significantly impacts instructional supervision by principals. This finding is consistent with the finding of Allais (1995) who explains that team leadership style deal with the condition in which a leader integrates concern for production with concern for people at a high level. Team-work is emphasized and it is goal-oriented. It also strives for high quality by means of participative management, people involvement and conflict resolution. Schilbach as

cited by Allais (1995) indicates that the democratic style is most likely to be successful, but it is clear that different leadership styles will be effective in different situations.

Research Question Three: What is the significant effect of laissez-faire leadership style on principals' instructional supervision?

Table 3. *Regression Analysis on principals' instructional supervision Data*

R = .638; R^2 = .408; Adjusted R^2 = .402					
Standard error of estimate= 4.098					
Analysis of variance					
Sum of square	(SS)	DF	Mean square	F	Sig
Regression	1132.901	1	1132.901	87.45	.000
Residual	1646.099	398	16.797		
Total	2779.000	399			

The table 3 above showed that there was significant effect of laissez-faire leadership style on principals' instructional supervision. A simple linear regression was calculated to determine the impact of laissez-faire leadership style on the instructional supervision. A significant regression equation was found Df (1, 98) = 87.45, P<0.05). An R2 of .408 indicated that 40.8% of the variation differences in autocratic style of leadership. Thus laissez-faire leadership style significantly impacts instructional supervision by principals. This finding is in collaboration with the finding of Robbins & Decenzo 2001) who concur that the laissez-faire leader generally allows employees complete freedom to decide and complete work in whatever way they deem fit, while this leader provides material for use and answers questions. The laissez-faire leadership style calls for a minimum of direction and control from the leader and maximum freedom of the workers. All authority is given to the employees and they must determine goals, make decisions and resolve problems on their own. It is not an absence of leadership but lack of leadership control. It is a free rein style. The laissez-faire leadership style has several advantages. First, as the leader believes in faith and trust, individuals become more responsible. They are motivated to work and have maximum freedom of activity. It is non-interference in the affairs of others style of leadership. This style is used when workers are able to analyse the situation and determine what needs to be done and how to do it (Northwest Leadership 2002).

CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, persistent poor instructional supervision of principal in secondary schools in Nigeria due to some factors should not continue indefinitely. There is hope that with the improvement of some basic recommendations such as leadership styles and efficient supervision, the situation can be changed for the better. The study discovered that there was significant effect of leadership styles (democratic, autocratic, laissez faire) and Gender on principal instructional supervision and teacher commitment to work in secondary schools, it is very crucial to ensure effective leadership style of principals (democratic, autocratic

and laissez faire) so as to eradicate the persistent occurrence of poor report of principal instructional supervision and job satisfaction in the schools.

- The public and private schools should endeavour to provide enabling environment for the teaching and non teaching staff of the schools, so as to enhance their job commitment and effectiveness.
- The school management/director should be enlightened on the significance of their styles of leadership (democratic, autocratic, laissez faire and transformational leadership styles) on the instructional supervision and teachers' job commitment. This will help in the earlier discovery of problems of styles of leadership and provide appropriate solutions to them.
- School leaders and administrators are to be geared towards the improvement of teachers' job performance in the course of teaching. This will help in increasing their productivity and efficiency in the school.
- School principals are to be encouraged to ensure effective and efficient leadership styles in the given of instructions to the students, this will help considerably to improve the teachers and staff productivity in the school system.
- There should be regular organisation of seminar and conferences for the principal on effective and efficient means of leadership and communication to the entire members of the staff to gear their performance toward the common goal of achievement.

REFERENCES

Allais, S. (1995). Transformational leadership and teacher learning in model schools. *Journal of Faculty of Education UAEU*, 23, 21-36.

Avolio, B. & Bass, B. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire instrument (leader and rater form and scoring guide) (English and Arabic versions)*. Mind Garden, Inc.

Andrew, M & Soder, A (2008). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire (third edition manual and sampler set)*. MindGarden, Inc.

Blumberg, H & Greenfield, B (1980). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bossert, G.C (2012). *Taxonomy and overview.* In W.K.Hoy (Ed.), Educational administration: The UCEA document base (p.9).

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Carless, R. (2008). *Reframing and reform: Perspectives on organization, leadership, and school change*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Cotton, K. (2003). Principals and student achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

DeFranco, C & Golden, R. (2003). School leadership and its relation to school performance. Unpublished Dissertation: University of Phoenix.

Druskat, D. X. (2010). Origins and consequences of school organizational culture for student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(4), 523-555.

Edmonds, G.W. (2009). *Studies in leadership*. New York: Russell &Russell.

Grossman, H & Ross, J. (1991). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 333-356.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-351.

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

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J.F. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals. *The Elementary School Journal*. 86(2), pp. 217-247.

Halpin, A.W. (1966). *Theory and research in administration*. New York: MacMillan.

Harris, A. (2004). Editorial: School leadership and school improvement: A simple and complex relationship, *School Leadership and Management*, 24(1), 3-5.

Hackman, K, Furniss, Shills, P & Paterson, K. (1992). *Hardball for women: Winning at the game of business*. New York: Plume.

Hessel, H. F & Holloway S.K. (2001). *In the company of women: Turning workplace conflict into powerful alliance*s. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Jantzi D, Leithwood K (1996). Toward an explanation of variation in teachers' perceptions of transformational leadership. *Edu. Admin. Q.*, 32(4): 512-538.

Kerlinger, H. R (2012) Introduction to research methodology. *NASSP Bulletin*, 88 (638), 1-4.

Komives, W.A. (1991) Teacher quality and student achievement: Recommendations for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 85 (628), 64-73

Kruger, Witziers, & Sleegers, 2007; Kurt, G & Lewin, H (1939). Gender issues in school headship: quality versus power? *European Journal of Education*, 31(4), 447–461.

Kruger, M., Witziers, B., & Sleegers, P. (2007). The impact of school leader variables on school level factors: Validation of a causal model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 18(1), 1-20.

Lezotte L (1991). Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd,

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Marks, H., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 39(3), 370-397.

Mohd, S.L (2008). Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology. (6th Ed.). Australia: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Mohd, B. H (1998). Leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes – what do we know? *Camb. J. Edu.,* 33(2): 175-95.

Nworgu, V. T (1991) School leadership and its relation to school performance. Unpublished Dissertation: University of Phoenix.

Peterson, R. P (2000). Origins and consequences of school organizational culture for student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(4), 523-555.

Robbins, J & DeCenzo, K (2001) Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing men and women. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591.

Northwest Leadership (2002) Principal Effectiveness in Leadership. Retrieved from www.google.com 4/ 4/2014

Saphier, J. N (1993) Leadership and school results. Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration (pp. 561-612). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Storey, A. (2004). The problem of distributed leadership in schools. *School Leadership and Management*, 24(3), 249-265.

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) (2002) Leaders in Context: Post Positivist Approaches to understanding Educational Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 32(3), pp. 452+. Retrieved September 28, 2002 from EBSCO database on the http://www.ebsco.com

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). Implementation guidelines for the UBE programme. Federal Ministry of Education, Abuja, February, federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). National Policy on Education. Abuja: 'NERDC.

Waters, T, Marzano, R & McNultry, B (2003). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. K-12 principals
guide to No Child Left Behind. (2003). Alexandria, Arlington, and Reston, VA.: NAESP, ERS, and NASSP.

Waters, T, Marzano, R & McNulty, B (2005) *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools*. Meedham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon

Waters. T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. Educational Leadership, 61(1), 48-52.

Wan, M. Z (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 398-425.

Marzano, D. Y. (2003). Instructional supervision in the schools. Retrieved from www.google.com 2/2/13

Ministry of Education in Nigeria (1987) Oyo state ministry of education. Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.

[1] Dr. Monsuru Babatunde MURAINA
Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria
murainamonsuru@gmail.com

[2] Muraina Kamilu OLANREWAJU
University of Ibadan, Nigeria
Department of Guidance and Counselling
muraina_kamilu@yahoo.com