

**EVALUATION OF THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ACTIVITIES IN THE  
CLASSROOM VISITATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOL IN  
KOGI STATE**

**Anibasa-Omuya F.**

Institute of Education,  
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

**Ajayi, F.O.**

Curriculum and Instruction Department  
Federal College of Education, Zaria, Kaduna State.

&

**Azeez, A.N.**

Primary Education Department  
Federal College of Education, Zaria, Kaduna State.

**Abstract**

In this study, the role of principals as regards the classroom visitation was assessed. One research question was asked in line with the study objective and one hypothesis was postulated that there was no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students in the supervisory role performance of principals of public secondary schools in Kogi State on regular classroom visitation. Descriptive survey was used in this study and the sampling size was determined by Adetoro (1986) and Nwana (2004) nine LGA, 21 Principals, 190 teachers and 337 students formed the sample size. The main instrument was structured questionnaire on which a pilot study was carried out to determine the reliability. Reliability coefficient was determined using Cronbach alpha resulting in 0.93. The test of the hypothesis was done using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 significant level since the respondents were more than two categories, Through the analysis it was discovered that the hypothesis was retained because the critical value was 2.533 which was greater than ratio value of 0.395. The findings showed a unanimous disagreement on the principals effectiveness in carrying out regular classroom visitation in the sampled schools. It was recommended that principals should do regular supervision which must include classroom visitation.

**Introduction**

Supervision is as old the school system. It is directed towards sustaining teaching and learning process in the educational system, this is because education plays an essential role in the growth and development of any nation socially, politically and economically (Akinwumi 2002). According to Igunnu 2015 writing of lesson plan and checking it by the principals before the teacher make use of it in the class during the lesson delivery is one of Successful teaching and another or second stage is effective utilization of the lesson plan in the classroom The principal has a legal duty to carry out classroom visitation regularly as this will enable the principals to follow the delivery of the lesson. Igunnu further said that during classroom visitation the headteacher evaluates the stepwise delivery of the lesson, the methodology used the teaching aids that the teacher employ in the classroom management that is the relationship between the teacher and students, sitting arrangement cordially student involvement the lesson and time management are both are monitored by the headteacher all towards the improvement of instruction. Effective classroom visitation by the principal makes the teachers to be more serious especially if the principal make use of the unannounced classroom visitation. However Igunnu 2015 and Ogunsaju and Osika, 2002 both suggested that for classroom visitation to be successful effective planning and preparation should take place.

**Statement of the Problem**

Classroom visitation is one of the technique of school supervision at school level by the headteacher or principals. However in many Nigerian schools the-head hardly visit the teachers during the lesson delivery. So many teachers do what they like and even when a lesson is beautifully prepared it may not be used by the teachers in class. Another issues of agitation is the fact that teachers hardly know how to manage their lesson within the period given to them. In the same vein many teachers are lazy and are not involving appropriate methodologies and instructional materials but have no body to check them as

2017

the principals are very reluctant to classes. Even the few teachers who used to go to classes do that once in term or not at all this has made this techniques ineffective.

Another area of agitation is that teachers do what they like with students since nobody to check them.

### **Review of Related Literature**

Classroom visitation is defined by Peretomode (2001) as a procedure by which school managers could be of great help to teachers in assisting the teachers to improve both in their instructional strategies techniques and learning process of students. Evaluating teachers is one of the principals most important role (Hunt, 2013) which the principals should concentrate on doing well, he must not allow for distraction which is possibility. According to Ogunsanya (2003) classroom visitation do bring about the fulfillment of many needs when performed by the principals who is aware of such responsibilities. Iqwe (2001) also describes classroom visitation as a duty for some one who possesses wisdom who can assist the teachers from the novice status to the region of expertise. Classroom visitation is seeing as the purposeful examination of teaching by.

Bailey (2001) since the principal will sit in the class during the teaching —learning process to observe and write down comments about the teachers strength and weakness.

In order to consolidate the instructional and improve the time management, subject mastery, use of instructional materials and appropriate methodology and even classroom management which can be regarded as a systematic data collection and analysis the principal should make use of checklists for his observation. According to Ogunsaju careful planning of classroom visit is expected. The principal will usually select activities to observe. He should also know the purpose of the visit, teaching- learning situation prior to the visit and discuss with the teacher on various issues.

### **Objective of the Study**

The following is the objective for this study:

Examine the supervisory role performance of principal's regularity on classroom visitation in Kogi State.

**Research Question**

The research question was set based on the objectives:

How does the supervisory role Performance of principals impact on regularity to classrodr11 Visitation?

**Research Hypothesis**

The following Null hypothesis was formulated:

There is no significant difference opinions of the respondents on the supervisory role performance of principals and adherence to classroom visitation.

**Research Methodology**

Survey research was used for the study. This was used in order to collect data from the respondents. It was also used because it will yield reliable data on which generalization can be made to the entire population. The population of the Study were 6,740 Senior Secondary 1 & Senior Secondary 2 students and 3800 teachers and 420 principals. The sample size was determined using percentage according Nwana (2004) format and stratified random sampling techniques was also used. Kogi State has a total of 21 Local government Areas and eight (8) local government were selected in a stratified random sampling from the three major tribes constituting the three senatorial sections (Central, East and West senatorial districts) based on Adetoro (1986), who said that one third of the population is adequate for a sampling size of local government areas using 21 schools, 190 teachers and 337 students.

Structured questionnaire with five liked scale point was used for the study and validated by expert in educational management. The instrument was distributed and collected through the help of research assistance in the sampled schools. The reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient and the result shows 0.931. The data collected was analyzed using simple percentage and frequencies to

2017

answer the research questions. One way—analysis ANOVA was used in testing the hypothesis at 0.05 significant level.

Table 1.1: The names of 8 local government selected for the study, the number of school principals, teachers and no Senior Secondary 1 and Senior Secondary 2 students were shown in table fashioned after Adetoro 1986.

S/N	Local government	No. od school principal	No. of teachers	No. of SSI and SS2 students
1	Adavi	2	20	40
2	Okene	2	20	40
3	Okehi	1	15	20
4	Dekina	6	50	74
5	Idah	1	15	20
6	Ankpa	5	30	63
7	Lokoja	2	20	40
8	Kabba-Bunu	2	20	40
	TOTAL	21	190	337

Source: Kogi State teaching Service Commission (2016)

Structured questionnaire with five likert scale point was used for the study and validated by expert in educational management. The instrument was distributed and collected through the help of research assistance in the sampled schools. The reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha reliability co-efficient and the result shows 0.931. The data collected was analyzed using simple percentage and frequencies to answer the research questions. One way analysis anova was used in testing the hypothesis at 0.05 significant level.

### Data Presentation

This focused on the presentation. analysis of data collected from the principals, teachers and students opinion the questionnaire administered mean, frequency, percentage and

2017

ANOVA were used to summarize analysis and give a general description of the data collected.

.....

Table 2: Opinion of principals, teachers and students on the supervisory role of principal on classroom visitation

S/N	Item Statement	Categories principals, teachers students of and students	Strongly Agreed		Agreed		Undecided		Disagreed		Strongly Disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	In the school the principal visits the teachers in the class regularly	Principals	10	47.6	11	52.4					2	
		Teachers	1	5	6	3.2	3	1.6	112	58.9	66	34.7
		Students	2	8.6	6	1.8	17	5.0	189	56.1	123	36.4
2	In my school principal check teachers methodology of teaching while in the class	Principals	13	61.9	8	38.1						
		Teachers	113	59.5	66	34.7	5	1.6	2	1.1	4	2.1
		Students	12	3.6	6	1.8	35	10.4	96	28.5	188	55.7
3	My principal sits at the back of the class and watch the teacher teaching	Principals	11	52.4	10	47.6						
		Teachers	7	3.6	4	2.1	1	5	116	61.1	62	32.6
		Students	10	3.2	9	2.7	34	10.1	179	53.1	104	30.9

4	My principal often stay in the classroom till duration of the period is over	Principals	11	52.4			10	47.6				
		Teachers	2	1.1	5	2.6	1	5	115	60.5	67	35.3
		Students	9	2.7	9	2.3	36	10.7	206	61.1	78	23.1
5	My principal while in my class ensures that I use appropriate instructional materials	Principals	9	42.9	12	57.1						
		Teachers	112	58.9	65	34.2	4	2.1	5	2.6	4	2.1
		Students	85	25.2	197	58.5	32	9.5	7	2.1	16	4.7
6	The principal ensures that there is an effective time management during his/her visit the teachers in the classroom	Principals	10	47.6	11	52.4						
		Teachers	107	56.3	78	41.0	3	1.6			2	1.1
		Students	90	26.7	190	56.4	47	13.9	4	1.2	6	1.8
7	principal in my school often visit the teachers in the classroom	Principals	11	52.4					10	47.6		
		Teachers	1	5	4	2.1	5	2.6	107	56.3	733	.48
		Students	10	2.9	11	3.3	42	12.5	96	28.5	181	53.7
8	Principal constant visit to the classroom	Principals	10	47.6	11	52.4						
		Teachers	109	57.4	73	38.4	2	1.1	1	5	5	2.6
		Students			12	3.5	30	30	83	24.6	212	62.9

	help me to have better understanding of classroom environment											
9	Constant classroom visitation helps principal to detect out teachers who lacks skills of classroom management	Principals	13	61.9	7	33.3	1	4.8				
		Teachers	107	56.3	73	38.4	4	2.1	5	2.6	1	5
		Students	10	2.9	4	1.2	36	10.7	84	24.9	203	60.2
10	It is the duty of the principal to make sure teaching and learning is done properly while visiting a teacher in the class.	Principals	12	57.1	9	42.9						
		Teachers	109	57.4	65	32.2	9	4.7	2	1.1	3	1.6
		Students	109	32.3	187	55.5	26	7.7	11	3.3	4	1.2
11	My principal makes sure that I don't deviate from the lesson plan which he eerier checked and marked	Principals	9	42.9			11	52.4	1	4.8		
		Teachers	2	1.1	2	1.1	9	4.7	111	58.4	66	34.7
		Students	6	1.7	165	48.9	9	2.7	147	43.6	10	3.0
12	The principal through regular classroom visitation	Principals			15	71.4	1	4.8			5	23.8
		Teachers	108	56.8	72	37.9	4	2.1	4	2.1	2	1.1
		Students	127	37.6	160	47.5	33	9.8	17	5.0		

	ensure that all the students are deeply involved in the lesson											
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 2. Item 1 indicates that the principal visits the teachers in the class regularly. 10 (47.6%) of principals strongly agreed, 11 (52.4%) agreed. 1 (0.5%) of teachers strongly agreed, 6 (3.2%) agreed, 2 (8.6%) of students strongly agreed, 6 (1.8%) students agreed while 112 (58.9%) of teachers disagreed, 2 (10%) of teachers strongly disagreed, 189 (56.1%) students disagreed, 123 (36.4%) strongly disagreed, this is because principals did not visit the teachers in the class regularly.

Item 2 states that the principals check teachers’ methodology of teaching while in the class. 13 (61.9%) principals strongly agreed, while 8 (38.1%) agreed, 113 (59.5%) teachers strongly agreed, 66 (34.7%) agreed five Teachers were undecided , 12 (3.6%) students strongly agreed. 6 (1.8%) agreed while 2 (1.1%) of teachers disagreed. 4 (2.1%) strongly disagreed and 96 (28.5%) of students disagreed. while 188 (57.7%) strongly disagreed, this is because the students felt teachers’ methodology were not properly checked by the principals.

Item 3 indicates that the principal sits at the back of the class and watch the teacher teaching. 11(52.4%) principals strongly agreed, 10 (47.6%) of the principals agree while 7 (3.6%) of teachers strongly agreed, 4 (2.1%) of teachers agreed and 10 (3.2%) of students strongly agreed, 9 (2.7%) of students agreed while 116 (61.1%) teachers disagreed, 62(32.6%) strongly disagreed and 179 (53.100) of students disagreed, 104 (30.9%) of students strongly disagreed. This is because the respondents felt that principals didn’t sit at the back to watch the teachers teaching.

Item 4 states that the principals often stay in the classroom till throughout the duration of the lesson. 11 (52.4%) principals strongly agreed. 10 (47.6%) of principals agreed, 2(1.1%) of teachers strongly agreed. 5 (2.6%) of teachers agreed, 9 (2.7%) of students strongly agreed. 8 (2.3%) of students agreed while 115 (60.5%) of teachers disagreed. 67

2017

(35.3% of teachers strongly disagreed, 206 (61.1%) of students disagreed. 78 (23.1%) of students strongly disagreed. This is because they felt that the principal hardly stay in the classroom to the end of the lesson.

Item 5 states that the principal while in the class ensures that the teachers uses appropriate instructional materials. 9 (42.9%) principals strongly agreed, 12(57.1%) principals agreed, 112 (58.9%) of teachers strongly agreed, 65 (34.2%) agreed and 85 (25.2%) of students strongly agreed. 97 (58.5%) students agreed while 5 (2.6%) of teachers disagreed. 4 (2.1%) teachers strongly disagreed and 7(2.1%) of students disagreed. 16( 4.7%) strongly disagreed.

Item 6 states responses on item which says that the principal ensures that there is an effective time management during his/her visit to the class 10 (47.6%) principals strongly agreed , 11 (52.4%) agreed, 117 (56.3%) teachers strongly agreed, 78 (41.0%) of teachers agreed and 90 (26.7%) students strongly agreed. While 2 (1.1%) of students strongly disagreed. This showed that the principal hardly visited the teachers in the classroom.

Item 7 states that principals often visit the teachers in the classroom. 11 (52.4%) principals strongly agreed. 1 (0.5%) teachers strongly agreed, 10 (2.9%) of students strongly agreed. The principals agreed because it was part of their duty to visit the teachers the class regularly. Meanwhile. 10 (47.6%) principals disagreed. 107 (56.3%) teachers disagreed, 73 (38.4%) teachers strongly disagreed. 96 (28.5%) students disagreed, 181 (53.7%) students strongly disagreed. This showed that the principal hardly visited teachers in the classroom.

Item 8 says that the principal constant visit the classroom which help the teachers to have better understanding of classroom environment . The result indicates that 10 (47.6%) principals strongly agreed. While 11 (52.4%) agreed, 109 (57.4%) teachers strongly agreed, 73(38.4%) teachers agreed and 12 (3.5%) students agreed.. While 1 (0.5%) of the teachers disagreed, 5 (2.6%) teachers strongly disagreed. 83 (24.6%) of students disagreed, two of the teachers and 30 (3.0%) were undecided.

2017

Item 9 states that constant classroom visitation helps principal to detect oat teachers who lacks skill of classroom-management. 13 (61.9%) principals strongly agreed, 7 (33.3%) agreed, 101 (56.3%) teachers strongly agreed, 73 (38.4%) teachers agreed, 10 (2.9%) of students strongly agreed, 4 (1.2%) agreed. Meanwhile, the principal agreed because it was part of the principal supervisory role. However, 5(2.6%) of teachers disagreed, 1(0.5%) teacher strongly disagreed and 84 (24.9%) of students disagreed. 203 (60.2%) of students strongly disagreed.

Item 10 is on the duty of the principal to make sure teaching and learning is done properly while Visiting a teacher in the class. 12(57.1%) strongly agreed, 9 (42.9%) agreed, 109 (57.4%) teachers agreed. 67 (35.2%) of teachers agreed. 109 (32.3%) of students strongly agreed, 187 (55.5%) agreed. this is because the respondents believed that whenever the principal was in the class teachers teach normally taught well. However, 2 (1.1%) of teachers disagreed, 3 (1.6%) of teachers strongly disagreed. 11 (3.3%) of students disagreed. 4 (1.2%) strongly disagreed. Nine teachers (4.7%), 26(7.7%) students were undecided

Item 11 states that the principal make sure that the teacher do not deviate from the lesson plan which the principal earlier checked and marked. 9 (42.9%) of principals strongly agreed. 2(1.1%) of teachers strongly agreed, 2 (1.1%) of teachers agreed, 6 (1.7%) of students strongly agreed while 165 (48.9%) of students agreed and 1 (4.8%) of principals disagreed, 111 (58.4%) of teachers disagreed, 66(34.7%) of teachers strongly disagreed, 147 (43.6%) of students disagreed. 10 (3.0%) of students strongly disagreed.

Item 12 indicates that the principal through regular classroom visitation ensure that all the students are deeply involved in the lesson. 15 (71.4%) of principals agreed. 108 (56.8%) of teachers strongly agreed, 72, (37.9%) of teachers agreed, 127 (37.6%) of students strongly agreed, 160 (47.5%) of students agreed. However. 5 (23.8%) of principals strongly disagreed, 4 (2.1%) of teachers disagreed, 2 (1.1%) strongly disagreed. 17 (5.0%) of students disagrees. One principal, 4 teachers and 33 students were undecided.

### **Test of Hypothesis**

The researcher formulated the hypothesis in a null form for the study. This was intended to objectively determine the opinions of the principals, teachers and students on the supervisory role performance of principal on classroom visitation in secondary schools in Kogi State. The statistical method adopted was Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 level of significance.

**Table 1.6: analysis of variance of no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on supervisory role performance of principal and classroom visitation in secondary school in Kogi State**

Variables	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	Prob.	Critical value
Between	39.537	2	19.768	395	674	2.53
Groups	27251.733	545	50.003	395		
Within Groups						
Total	27291.270	547				

Table 1.6 shows f-ratio value (395) at 2 of 545 and at the level 0.05. the critical value (2.53) is greater than f-ratio values (395), The probability level of significant P(647) is greater than 0.05. this means that there is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, Teacher and Students on supervisory role performance of principals and classroom visitation in Secondary School in Kogi State.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained.

1. It was discovered that principals do not do classroom visitation regularly and are do not doing it at all instead they stayed outside and just looked briefly at the teachers through the window.

**Discussion of Findings**

Classroom visitation is very important as such considered as part of the supervisory role performance of principal Rayan (2010). However, principals have failed in the area. Failure of classroom visitation regularly makes most teachers not to do what they are suppose to do this in line with Sule (2011) that failure of classroom visitation by principals has negative influence on teachers job performance.

**Recommendations**

1. Principal should do regular supervision which must include classroom visitation.

**Conclusions**

Principals ensured that teachers break the curriculum content into scheme of work and principals, teachers and students also believe that principals check teacher lesson note/plan before teaching. Principals do not do regular classroom Visitation.

**References**

- Adetoro T.O (1986) Research process foe higher institutions, university, press Ibadan
- Akinwumi, F.O. (2002) The effect of instructional supervision on principal. Retrieved r- June 16, 2013 from [udinLproquest.com>education>educational leadership](http://udinLproquest.com/education/educational%20leadership).
- Bailey, Terence (2001). Classroom Observation A Powerful Tool for Teachers. Reviewed from [onlinelibrary. wiley.com](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com)
- Bob, K. (2012) Strategic teaching, strategic learning and thinking skills. Retrieved June 17,201 3, from [www.strategicteaching.com](http://www.strategicteaching.com)

2017

- Christopher, W. (2015) Instructional methods and strategies for secondary school - teachers. Unpublished Lecture Material, University of Ibadan.
- Cushman, K. 2016 .Developing curriculum in essential schools. Retrieved June 1 ill. 2013 , from [www.curriculumedu.com/http](http://www.curriculumedu.com/http).
- Denise F.O (2008> Lesson planning. A research based model for K12 classrooms. Alexandra prentice. Retrieved June 14, 2013
- Donald, -L. (2008). -Effect----of evaluation on students' academic performance. Retrieved May 16, 2014 from [www.nmu.edu/education/node/151](http://www.nmu.edu/education/node/151).
- Federal Ministry of Education (2005). National policy on education, federal government press, Abuja.
- Fullan, O. (2000). The new meaning of educational change. New York Teachers College Press.
- George, A. (2009) Looking into and beyond lesson plan. Retrieved June -L 2013 from [www.georgelessonplan.com](http://www.georgelessonplan.com).
- Hunt Layne Excellent Evaluations, practical tips for improving principals observation teacher observation skills retrieved on 4th August 2013 from [fromeducational.com](http://fromeducational.com).
- Igwe, S. O. (2001). Supervision. Evaluation and quality Control in Education. Owerri. International University Press Ltd.
- Ibrahim M.O (2009) Importance of Scheme of Work Retrieved on 25<sup>th</sup> November, 2014 From [www.principals.org/content.asp](http://www.principals.org/content.asp)
- Jackson, D. (2002) Developing a curriculum, a practice guide. London George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Jeffrey, J.O. (2004) Evaluating teachers mastery of subject and teaching e/lecti.'encss. /Unpublished Dissertation Thesis for Master Degree. University of California.
- Jekayinfa, A.A. (2001) Effects 4 instructional resources on the academic performance of students. retrieved February 9, 2013 from [www.uniIlorin.edu.ng/publications](http://www.uniIlorin.edu.ng/publications)
- Kochhar, S. (2007) Secondary school administration. Sterling Publishing Ltd.
- Nwana L.O. (2004) "Research process in -educaffon" Retrieved May 201h 2014 from [www.montgomeryschool.sm](http://www.montgomeryschool.sm).

2017

Ogundipe, M.A (2007) “Developing curriculum for Nigerian education system . Asaba Journal of Education Studies Vol. 1. No.1. F.C.E. (T) Asaba.

Ogunsanya. (2003). Roles and Responsibilities of. a Supervisor. Retrieved from Managementhelp.org.

Onuoha, I.O. (2016). Assessment of Supervisory Roles Performance of Principals on Teachers Duties in Secondary Schools in Kaduna State. Master Dissertation Submitted into National Open University of Nigeria Special Study Centre for the Air Force, Kaduna.

Palmer P.O (2004) Teaching practice and teaching methods for secondary school teachers. University of if a press.

Peretomode V. F. (2001). Educational Administration Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspectives for students and practitioners, Lagos, Joja Educational Research and Publishers.

Phillips. O. (2012) A Handbook on teachers preparedness and punctuality. Florida Department of Education. Retrieved June 14,2013. [www.ildoe.org/hillsborough](http://www.ildoe.org/hillsborough).

Rayan, MO. (2010). A study in classroom visitation. Retrieved from [www.ascd.org/A5CD/](http://www.ascd.org/A5CD/) 10th may2015

Reuben, M.O (2006) useful guides to lesson planning and lesson design for teachers. Ibadan University press.

Rief S.U (2006) Time management in education. Retrieved June 14,2013 from [www.sandranef.com](http://www.sandranef.com)

Sule, M.A. (2011) Principals classroom visitation and inspection. Retrieved from [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org) on 15th May, 2015.

Suleiman U.E (2008) Why Lesson Plans/Notes Should Be Marked retrieved on 24th November, 2014. From [www.slideshare.net.com](http://www.slideshare.net.com)

Tarelee A.I (2005) Children literature in social studies curriculum Retrieved 12th June, 2013 from [www.preparetomorrowcurriculumprog](http://www.preparetomorrowcurriculumprog).

Usman, I. (2009). Writing professional and effective lesson plan guide book for LGJ:/1 Teachers. Vocabs Publishing Educational Services Limited.

2017

Willford. C.W. (2000) Techniques for better classroom management London George Allen and Unwin Ltd.