

**ASSESSMENT OF THE PRINCIPALS RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE  
ENFORCEMENT OF CURRICULUM CONTENT AND DELIVERY IN KOGI  
STATE PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

BY

**AnibasaOmuya, F.**  
Institute of Education,  
Ahmadu Be/b University, Zaria.

**Keston, B.**  
General Studies Department  
Federal College of Education Zaria, Kaduna State.  
&

**Ajayi, F.O.**  
Curriculum and instruction Department  
Federal College of Education, Zaria, Kaduna State.

**Abstract**

The main objective of this study is to assess the role performance of principals on the teacher's adherence to the curriculum content in public secondary schools in Kogi State. Descriptive survey design was used and according to Adetoro (1986) and Nwana (2004) the following were the samples. Eight Local Government Areas. 21 principals, 190 teachers and 337 students were involved in this research in Kogi State Nigeria. The instrument used was a structured questionnaire which reliability was found to be 0.9310 using Cronbach alpha. The hypothesis was tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 significant level. The hypothesis which stated that there is significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and Students (respondents) on teachers adherence to the curriculum was rejected as there were significant differences in the 3 categories of respondents. The finding showed that in the opinion of respondents the Principals did not closely supervise the teachers on the adherence to the curriculum. The recommendation is that the principals should monitor and supervise the breaking of curriculum into, lesson plan and the actual lesson delivery.

**Introduction**

According to Paechter (1999) curriculum means the learning opportunities which are organized in a particular learning situation it implies organization, a programme of learning, through the organization involved may turn out to be neither overt nor international. Curriculum implementation is the act of working out the plans and suggestions that have been made by curriculum specialists and subject experts in a classroom or school setting. Teachers are the main curriculum implementers, while at the same time both the students, parents (indirectly) and school administrators like principals are directly involve in the implementation process. According to Philip (2003) the successful implementation of curriculum involves thoughtful planning and hard work from the principal. Fullan (2000) outlined some of the supervisory roles of principal of which curriculum implementation and development are included.

Ogundipe (2007) asserted that curriculum at the various levels of education have been expanded and enriched in content to meet the expected level of change in behavior performance of the students and the needs of the dynamic environment. This shows that principal has to make sure teachers adhere to the curriculum content.

According to Jackson (2000) teachers who adhered to curriculum content are influenced of reality by the standard based movement in which all students are taught the same body of knowledge. Cushman (2006) explained that if curriculum is to reflect the goals of a school and the needs of its students, it make sense for teachers to develop it themselves. He further stressed that curriculum comprises not just content, knowledge but every encounter among teachers, students and everything that makes up understanding and everything that demonstrate it. Based on this the daily lesson plan of a teacher should reflect the curriculum as surely as the choice of what books to be used for instructional materials.

**Statement of the Problem**

It is a known fact that the federal government controls the curriculum for all the levels of education in Nigeria and secondary school is no exception. However the curriculum for JSSI to SS3 in each subject are handed over to the school to be implemented. There has been a lot agitation because the implementers are never involved in the formulation and this pose a lot of difficulty as some curricular are seen to be too different to interpret and the state recommended books in most cases have some part of the curriculum not being catered for in the recommended text books.

Also some teachers only teach the aspect of the curriculum leaving others out especially the ones that are not in the recommended textbooks.

### **Review of Relevant Literature**

Rays (2003) and Brasavsky (2003) state that curriculum is a set of learning goals articulated across grades that outline the intended content and process goals at particular points in time throughout the school programme. Child (1977) cited by Kapoma and Namusokwe (2011) sees curriculum content as what the teacher and students pay attention to when they are teaching and learning. Abbot (2014) defined curriculum as the knowledge and skills students are expected to meet and according to Onuoha 2016, it is the expectation o units and lessons that teachers teach, the assignments and project given to students, the books, materials, videos, presentations, and readings used in a course and the tests, assessment and other methods used to evaluate students learning.

Kelly (2009) discussed the four elements of the curriculum as aims objectives (purpose) content (subject matter), teaching strategies (methods of learning experience) and evaluation. In evaluation the selection of appropriate content based on the purpose of curriculum, the selection of appropriate methods that will suit or address the content and purpose and -also the effective assessment of instruction are done by the teachers with the co-operation of the principals.

Scheffler (1970) outline criteria used selection of subject matter curriculum as self-sufficiency, significance, validity, utility, learnability (within the range of the learner) and feasibility (which can be learned within the time allowed; resources available

and expertise of the teacher and nature of the student). Cablies (2013) also presented another consideration for the selection of the learning content to be what the learners frequently and commonly used in daily life suitable for the students. With the help of the regular supervision of the principal this becomes possible overtime as he work cooperatively together with the teachers.

### **Objective of the Study**

The following objective has been set for this study:

Determine the role performance of principals on teachers' adherence to curriculum content in secondary schools in Kogi State.

### **Research Question**

This research question is asked in-line with the objective:

What is the role performance of principals in teachers' adherence to curriculum content?

### **Research Hypothesis**

The following Null hypothesis was formulated:

There is no significant difference in opinions of the principals, teachers and students on the supervisory role performance of principals and teachers' adherence to curriculum content.

### **Research Methodology**

Survey research was used for the study. This was used in order to collect data from the respondents. It was also used so as to yield reliable data on which generalization can be made to the entire population. The population of the study were 6,800 Senior Secondary 1 & Senior Secondary 2 students and 2,280 teachers.

The sample size was determined using percentage according to Nwana (2004) format and stratified random sampling techniques was also used. Kogi state has a total of 21 Local

Government Areas. Based on Adetoro 1986, one third of the local government constituted the sample and Nwana 2004 was used for the teachers and students.

**Table 1: The, names of 8 local governments selected for the study, the number of school principals, teachers and number of Senior Secondary SS1 and Senior Secondary SS2 students were shown in this table fashioned after Adetoro 1986.**

s/n	Local Government	No of School principal	No of teachers	No of SS1 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/bunnu	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 levels

### 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 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 performance of principal on teachers adherence to curriculum contents.**

S/N	Item Statement	Categories principals, teachers students of and students	Strongly Agreed		Agreed		Undecided		Disagreed		Strongly Disagree	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	It is role of the principal to ensure that teachers teach according to content of curriculum	Principals	9	42.9	11	52.4	1	4.8				
		Teachers	111	58.4	66	34.7	9	4.7	2	1.1	2	1.1
		Students	147	43.6	165	49.0	9	2.7	10	3.0	6	1.7
2	It is the principal's role performance to ensure that teachers break the curriculum into scheme of work.	Principals	10	47.6	10	47.6	1	4.8				
		Teachers	107	56.3	73	38.4	2	1.1		1.1	6	3.1
		Students	131	38.9	176	52.2	17	5.0	9	2.1	4	1.2

3	The principal's duty is to ensure that topics taught are in sequence of curriculum	Principals			15	71.4	1	4.8			5	23.8
		Teachers	108	56.3	73	38.4	2	1.1		1.1	6	3.1
		Students	127	40.1	160	47.5	33	9.8	2	6	3	9
4	The principal's duty is to ensure that teachers do not teach outside the curriculum content.	Principals			15	71.4	1	4.8	1	4.8	4	19.0
		Teachers	96	50.5	77	40.5	4	2.1	10	5.2	3	1.5
		Students	135	40.1	135	40.1	54	16.0	6	1.8	7	2.1
5	It is the role of principal to ensure that teachers select appropriate methodology relevant to the content	Principals			14	66.7	1	4.8			6	28.6
		Teachers	100	54.2	71	37.4	7	3.7	9	4.7	1	5
		Students	141	42.1	144	42.7	26	7.7	22	6.5	4	1.2
6	It is the principal's duty that teachers, school use different techniques for the implementation of the school curriculum	Principals			11	52.4	1	4.8			9	42.9
		Teachers	165	54.2	64	33.7	14	7.4	7	3.7	9	42.9
		Students	142	42.1	157	46.6	25	7.4	7	2.1	4	1.2
7	The principal role performance is	Principals			12	57.1	1	4.8			8	38.6

	to involve teachers in curriculum formulation implementation.	Teachers	106	55.8	70	36.8	6	3.2	6	3.2	6	
		Students	128	38.0	114	42.7	28	8.3	17	5.0	8	5.0
8	It is the role of principal to ensure that teachers select topics in the curriculum that are functional and useful.	Principals			12	57.1	1	4.8			8	38
		Teachers	107	56.3	67	35.3	6	3.2	8	4.2		
		Students	125	37.1	156	46.3	31	9.1	8	2.4	17	5.0
9	It is the duty of principal to ensure that teachers select appropriate instructional materials' such as textbooks that are relevant to the content.	Principals			13	61.9	1	48			7	38.3
		Teachers	106	55.8	72	37.9	8	4.2	2	1.1	2	1.1
		Students	146	43.3	134	39.8	27	8.0	12	3.6	18	5.3
10	The principal's duty is to ensure that teachers enter the topics right each week in the diary.	Principals	10	47.6	10	47.6	1	4.8				
		Teachers	106	55.8	71	37.4	4	2.1	8	4.2	1	5
		Students	151	44.8	153	45.4	12	3.6	9	2.7	12	3.6

Items 1, on table 2 indicates that 9 (42.9%) of principals agreed, 11(52.4%) agreed that is the principals ensured that teachers taught according to the content of curriculum, while 111(58.4%) of teachers strongly agreed. 56(34.7%) of teachers agreed and 147(43.6%) of students strongly agreed and 165(49.0%) agreed. This is because the respondents believed that for teachers to teach effectively, the principals had to ensure they based 1 on the content. While 2(1.1%) of teachers disagreed. 21(11.1%) strongly disagreed and 10(3.0%) of students disagreed and 6(1.7%) students disagreed this is because they felt principals were not checking the teachers to know whether they taught according to the content.

Meanwhile on item 2 10(47.6%) of principals strongly agreed. 10(47.6%) agreed, 107 (56.3%) of teachers strongly agreed 73 (38.4%) agreed and 131(38.9%) of students strongly agreed and 176 (52.2%) agreed that it was the principals role performance to ensure that teachers broke the curriculum into scheme of work. On the other hand 2(1.1%) of teacher disagreed, 6(3.1%) strongly disagreed and 9(2.1%) of students disagreed, 4(1.2%) strongly disagreed because they felt principals were allowed the teachers to teach without breaking the content into scheme of work.

Item 3 indicates that 108 (56.8%) teachers strongly agreed, 127 (37.7%) students strongly agreed, 15 (71.4%) of principals agreed, 72 (37.9%) teachers agreed, 160 (47.5%) students agreed that it was the principal's duty to ensure that topics taught were in sequence of curriculum. While 4(2.1%) teachers disagreed. 41(11.2%) students disagreed, 5 (23.8%) principal strongly disagreed, 2(1.1%) teachers strongly disagreed and 3(9%) students strongly disagreed. However, 1(4.8%) principal surprisingly was undecided. 4(2.1%) teachers were undecided and 33(9.8%) students were undecided.

item 4 states that 96-(50.5%) teachers strongly agreed and 135 (40.1%) students strongly agreed, while 15(71.4%) of principals 77 (40.5%) of teachers and 135(40.1%) students agreed that it was the principal's duty that teachers did not teach outside the curriculum. While 1(4.8%) principal, 10(5.2%) teachers and 6 (1.8%) students disagreed, 4(19.0%) principals strongly disagreed a, 3(1.5%) teachers strongly disagreed and 7(2.1%) students

strongly disagreed. However, 1(4.8%) principal 4(2.1%) teachers and 54 (16.0%) students were undecided.

Item 5 states that 96 (50.5%) of teachers and 135 (40.0%) of students strongly agreed also 14(66.7%) Principals 71(37.4%) teachers 44(42.7%) and students agreed that it was the role of teachers to select appropriate methodology relevant to the content. While 9(4.7%) teachers, and disagreed, 22(6.5%) students disagreed. 6(28.6%) of principal 1(5%) teacher and 4(12%) and students strongly disagreed. However, 1(4.8%) principal 7(3.7%) teachers and 26(7.7%) students were undecided.

Item 6 indicates that 165 (54.2%) teachers, 142 (42.1%) students strongly agreed. Eleven (52.4%) of principals 64 (33.7%) teachers 157(46.76%) and students agreed that it was the principal's duty that teachers in his school should use different techniques for the formation and implementation of the school curriculum. While 7(3.7%) teachers and 7(2.1%) students disagreed, while 9(42.9%) principals strongly disagreed and 4(12%) students strongly disagreed. However, 1 (4.8%) principal 14(7.4%) teachers and 25(7.4%) students were undecided.

Item 7 indicates that 106(55.8%) teachers and 128 (38.0%) students strongly agreed, also in the same zone 12(57.1%) principals, 70 (36.8%) teachers and 114(42.7%) students agreed that it was the principals role to involve teachers in curriculum formulation and implementation. While 6(3.2%) teachers disagreed, 17(5.0%) students disagreed. 8(38.6%) principal strongly disagreed, 2(2.1%) teachers strongly disagreed and 6(12.8%) students strongly disagreed. However, 1(4.8%) principal was undecided, 6(3.2%) teachers were undecided and 28(8.3%) students were undecided.

Item 8 indicates that 107 (56.3%) teachers and 125 (37.1%) students strongly agreed, in the same positive vein 12(57.1%) principals 67 (35.3%) teachers and 156(46.3%) students agreed that it was the role of principals to ensure that teachers selected topics in the curriculum that would be functional and useful. While 8(4.2%) teachers and 8(2.4%) students disagreed 8(38%) principals and 17(5.0%) students strongly disagreed. However, 1(4.8%) principal 6(3.2%) teachers and 31 (9.1%) students were undecided.

Item 9 indicates that 106 (55.8%) teachers and 146 (43.3%) students strongly agreed, 13 (61.9%) principals a, 72 (37.9%) teachers and, 134(39.8%) students agreed that it was the duty of principal to ensure that teachers selected appropriate instructional materials such as textbooks that were relevant to the content. While 2 (1.1%) teachers disagreed. 7(38.3%) principal 2(1.1%) teachers and 18 (5.3%) students strongly disagreed. However. 1(4.8%) principal was. 8(4.2%) teachers and 27(8.0%) students were undecided.

Item 10 indicates that 10(47.6%/a) principals 106 (55.8%) teachers and 151 (44.8%) students strongly agreed, 10 (47.6%) of principals, 71 (37.4%) teachers and 153(45.4%) students agreed that it was the principal's duty to ensure that teachers entered the topics each week in the diary. While 8 (4.2%) teachers. 9 (2.7°.o) students disagreed, 1(0.5%) teacher and 12 (3.6%) students strongly disagreed. However, 1(4.8%) principal was. 4(2.1°a) teachers were undecided and 12 (3.6%) students were undecided.

### **Test of Hypothesis**

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

### **Hypothesis 1**

There is no significance different in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the role performance of principals' on teachers' adherence to curriculum content.

### **Summary of Analysis of variance on the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the role performance of principals' and teachers' adherence to curriculum content**

Variables	Sum of square	Df	Mean F	Prob	Critical
-----------	---------------	----	--------	------	----------

			Square		Value
Between Groups	1117.401	2	558.039	7.219	.000
Within Groups	42180.475	545	77.395		
Total	43297		547		

Table 3 shows the calculated f-ratio value (7.219) at 547 and the level of 0.05. the critical value (5.19) is less than f-ratio value 7.219) and observed level of significance P(.001) is less than 0.05. this means that there is a significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the role performance on teachers or principal adherence to curriculum content. Therefore, the null hypotheses is rejected.

### **Discussion of Findings**

There is no significant difference in the opinions of principals, teachers and students on the role performance of Principal and Teachers' adherence to curriculum content. This hypothesis indicates a significant difference as Principals, Teachers and Students all agreed that principal ensures that teachers teach according to the content of the curriculum. This is in line with Jackson (2000) who opines that teachers who adhered to curriculum content were influenced greatly by the standard based movement. All the students were taught the same body of knowledge. The finding revealed that teachers broke the curriculum into scheme of work and this is in line with the opinion of Taralee (2005) who said that the topics in the curriculum have to be broken into weeks for easy preparation of lessons.

The study revealed that principals made sure that the teachers were not teaching outside what was in the curriculum content. likewise teachers made use of appropriate methodologies relevant to the content through the principals' close work with the teacher which is in line with Palmer (2004) who asserted that teachers need to vary their teaching

methodologies according to relevance to the content. The study also revealed that principal involves teachers in curriculum implementation and the Principal also ensures that Teachers use different techniques for the implementation of the school curriculum. From the study, it reveals that principals make sure that teachers select appropriate instructional materials like textbooks which are relevant to the curriculum content in order to facilitate students to learn. It was also revealed in the study that teachers entered the topics taught each week in the diary for the principals awareness of the areas teachers had not been able to cover in the scheme of work.

### **Recommendation**

The following recommendation is proffered.

The principal should be conversant with the curriculum content for each subject and class from time to time evaluates the work done by the teachers. This will help the principal in Kogi State secondary schools to make sure that teachers adhered strictly to the curriculum content and also help in effective delivery of the lessons in each subject.

### **Conclusion**

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**

- Abbott, (2014) The glossary of education reform retrieved from <http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum>.
- Braslavsky C. (2003) The Curriculum en.m.wikipedia.org
- Cabiles J. D. (2013) Curriculum. Retrieved from [slidshare.net/corn](http://slidshare.net/corn)

- Cushman, K. 2016 Developing curriculum in essential schools. Retrieved June 1 ill. 2013 ,from [www.curriculumdu.com/http](http://www.curriculumdu.com/http).
- Eullan, O. (2000). The new meaning of educational change. New York Teachers College Press.
- Jackson. D. (2000) Developing a curriculum, a practice guide. London George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Kapoma, G.C and Namusokwe, C. (2011),when is the curriculum content of social Reliance retrieved from [sitwc.wordprocess.com](http://sitwc.wordprocess.com)
- Kelly A. V. (2009) The Curriculum Theory and Practice Newbury Park, C A sage.Nwana
- L.O. (2004) “Research process in education” Retrieved May 20 2014 from [www.montgomeryschool.sm](http://www.montgomeryschool.sm).
- Ogundipe. MA. (2007) “Developing curriculum for Nigerian education system “. Asaba Journal of Education Studies Vpl. 1. No.1. FOE. (T) Asaba.
- Paechter C. (1999). Issues in the study of Curriculum in the Context of Lifelong Learning. Paper Presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference University of Sussex, UK 2nd — 5Th September 1999.
- Palmer P.O (2004) Teaching practice and teaching methods for secondary school teachers. University of fe press.
- Phillips. O. (2012) A Handbook on teachers preparedness and cunctualiry. Florida
- Rays S. (2003. Ernegin Pattern of Supervision Human Pe7suectives. New York McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Scheffier (1970) Criteria usea in Selection of Subject matter for the Cu'iculum. Retrieved from [khayma.com](http://khayma.com)