

ASSESSMENT OF MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT EDUCATION AUTHORITIES IN ENUGU STATE

Ada M. Eze

*Department of Education Management,
African Thinkers Community of Inquiry College of Education, Enugu,
Enugu State.*

And

Chinwendu M. Okoro

*Department of Guidance and Counselling,
African Thinkers Community of Inquiry College of Education, Enugu,
Enugu State.*

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to assess the management of basic schools by Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs) in Enugu State. Four research questions and four hypotheses guided the study. Descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. The sample for the study comprised 578 head teachers and 51 supervisors in the 17 Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu State. The instrument for data collection was a self structured questionnaire developed by the researcher. The research questions were answered with mean and standard deviation, while the hypotheses were tested using t-test. The findings showed that, both head teachers and supervisors agreed to a great extent on the management in terms of funding, supervision, maintenance of school plant and staff development of basic schools by the LGEAs. One of the recommendations made was that, head teachers and supervisors should adopt another means of sourcing funds in case the Local Government Education Authorities fail.

Keywords: Management, Primary Schools, Local Government Education Authority.

The importance of education to any society, state, or country cannot be overemphasized because it is the catalyst that propels national development. No wonder every nation strives to provide its citizens with qualitative education knowing very well that what they receive determines her political and social sectors directions.

Perhaps this background made Adepoju and Fabiyi (2007) to observe that education remains a social process for capacity building and the maintenance of society for decades. Basic education is regarded as the most important and the most patronized level by people. This is due to its foundational pride of place in the whole educational system. In other words, it helps to eradicate illiteracy, which is one of the strongest predictors of poverty (Bruns, Mingart & Rakotomalal, 2003). Thus, basic education is the only level of education that is available everywhere in both the developed and the developing countries as well as in urban and rural areas (Akinbote, 2001).

Hence, the National Policy on Education by the Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014) described basic education as the “education given to children aged 6 – 12 years”. It further acknowledged that since the rest of education system is built upon it, this level is key to success or failure of the entire system and as such requires proper management. The term ‘management’ has been defined in various ways. Akpakwu (2012) defined it as a process of getting the work done in order to get the objectives of the organization accomplished in a pre-planned way. Management has also been seen as the effective organization and utilization of the human and material resources in a particular system for the achievement of identified objectives (Yawe, 2010).

However, following the 1979 Federal constitution, the provision, funding and management of primary education came under the statutory obligation of Local Government Councils. In order to enable local government councils discharge this responsibility creditably, the Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs) were established under the supervision and control of the National Primary Education Commission (NPEC) (Enyi, 2001). National Primary Education Commission was established in 1988 as a decentralized primary education management body in order to engender uniformity in the quality of primary education provided across the country. The National Primary Education Commission was charged with the following responsibilities:

- Schools financial management assessment
- Supervision of schools and instructions
- Submission of annual estimates and accounts
- Responsible for general maintenance of primary school buildings and other infrastructures
- Enhancement of pupils’ enrolment and active participation of the communities in running schools in their areas (Enyi, 2001:289).

Management of basic schools by LGA in this study is focused on financial management, instructional supervision, maintenance of school plants, and staff development. Effective school management guarantees effective education delivery. In essence, the major reason for having management outfit in organizations or establishments of which basic schools are part of is to enhance, promote, protect and harmonize the human and material resources available towards productivity. When

this is lacking, it results to multiplier effects ranging from poor teaching, poor learning to laissez affaire attitude among teachers. More so, nonchalant attitudes of supervisors and education stakeholders in the LGEAs towards the discharge of their duties as regards the management of basic schools, in some cases it leads to break down of law and order in the school system and brings about poor productivity. It is against this background that this study is being undertaken. Hence, this study will close the gap in literature by appraising the managements of basic schools by Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu State. The problem of this study therefore, put in question form is, what is the extent of management of basic schools by LGEA with particular reference to financial management, instructional supervision, maintenance of school plants and staff development?

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to assess the management of basic schools by Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu State. Specifically, the study sought to;

1. Determine the extent to which the Local Government Education Authorities contribute to effective basic schools' financial management in Enugu State;
2. examine the extent to which the Local Government Education Authorities participate in supervision of instructions in basic schools in Enugu State;
3. find out the extent of involvement of Local Government Education Authorities in the maintenance of basic school plants in Enugu State;
4. investigate the extent to which the Local Government Education Authorities participate in staff development in basic schools in Enugu State.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study.

- I. To what extent do Local Government Education Authorities contribute to effective funding of basic education in Enugu State?
- II. To what extent do Local Government Education Authorities participate in supervision of instructions in basic schools in Enugu State?
- III. To what extent are Local Government Education Authorities involved in the maintenance of basic school plants in Enugu State?
- IV. To what extent do the Local Government Education Authorities participate in staff development in basic schools in Enugu State?

Hypotheses

Ho₁. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors on the extent to which LGEAs contribute to effective funding of basic schools in Enugu State.

Ho₂. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors on the extent to which LGEAs participate in supervision of instructions in basic schools in Enugu State.

Ho₃. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors on the extent to which LGEAs are involved in the maintenance of basic school plants in Enugu State.

Ho₄. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors on the extent to which LGEAs participate in staff development in basic schools in Enugu State.

Literature Review

Theoretically, studies are anchored on set of theories hence this study adopted the classical management theory which posited that approach to management was primarily concerned with the structure and activities of formal, or official organization. It is characterized division of work; the establishment of hierarchy of authority and the span of control were seen to be of utmost importance in the achievement of an effective organization (Cole, (2004). Thus, its emphasis is on purpose, formal structure, hierarchy of management, technical requirement and common principles. Looking at the structure of the educational management system in Nigeria, this theory aptly explained the need for proper management structure in terms of supervision, funding, maintenance of school plants and manpower development.

Plethora of empirical researches abound on the study variables, for instance, some studies recorded the existence of poor infrastructure facilities and school plants in most schools in Nigeria (Alimi, 2012), poor supervision in the sense that evaluators lack facilities and equipment for school monitoring. (Adeyemi, 2006; Ezenwaji, Ejionueme, Ugwoke & Chigbu, 2014) and poor school management in terms of funding, planning, and development showed lack of inadequate structure for proper management (Iwu & Iwu, 2013). In the same vein, scholars like Owoeye (2000) have long identified the importance of school facilities in teaching and learning while the inadequacy, deterioration and lack of maintenance of these facilities will spell doom for the teachers and students in the teaching and learning activities.

Method

Design of the Study

The design of the study was a descriptive survey design. The researcher found this design most suitable in carrying out this study, because it will enable the researcher to collect primary data as they exist in the natural setting on the appraisal of Management of basic schools by Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu State.

Area of the Study

The study covered the entire Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu State. These LGEAs harbour 1,222 basic y schools which are under their watch.

Population Sample and Sampling Technique: The population of the study comprised all the 1,222 head teachers in government (public) basic schools in Enugu State and 156 supervisors from the 17 Local Governments in Enugu State (Department of Statistic, ESUBEB, 2015). The population of the study was relatively large; hence, the researcher adopted systematic random sampling technique. This sampling involves listing the whole population serially from which a sample was taken and the sample size determined by dividing the population by the sample size and using the K as the basis for selecting the sample, thus: $K = N/n$ (Alumode, 2011).

So, from the list of 1, 222 basic schools in Enugu State, the researcher took every 2nd school on the list. On the other hand, 3 education supervisors were randomly selected from each Local Government Education Authorities in the local governments. This amounted to 51 supervisors out of a pool of 156 supervisors in all the LGEAs in Enugu State. To this end, the sample size for this study amounted to 578 head teachers, 51 supervisors in all the education zones in Enugu State. This gave a total of 629 respondents.

Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument used for this study was a 34-item questionnaire called Appraisal of Management of Basic Schools by Local Government Education Authorities Questionnaire (AMBSLGAEQ) developed by the researcher and designed to evaluate the activities of the LGEA on the basic schools under their watch. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, the first part (Section A) dealt with demographic information while the second part (Section B) had four clusters that contained items designed to help gather data that helped the researcher in answering the research questions. The questionnaire was developed on 4-point scale of: Very Great Extent (VGE), Great Extent (GE), Low Extent (LE) and Very Low Extent (VLE) respectively.

Validation and Reliability of the Instrument

This instrument AMBSLGAEQ was face validated by three research experts. The comments, suggestions and criticism made by these experts helped the researcher to modify and produce the final instrument which had 50 items originally, but after validation the items were reduced to 34 items. In ascertaining the reliability, a pilot study was carried out using Ngor-Okpala LGEA in Imo State of which 30 participants were sampled. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability estimate was employed to determine the internal consistency of the instrument, the following reliability coefficients were established for the four clusters; cluster 1 = .65, Cluster 2 = .77. Cluster 3 = .88 and Cluster 4 = .78. On the overall, AMBSLGAEQ questionnaire obtained a reliability

coefficient of 0.77. Based on the fact that the coefficient alpha was relatively high, the instrument was considered reliable and appropriate for this study.

Method of Data Collection

The researcher recruited and trained 18 (11 males and 7 females) research assistants in a one day consultative meeting during which the purpose of the study was specified as well as the process of administration and collection of the questionnaire. These assistants were recruited based on the local government areas they are from and were further deployed in threes to cover the entire local government education authorities. This was necessary due to the large geographical area covered by this study and the more the assistants' knowledge about the terrain the better the access and reach out. The questionnaires were administered individually and collected upon completion for analysis. The whole field exercise lasted for a month and one week. The researcher distributed and retrieved the administered questionnaires using direct delivery and retrieval system.

Method of Data Analysis

In analysing the data, the researcher used mean score and standard deviation in answering the research question of this study. The t-test statistics was also used to test the null hypotheses at .05 level of significant.

Results

The presentation and analysis are according to the research questions and hypotheses. **Research Question 1:** To what extent do Local Government Education Authorities contribute to effective primary education funding in Enugu State?

Table 1: Mean Score of Head Teachers and Supervisors Regarding the Extent to which Local Government Education Authorities Fund Basic Education

S/N		Head Teachers			Supervisors		
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.
1	Pay teachers' salaries as and when due	2.81	1.03	GE	2.90	1.07	G.E
2	Provide monetary incentives to teachers for job well done	2.97	0.97	GE	2.98	1.02	G.E
3	Sponsor teachers' workshops, seminars and conferences	3.26	0.95	GE	2.73	1.09	G.E
4	Make financial donations during school events	3.12	1.01	GE	2.76	1.02	G.E
5	Give grants to financially empower the school programmes	3.16	0.94	GE	2.80	0.93	G.E
6	Regulate school financial expenditures	3.07	0.92	GE	2.80	1.05	G.E
7	Submit school financial report to State Universal Education Board	3.28	0.84	GE	3.06	1.04	GE
8	Give scholarship to teachers in basic schools	3.19	0.86	GE	2.80	1.07	GE
	CLUSTER MEAN	3.11	0.94	GE	2.85	1.04	GE

From Table 1 above, the results of the data analysis for research question 1 indicated that items 1 to 8 had mean responses that were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. The value of the cluster means (3.11) and SD (0.94) for head teachers and (2.85) and SD (1.04) for supervisors were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. This implied that the respondents agreed to a great extent that Local Government Education Authorities contribute to effective basic education funding in Enugu state.

Research Question 2: To what extent do Local Government Education Authorities participate in supervision of instructions in basic Schools in Enugu state?

Table 2: Mean Score of Head Teachers and Supervisors regarding the Participation of LGEAs in the Supervision of Instructions in Basic Schools in Enugu State

S/N		Head Teachers			Supervisors		
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.
9	Ensure that capacity building programmes in the school are properly carried out	3.12	0.92	GE	2.76	1.02	GE
10	Visit the school to supervise teaching and learning	3.04	0.89	GE	2.75	1.04	GE
11	Assess the provision of teaching and learning materials in the school	3.33	0.82	GE	3.04	0.99	GE
12	Furnish head teachers with necessary information and suggestions for instructional improvement	3.30	0.85	GE	2.63	1.05	GE
13	Correct areas of instructional weakness among teachers in basic schools	3.17	0.94	GE	2.63	1.01	GE
14	Supervise teachers' lesson notes in the school	2.98	0.94	GE	2.82	0.96	GE
15	Holds conference with teachers to discuss ways of solving their career problems	3.18	0.93	GE	2.75	0.97	GE
	CLUSTER MEAN	3.16	0.90	GE	2.77	1.00	GE

From Table 2 above, the results of the data analysis for research question 2 indicated that all the items had mean responses that were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. The value of the cluster means (3.16) and SD (0.90) for head teachers and (2.77) and SD (1.00) for supervisors were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. This implied that the respondents agreed to a great extent that LGEAs participate in supervision of instructions in basic schools in Enugu State.

Research Question 3: To what extent are Local Government Education Authorities involved in the Maintenance of Basic School Plants in Enugu State?

Table 3: Mean Score of Head Teachers and Supervisors Regarding the LGEAS Involvement in the Maintenance of the Basic Schools Plants in Enugu State

S/N		Teachers			Supervisors		
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.
16	Renovate old classrooms in the school	3.15	0.92	GE	2.63	1.07	GE
17	Provide desks, chalkboards, and office furniture in the school	3.18	0.88	GE	2.88	1.08	GE
18	Equip the school library with current learning materials	3.28	0.92	GE	2.75	1.04	GE
19	Make provision for recreational facilities in the school	3.28	0.87	GE	2.63	0.97	GE
20	Provide facilities for sporting events in the schools	3.16	0.90	GE	3.04	0.99	GE
21	Build toilets facilities for the school staff and the pupils	3.16	0.95	GE	2.88	1.02	GE
22	Install transformers and other facilities for electricity in the school	3.20	0.88	GE	2.67	1.02	GE
23	Ensure availability and maintenance of school canteen	3.32	0.85	GE	2.82	1.02	GE
24	Construct roads and drainages to prevent erosion in the school	3.06	1.01	GE	2.82	0.89	GE
	CLUSTER MEAN	3.20	0.91	GE	2.79	1.01	GE

From Table 3 above, the results of the data analysis for research question 3 indicated that all the items had mean responses that were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. The value of the cluster means (3.20) and SD (0.91) for teachers and (2.79) and SD

(1.01) for supervisors were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. This implied that the respondents agreed to a great extent that LGEAs are involved in the maintenance of basic school plants in Enugu state.

Research Question 4: To what extent do the Local Government Education Authorities participate in staff development in Enugu state?

Table 4: Mean Scores of Head Teachers and Supervisors in Relation to LGEAS Participation in Staff Development

S/N		Head Teachers			Supervisors		
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.
25	Provision of computer facilities for information technology (IT) in schools	2.89	1.01	GE	2.63	1.05	GE
26	Involve in personnel recruitment of new teachers in the school	3.17	1.01	GE	2.67	1.16	GE
27	Organize staff orientation for new staff	2.95	0.97	GE	2.82	1.04	GE
28	Conduct staff performance appraisal in the school	3.08	0.98	GE	2.92	1.04	GE
29	Engage in staff motivation	2.99	0.96	GE	3.00	1.01	GE
30	Provide staff welfare packages in the school	3.28	0.84	GE	2.73	1.01	GE
31	Ensure promotion of staff as and when due	3.15	0.92	GE	2.98	1.02	GE
32	Settle conflicts among staff in their areas of jurisdiction	3.16	0.96	GE	2.57	1.17	GE
33	Discipline staff that are involved in gross misconduct	3.23	0.86	GE	2.61	0.92	GE
34	Helps staff to plan their retirement process	3.08	0.98	GE	2.84	1.07	GE
	CLUSTER MEAN	3.10	0.95	GE	2.78	1.05	GE

From Table 4 above, the results of the data analysis for research question 4 indicated that items 25 to 35 had mean responses that were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. The value of the cluster means (3.10) and SD (0.95) for head teachers and (2.78) and SD (1.05) for supervisors were higher than the cut-off point of 2.50. This implied that the respondents agreed to a great extent to the fact that LGEAs participate in the staff development of the basic education in Enugu State.

Hypotheses

HO₁: There is no significant difference between the mean score of head teachers and supervisors on the funding of basic education by the Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu state.

Table 5: t-test Results of Teachers and Supervisors on the Funding of basic Education by the Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu State

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision
Head Teachers	578	3.11	0.94	627	1.73	±1.96	Not significance
Supervisors	51	2.85	1.04				Do not reject HO ₁

Table 5 above presents the independent t-test analysis of the mean difference in the response opinions of head teachers and supervisors on the funding of basic education by the Local Government Education Authorities. The result in table 5 shows that the calculated t-value (1.73) was less than the critical value (±1.96). The null hypothesis is hereby not rejected. Thus, no significant differences existed between the mean scores of head teachers and those of the supervisors in the funding of basic education by the Local Government Education Authorities in Enugu State.

HO₂: There is no significant difference between the mean score of head teachers and supervisors with regards to LGEAs participation in supervision of instructions in basic schools in Enugu State.

Table 6: t-test Results of Head Teachers and Supervisors with regards to LGEAs Participation in Supervision of Instructions in Basic Schools in Enugu State

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision
Head Teachers	578	3.16	0.9	627	2.79	±1.96	Significance
Supervisors	51	2.77	1.00				Reject HO ₂

Table 6 above presents the independent t-test analysis of the mean difference in the response opinions of head teachers and supervisors with regards to LGEAs participation in supervision of instructions in basic schools. The result in table 6 shows that the calculated t-value (2.79) is more than the critical value (±1.96). The null hypothesis is hereby rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors with regards to LGEAs participation in supervision of instructions in basic schools in Enugu State.

HO₃: There is no significant difference between the mean score of head teachers and supervisors with regards to LGEAs involvement in the maintenance of basic schools plants in Enugu State.

Table 7: t-test Results of Head Teachers and Supervisors with regards to LGEAs Involvement in the Maintenance of Basic Schools’ Plant in Enugu State

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision
Head Teachers	578	3.20	0.91	627	2.93	±1.96	Significance
Supervisors	51	2.79	1.01				Reject HO ₃

Table 7 above presents the independent t-test analysis of the mean difference in the response opinions of head teachers and supervisors with regards to LGEAs involvement in the maintenance of basic schools’ plants. The result in table 7 shows that the calculated t-value (2.93) is more than the critical value (±1.96). The null hypothesis is hereby rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors with regards to LGEAs involvement in the maintenance of basic schools’ plants in Enugu State.

HO₄: There is no significant difference between the mean score of head teachers and supervisors in the participation of staff development by LGEAs in basic schools in Enugu State.

Table 8: t-test Results of Head Teachers and Supervisors in the Participation of Staff Development by LGEAs in Basic Schools in Enugu State

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	t-crit.	Decision
Head Teachers	578	3.10	0.95	627	2.29	±1.96	Significance
Supervisors	51	2.78	1.05				Reject HO ₄

Table 8 above presents the independent t-test analysis of the mean difference in the response opinions of head teachers and supervisors in the participation of staff development by LGEAs. The result in table 8 shows that the calculated t-value (2.29) is more than the critical value (±1.96). The null hypothesis is rejected that means there is a significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors in the participation of staff development by LGEAs in basics schools in Enugu State.

Discussions

The result of research question one which stated “to what extent do Local Government Education Authorities contribute to effective primary education funding in Enugu State?” It shows that head teachers and supervisors adopted the effective level of funding of basic schools by the LGEAs. With reference also to hypothesis one, which shows no significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors on the funding of basic schools by the LGEAs and HO_1 was not rejected. In other words, it shows that both head teachers and supervisors agreed to a great extent in the funding of basic schools by the LGEAs. Thereby, disagreeing with earlier studies from Iwu & Iwu, (2013) that LGEA has failed in its management of the basic schools.

The result of research questions two which stated “to what extent do Local Government Education Authorities participate in supervision of instructions in basic Schools in Enugu state?” It shows that the LGEAs have been participating in the supervision of instructions in the basic schools based on the level of response from the head teachers and the supervisors. With reference also to hypothesis two which shows a significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors on the participation in supervision of instructions in basic schools by the LGEAs and HO_2 was rejected. In other words, it shows that both head teachers and supervisors had high response in the supervision of instructions in the basic schools. The findings disagreed with Ezenwaj et al. (2014) and Adeyemi (2006) results which showed that the level of management of basic schools in the State was low and ineffective in the study area.

The results of research question three which stated “to what extent are Local Government Education Authorities involved in the Maintenance of Basic School Plants in Enugu State?” It shows that, there was great extent of responses from head teachers and supervisors on the LGEAs involvement in the maintenance of basic school plants. With reference to hypothesis three, which showed a significant difference between the mean scores of head teachers and supervisors on the maintenance of plants of basic schools by the LGEAs and HO_3 was rejected. In other words, the head teachers and supervisors had great response in the maintenance of basic school plants by the LGEAs. The findings disagreed with Alimi (2012) that while land space for development purposes were adequate, classrooms, sports and recreation equipment, toilet facilities and portable water were inadequate.

The results of research question four which stated “to what extent do the Local Government Education Authorities participate in staff development in Enugu State? It shows that the head teachers and supervisors agreed to a great extent that, the LGEAs do participate in the development of their staff. With reference to hypothesis four, which showed a significant difference between the mean scores head teachers and supervisors on the participation of staff development of basic schools by the LGEAs and the HO_4 was rejected. In other words, head teachers and supervisors

acknowledge the fact to a great extent that LGEAs participate in staff development in basic schools in Enugu State. The findings disagreed with Iwu & Iwu (2013) who found out that, staff development are not necessarily carried out by the LGEA in Ebonyi State.

Conclusion

This research studies the appraisal of management of basic schools by local government education authority in Enugu state. Based on the findings of the study, LGEA in Enugu State are doing much in terms of management of basic schools in their areas in terms of supervision, maintenance of school plants and staff development and funding as agreed by head teachers and supervisors in basic schools in the LGEAs in Enugu State.

Educational Implications of the Study

The findings of this study have educational implications which include:

1. Since there is a total positive response by the respondents with regards to the funding of basic schools by LGEAs, it would create a platform for actual possession of administrative duties by the local government authorities. The impact of funding will also make the learning environment to be conducive because all the needed facilities will be provided to the schools for academic advancement.
2. Since the respondents agreed to all the items on the supervision of instructions by LGEAs in the basic schools, it will make the teachers to always be at alert thereby doing the right thing at the right time.
3. Since the respondents also agreed to all the items on the management of the basic school plants by the LGEAs, the pupils will be sure of always studying in classrooms that are well equipped.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were proffered:

1. Head teachers and supervisors should adopt another means of sourcing funds in case the Local Government Education Authorities do otherwise.
2. The contract of the management of the school plants should be given to well experience contractors rather than quacks to avoid collapse of buildings, water facilities etc thereby hindering educational activities at that moment.
3. Conference, workshops, seminars and other in-service programmes should be regularly organized for teachers to acquaint them with latest skills of teaching.

Limitations of the Study

The researcher had difficulty distributing and collecting the instrument as most of the head teachers and supervisors were consistently not accessible during office

hours. The researcher also had difficulty in soliciting the co-operation of the respondents.

References

- Adepoju, A. & Fabiyi, A. (2007). *Universal Basic Education in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects*. Sub mission Id=70830> (Retrieved March 20, 2017).
- Adeyemi, T.O. (2006). The effective management of primary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria: an analytical assessment. *International Journal of Emotional Psychology and Sport Ethics*, 8, 26-33.
- Akinbote O. (2001). *The Nigerian Primary School Teachers: Angels of Instruction or devils of destruction?* Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Akpakwu, O.S. (2012). *Educational Management: Theory and Practice*. Makurdi: Destiny Ventures.
- Alimi, O.S. (2012). Appraisal of school plant adequacy for primary education in Ayedade Local Government Area of Osun State, Nigeria. *Asian. Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 1(4), 206 – 211.
- Alumode, B. E. (2011). Population sampling techniques in research in education and social sciences. In B. Ezeliora, J. Ezeokara, H. Inyega & Co. *Principles of research in Education and social sciences*. Enugu, Nig. Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Bruns, B., & Rakotomalala, R. (2003). *Achieving universal primary education by 2015: A chance for every child* (Vol. 1). World Bank Publications.
- Cole, G. A. (2004). *Management theory and practice*. Cengage Learning EMEA.
- Enyi, D. (2001). Implementing alternative sources of funding higher education in Nigeria: Managing the weak sports. In A.U. Akubue and D. Enyi (eds); *Crisis and challenged in higher education in developing countries*. Ibadan: Nazareth press Ltd.
- Ezenwaji, I. O., Ejionueme, L.K., Ugwoke, S.C., & Chigbu, B.C. (2014). Appraisal of the Functions of Evaluators for Quality Assurance in Primary Schools in South East, Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 3(3), 1 – 7.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014). *National Policy on Education*. Yaba Lagos
NERDC Press.

Iwu, C. G. & Iwu, I. C. (2013). Factors inhibiting effective management of primary schools in Nigeria: The Case of Ebonyi State. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 35(1), 51-60.

Owoeye, J.S. (200). The Effect of Interaction of location, Facilities and Class size on Academic Achievement of Secondary School Students in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan*.

Yawe, A. A. (2010). *Educational Management*. Katsina-Ala: Eddison Publishers.