



## PRINCIPALS' QUALITY CONTROL MECHANISMS AS DETERMINANTS OF TEACHERS' JOB PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN IMO STATE, NIGERIA

Ogbo, Rosita N.<sup>i</sup>,  
Anyanwu, Jude A.,  
Emengini Boniface,  
Okeke-James, Jacinta N.,  
Umeozor, Juliana U.

Department of Educational Management and Policy,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University,  
Awka, Anambra State,  
Nigeria

### Abstract:

The study investigated principals' quality control mechanisms as determinants of teachers' job performance in public secondary schools in Imo state. Six research questions and six hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study consisted of 320 principals while the proportionate random sampling technique was used to obtain 200 principals that form the sample size. A 38 item questionnaire titled; "Principals' Quality Control Mechanisms as Determinants of Teachers' Job Performance in Public Secondary Schools Questionnaire" (PQCMDTJPQ) was used to obtain responses from respondents. The instrument was validated by three experts, two from the Department of Educational Management and Policy and one from Educational Foundations Department. The reliability of the instrument was established through pilot-testing and analysis using Cronbach alpha which yielded an overall coefficient of 0.84 which was considered reliable enough for the study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses. The findings of the study indicated that most principals of public secondary schools in the study area do not adequately employ the use of quality control mechanisms to guide teachers' job performance. It was therefore recommended principal of public secondary schools should deliberately adopt an all-encompassing quality control mechanism that will help to enhance teachers' job performance.

**Keywords:** principal, quality control, mechanisms, teachers, job performance, public secondary schools

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: [drrositaogbo@gmail.com](mailto:drrositaogbo@gmail.com)

## 1. Introduction

The principal is the chief executive of every secondary school in Nigeria. He is the administrative head and he takes responsibility for all actions and inactions of both staff and students under him. Even though there could be the vice principal academic, the principal is the head of scholarship in the school and accounts for the performance of teachers and students in every examination. In fact, it is the quality of academic achievement of the school (teachers and students) that forms the basis for the assessment of his performance (Edumark, 2017).

As the head of the school, the principal has three important variables to bring under his control. They are the people (staff, students and parents), the task (both his own and that of teachers) and the environment (school climate). Ekhaton (2009) stated that the principal is the modifier of school organisational task and behaviour. Taking redundantly, both the human elements and the jobs they perform are the variables that fall under his control.

Though he does not recruit, he assigns every teacher with the work they do, be it academic or extra academic. He is therefore the head of pedagogy. In addition to this, he creates the school climate or at least modifies it (Eboka, 2009). For simplicity of language, the principal controls the teachers in the school, monitors the various tasks they do, controls the students under his care and controls the relationship between the school and parents. He also controls the daily interaction between teachers and students on one hand and between teaching staff and non-teaching staff on the other hand (Lunerberg and Ornestein, 2012).

Beyond this, the principal anchors the culture, norm and all forms of attitudinal amplitude that form the collegiality of a school and he ensures that he delivers or performs qualitatively.

The concept of quality refers to high perfection or degree of goodness. It is a form of increased superiority that is secondary to none. In this case, it is superiority in terms of evaluation, content, standard and performance. To control is to exercise responsibility over work, process or a person. It is the ability to ensure that work is done according to job design (Ezeugbor & Anozie, 2019). In the work setting especially a school, control is exercised over work and the people doing the work. Quality control can therefore be defined as the process of diligently exercising responsibility over work and the people that do the work. The process is carefully and deliberately crafted and carried out in such a way that the method of doing the work and the outcome of it represents excellence. In other words, the job performance and the result will not only satisfy the aspirations of the job designers but will also meet the expectations of the clientele (Edumark, 2017).

This pre-supposes that the principal according to Ejimofor (2007) takes his time to ensure that teachers do their jobs as prescribed by the supervisory ministry and that their attitude while at work corresponds with the ethical requirements contained in the job description. Teachers' job performance explains how teachers do their work. It can be regarded as "*teachers' work profile or teachers' work behaviour*" (Edumark, 2017). The teacher

is anyone that is trained for a specified period on specific subject content and duly certified to teach or transmit the contents of the subject to others in a formal or informal class setting. They are the bedrock of curriculum implementation (FRN, 2004).

Public secondary schools are those post-primary institutions that are established and run by the government. They could be established by the Federal Government or the state government (FRN, 2004). As hinted above, they are the next level of education after primary schools. Principals and other categories of staff of such schools are recruited by the government and posted to them. They are therefore the employees of government and the principals who head these schools report back to government on what is done and on outcome of actions taken.

Principals' quality control mechanisms stand for quality control strategies. They are measures or steps, principals take to ensure that performance and result are of excellent standard (Eboka, 2009). One of such control mechanisms is control over teachers' lesson preparation. The principal ensures that teachers carefully prepare their lessons qualitatively. This he does by deliberately going through teachers' lesson plan to ensure that lesson presentation is organised in steps that will guarantee easy and quality delivery to the understanding of the students. Poorly prepared lesson plans are corrected and returned to the teachers concerned (Cheng & Tam, 2013).

Another quality control strategy of the principals is the establishment of standards and specifications. This is achieved by dividing the teaching staff into departments and subject units. In some schools, there are Arts Department, Science, Vocational and Social Science Departments. In some other schools, subject units like English Language, Mathematics, Economics and even Chemistry are created and sometimes departmentalized. This is to ensure that subject specifications in terms of the qualifications and competencies of teachers are classified and monitored (Omebe, 2013). In addition to the above, standard is set as a means of achieving excellent outcome.

Control over the teaching method regularly adopted by teachers is monitored by the principals. To ensure that teaching methodology that will help students understand the lesson is used by teachers, principals organise or send teachers to workshop periodically. They also move round the school from class to class to see what teachers are doing and to make sure that teaching is student centered (Atanda & Jaiyeoba, 2011).

Another quality control mechanism of the principal is the periodic audit of teachers' work behaviour or attitude to work. Teachers' attitude to work can be explained in terms of commitment to work, punctuality, discipline and obedience to constituted authority. There is also the control of instructional materials used by teachers. Principals ensure that teachers use the relevant instructional materials, be they objects or materials that will drive the lesson to the understanding of the students (Ikechukwu, 2011).

Another important quality control mechanism of the principal is control over test instrument, their administration and the evaluation of the marking guide. Jackson (2002) submitted that the technical nature of the test instrument and its administration require the oversight function of the principal. Edumark (2017) submitted that the test instrument

should be measurable to ensure that its outcome will attest to the ability or capacity of students in the subject concerned.

## **2. Statement of the Problem**

The main objective of the study is to investigate the relationship between principals' control mechanisms and teachers' job performance in public secondary schools in Imo State. The principal of every post-primary school is a teacher trained and prepared to administrate. He is more than a mere teacher in a school. He leads and others follow. He interfaces with both the staff and the job or task and he controls the human elements and their duties in the school system.

However, the job performance of teachers in public secondary schools in the study area needs much to be desired. The performance and attitude of the students under their tutorship have been problematic (WAEC, 2017). In addition, there seem to be insufficient empirical research on the influence of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' job performance in public secondary schools in Imo state. It is on account of this that this study is set to investigate on how principals' job impacts on teachers' job performance.

### **2.1 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to find out the influence of principals' quality control mechanism on teachers' job performance. Specifically, the study investigated;

- 1) The impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' work attitude.
- 2) The influence of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' method of lesson delivery.
- 3) The effect of principals' quality mechanisms on teachers' use of instructional materials.
- 4) The impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' preparation of administration of test instrument.
- 5) The influence of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' lesson plan preparation.

### **2.2 Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study

- 1) How do principals' quality control mechanisms impact on teachers' attitude to work?
- 2) What is the influence of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' method of lesson delivery?
- 3) How do principals' quality control mechanisms impact on teachers' use of instructional materials?
- 4) What is the impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument?

- 5) How do principals' quality control mechanisms influence teachers' lesson plan preparations?

### 2.3 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were adopted to aid the study.

- 1) There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' attitude to work.
- 2) There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' method of lesson delivery.
- 3) There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' use of instructional materials.
- 4) There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument.
- 5) There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' lesson plan preparation.

### 3. Method

The study investigated principals' quality control mechanism as determinants of teachers' job performance. Four research questions and four null hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study consisted of 230 principals of the public secondary schools in the study area. There was no sampling since the population was manageable. The instrument used for data collection is a 38-item questionnaire titled: "Principals' Quality Control Mechanisms as Determinants of Teacher's Job Performance Questionnaire (PQCMDTJPQ)". The instrument was validated by three experts, two from the Department of Education Management and Policy and one from the Department of Educational Foundations. The reliability of PQCMDTJPQ was established using pilot-testing and analysis using Cronbach alpha which yielded 0.82 and 0.84 respectively and an overall correlation value of 0.83 which was considered high enough for the instrument to be reliable. For the purpose of data analysis, each of the instruments was scored. The four points rating scale was used in rating the respondents' responses. Each item was weighted and calculated as: Strongly Agree (SA) = 4 points, Agree (A) = 3 points, Disagree (D) = 2 points and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 point. Mean and standard deviation was used to answer the research questions and determine the homogeneity of the respondents' ratings. Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance by computed correlation index for appropriate decision. In testing the null hypothesis, when p-value is less than 0.05 ( $< 0.05$ ), the null hypothesis was rejected, where otherwise, it is accepted.

#### 4. Results

**Research Question 1:** How do principals' quality control mechanisms impact on teachers' attitude to work?

**Table 1:** Respondents' mean ratings on impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' attitude to work

S/N	Questionnaire	$\bar{X}$	SD	Remark
1	Principals monitor teachers' attitude to work.	3.06	0.61	Agree
2	Attitude to work includes punctuality to schools and to class.	3.62	0.87	Strongly Agree
3	Principals monitor punctuality to schools through staff attendance register.	3.04	0.74	Agree
4	Commitment in terms of quality lesson delivery in the class is also attitude to work.	3.06	0.89	Agree
5	Teachers' coverage of their schemes of work is equally part of attitude to work.	3.72	0.91	Strongly Agree
6	Principals monitor these work processes through the subject heads and head of departments.	3.56	0.67	Strongly Agree
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.34</b>		<b>Agree</b>

Data in Table 1 shows that out of 6 items listed on impact of principals' quality mechanisms on teachers' attitude to work, principals strongly agree to items 2, 5 and 6 with mean scores ranged between 3.56 and 3.72 while principals agree on the remaining three items (items 1, 3 and 4) with mean scores ranged between 3.04 and 3.06. The grand mean score of 3.34 shows that on the whole, principals in public secondary schools in Imo State agree that their quality control mechanisms impact on teachers' attitude to work. The standard deviation ranges between 0.61 and 0.91 indicating that the respondents are not wide apart in the mean ratings.

**Research Question 2:** What is the influence of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' method of lesson delivery?

**Table 2:** Respondents' mean ratings on impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' method of lesson delivery

S/N	Questionnaire	$\bar{X}$	SD	Remark
7	Principals ensure that teacher adopt effective teaching methods in their lesson delivery.	2.68	0.61	Agree
8	Principals monitor teachers' use of learner-centered method of teaching for instructional delivery.	3.03	0.51	Agree
9	Principals ensure that teachers adopt less of rote teaching in their instructional delivery	2.82	0.89	Agree
10	Principals monitor teachers to ensure they use teaching methods that encourage students' critical thinking	2.42	0.76	Disagree
11	Principals monitor teachers to ensure that they use methods that stimulate students' interest	2.43	0.68	Disagree
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>2.68</b>		<b>Agree</b>

Data in Table 2 reveals that out of 5 items listed in impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' method of lesson delivery, principals disagree on two items (items 10 and 11) with mean scores ranged between 2.42 and 2.43 while they agree on the remaining three items (items 7, 8 and 9) with mean scores ranged between 2.68 and 3.03. The grand mean score of 2.68 shows that principals agree that their quality control mechanisms impacts on teachers' method of lesson delivery. The standard deviation ranges between 0.51 and 0.89 indicating that the respondents are not wide apart in the mean ratings.

**Research Question 3:** How do principals' quality control mechanisms impact on teachers' teachers' use of instructional materials during lessons?

**Table 3:** Respondents' mean ratings on impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' use of instructional materials during lessons

S/N	Questionnaire	$\bar{X}$	SD	Remark
12	Principals monitoring leads to teachers using appropriate instructional materials that relate to the topic taught.	3.13	0.72	Agree
13	The monitoring ensures that relevant instructional materials to the topics are being used.	3.24	0.54	Agree
14	Where wrong instructional materials are used, the principals insist on change.	2.71	0.83	Agree
15	They also ensure that the correct instructional materials are used by teachers during lesson in the class.	3.86	0.64	Agree
16	Ensure that teachers suitably display instructional materials for all students to see clearly	3.84	0.68	Strongly Agree
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.36</b>		<b>Agree</b>

Data in Table 3 discloses that principals strongly agree that their quality control mechanisms ensure that teachers suitably display instructional materials for all students to see clearly with mean score of 3.84 while they agree on the remaining four items (items 12, 13, 14 and 15) with mean scores ranged between 2.71 and 3.24. The grand mean scores of 3.36 shows that on the whole, principals agree that their quality control mechanisms have impact on teachers' use of instructional materials during lessons. The standard deviation ranges between 0.54 and 0.83 indicating that the respondents are not wide apart in the mean ratings.

**Research Question 4:** What is the impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument?

**Table 4:** Respondents' mean ratings on impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument

S/N	Questionnaire	$\bar{X}$	SD	Remark
17	Principal vets all test instruments meant to examine students at the end of the term.	2.86	0.59	Agree
18	Test instruments are prepared by teachers.	2.84	0.62	Agree
19	Teachers submit them to principals through their heads of department.	3.04	0.83	Agree
20	The principals go through them to ensure that they are standardized.	3.02	0.79	Agree
21	The test instruments should be structured to elicit the understanding of the students in each of the subjects.	3.74	0.88	Strongly Agree
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.10</b>		<b>Agree</b>

Data in table 4 shows that out of 5 items listed on impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument, respondents strongly agree on item 21 with mean score of 3.74 while they agree on the remaining four items with mean scores ranged between 2.84 and 3.04. The grand mean score of 3.10 indicates that principals agree that their quality control mechanisms impact on teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument. Standard deviation ranging from 0.59 to 0.88 indicates that the respondents are not wide apart in the mean ratings.

**Research Question 5:** How do principals' quality control mechanisms influence teachers' lesson plan preparations?

**Table 5:** Respondents' mean ratings on impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' lesson plan preparations

S/N	Questionnaire Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	Remark
22	Principals monitor how teachers prepare their lesson plans.	2.84	0.78	Agree
23	They do this by asking teachers to submit their lesson plans for marking.	2.71	0.85	Agree
24	Sometimes heads of department inspect teachers' lesson plans and report to the principals.	2.68	0.61	Agree
25	At other times, principals mark teachers' lesson plans by themselves.	3.02	0.82	Agree
26	Heads of departments modify mistakes in teachers' lesson plans.	2.84	0.79	Agree
27	They insist that the teachers correct the mistakes identified and report back to them for marking.	3.04	0.48	Agree
28	Principals can also identify teachers' errors in their lesson plans.	3.84	0.66	Strongly Agree
29	They insist that teachers correct the identified mistakes and report back to them for marking.	3.62	0.85	Strongly Agree
30	This quality control mechanism ensures an improved job performance of teachers.	3.70	0.91	Strongly Agree
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.14</b>		<b>Agree</b>



Data in Table 5 shows that out of 9 items listed on impact of principals' quality control mechanisms on teachers' lesson plan preparations, principals strongly agree to three items (items 28, 29 and 30) with mean scores ranged between 3.62 and 3.84. The principals agree remaining on the remaining six items with mean scores ranged between 2.68 and 3.04. The grand mean score of 3.14 indicates that on the whole, principals agree that their quality control mechanisms impact on teachers' lesson plan preparations. Standard deviation ranging from 0.48 to 0.91 indicates that the respondents are not wide apart in the mean ratings.

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' attitude to work.

**Table 6:** Correlation coefficient of the relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' attitude to work

		Teachers' attitude to work
Quality control mechanisms	Pearson Correlation( <i>r</i> )	.815
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030
	N	309

Table 6 shows that *r* is .815 with a *p*-value of .030 which is less than 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' attitude to work in secondary schools in Imo State.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' method of lesson delivery.

**Table 7:** Correlation coefficient of the relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' method of lesson delivery

		Teachers' method of lesson delivery
Quality control mechanisms	Pearson Correlation( <i>r</i> )	.679
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	309

Table 7 shows that *r* is .679 with a *p*-value of .001 which is less than 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' method of lesson delivery in secondary schools in Imo State.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' use of instructional materials.

**Table 8:** Correlation coefficient of the relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' use of instructional materials

		Teachers' use of instructional materials
Quality control mechanisms	Pearson Correlation( <i>r</i> )	.681
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.201
	N	309

Table 8 shows that *r* is .681 with a *p*-value of .201 which is greater than 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This shows that there is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' use of instructional materials during delivery in secondary schools in Imo State.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument.

**Table 9:** Correlation coefficient of the relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument

		Teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument
Quality control mechanisms	Pearson Correlation( <i>r</i> )	.797
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004
	N	309

Table 9 shows that *r* is .797 with a *p*-value of .004 which is less than 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument in secondary schools in Imo State.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is no significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' lesson plan preparation.

**Table 10:** Correlation coefficient of the Relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' lesson plan preparation

		Teachers' lesson plan preparation
Quality control mechanisms	Pearson Correlation( <i>r</i> )	.836
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	309

Table 8 shows that *r* is .836 with a *p*-value of .000 which is less than 0.05 alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' lesson plan preparation in secondary schools in Imo State.

## 5. Discussion

The finding of the study as contained in Table 1 indicated that there is a positive relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' attitude to work. The principal controls teachers' attitude to work by monitoring their attendance to school through the attendance register and their punctuality to class for lessons through heads of departments' report. Teachers' attitude to work also includes proper execution of the curriculum and their commitment to co-curricular activities. Errant teachers are warned and sometimes issued with queries to curb their excesses.

Another finding of the study as seen in Table 2 showed that there is a significant relationship between principal's quality control mechanisms and teachers' method of lesson delivery. Teachers' method of teaching can be noted from the lesson plans they prepare and use to teach. It is in the thinking of education authorities that teaching should be students' centered. This is because when teaching becomes a point of interaction between the teachers and the learners, understanding is increased. The principal ensure that this is achieved by visiting some classes to see what teachers are doing to make sure that teachers are teaching at nexus.

One other finding of the study as indicated in Table 3 is that there is a high and positive relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' use of instructional materials. Instructional materials are material objects that are used by teachers to make lesson delivery practical for students' assimilation. These material objects are cited in the lesson plans.

However, the principals go round the schools during lessons to see the instructional materials and ensure that they are relevant to the lesson being taught and used properly. Where errors are detected, principals ensure that the teachers concerned effect the necessary correction.

Another finding of the study as shown in Table 4 is that there is a significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' preparation and administration of test instrument. Test instruments are in a layman's language questions and quizzes given and administered to students during examinations. These test instruments are prepared to assess the abilities of students in the various subject.

Students understanding of the lesson taught, is ascertained through their performance in termly examinations. Principals control test instruments and their administration by ensuring questions set for examinations are submitted to the examination committee for vetting. Sub-standard questions are returned to affected teachers for amendment. The instruments are also properly administered to students through thorough supervision and invigilation. Teachers and students that engage in wrong attitude in the examinations are punished to deter others.

One other finding of the study as seen in Table 5 showed that there is a positive and significant relationship between principals' control quality mechanisms and lesson preparation. Lesson plan contains the explanation of the lesson to be delivered and the steps the teachers would take in order to deliver the lesson to the understanding of the

students. Principals control this teachers' preparation of those lesson plans by ensuring that heads of department mark them weekly and report back to them. Periodically too, principals collect teachers' lesson plans to mark. Where mistakes are identified, principals ensure that the affected teachers effect the necessary corrections.

## 6. Conclusion

In view of the findings of the study, it could be seen that there is a significant relationship between principals' quality control mechanisms and teachers' job performance. Principals are teachers appointed to lead and administer others in the school. It is their responsibilities to ensure that teaching and learning is effective.

### 6.1 Recommendation

From the findings of the study, recommendations are made as follows;

- 1) Principals should be hands-on leaders as they inter-face with their teachers and students.
- 2) They should provide teachers with the necessary instructional materials to facilitate their work.
- 3) Principals should organize periodic in-service training programmes to update their teachers with the use of modern teaching aids.
- 4) Principals of schools in the study area should also organize seminar for their teachers to keep their teachers abreast of modern and elaborate teaching methods that can enhance the understanding of the students.

### Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interests

## References

- Atanda, A. I. and Jouijeoba, A. O. (2011). School quality factors and secondary students' achievement in Mathematics in Southern Western and North Central Nigeria. *The African Symposium. An online journal of the African Educational Research Network*, 11. 91-100.
- Cheng, Y. C., and Tam, W. M. (2013). Multi-models of Quality in Education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 5(1), pp. 22-51.
- Eboka, C. O. (2009). Influence of principals' leadership styles and organisational climate on teachers' morale in secondary schools in Delta state. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Nigeria.
- Edumark, (2017). Quality control in formal organizations. Edumark Publishers Limited.

- Ejimofo, F. O. (2007). Principals' transformational leadership skills and their job satisfaction in Nigeria. (An unpublished PhD Thesis). Clever Land State University.
- Ekhator, V. E. (2009). Rudiments of public administration. Joyce publisher.
- Ezeugbor, C. O. and Anozie, P. O. (2019). Educational management: A New Dimension SCOA Heritage Publications.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). National Policy of Education, Abuja.
- Ikechukwu, L. D. (2011). Curriculum implementation in religious education in Nigeria. *Journal of CUDMAN University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.
- Jackson, N. (2008). Internal academic quality audit in U.K higher educational Part II implications for a national quality assurance framework; *Quality Assurance in Education*, 5(1), pp. 25 -29.
- Lunerberg, F. C. and Ornestein, A. C. (2012). Educational administration, Concepts and Practices. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Wadsworth.
- Omebe, C. A. (2010). Strategies for effective teaching practice. Fred-ogah Publishers.
- WAEC, (2017). WAEC Chief examiners' report of West African Senior Secondary School Certificate Examination, Mary/Jane, 2017. WAEC National Office, Yaba, Lagos.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).