



School Infrastructural Quality and Principals' Administrative Job Performance in Secondary Schools in Cross River State, Nigeria

Arop, Festus Obun., Okon, James Ekpanyong & Ngban, Joseph Nkom

*Department of Educational, Administration and Planning, University of Calabar, Nigeria. Corresponding author: aropfestusobun@yahoo.com
Mobile: 08037343667*

dreteteokon@yahoo.com; Mobile: 0803383127 and 07039263436

Received April, 2018, Accepted, may, and published June, 2018

Abstract

The study investigated schools' infrastructural quality and principals' administrative job performance in secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria. Survey research design was adopted for the study using the stratified random sampling technique; a sample of 184 principals was drawn from a population of 245 principals covering the entire public schools in the study area. Six (6) teachers were selected from each of the one hundred and eighty four (184) sampled secondary schools, this brought the total sample to one thousand, two hundred and eighty eight (1,288) principals and teachers to assess school quality and principals' administrative job performance. Data collection was carried out with the researchers' developed questionnaire titled: School Infrastructural Quality and Principals Administrative Job Performance Questionnaire (SIQPAJPQ). The instrument was face validated, while the reliability coefficient done after a sample of 20 copies of the instrument was administered and analyzed using the Cronbach alpha method. The reliability estimates range from 0.77-0.89 which was considered high enough to justify the use of the instrument for the study. The data were analyzed using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). The findings indicated that school infrastructural qualities significantly influence principals' administrative job performance in terms of planning, organizing, coordinating and directing. Based on the findings, it was recommended among others that government should provide and maintain infrastructural facilities in public secondary schools to enhance principals' administrative job performance.

Keywords: School, infrastructural quality, principals, administration, job performance.

Introduction

School infrastructural quality encompasses quality physical environment, infrastructures, school facilities, quality record management tools, adequacy in class size and space with regards to teacher-student ratio as stipulated in the National Policy on Education (FRN 2004). Jaiyeoba and Atanda (2005) posited that quality is synonymous with standard, efficiency, excellence, relevance and worthiness. When applied to education and the school system, it is the success with which an institution provides educational environment which enables students to achieve worthwhile learning goals including appropriate academic standards. Quality is concerned with how good or bad a product is. It is about the standard of something when compared with other things. It therefore presupposes that there is a standard against which the outcome is compared (Okebukola, 2006).

Uchendu, Nnaji and Nwafor (2016) reported that the more quality school physical environment becomes, the better the productivity of the workers. This quality of environment may be evidenced in the quality of classroom space, library and laboratory facilities, record management and indeed the school climate; this will no doubt boost the morale and capability effectiveness of the staff. Oyesola (2017) observed that in educational institutions, facilities constitute essential input which create favourable learning environment. Facilities interact and enhance achievement of principals' job performance and educational objectives in general. The adequacy or otherwise of the facilities will largely determine the quality of performance of the principals. Asiabaka (2008) maintained that quality school facilities play a vital role in the actualization of principals' administrative job performance by satisfying the physical and national needs of both staff and students.

Principals' job performance refers to the level of effectiveness in the running of the school affairs by the school head. It is the primary responsibility of the school head to carry out the administrative functions in the school organization. Hence, administrative job performance can be seen as the principals' capability to plan, organize, direct and coordinate school activities and programmes in order to attain desired goals. However, principals' job performance can be corroborated as actual implementation of school policies and programmes to reach secondary school goals.

Unfortunately, principals' administrative job performance in Cross River State Secondary Schools over the years seems to be poor. This had led to the deplorable state of secondary education in the state. This is further evidenced in poor academic activities, limited organizational skills, poor coordination of school programmes and policies. Proper execution of administrative function by the principals would guarantee optimal goal attainment of secondary school education, but the reverse is the case where sub standard products are churned out of the system. The situation is quite alarming; principals allege that their job performance is hampered by the dearth of infrastructure. Government is unable to provide adequate infrastructure and or maintain existing ones. According to Vischer (2007), the concept of environmental comfort links the psychological aspects of workers environmental likes and dislikes with concrete outcome measures such as improved task performance, as well as with organizational productivity through workspace support for work related tasks. Principals' administrative job performance is no doubt largely contingent on school infrastructural quality as it were.

Philips (2012) argued that even though school facilities is critical in the realization of quality school and job performance, most principals seldom carry out routine checks of the facilities as well as repair the ones within their means. The author added that among the many tasks that principals perform, only one tenth are devoted to providing quality facilities for quality teaching.

The provision of necessary facilities such as tables and chairs for both teachers and students to enable them carry out their duties is not given due attention (Isa, Jailani & Suleiman, 2014). Principals of secondary schools are themselves expected to exhibit creativity, resourcefulness and expertise in the provision and maintenance of facilities for enhanced performance of their job. Hargreaves, Earl Moore and Manning (2011) argued that there should be a paradigm shift in the conception of principals' job performance from the managerial and administrative perspective to that of instructional leadership. Principals should act as leaders in all aspect of the school curricula, impacting and enforcing on the intellectual and emotional development of the teachers, charging the instructional environment of the school and affecting and transforming the students' learning and achievement behaviour and attitude.

The role of secondary education is preparing citizens for higher education and for useful living within the society is becoming increasingly important. Due to the relevance of this level of education, it is the duty of the government through the education management agencies and personnel to ensure that secondary education is given at the best standard which will ensure that the aims of its establishment are optimally actualized. However, it has been observed over the years that output from secondary education has not been able to live up to the expectation of contributing meaningfully to the society, rather consisting sorts of miscreants in the society. Also they lack the needed skills to secure admission in higher institutions, and for those who manage to find themselves there will involve in malpractices, and unbeneficial gangsterism. These have been attributed to poor administrative job performance of the principals in secondary schools. Following the views of the principals, the drawbacks in their administrative job and the inadequacy in the school functioning can be attributed to government inability to provide the quality of physical environment needed in school, inadequacy in supervision and inspection and replacement of outdated ones, non-provision of in-service education for teachers to upgrade their professional skills, inadequacy in the provision of needed office facilities for proper record management, non-provision of student support services, among others.

However, adequacy in administrative job performance of the principal would have been able to create a conducive school environment capable of producing high intellects and well skilled individuals. Principals job performance in Cross River State public secondary schools tend to be centered on planning, organizing, directing, supervising and evaluation of the school system so as to produce quality school as well as quality output. Unfortunately, these administrative roles are not effectively carried out by the principals, leading to poor planning of school routine, inadequacy in the organization of school schedules, poor coordinating abilities and inadequacies in directing of school affairs. Philips (2012) argued that even though school facilities are critical in the realization of quality school and job performance, most principals seldom carry out routine checks of facilities

as well as repair the ones within their means. The researcher added that among the many tasks that principals perform, only one tenth are devoted to providing quality facilities for quality teaching. These poor administrative culture has led to inefficiency of the school system, leading to poor programme implementation that lack the standard to impart the needed skills on the students to achieve the expected goal of academic success.

Efforts has been made by the government through its education management agencies in providing the needed good working atmosphere by ensuring that schools are well equipped with the needed facilities. Also, professional development training has been provided for principals to upgrade their administrative skills, yet the problems of poor administrative job performance persists, it is against this background that the researchers engaged themselves in the investigation of the influence of school infrastructural quality on principal's administrative job performance in the study area. One research question and a a null hypothesis was formulated to guide the study thus:

To what extent does quality of school physical environment influence principals' administrative job performance in secondary schools?

Quality of school physical environment does not significantly influence principals' administrative job performance in secondary schools in terms of planning, organizing, coordinating and directing

Methodology

The Survey research design was adopted for the study. The area of study was public secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria, which comprise eighteen local government areas. Using stratified random sampling techniques, a sample of 184 principals from 184 public secondary school were selected from a population of 245 schools for the study. Additional 6 teachers from each of the 184 (1104) school were further selected to join in the study, making a total of 1288 sample teachers and principals formed the selected sample for the study. A modified four point likert type response option was adopted for the structured questionnaire titled: School Infrastructural Quality and Principals Administrative Job Performance Questionnaire (SIQPAJPQ) were used for data collection. The questionnaire had three sections, section 'A' contained demographic items, section 'B' had six option items to elicit information on quality of school infrastructure while section 'C' had twenty four option items which elicited information on the four domains of principals administrative job performance identified as: academic planning, organizing, coordinating and directing. The instrument was face validated after samples were administered to respondents outside the study area. The Cronbach alpha reliability statistical method was used to ascertain the reliability estimates for the sub-variables which ranged from between 0.77-0.89, which was considered high enough to justify the use of the instrument for the study. The 1,288 copies of the questionnaire were administered to the secondary school principals and their teachers' for the exercise by the

researchers and three research assistants, all the copies of the questionnaire were correctly filled and returned for data analysis. The hypothesis was tested at .05 alpha levels.

The independent variable is the quality of school physical environment which was seen in three categories of high, moderate and low quality of school physical environment. The variable measured is continuous and was categorized based on the scores obtained by the respondents. Those that their scores ranged from 19-24 were considered as perceiving their schools to have high quality of schools physical environment, those that their scores ranged from 13-18 were considered as perceiving their schools to have moderate quality of school physical environment, while those whose scores ranged from 6-12 were considered as perceiving their schools to have low quality of school physical environment. The dependent variables are principals' administrative job performance. This was seen in the aspect of academic planning, organizing, coordinating and directing. Having the independent variable to be categorized into three and the four aspect of the dependent variable to be continuous, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied as the statistical tool to establish the influence of quality of school physical environment on the four aspects of principals' administrative performance which are: academic planning, organizing, coordinating and directing. Summaries of the result are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Results and Discussion

The quality of school physical environment does not significantly influence principals' administrative job performance in secondary schools. Table 1 showed the descriptive statistics of influence of quality of school physical environment on principals' job performance. The quality of school physical environment was categorized into high, moderate and low quality. The job performance was seen in the aspects of academic planning, organizing, coordinating and directing. Results on table 2 showed that at .05 level of significance and degrees of freedom 2 and 1243, the critical f-ratio is 3.00. The calculated f-ratios obtained in establishing the influence of quality of school physical environment on four aspects of principals' job performance are: academic planning, $F=4.65(p<.05)$; organizing, $f=12.20 (p<.05)$; coordinating, $f=7.43 (p<.05)$; directing, $f=9.85 (p<.05)$. The calculated F-ratios were greater than the critical F-ratio and their obtained significant value less than .05 level of significance used in the study. With these results, the null hypothesis which stated that quality of school physical environment does not significantly influence principals' administrative job performance is rejected regarding the four aspect of job performance, while the alternate hypothesis which stated that quality of school physical environment does significantly influence principals' administrative job performance in the aspects of academic planning, organizing, coordinating and directing was accepted.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of influence of quality of school physical environment on principals' job performance (N=1288)

Administrative job performance	Quality of school physical environment	N	Mean	Standard. Deviation
Academic performance	High	388338	16.77	2.85
	Moderate	562	16.29	2.83
	Low	1246	16.24	2.59
	Total		16.41	2.74
Organizing	High	388	18.07	3.09
	Moderate	338	17.65	2.77
	Low	562	17.12	2.89
	Total	1288	17.54	2.95
Coordinating	High	388	18.48	2.69
	Moderate	338	17.85	2.52
	Low	562	17.83	2.82
	Total	1288	18.03	2.72
Directing	High	388	18.05	
	Moderate	338	17.64	
	Low	562	17.16	
	Total	1288		

Having obtained significant F-ratios, a post hoc test was carried out using Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) multiple comparison test. This is to ascertain which groups the significance occurred among the three categories of the independent variables. The pair-wise comparison was done between the three categories or levels of quality of school physical environment which are high, moderate and low quality of school physical environment. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 showed that with regards to academic planning, the comparison of groups categorized as perceiving the quality of their school physical environment to be high with those that perceived it to be moderate and low yielded the following t-values: high and moderate, $t = 3.02$ ($p < .05$); high and low, $t = 4.15$ ($p < .05$).

With regards to organizing, the comparison of groups categorized as perceiving the quality of their school physical environment to be high with those that perceived it to be moderate and low yielded the following t-values: high and moderate, $t = 2.52$ ($p < .05$); high and low, $t = 7.08$ ($p < .05$). The comparison indicated insignificant difference between the comparison of high and low, and comparison of moderate and low. The positive t-value showed that the significance is in favour of the first comparison group, which is schools with high and schools with high and moderate quality of school physical environment have their principals carry out organizing better than the principals in schools with low quality of school physical environment.

Table 2: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of influence of quality of school physical environment of principals' job performance (N=1246)

Administrative job performance	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Academic planning	Between groups	69.55	2	34.78	4.65*	.010
	Within groups	9288.23	1243	7.47		
Organizing	Between Groups	208.44	2	104.22	12.20*	.000
	Within groups	10618.72	1243	8.54		
	Total	10827.16	1245			
Coordinating	Between groups	108.97	2	54.48	7.43*	.001
	Within groups	9109.75	1243	7.33		
	Total	9218.72	1245			
Directing	Between groups	178.59	2	89.29	9.85*	.000
	Within groups	11264.98	1243	9.06		
	Total	11443.57	1245			

*p<.05; df2 & 1243; critical f= 3.00

Table 3: Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) multiple comparison test of influence of quality of school environment on principals' job performance

Administrative job performance	Quality of school physical environment	High (n=375)	Moderate (n=325)	Low (n=546)
Academic planning	High	16.77 ^a	0.48 ^b	0.53 ^b
	Moderate	3.02* ^c	16.29 ^a	0.05 ^b
	Low	4.15* ^c	0.36 ^c	16.24 ^a
			Msw=7.47	
Organizing	High	18.07 ^a	0.43 ^b	0.96 ^b
	Moderate	2.52* ^c	17.65 ^a	0.53 ^b
	Low	5.13* ^c	3.87* ^c	17.12 ^a
			msw=8.54	
Coordinating	High	18.48 ^a	0.46 ^b	0.96 ^b
	Moderate	3.99* ^c	17.65 ^a	0.53 ^b
	Low	5.13* ^c	3.87* ^c	17.12 ^a
			Msw=7.33	
Directing	High	18.05	0.41 ^b	0.89 ^b
	Moderate	2.36 ^c	17.64 ^a	0.48 ^b
	Low	6.40* ^c	3.39* ^c	17.16 ^a
			Msw=p.06	

*p<.05

a. Group means are placed on the diagonal

b. Difference between the group means are placed above the diagonal

c. Fishers LSD t-value are placed below the diagonal

With regards to coordinating, the comparison of groups categorized as perceiving the quality of their school physical environment to be high with those that perceived it to be moderate and low yield the following t-values; t=3.99 (p<.05); high and low, t=5.13 (p<.05).

The comparison of those that perceived the quality of their school physical environment to be moderate with those that perceived it to be low yielded t-value of 0.14 ($p > .05$). The comparison indicated significant difference between comparison of high and moderate and high and low, but indicated insignificant difference between comparison of moderate and low. The positive t-value showed that the significance is in favour of the first comparison groups, which are schools with high quality of school physical environment. This indicated that schools with high quality of school physical environment have their principals carry out coordinating better than the principals in schools with moderate and low quality of school physical environment.

With regards to directing, the comparison of groups categorized as perceiving the quality of their school physical environment to be high with those that perceived it to be moderate and low yielded the following t-value: high and moderate, $t=2.36$ ($p < .05$); high and low, $t=6.40$ ($p < .05$). The comparison of those that perceived the quality of their school physical environment to be moderate, with those perceived it to be low yielded t-value of 3.39 ($p < .05$). The comparison indicated insignificant difference between comparison of high and moderate but indicated significant difference between the comparison of high and low, and comparison of moderate and low. The positive t-value showed that the significance is in favour of the first comparison group, which are schools with high and schools with moderate quality of school physical environment. This indicated that schools with the high and moderate quality of school physical environment have their principals carry out directing better than the principals in schools with low quality of school physical environment.

Quality of school physical environment and principals' job performance

Findings from this aspect of study showed that quality of school physical environment significantly influence principals' administrative job performance which was considered in the aspects of academic planning, organizing, coordinating and directing. It was found that schools with high and moderate quality of school physical environment have their principals perform their administrative job better than the principals in schools that have low quality of school physical environment. High quality of school physical environment entails schools that have good structures and spacious office space to perform duties. Also, well decorated and equipped offices as well as availability of other infrastructures like good roads, drainage system, water system and others all account for high quality school physical environment. The provision of all these necessities will enable conduciveness of the school environment for effective discharge of duties by the principals.

The findings from this study is in line with the studies of Uchendu, *et al* (2016); Asigele (2012) whose studies associated school physical environment with workers productivity.

Their studies found that there is significant positive relationship between physical work environment and productivity of workers. It suggested that the more quality school physical environment becomes in terms of good infrastructure, good working tools and offices, beautified work environment and so on, the better the productivity of workers. The findings of this study also agrees with Vischer (2007), that environmental comfort links the psychological aspect of workers' environmental likes and dislikes with concrete outcome measures such as improved task performance as well as with organizational productivity through workspace support for work related tasks. However, when the school physical environment is of adequate quality, the principal will find the work environment and the condition to be conducive in the discharge of their administrative duties.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that school infrastructural quality can influence principals' administrative job performance in secondary schools in Cross River State. When there is adequacy and conduciveness in the work environment provided by sufficient and good infrastructural development in schools, principals will make effective use of them to perfect administrative job performance in their domains. It is therefore concluded that the presence of functional school facilities including infrastructures, can effectively boost school principals administrative job competences and productivity in public secondary schools.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion, it was recommended that there should be adequate provision and maintenance of school facilities by the government as this would enhance principals' administrative job performance.

Government and other stakeholders in the business of education should provide the needed facilities including infrastructure for the optimum enhance of principals job performance in secondary schools. Private individuals and companies should contribute their own quota towards infrastructural and other facilities provision in secondary schools

Above all, school administrators and management should ensure prompt repairs and maintenance of school facilities before they completely go bad.

Students must learn to value whatever school facilities in the school and learn to maintain them too.

REFERENCES

- Asiabaka, I. P. (2008). The need for effective facilities management in Nigeria. *New York Science Journal* 3(2): 233-24; 8 Available online at <http://www.sciencepub.org>

- Hargreaves, A. E., & Moore, S. M. (2001). *Leaving to change: Teaching beyond subject and standards*. San Francisco. C A Jossey-Bass
- Isa, Y. K., Jailari M. Y., & Suleiman Y. A. (2014). The Role of Principals in Sustaining Management of Quality Secondary School Education in Nigeria. *Journal of Education* 1(2) 2-13.
- Jaiyeaba, A. O., & Atanda A. I (2005). Quality Sustenance in Nigeria Educational System: Challenges to government in G. O. Akpa, S. U. Udoh & E. O. Fagamiye (Ed). *Deregulating the provision and management of education in Nigeria*. Jos: M. P Ginac Concept Ltd 98-103
- Okebukola, P. (2005) Quality Assurance in Teachers Education in Nigeria: The role of facilities of education. A paper presented during the meeting of committee of Deans of Education in Nigerian University.
- Oyesola, G. O. (2007). Planning educational building and facilities. Alphabetic building and facilities. *Alphabetic list of journal articles Illorin: 7:11-18*
- Phillip, J. A. (2012). Manager, Administrator is Instructional Leader: Shift Role of the Principal from <http://www.learningdomain.com/principalsinstructleader.html> (Retrieved March 7th)
- Uchendu, C. C., Nnaji, E. S., & Nwafor, I. A. (2016). Physical Work Environment and Academic Staff Productivity in Universities in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 2(5), 14-25.
- Vischer, J. C. (2007) The Effect of the Physical Environment on Job Performance: Towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. *Stress and Health*. 23:175-184