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**ABSTRACT**

The study evaluates the Principals’ Supervisory and Motivational Roles on Secondary School Agricultural Science Instruction in Kogi State. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. One Hundred and Eighty (180) agricultural science teachers and five hundred and forty (540) agricultural science students in senior secondary three (SS3) were randomly sampled from all the two hundred and fifty eight (258) secondary schools in Kogi State. A ten item questionnaire was drafted by the researcher, subjected to validation by experts and used for data collection. The data collected were analysed with the use of frequency counts, mean, simple percentage and chi-square. The results of the analysis showed that principals were ineffective in performing their supervisory roles but on the other hand, they proved to be more effective in performing their motivational roles based on the responses of the agricultural science teachers and students. Some useful recommendations such as incorporating principals in the planning and implementation process of agricultural science programmes, encouraging principals’ attendance to professional seminars, workshops and conferences among others were proffered.

**Introduction**

Agriculture is the pivot on which the country’s economy resolves. The economic activities and growth of any nation depend solely on it. It is a good source of income, food, shelter and employment opportunities to the growing population. In spite of this laudable recognition given to agriculture, the quantity of food production has been on a steady decline in recent years. Onuoha (1988), in support of this, stated that the present demand for food in Nigeria today is
seriously on the increase compared to the level of supply and that the problem can only be solved by doubling the level of food production within the shortest possible period through the process of incorporating youths into the production folds.

For youths, therefore, to be fully committed in agriculture, its teaching and learning should be made compulsory, stimulating and practical oriented in schools (secondary schools inclusive), (Majasan, 1995 & Federal Republic of Nigeria (FGN), 2009). This attempt will make youths to develop interest and skills in agriculture and promote it for the survival of the nation.

The success and attainable of the above outstanding and challenging objectives, undoubtedly depends on the principals’ administrative capability as heads of such schools. Supporting this, Aderounmu and Ehiametolor (1985), observed that school administrators irrespective of the level at which they operate should try to handle their responsibilities diligently and effectively. For this reason, there is the need for much improvement in the area of supervision of instruction and motivation of teachers and students’ interest in agriculture by secondary school heads (principals) as this will greatly help to minimize mass failure and withdrawal of students (youths).

It is against the above background that the researcher evaluates the supervisory and motivational roles of school principals on secondary schools agriculture in Kogi State, Nigeria.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study is to evaluate the supervisory and motivational roles of school principals in the teaching and learning of agriculture in secondary schools in Kogi State, Nigeria. Specifically the study sought to:

Examine the supervisory role of principals on agricultural science instruction in secondary schools in Kogi State.

Examine the motivational role of principals on agricultural science instruction in secondary schools in Kogi State.

Research Questions

Based on the purpose of the study, the following research questions were formulated:

What were the views of the Agricultural Science teachers and students on principals' supervisory roles on agricultural science instruction in secondary schools in Kogi State?

What were the views of the agricultural science teachers and students on principals’ motivational roles on agricultural science instruction in secondary schools in Kogi State?

Hypothesis

Two null hypotheses formulated at 0.05 level of significance guided the study:

Ho₁: There is no significant difference in the views of Agricultural Science teachers and students on the principals’ supervisory roles on secondary school agricultural science instruction in Kogi State.

Ho₂: There is no significant difference in the views of Agricultural Science teachers and students on the principals’ motivational roles on secondary school agricultural science instruction in Kogi State.
Methodology

The study employed a descriptive survey research design. The study covered all the two hundred and fifty – eight secondary schools, all the agricultural science teachers and students in Kogi State. Kogi State is made up of three Education zones which include Kogi Central, Kogi East and Kogi West. The subjects comprised of one hundred and eighty (180) Agricultural Science teachers and five hundred and forty (540) students of which sixty (60) were randomly selected from each of the three education zones in Kogi State.

Two point rating scale questionnaire of Agree and Disagree was designed by the researcher and used for the study. The questionnaire was divided into three sections (A – C). Section A was used to collect personal data information about the respondents while sections B and C was used to address research questionnaire 1 and 2. The questionnaire items were made up of ten (10) of five (5) each for section B and C. The questionnaire items were validated by four (4) experts drawn from the Department of Agricultural Education and Measurement and Evaluation, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. A total of 720 questionnaire were administered by the researcher with the help of six (6) trained research assistants. A trial testing of the instrument was done to 40 students and 10 Agricultural science teachers outside the study area. Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. A reliability index of 0.79 was obtained. Of the 720 questionnaire distributed to the respondents, all the 720 were correctly filled and returned representing 100% return. The data generated was analysed using frequency counts, mean, simple percentage and chi-square. The responses of Agree and Disagree were weighed one (1) each for the purpose of identification only, to enable frequency counts.

Decision Rule

In the analysis of the data, any item that scored 50% and above was considered significant while on the other hand, any item with a percentage score less than 50% was regarded insignificant for consideration.

Result and Discussion

The results were presented in the tables as follows:

Research Question 1

What were the views of the Agricultural science teachers and students on principals’ supervisory roles on agricultural science instruction in secondary schools in Kogi State?

Table 1 above shows that both the agricultural science teachers and students resposnes to all the items recorded very low percentage agreement, that is to say that the percentage disagreement were all very high. The records shows that principals of the schools surveyed were not really performing their expected supervisory roles on the teaching and learning of agricultural science.

Research Question 2

What were the views of Agricultural science teachers and students on principals’ motivational roles on agricultural science instruction in secondary schools in Kogi State?

From table 2, items 1 and 4 recorded percentage response disagreement far
above the cut-off point of 50% by both the agricultural science teachers and students indicating that the principals are not performing these motivational roles. Items 2, 3 and 5 recorded high percentage response agreement by both respondents (Agricultural Science Teachers and Students). This shows that the principals are effectively performing these major motivational responsibilities.

From table 3, it was found that the calculated $\chi^2 = 10.14$ is greater than the $\chi^2$-critical or table value of 3.84 which then leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis formulated. This then means that slight significant difference exist between the views of teachers and that of students of agriculture. It was also found that principals did not perform their expected supervisory roles in agricultural science instruction.

The data on table 4 shows that the calculated $\chi^2$ is equal to 0.22 which is less than the $\chi^2$-critical or table value of 3.84. This then makes null hypothesis to be upheld. This also implies that no significant difference exist between the views of agricultural science teachers and that of students. It was also discovered that the principals on the average performed their expected motivational roles in agricultural science instruction.

**Major Findings**

The major findings include the followings:

Principal were ineffective in performing their expected supervisory roles in agricultural science instruction based on the responses of the agricultural science teachers and students.

Principal moderately motivated teachers and students of Agricultural Science in the areas of:

- a) Encouraging field trips and excursions to agricultural establishments.
- b) Attending to farm accidents
- c) Encouraging formation of agricultural associations.

There exists a significant difference between the views of agricultural science teachers and that of students on principals’ supervisory roles in agricultural science instruction.

There is no significant difference between the views of agricultural science teachers and that of students on principals’ motivational roles in agricultural science instruction.

The principals were not very effective in the supervision of agricultural science instruction most especially in the areas of visiting the school farms during practicals, visiting teachers during class lessons, marking agricultural science teachers’ lesson notes, checking students’ note books and results in agricultural science. The reason(s) may be that most principals were graduates in non-agricultural disciplines making them to be less knowledgeable in agricultural science programmes and what it entails. Principals’ administrative commitment too, may also hinder them from attending to some other programmes in the school (agricultural science programmes inclusive). If this anomaly is allowed to continue it would affect quality maintenance in agricultural science in secondary schools within the study area. This is in contrast with the National Policy on Education (2009) and Ezeocha (1990) when they jointly observed that, the cardinal objective of administration in education was to ensure quality control, regular inspection and continuous supervision of instruction and other
**Table 1** Agricultural Science Teachers’ and Students’ Ratings on Principals’ Supervisory Roles on Agricultural Science Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Supervisory functions</th>
<th>Agricultural Science Teachers</th>
<th>Agricultural Science Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Visit school farms during practicals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mark Agricultural Science teachers’ lesson notes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Visit teachers during class lessons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Check students’ notes on agricultural science</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Check students’ results in Agricultural science.</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No of Agric. Teachers = 180  No of Agric. Science Students = 540

**Table 2** Agricultural Science Teachers’ and Students’ Ratings on Principals’ Motivational Roles on Agricultural Science Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Supervisory functions</th>
<th>Agricultural Science Teachers</th>
<th>Agricultural Science Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Involving students in the share of farm products</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Encouraging field trips and excursion to Agricultural Establishments</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Attending to farm accidents</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sponsoring school attendance to Agricultural shows and exhibitions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Encouraging formation of Agricultural associations e.g. young farmers’ club and young foresters club.</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No of Agric. Teachers = 180  No of Agric. Science Students = 540
Table.3 Comparison of the Percentage Mean Agreement and Disagreement of Agricultural Science Teachers and Students of Principals’ Supervisory Roles on Secondary School Agricultural Science Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% x Agreement</th>
<th>% x Disagreement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>x²-cal</th>
<th>x² crit.</th>
<th>Sig n.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Sc. Trs</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Sc. Students</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table.4 Comparison of the Agricultural science teachers’ and students Percentage Mean Agreement and Disagreement of Principals’ Motivational Roles on Agricultural Science Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% x Agreement</th>
<th>% x Disagreement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>x²-cal</th>
<th>x² crit.</th>
<th>Sig n.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Sc. Trs</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Sc. Students</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

educational services. Lovell (1975), stated that the work of the principal is to influence teaching in such a way as to improve the quality of teaching.

The principals moderately encouraged the formation of agricultural organizations, attended to farm accidents and encourage field trips and excursion to agricultural establishments as a way of sustaining staff and students’ interest in agricultural science programs. This is because, the promotion and other upgrading exercises to be enjoyed by the principal of a school depend to a greater extent on the performance of his students, which can be assessed from the students’ end of programme results. To encourage good results among students, staff and students need to be positively motivated via the above approaches. This agrees with Federal Ministry of Education and Youth Development (1993) when it stated that merit awards, the work environment, group identity greatly assist in the motivation of teachers and students of agriculture for effective performance and that this should be urgently attended to by school heads (principals).

In another dimension, principals were ineffective in involving students in the share of farm proceeds and sponsoring school attendance to agricultural shows and exhibitions. This may be because the principals want to be self centered and conservative in managing school resources and materials. This contradicts Egwuelu (1996) when he stated that motivation is an incentive and encouragement used to stimulate workers and servants towards maximum output, and that their productivity will be relative to the degree of such incentive and an attempt of withdrawal will lower performance. There exist a difference in the responses of the agricultural science teachers and that of the students on principals’ supervisory
roles in agricultural science instruction. The difference may be attributed to the fact that he teachers will reserve exposing the real nature of things as the principals are their colleagues in the profession while the students will like to be truthful in x-raying the real picture of what is happening exactly without reservation. Both the teacher and the students tends to feel the pinch of the motivational impact of the principals thus there been align in expressing their views in the same directions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussion of the study, most principals are not very effective in performing their expected supervisory roles compared to the way they performed their motivational responsibilities. Based on the above, principals of secondary schools should be periodically supervised so as to make them to be alive, devoted and dedicated to the performance of their duties. The principals should be incorporated into the planning and implementation stages of the agricultural science programmes as this will motivate them to develop positive attitude towards agriculture. Finally, school principals should also be made to attend professional seminars, workshops and conferences on agriculture, as this will aid their encouragement for agricultural science programmes.
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