

Ph.D. EDM

55736483

M. M. BINUYO

**THE EFFECT OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY ON LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE IN
EGBEDA LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OYO STATE,
NIGERIA**

BY

BINUYO, MONILOLA MARY

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the subject

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR:

PROF. RJ (Nico) BOTHA

September, 2020

ABSTRACT

Education plays prominent role in the development of nations considering that the progress of nations depends on the capability of its workforce which is informed by the quality of education offered its citizenry. Program for international students' assessment revealed the need to improve upon the quality of education across nations. This need was corroborated by the unimpressive performance of the secondary schools learners in Egbeda local Government of Oyo State. Ironically, secondary schools management in the local government have been found to have very little discretionary powers in the administration of their schools – a situation that could have contributed to the poor performance of the learners. The study thus focussed on the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.

Cross-sectional survey research design was adopted for the study. The population comprised 72 Principals, 158 Vice Principals and 125 Heads of Departments from the 72 schools covered by the study. Thirty schools were excluded from the study for not meeting selection criteria of ten years of establishment. Sample size of 355 was purposively selected for the study. Response rate was 97.7%. Data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics.

Findings revealed that school autonomy dimensions have statistically significant effect on learners' work quality ($F_{5, 341} = 221.357$, $Adj. R^2 = 0.761$, $p < 0.05$); school autonomy dimensions have statistically significant effect on learners' affective performance ($F_{5, 341} = 66.085$, $Adj. R^2 = 0.492$, $p < 0.05$); school autonomy dimensions have statistically significant effect on learners' character formation ($F_{5, 341} = 553.982$, $Adj. R^2 = 0.889$, $p < 0.05$); school autonomy dimensions have statistically significant effect on learners' personal development ($F_{5, 341} = 104.177$, $Adj. R^2 = 0.599$, $p < 0.05$); school autonomy dimensions have statistically significant effect on learners' social development ($F_{5, 341} = 45.928$, $Adj. R^2 = 0.394$, $p < 0.05$).

The study concluded that school autonomy affected learners' performance. The study recommended that education authorities should make policy provisions that will enhance school autonomy in both private and public secondary schools in the Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State to improve learners' performance.

Ph.D. EDM

55736483

M. M. BINUYO

KEY TERMS

Learner

Secondary schools

School autonomy

Local Government

Performance

Oyo State

Egbeda

Public school

Private school

School based management

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge the Almighty God the creator of heavens and the earth for the gift of life and enablement to complete this academic journey. Words will be insufficient to adequately thank my diligent and highly committed supervisor - Professor R. J. (Nico) Botha for his consistent supports and encouragements coupled with his resourcefulness and patience with me all through this study. I sincerely cannot thank him enough.

I must not forget to thank my affectionate husband – Professor Adekunle Binuyo who encouraged me to pursue the doctoral program and also for giving me the spiritual, moral and financial supports all through the academic pursuit. I thank the following persons for their various contributions to the success of this work:

- The University of South Africa for the financial support.
- My brother in-law – Elder Adelani Binuyo for linking me with relevant authorities that oversees the secondary schools covered by this study.
- The Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments in the schools covered by the study for participating in the study as respondents to the questionnaire administered.
- Mr. Chinedu Solomon for the statistical analyses.
- Dr. Babatunde Adebua for proofreading this work.
- .My daughter – Dr. Tolulope Binuyo for moral support and timely counsels.
- My sons – Adedeji Binuyo, Ireoluwa Binuyo and Imisioluwa Binuyo for your concern and prayers.
- Dr. Matthew Ovbiebor for helping to process the admission for this study.
- Reverend Canon (Dr.) Israel Odewole for his useful advice and guidance.
- All other individuals that also contributed in various ways whose names time will not permit me to mention. I appreciate you all.

Ph.D. EDM

55736483

M. M. BINUYO

DECLARATION

Name: MONILOLA MARY BINUYO

Student number: 55736483

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy in Education Management

Exact wording of the title of the thesis as appearing in the electronic copy submitted for examination:

**THE EFFECT OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY ON LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE IN
EGBEDA LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OYO STATE,
NIGERIA**

I declare that the above thesis is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

I further declare that I submitted the thesis for originality checking software and that it falls within the accepted requirements for originality.

I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work, or part of it, for examination at Unisa for another qualification or at any other education institution.

Signature

Date

ABBREVIATIONS

ELG:	Egbeda Local Government
OYSG:	Oyo State Government
GL:	Grade Level
HAQ:	Highest Academic Qualification
YTE:	Years of Teaching Experience
PiS:	Position in School
ToS:	Type of School
PA:	Pedagogic Autonomy
DDA:	Disciplinary Decision Autonomy
PMA:	Personnel Management Autonomy
FA:	Financial Autonomy
AA:	Accountability Autonomy
ASA:	Affective Skills Achievement
PD:	Personal Development
WQ:	Work Quality
SD:	Social Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

KEY TERMS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
1.2 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY	4
1.3 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	5
1.4 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	7
1.5 THE RESEARCH QUESTION AND SUB-QUESTIONS.....	9
1.6 FORMULATION OF THE HYPOTHESES	9
1.7 THE MAIN OBJECTIVE AND SUB-AIMS OF THE STUDY.....	10
1.8 CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY.....	10
1.9 THE RESEARCH DESIGN	12
1.9.1 Research approach and research paradigm.	12
1.9.2 Population and sampling	14
1.9.3 Instrumentation and data collection technique	15
1.9.4 Data analyses, interpretation and presentation.....	16
1.10 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY/ CREDIBILITY OF THE STUDY.....	16
1.11 RESEARCH ETHICS / ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	17
1.11.1 Anonymity and confidentiality	17
1.11.2 Informed consent	18
1.12 POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	18

1.13	DEFINITIONS OF KEY CONCEPTS	19
1.13.1	School autonomy.....	19
1.13.1.1	Personnel management autonomy	
1.13.1.2	Financial autonomy	19
1.13.1.3	Disciplinary decision autonomy	20
1.13.1.4	Pedagogic autonomy	20
1.13.1.5	Accountability autonomy	20
1.13.2.	Learner’s performance	20
1.13.2.1	Work quality	21
1.13.2. 2	Affective performance	21
1.13.2.3	Character formation	21
1.13.2. 4	Personal development	21
1.13.2.5	Social development.....	22
1.14	PLANNING OF THE STUDY / CHAPTER OUTLINE	22
1.15	CONCLUSION	23
 CHAPTER TWO		
SCHOOL AUTONOMY AND COUNTRY SPECIFIC EXPERIENCES		25
2.1	INTRODUCTION	25
2.2	CONCEPTUALISING SCHOOL AUTONOMY.....	28
2.3	DIMENSIONS OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY	30
2.3.1	Personnel management autonomy.....	33
2.3.2	Financial autonomy	34
2.3.3	Disciplinary decision autonomy.....	34
2.3.4	Pedagogic autonomy	35
2.3.5	Accountability autonomy.....	36

2.4	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY.....	37
2.5	ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY	38
2.6	COUNTRY SPECIFIC EXPERIENCES WITH SCHOOL AUTONOMY	40
	2.6.1 Introduction	41
	2.6.2 The United Kingdom.....	41
	2.6.3 The Netherlands	42
	2.6.4 Finland	43
	2.6.5 Australia	44
	2.6.6 Sweden	45
	2.6.7 New Zealand	45
	2.6.8 Hong Kong	46
	2.6.9 South Africa	48
	2.6.10 The Nigerian experience	49
	2.6.11 Summary	51
2.7	CONCLUSION	52

CHAPTER THREE

THE CONCEPT OF LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE AND ITS POSSIBLE LINK WITH SCHOOL AUTONOMY 53

3.1	INTRODUCTION	53
3.2	CONCEPTUALISING LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE	54
3.3	DIMENSIONS OF LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE	55
	3.3.1 Introduction	55
	3.3.2 Work quality	56
	3.3.3 Affective performance	58
	3.3.4 Character formation	59
	3.3.5 Personal Development.....	65
	3.3.6 Social development	67
	3.3.7 Summary	68
3.4	THE POSSIBLE LINK BETWEEN SCHOOL AUTONOMY AND LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE	69

3.4.1	Introduction	69
3.4.2	School autonomy and learners' work quality	69
3.4.3	School autonomy and learners' affective performance	72
3.4.4	School autonomy and learners' character formation	74
3.4.5	School autonomy and learners' personal development	76
3.4.6	School autonomy and learners' social development	77
3.4.7	Summary	78
3.5	CONCLUSION	78

CHAPTER FOUR

	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	79
4.1	INTRODUCTION	79
4.2	RESEARCH DESIGN	80
4.2.1	Introduction	80
4.2.2	Research paradigm and approach	80
4.2.3	Objectives of the research	85
4.2.4	Research problem	85
4.2.5	Specific research questions and hypothesis	86
4.3	POPULATION AND SAMPLING	88
4.3.1	Study population	88
4.3.2	Sample selected for the study	92
4.3.3	Sampling method used	93
4.4	INSTRUMENTATION	94
4.5	PILOT TESTING	95

4.6	ETHICAL ISSUES RELATING TO THE STUDY	96
4.7	DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION	96
	4.7.1 Data analysis	96
	4.7.2 Data presentation	97
4.8	VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY	98
4.9	RESEARCHER ROLE AND COMPETENCY	98
	4.9.1 Informed consent	98
	4.9.2 Anonymity and confidentiality	99
	4.9.3 Ethical measures and contributions	99
4.10	SUMMARY	99
	 CHAPTER 5: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	 101
5.1	INTRODUCTION	101
5.2	THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE RESEARCHER TO THE SUBJECTS...	102
5.3	DATA COLLECTION	102
5.4	DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	103
	5.4.1 Descriptive statistics of respondents' biographic information	103
	5.4.2 Descriptive statistics of school autonomy dimensions	108
	5.4.2.1 Descriptive statistics of pedagogic autonomy	109
	5.4.2.2 Descriptive statistics of disciplinary decision autonomy....	114
	5.4.2.3 Descriptive statistics of personnel management autonomy	117
	5.4.2.4 Descriptive statistics of financial autonomy	121
	5.4.2.5 Descriptive statistics of accountability autonomy	124
	5.4.3 Descriptive statistics of learners' performance	127

5.4.3.1	Descriptive statistics of affective skills achievement	128
5.4.3.2	Descriptive statistics of personal development	134
5.4.3.3	Descriptive statistics of work quality	140
5.4.3.4	Descriptive statistics of character formation	145
5.4.3.5	Descriptive statistics of social development	151
5.5	EMPIRICAL ANALYSES	156
5.5.1	Test of hypothesis one (Multiple regression of school autonomy dimensions on learners' work quality)	161
5.5.2	Test of hypothesis two (Multiple regression of school autonomy dimensions on learners' affective performance)	166
5.5.3	Test of hypothesis three (Multiple regression of school autonomy dimensions on learners' character formation)	171
5.5.4	Test of hypothesis four (Multiple regression of school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development)	175
5.5.5	Test of hypothesis five (Multiple regression of school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development)	180
5.6	SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS	186
5.7	CONCLUSION	187
	CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	188
6.1	INTRODUCTION	188
6.2	SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	188
6.3	FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	193
6.3.1	Introduction	193
6.3.2	Findings in relation to research sub-question one	194
6.3.3	Findings in relation to research sub-question two	196
6.3.4	Findings in relation to research sub-question three	198

6.3.5	Findings in relation to research sub-question four	200
6.3.6	Findings in relation to research sub-question five	203
6.3.7	Conclusion	205
6.4	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STUDY	205
6.4.1	Introduction	205
6.4.2	Recommendation with respect to sub-research question one:	205
	What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria?	205
6.4.3	Recommendation with respect to sub-research question two:		
	What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' affective performance in Egbeda local government schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?	206
6.4.4	Recommendation with respect to sub-research question three:		
	How is learner's character formation affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?	207
6.4.5	Recommendation with respect to sub-research question four:		
	What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?	207
6.4.6	Recommendation with respect to sub-research question five:		
	What effect has school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools		

in Oyo State, Nigeria?	208
6.5 CONTRIBUTION AND MAIN OUTCOMES OF THE STUDY	209
6.5.1 Introduction	209
6.5.2 Contribution to knowledge	209
6.5.2.1 Conceptual contribution	209
6.5.2.2 Theoretical contribution	212
6.5.2.3 Empirical contribution	213
6.5.2.4 Methodological contribution	214
6.6 AVENUES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	214
6.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	215
6.8 CONCLUDING REMARKS	216
REFERENCES	217
APPENDICES		
APPENDIX A	INFORMED CONSENT	
APPENDIX B	PERMISSION REQUEST LETTER	
APPENDIX C	APPROVAL LETTER	
APPENDIX D	LETTER OF CONSENT FOR PARTICIPANTS	
APPENDIX D	ETHICAL CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE	
APPENDIX E	QUESTIONNAIRE	
APPENDIX F	PROOF OF EDITING	

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The role of education in the progressive and sustainable development of any nation cannot be overemphasized. This is owing to the notion that education is the bedrock of any meaningful growth and development of any nation (Barrera-Osorio, Fasih & Patrinos, 2009; Kingdom & Maekae, 2013; Ugbogbo, Akwemoh, & Omoregie, 2013; Altbach, 2015). However, Barrera-Osorio, et. al., (2009) noted that the education systems of many developing countries have not yielded desired outcomes for the learners (Arcia, Patrinos, Porta & Macdonald, 2010). According to the study (ibid), a pivotal predictor of learner's performance is school autonomy.

School autonomy has been defined in several ways by different scholars over time. Kiragu, King'oina, and Migosi (2013) for example viewed school autonomy as decentralization of decision making authority to empower local schools thereby promoting effectiveness and efficiency of school administration. According to Murphy (1997), school autonomy can be defined as a strategy that advocates higher authority for local schools through the adoption of a school-based management philosophy of educational administration. Further, Patrinos (2011) posited that school autonomy is a form of school management in which schools are given decision making authority over their operations.

School autonomy research has received much attention from researchers in recent times. Arcia et al., (2010) identify five indicators of school autonomy as budget planning and approval autonomy, personnel management autonomy, school finance autonomy, learner's assessment autonomy, and accountability autonomy. The budget planning and approval autonomy is concerned with the central-local finance matters affecting the school activities. The study however was lopsided in its choice of pedagogic efficiency as the benchmark for measuring learner's performance. This is in view of the fact that learner's performance could be better

measured using the indicators of learner's performance such as work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development, and social development.

Barrera et al., (2009) identify school-based management (SBM) as a critical success factor for learner performance in schools. According to their study, SBM components of school autonomy and accountability complement each other to boost the operational and pedagogical efficiency of schools in Europe which is revealed in the performance of the learners. The study further argued that if schools have sufficient freedom in terms of freehand in the management of their financial and human resources, then they will be more accountable to their various stakeholders who are principally the students and their parents. Further, this will enhance the performance of the learners significantly. This is one of the arguments on which the case in favour of school autonomy is anchored. A shortcoming of their study however is its concentration on pedagogic efficiency which relates to academic performance and neglected the non-academic dimension of learners' performance index.

The personnel management autonomy is concerned with the school's authority to recruit and sack personnel as the need arises. Personnel management autonomy also supports the need for individual school authority to exercise freedom of determination of the remuneration of the workers of their respective school. The third indicator of school autonomy relates to the ability of the school to exercise freedom in the operationalizing the approved budget. This will make for timely implementation of budgetary plans with minimal delay. This measure is capable of enhancing learner's character formation (Magwa & Ngara, 2014; Sachar, 2015). The study however neglected the other dimensions of school autonomy other than the financial such as pedagogic, disciplinary decision and accountability autonomy respectively.

Further, the autonomy in the aspect of learners' assessment aims at addressing freedom of the school management in the setting up of assessment criteria on the basis of which the progress of the individual learner is to be determined. This autonomy is to ensure fairness and objectivity of learner assessment in line with the school's ideology (OECD, 2004).

Finally, the accountability autonomy indicator is meant to ensure the establishment of the mechanisms aimed at timely and efficient rendering of accounts of the school activities to concerned stakeholders such as the students, parents, government and the larger society from

time to time unhindered. Arcia, Patrinos, Porta, and Macdonald (2010) posit that accountability autonomy is capable of enhancing pedagogic efficiency as observable in the rate and level of achievement of social and personal development of the learners.

Building on the dimensions of school autonomy, Hanushek, Link, and Woessmann (2011) identified the personnel management dimension of school autonomy and autonomy in choice of curriculum items. The argument in favour of personnel management autonomy was as advanced by Arcia et al. (2010) in their view that it will promote objectivity and merit in the selection procedure of teachers if the individual school is given the authority to recruit applicants considered most suitable for the job. The autonomy in the aspect of choice of curriculum items were predicated on the argument that the needs of individual society is to dictate the curricular items to be covered by schools located within the respective communities where those needs arises.

Nandamuri and Rao (2012) pointed out that autonomy can be categorized into three namely: administrative autonomy, academic autonomy, and financial autonomy. The above categorization can be safely juxtaposed with the various dimensions advanced by the researchers already covered so far in this chapter.

In another study by James, Cheong and Tai (2016), school autonomy was broken down into the following sub-components: budget management flexibility, flexibility in facility management, staffing flexibility, learners' access flexibility, curriculum flexibility, as well as assessment flexibility. This disaggregation however did not cover some other aspects of school autonomy such as pedagogic and accountability autonomy.

Most studies on learner's performance have focused on such areas as learning environment, the role of parents, the role of teachers and the role of principals in predicting learner performance (Barth, 1999; Barnett, McCormick, & Connors, 2001; Barth, 2001; Achinstein, 2002; Behrman, Hoddinott, Maluccio, Soler-Hampejsek, Behrman, Ramirez-Zea, & Stein, 2005).

However, it is worthy of note that studies on the role of school autonomy on learner performance have been very limited especially in developing countries. Those that address the issue have

diverse deficiencies in their coverage as found out from the review of the literature on the subject. These are the gaps in literature that this study intends to fill.

1.2 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

The educational systems of many nations of the world started witnessing diverse problems in their educational sector. Empirical evidence revealed that such problems include low educational quality (Hanushek, 2002), poor learner performance (Cheong, Theodore & Lee, 2016; Terry & John, 1990) as well as indiscipline (Kamaruddin, 2012; Magwa & Ngawa, 2014; Thompson, 2002). More specifically, Olanipekun and Aina (2014) noted that the performance of students in Nigerian schools calls for concern and requires attention of stakeholders. These identify challenges have adversely affected effectiveness and efficiency of educational systems of many nations across the globe whether developed or developing and has consequently attracted the interest of scholars in the discourse of school based management as a plausible solution to the several challenges confronting learner's performance in recent past.

In the light of the aforementioned challenges confronting the sustainable success of the educational systems of many countries of the world, a move towards a school based management system was initiated in the United States in the 1980s and Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom 1990s. A number of developing nations such as Latin America, South Asia and parts of Europe have also embraced the initiative. However, many countries in sub-Saharan Africa such as Nigeria are yet to embrace the initiative significantly. This may be unconnected with the low-quality education coupled with sporadic cases of indiscipline and poor learners academic and non-academic performance reported in such countries (Nandamuri & Rao, 2015). Can the issues with poor learner's performance from the academic and non-academic perspectives be blamed on autonomy issues? This is the main issue that the research intends to solve.

In view of the above, this study is focused on investigating the effect of school autonomy (school based management) on learner's performance in both private and public secondary schools of Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. This is to extend the discourse on school autonomy research thereby contributing to empirics in this direction among other anticipated contributions.

1.3 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The standard of education is a major concern to education researchers across the globe in recent past. This is due to the fact that the growth of any nation depends largely on the capability of its human capital more than any other factor endowment (Ajayi, 1997; Crocker, Mercier, Lachapelle, Brunet, Morin, & Roy, 2006). Studies have affirmed that the capability of the human capital of any nation depends to a large extent on the type and quality of education of its human capital (Romer, 1990; Hanushek, 2002; Baah-Boateng, 2013; Baah-Boateg, 2013b).

In spite of the importance of education in the growth and development of nations, the educational sector of several countries of the world has been confronted with diverse challenges. Such challenges include poor academic non-academic performance, unruly behaviour, etc. These challenges have consistently undermined the efficiency and effectiveness of the educational system of several nations with their consequential negative impact on the growth and development of nations across the globe (Adepoju, 1998; Obanya, 2004).

In a bid to address the diverse challenges confronting education in various parts of the world the school management reforms was initiated in the 1980s and 1990s (Nandamuri & Rao, 2015, Ojo, 2007). The issue of enhancement of learner performance has attracted the attention of educational research scholars in recent times. This is in view of the belief that education plays a major role in the life of a nation (Ajayi, 1997). In the last two decades, several countries and regions have adopted school management reforms to varying degrees. The implementation was notable in such countries as Australia, Canada, Finland, Hong Kong, Israel, Singapore and the U.K. (Griffin, McGaw, & Care, 2012; Salas-Pilco, 2013).

Arising from the concept of school management reforms is the concept of school autonomy which is concerned with decentralization of decision making authority from the central point to the school level. In England for example, in the 1990s and 1980s there was a substantial delegation of control from local education authorities (LEAs) to the various schools. This move is believed to be capable of addressing learner's poor performance.

Earlier studies showed that low quality education is an endemic problem in many developing countries. This is revealed in the reported persistently low scores of learners from developing countries who took international tests of student achievement (Hanushek, 2002). The argument

in support of school autonomy is predicated on the notion that it is able to enhance learner's performance (Schütz, West, & Wöbmann, 2007). Braslavsky (2001) argue that for schools to be rightly held accountable for learner's performance, they must be provided with both resources as well as the authority to design and implement strategies to enhance learners' outcomes.

This view was corroborated by Ojo (2007) who maintained that the success of education is not just about how laudable and lofty the objectives or policy might be but is rather dependent on the effectiveness of the implementation of such lofty objectives and policies. This view was further supported by Fafunwa in Fagbamigbe (2004) who correctly observe that the standard of education particularly for developing countries is not the real issue but rather the ability to meet the set standard owing to the inability and failure of the implementers to ensure that the standards are attained and maintained.

The above studies were concerned with the policy implementation aspect of the education system as a way to achieve the objectives targeted at the standard of the educational system. This was a rather blanket approach considering that it was not focused at a particular direction. In another study that investigated the impact of school autonomy on student achievement in the 21st Century, Caldwell (2014) associated school autonomy with empowerment of schools with minimal interference from external bodies. The study identified areas where autonomy was needful for school effectiveness to be enhanced. The study however failed to disaggregate school autonomy into its various components for robustness of the findings.

Literature reveals that areas identified as requiring high levels of school autonomy are in matters of staffing, budgeting, curriculum and assessment. Empirical evidence suggests that school autonomy enhances innovation abilities of schools in diverse areas such as innovative pedagogic practices across all countries leading to innovativeness on the part of teachers in their use of assessments and in the accessibility and use of support resources for instruction. It was in this regard that Botha (2010) posited that initiation of school autonomy was aimed at enhancing learner performance.

Caldwell (2014) opined that intuitively, it may be argued that a relatively high degree of autonomy is expected to lead to improved latitude of freedom for a school and its workers both teaching and non-teaching staff to innovate. This however will be determined by the extent to

which they are willing and are able to take well calculated risks. The author posits that innovation practices of such schools can only be possible in the event of existence of autonomy.

Several studies have also linked innovation with school autonomy (Kiragu, King'oina, & Migosi, 2013; Alabi & Okemakinde, 2010). Empirical evidence suggests that there is a link between school autonomy and learners performance in the United States. Some studies were carried out in Boston, the birthplace of public education in the United States. The study covering selected public schools in Massachusetts, USA link innovation with school autonomy (French, Hawley, & Nathan, 2014). This position is consistent with the study of French, Miles, and Nathan (2014) whose research revealed that flexibility can promote improved performance when it is focused on designing instruction and organization of resources strategically to strengthen school culture which in turn impacts positively on school effectiveness.

In view of the aforementioned empirical evidence, this study seeks to establish the effect of the various dimensions of school autonomy such as personnel management autonomy, financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and accountability autonomy on the various dimensions of learner's performance such as work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal and social development.

1.4 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The need for school based management was born out of the rising challenges confronting the education system of different countries as far back as the 1980s and the 1990s (Arcia, Patrinos, Porta & Macdonald, 2010; Nandamuri & Rao, 2015). The argument about school based management researchers was predicated on the documented capacity of school based management to address the myriad of issues confronting the success of the educational sector (Botha, 2010).

Various studies carried out by earlier researchers on school autonomy and learner performance are riddled with diverse limitations which need to be addressed. Magwa and Ngara (2014) and Sachar (2015) in their studies that investigated the effect of budget implementation autonomy on learner's performance revealed that budget implementation autonomy enhances character

formation of the learner significantly. Moreover, studies have also revealed poor trend in the performance of students in various institution in Nigeria and requires attention of the appropriate regulatory bodies and other concerned stakeholders (Olufemi, Adediran & Oyediran, 2018; Nbina, 2012). The studies however failed to capture the personnel management dimension of school autonomy neither did the study considered the work quality dimension of the non-academic performance of the learner which is a cause for concern.

From theoretical postulation, it could be argued that the quality of personnel is expected to significantly influence the learner's work quality. This stemmed from the fact that the quality of the teacher to a large extent is expected to be reflected in the learner. In another study by Cheng, Theodore and Lee (2016), school autonomy was found to significantly influence learning outcomes. The study sees school based management as a form of internal autonomy which they broke down into functional, structural and cultural components. However, these components are still somewhat nebulous as the functional autonomy itself needed to be resolved into financial, personnel and accountability autonomy as the associated components.

Further, the learning outcomes can be broadly divided into two namely: academic outcomes and non-academic outcomes. While the academic outcomes can also be further disaggregated into cognitive and meta-cognitive elements, the non-academic outcomes can be disaggregated into work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development, and social development. This study however, will be focussed on the non-academic outcomes of learners in the schools selected for the study.

The rationale for this focus is considering that several of the earlier studies in this regard has focussed more on the academic outcomes while studies focussing on non-academic outcomes have been very limited. Moreover, documentary evidence indicated persistently low performance of learners in both academic and non-academic outcomes as found in a report of the international tests of student achievement (Hanushek, 2002).

The dwindling performance of learners in public secondary schools has attracted the attention of researchers in recent times (Hanushek, 2002; Magwa & Ngara, 2014; Sachar, 2015). Few of those studies addressed the issue from the school autonomy perspective and those that did failed to resolve autonomy into such components as personnel management autonomy, financial

autonomy and disciplinary decision autonomy. Further, many of the earlier studies focussed on academic performance thus paying little attention to the non-academic element of learner's performance. Having identified the issues that bothered on school autonomy as it relates to learner's performance from literature, the main statement of the problem was stated as follows:

Which practices could promote learner's performance in Egbeda local government schools of Oyo state, Nigeria?

1.5 THE RESEARCH QUESTION

With the sections above in mind, the main research question for the study can be phrased: **What effect has school autonomy on learner's performance in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State, Nigeria?** Arising from the gaps in literature coupled with the concomitant problems identified this study aims at answering the following specific sub-research questions:

- What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria?
- What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' affective performance in Egbeda local government schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?
- How is learners' character formation affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?
- What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?
- What effect has school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

1.6 FORMULATION OF HYPOTHESES

In accordance with the above stated research questions and from literature, the study hypothesized as follows:

- School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria.
- School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's affective performance in Egbeda local government schools in Oyo State, Nigeria
- Learner's character formation is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria
- Learner's personal development is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria
- School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria

1.7 MAIN OBJECTIVE AND SUB-AIMS OF THE STUDY

The general objective of this study is to determine the effect of school autonomy on learner's performance in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State, Nigeria. In line with this general objective, the specific objectives are to:

- determine the effect of school personnel management autonomy on learner's work quality in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- establish the effect of school financial autonomy on learner's affective performance in Egbeda local government schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- assess the effect of school disciplinary decision autonomy on learner's character formation in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- examine the effect of school pedagogic autonomy on learner's personal development in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- investigate the effect of school accountability autonomy on learner's social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria?

1.8 CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY TO THEORY AND PRACTICE

The study will contribute to the body of existing knowledge in different ways. Basically, the study will contribute to theory and practice amongst other contributions the study stands to

generate. Theoretically, the study will contribute to the theory of school-based management which posits that school effectiveness and efficiency is contingent upon school autonomy. The findings of this study by a priori postulations are expected to support the theory of school-based management. It is expected a priori wise that the more autonomous a school is the better the performance of such schools as evident in the performance of the learners.

The study will also contribute to the practice of school management as the findings will aid school management to appreciate the role of autonomy in the enhancement of learner's performance thereby enlightening school managers on the benefits of school autonomy. The study will shed more light on the various types of autonomy that can positively influence the various dimensions of learner's performance in secondary schools. Of particular relevance to this study are the non-academic performance elements of learners in a secondary school. Such elements of performance include: affective performance, work quality, character formation, personal development as well as social development.

The study will contribute to the existing studies on school effectiveness by looking at the issue from the school autonomy perspective. This is in view of the fact that most of the earlier studies have focused extensively on other factors such as school environment, teacher efficiency, learners' back ground characteristics, classroom behaviour, learners' participation rates, attitudes toward learning, and community involvement as determinants of school effectiveness (Coleman, 1966; Rutter, 1983; Sammons, Mortimore, & Thomas, 1996; Harbaugh, 2005). Studies in this direction of research having the school autonomy approach have been quite limited. Hence, this study will extend the existing discourse on school effectiveness.

Moreover, the only study known to this research that approached the school effectiveness research from the school autonomy perspective was that of Caldwell (2014) was titled "impact of school autonomy on student achievement in 21st century education. The study however used learners' achievement as the sole indicator of school effectiveness without focusing on the other dimension of school effectiveness which is teacher efficiency. This study intends to fill this gap in the body of existing knowledge as well.

Empirically, studies focusing on school effectiveness from the school autonomy perspective though limited have also not been carried out in Nigeria especially with specific emphasis on learner efficiency. This study thus is expected to contribute to empirics by extending the unit of analysis covered by school effectiveness research to include Nigeria as it focuses on one of the educationally privileged states of the country.

1.9 THE RESEARCH DESIGN

This section deals with the type of research design to be adopted for the study and also focused on the study population and sample size determination and sampling technique. The research design as the blueprint for this study is the descriptive survey research design. A self-structured questionnaire will be developed for the study. The instrument will be subjected to both validity and reliability tests.

The validated instrument will be administered to teaching staff on management cadre of the teaching service commission of the state. The study population was so determined considering that the study is about school autonomy and only that category of staff will be well informed enough to adequately respond to the question items on the instrument.

1.9.1 Research approach and research paradigm

A quantitative approach will be adopted for this study. According to Powers, and Knapp (2006), a quantitative research is one that is based on traditional scientific methods which generate numerical data and usually seeks to establish causal relationships (or association) between two or more variables, using statistical methods to test the strength and significance of the relationships. Considering the topic of this study in which the researcher intends to determine the effect of school autonomy on learner's performance in Egbeda local government schools of Oyo state, Nigeria. The researcher intends to make use of hypotheses testing in the course of doing the study; hence, a quantitative approach is ideal for use in carrying out the study.

Concerning the paradigm to be used for the study, Joubert, Hartell, and Lombard (2015) see a paradigm as an individual's worldview about a phenomenon. It influences how a person treats or reacts to an event. Arising from this assertion, a positivism approach will be adopted for this

quantitative study. This is because the data to be generated for the study will be collected by administration of copies of a Likert-like type of questionnaire with a six point response scale.

Extensive review of literature in the area of interest of this research will be done to enable the student researcher obtain ideas about the topic of the research through identification of themes and keywords that are recurring. Works of other scholars and authors that are related to this study will also be reviewed to identify gaps in the extant literature within the domain of the research focus. The literature to be reviewed will include books, journal publications, published dissertations, electronic documents, government publications and other relevant documents.

This study followed the positivist approach. This view was predicated on the doctrine that supports scientific knowledge as the only form of reliable knowledge since knowledge can be advanced through scientific inquiry. Such knowledge is known to also come from positive affirmation of theories by means of application of scientific method. It is worthy of note that the post-positivist paradigm does not take cognisance of the possible causal relationships between facts and measurements to be superior to the perceptions and the meanings that people attach to their experiences (Blake, Smeyers & Standish, 2003).

This research aligns with the positivist stance in the light of the reasons cited by Neuman (1997:63) which are as outlined hereunder:

- Positivists use quantitative data and adopt experiments, surveys and statistical methods, which often underplay the views of those under study.
- The positivist measures the process of research against its objectivity and excludes the subjectivity.
- The research participants are reduced to statistical numbers.
- Reality is regarded as being ‘out there’ and measurable.

This approach was also preferred as it is often used by several researchers and authors in the area of this study who are well published in accredited journals (Kamaruddin, 2012; Saleem, Naseem, Ibrahim, Hussain, & Azeem, 2012; Aja-Okorie, 2016; Simba, Agak, & Kabuka, 2016).

Following the above approach, each of the hypotheses was aligned with theory. In line with the positivist approach, a structured questionnaire will be used to elicit required data from the

potential respondents on the various constructs that emanated from literature. Considering that the study focus is school autonomy, being a management issue, all teaching staff of the secondary schools targeted for the study that are on management cadre will be involved in this study as they are the ones that will be capable of supplying adequate responses to the question items on the questionnaire.

The study being descriptive in nature as it seeks to describe the school autonomy and learner's performance nexus with respect to secondary schools (both public and private) in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. Hence, a descriptive survey research design will be adopted for the study. Primary data will be collected by means of a validated structured questionnaire to be administered to school principals, vice principals, and teachers in the schools selected for the study. The ordinary least square regression will be used to estimate the effect of the independent sub-variables of the study on the dependent sub-variables of the study while multiple regression analyses will be used to estimate the effect of the aggregate independent variables on the dependent sub-variables respectively.

1.9.2 Population and sampling

The primary population of the study comprise all the registered and approved private and public secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State of Nigeria which is 53 while the secondary population comprised teaching staff that are on salary grade level 12 (management cadre) and above in the schools to be covered by the study. The total number of teachers on grade level 12 and above in all the 53 schools is 430. The researcher will adopt the Taro Yamane (1967) sampling size determination formula. This formula was chosen considering that it applies to a finite population as in the case of this study and also for the fact that the formula gives a more conservative sample size compared to sample size by other methods like the Cochran and the research advisor. The formula (Taro Yamane) factored the population size, and margin of error in the computation of the sample size. The formula is as shown below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}$$

From the above Taro Yamane formula, n = sample size, N = population size, and e = margin of error. The equation gives a more conservative sample size when dealing with finite population hence it is preferred for the study.

The sample size (n) going by the Taro Yamane formula is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}n &= \frac{430}{1 + 430(0.05^2)} \\&= \frac{430}{2.075} \\&= 207\end{aligned}$$

The calculated figure will be beefed up by 30% in view of attrition as suggested by Cresswell, 2012; Diaeldin, Conor, Mark and Yousef, 2017; Israel, 2013; Zikmund, 2000. In view of this rationale, the calculated sample size (207) will be increased by 62 thus leading to the final augmented sample size of 269.

1.9.3 Instrumentation and data collection technique

Primary data collected by means of a structured questionnaire will be used for the study. The instrument will be patterned after the Likert scale. The Likert scale as an ordinal psychometric tool is used for the measurement of attitudes, beliefs and opinions of respondents concerning a number of questions and statements. For each question, a statement is presented in which a respondent must indicate a degree of agreement or disagreement in a multiple choice type format.

It will have a six point response scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The weight to be attached to the scale will range from “1” for “strongly disagree” to “6” for “strongly agree”. This scale helps to measure the extent of agreement or disagreement of a respondent to each of the question items and statements. It is a very good approach used by scholars to elicit a measurable response of respondents concerning an issue.

The instrument will have three parts namely: biographic and the constructs sections. The constructs section will be partitioned into two. The first part will contain items for measuring the dimensions of the main independent sub-variables (personnel management autonomy, financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and accountability autonomy) whereas the second part will contain items for measuring the main dependent sub-variables (work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development, and social development).

The instrument will be administered on the teaching staffs that are on the management salary scale cadre as they are considered to have the requisite experience required to provide credible answers to the question items on the research instrument.

1.9.4 Data analysis, interpretation and presentation

After the Likert-scale questionnaire have been completed and retrieved from the respondents, the “frequency distribution method will be used to sort the scores from the lowest to the highest revealing the number of times each of the scores occurs” (Brink, 2007:172). De Vos et al. (2012:257) indicated that “in presenting the frequency distribution data, one should be sensitive to the need to present the data clearly and in a manner that will make it easy for readers to grasp the information easily when going through the presentation. This is the mode of presenting the data.

The data will be summarized using descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistics will include tables and graphs to show how the data are distributed. The inferential statistics to be used include the ordinary least square regression technique to test each of the study hypotheses since they are all linear. The beta coefficient will reveal the strength of the effect of each of the independent sub-variables on the respective dependent sub-variables.

Also, the unadjusted R-square will reveal the percentage of the variation in the respective dependent sub-variables that are explained by the respective model. The p-value if less than 0.05 will indicate that there is a significant effect of each of the independent sub-variables on each of the dependent sub-variables and vice versa. This value will be used to determine whether or not to reject any or all of the hypotheses.

1.10 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY/ CREDIBILITY

The reliability of the research instrument will be ascertained through the test-retest method. The extent to which respondents of the questionnaire from the pilot study gave consistent responses to the instrument administered on repeated occasions will be computed by the use of Cronbach’s alpha statistics estimation. Values of 0.6 will be regarded as fair while values above 0.8 will be

adjudged to be very good. Any item whose value is less than 0.6 will be deleted and replaced with a more valid and reliable item.

This is to ensure that all the items on the instrument are both valid as well as reliable for measuring each of the constructs of the study. The test – retest method of reliability analysis will be adopted for the instrument of the study. The instrument will be administered to teaching staff on salary grade level 12 and above in another school that represents 10% of the sample size on two different occasions and the reliability statistics will be computed accordingly.

The content and criterion validity will be tested by subjecting the instrument to the scrutiny of my supervisor and other approved sources will also be used to validate the content, face and criterion validity. Responses of respondents from the pilot study will be used to estimate the construct validity using the exploratory factor analysis technique. Each item is expected to load from 0.6 and above for such to be valid for each factor.

1.11 RESEARCH ETHICS/ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In keeping with the policy on research of the University of South Africa, the following principles will guide the study:

1.11.1 Anonymity and confidentiality

This research will be carried out in line with the UNISA policy on research ethics. The anonymity of respondents will be preserved. This is in line with the principle of confidentiality which according to De Vos et al. (2012) refers to the agreement between persons that information shared in the course of doing a research will not be disclosed to anyone but kept in strict confidence. This will be ensured as the identity of the respondents will not be needed on the research instrument. The potential benefits of the anticipated study outcomes to them will be made known to them after the study.

No respondent will be forced to participate in the study as participation will be purely voluntarily and any of them that wish to withdraw will be entitled to do so at will. No person with physical disability will be involved in this study considering their vulnerability. Senior citizens will not be used in the study since the population of study comprised those who are in regular employment

and are within the age limits of 60 years maximum by going by the Oyo State civil service regulations.

Any other ethical issues considered worthwhile by my supervisor will also be strictly adhered to.

1.11.2 Informed consent

According to De Vos et al. (2012:117), “obtaining informed consent implies that all possible or adequate information on the goal of the investigation, the expected duration of participants’ involvement, the procedures which will be followed during the investigation, the possible advantages, disadvantages and the degrees to which respondents may be exposed, as well as the credibility of the researcher” will be established and communicated to the participants.

The aforementioned position is in tandem with the ethical consideration that should be borne in mind by researchers to secure and protect the interest of research participants following the argument of Denscombe (1998) that research in the social and management sciences should be conducted with high level of ethical standard. By this argument, the rights coupled with the dignity of research participants are expected to be protected and their involvement should not predispose them to harms and dangers.

Following Denscombe’s argument, Campbell and Groundwater-Smith (2007) noted three areas of concerns which the researcher is to safeguard while carrying out a study. These areas of concerns are: confidentiality of the information supplied by the respondents, transparency of the researcher in handling of feedbacks to the research participants especially in the area of communicating the findings of the research and the benefits it offers to the participants. Also, the interest of the third parties to a study such as the organizations that the respondents are affiliated with must be well protected by the researcher. Following the aforementioned submission and in compliance with the UNISA policy on research ethics, this study will be carried in line with the prescribed ethical norms and practices.

1.12 POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study is limited by the foreseeable non-availability of some of the targeted management staff of the schools to be used for the study. In view of this foreseeable limitation, the estimated sample size will be beefed up by a 30 % margin. This is to mitigate the effect of attrition as well as those management staff of the schools to be covered by the study that may be unreachable in the course of carrying out the study.

The study is delimited with respect to the public and private secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo state that are registered by the state ministry of education. The choice of Egbeda local government out of the thirty three local governments was based on the premise that the local government has the highest number of secondary schools in the entire State. Furthermore, the local government has the highest population of learners compared to the other local governments in the state.

1.13 DEFINITIONS OF KEY CONCEPTS OF THE STUDY

The key concepts of the study are defined as follows:

1.13.1 School autonomy

According to Kigaru, King'oina and Migosi (2013), School autonomy is decentralization of decision making authority with a view to empowering local schools thereby promoting effectiveness and efficiency of such schools. Eskeland and Filmer (2002) defined autonomy as the extent to which a school has control over its inputs. It is the capacity of a school to allocate resources in the interest of the smooth running of a school. From these definitions, school autonomy is a strategy adopted by policy makers by which a significant level of authority is ceded to local school to enhance decision making in the interest of smooth running of their respective school.

1.13.1.1 Personnel management autonomy

This is the ability of local school management to exercise discretionary powers in matters of hiring and firing of workers as well as in determining their remuneration. This autonomy grants

the management of secondary schools appreciable latitude of freedom to deal with personnel related matters that concerns the smooth running of their respective schools as opined by Boudreaux, 2017.

1.13.1.2 Financial autonomy

According to Mitsopoulos and Pelagidis (2008), financial autonomy is the capacity of a secondary school management authority to take volitional decisions that relate to the financial activities of their respective schools with minimal interference by the authorities with oversight responsibilities. This autonomy empowers the individual school management to take decisions on financial matters as it affects their respective schools with little recourse to their regulatory bodies.

1.13.1.3 Disciplinary decision autonomy

Disciplinary decision autonomy is the volitional capacity of the individual school management to take decisions of matters that concerns disciplinary matters affecting their subjects whether staff and learners. This autonomy enables the school based management to take decisions on both staff and students in the spirit of maintaining peace and stability in their respective schools (Claver, Martinez-Aranda, Conejero & Gil-Arias, 2020).

1.13.1.4 Pedagogic autonomy

Pedagogic autonomy is concerned with the ability of individual school management to decide on issues relating to teaching and examinations as well as criteria for promotion in their respective school. Pedagogic autonomy empowers a school to be fully responsible for decisions on curriculum design, teaching methodology, examinations standards, text materials to be used as instructional materials and such other related matters (Vazquez, 2014).

1.13.1.5 Accountability autonomy

According to Patrinos (2014), accountability autonomy refers to the privilege of being made to be accountable for developments and activities of an organisation or establishment. This autonomy recognises the capacity of being accountable for ones actions and inactions as a leader

or manager of a place. This privilege and opportunity enhance the spirit of commitment in leaders thereby making them to be more proactive knowing fully well that they are responsible and accountable for developments and progress of their organisations and establishments.

1.13.2 Learner's performance:

Caldwell (2014) equates learner's performance with the level of achievement of the learner with respect to planned or achievable target. From this definition, learner's performance can be contextualised as the level of the outcomes achieved by the learners resulting from their learning and other activities to which they were exposed while in their secondary schools. Of particular interest to this study are such measures of performance such as learner's work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development, and social development.

1.13.2.1 Work quality

Work quality is the measure of how well the output of learners' work conforms to acceptable standard. It is an attribute that describes how good the works of learners are when compared with expected outcomes. The quality of learners' work can be defined in terms of such attributes as neatness, precision, comprehensiveness and timeliness of delivery (Hobden & Hobden, 2019).

1.13.2.2 Affective performance

The affective performance of learners is the measure of how emotionally stable the learners are. The emotional stability of learners is considered to be a measure of performance because it is a factor that contributes to how well a learner can independently plan for growing in his or her career path in life with minimal guidance from either parents or teachers.

1.13.2.3 Character formation

This is an indication of how well-mannered a learner is in the society. The attitudes of learners do play a significant role in the level of achievement a learner can record in his or her life. Character formation is a measure of the development of a learner both in character and in behaviour. A well behaved learner has higher chances of growing and achieving more than an ill-mannered learner (Almerico, 2014).

1.13.2.4 Personal development

Personal development is the ability of a learner to take responsibility for own growth and development, it is the capacity of a learner to be able to map out plans on how to improve himself or herself all odds notwithstanding (Council for the curriculum examinations and assessment (CCEA, 2017).

1.13.2.5 Social development

According to Jones, Mark, and Max (2015), social development is the ability of a learner to get along well with others around him or her. A socially adjusted individual will be a good team member and to a large extent can determine how far one will be able to go in life in consonance with the dictum “if you want to go fast, go alone but if you want to go far, go with others”.

1.14 PLANNING OF THE STUDY/CHAPTER OUTLINE

Each of the chapters in this study in line with what the researcher planned to do will be structured as follows:

Chapter One: The first chapter of the study focussed on the introduction and background to the study. It will discuss such concepts of learner performance as follows: work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development, and social development. The chapter will also situate the problem statement in literature and also covered the study objectives, research questions, research hypotheses, motivation for the study, limitation of the study, and organization of the study.

Chapter Two: The second chapter focused on appraisal of the concept of school autonomy. The chapter will discuss the historical background of school autonomy and thereafter review the dimensions of school autonomy. The features and advantages and characteristics of the various dimensions of school autonomy will be explored.

Chapter Three: The third chapter dwelt on the conceptual overview of learner’s performance. Various dimensions of learner’s performance and their characteristics will be reviewed. Theories relevant to the study as well as related empirical works will also be reviewed.

Chapter Four: The fourth chapter focussed on the methodology to be followed in carrying out the study. The chapter will focus on the research approach of the study, research design to be adopted for the study, population and sampling, research instrument, objectivity, reliability and validity of the instrument, and data collection technique as well as data analytical techniques to be adopted for the study.

Chapter Five: The chapter focused on the data presentation, analyses, interpretation of results. The section will also include data summary in descriptive forms. Thereafter the inferential analyses will also be carried out on the data.

Chapter Six: The last chapter of the study covered the summary of the study, limitation, findings, recommendations and conclusion of the study.

1.15 CONCLUSION

This chapter on the study of the effect of school autonomy on learner's performance in Egbeda local government of Oyo state, Nigeria include an introduction to the study which looks at the relevance of school autonomy in enhancing learners; performance drawing from the experience of different countries of the world. The motivation for the study was covered. This was predicated on the diverse problems confronting the educational sector in different countries of the world evidenced in literature.

While a move towards more autonomous schools are being made and adopted in other climes while many countries in the sub-Saharan Africa are yet to embrace such initiative. The literature reviewed identified a number of gaps in the school autonomy literature which the study intends to fill. Arising from the gaps, this chapter developed corresponding research objectives, questions and hypotheses. The research approach as well as research design for the study was covered. A self-structured questionnaire was developed to be administered for relevant data to be generated for the study. This chapter indicates how this study will progress from the gaps and problems identified in the body of extant literature on the subject of discourse. Relevant data will be collected and analysed and informed recommendations will be made to relevant authorities accordingly.

In the next chapter, the concept of school autonomy will be appraised. The chapter will also concentrate on the historical background of school autonomy and thereafter touch on review of the dimensions of school autonomy. The features, advantages and characteristics of the identified dimensions of school autonomy will also be explored.

CHAPTER TWO

SCHOOL AUTONOMY AND COUNTRY SPECIFIC EXPERIENCES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter was focused on appraisal of the concept of school autonomy. The chapter also discussed the historical background of school autonomy and thereafter review the dimensions of school autonomy namely personnel management autonomy, financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy, and accountability autonomy. The features and advantages and characteristics of the various dimensions of school autonomy were explored. The country specific experiences in relation to school autonomy were also covered.

Scholars have contributed copiously to the school autonomy literature from various viewpoints. The focus is contingent upon the importance that was attached to the educational system in the overall development of any nation. It is unarguable that the development of any nation depends largely on the quality of education that it offers its citizens (Thom-Otuya, & Inko-Tariah, 2016; Jelilov, Aleshinloye, & Onder, 2016).

Considering the pivotal role of education in national development, several studies have been focused on the various ways in which education can be structured with a view to optimizing the efficiency and effectiveness of the system in the various nations of the world. The quality of educational system of any country is best defined in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of the system. There is no consensus as to the definition of quality of education. This is in view of the diversity of the environments as well as circumstances and values, goals and desires of the various stakeholders that are concerned with educational system of various countries (UNICEF, 2000; Chapman & Adams, 2002; Scheerens, 2004). In the words of Creemers and Scheerens (1994), educational quality is Diverse scholars have proffered different definitions over time as to what quality education is.

The attention of researchers have been While, several studies including the foregoing looked at various ways of improving learners' performance, those that focused on the effect of school autonomy on learners performance were very limited and the few that focused in that direction

such as Greany, and Cheng (2016) and Cheng, Theodore, and Lee (2016) did not elaborate on the dimensions of autonomy as undertaken in this study.

Much as the focus of this study is on learner's performance, it should be noted however, that learner's performance can be assessed through school effectiveness as opined by Allen & Plank (2005). Different authors have however proposed different strategies for improving school effectiveness in recent times. Mintrom (2001) is of the view that effectiveness of school can be enhanced through devolution of authority to well constituted boards of governance. This view was also shared by Allen and Mintrom (2010) who also made a case in favour of decentralization of authority to facilitate greater responsiveness at local levels. It is worthy of note that

In their argument in support of the need to enhance school effectiveness, Arcia, Patrinos, Porter, Macdonalds (2010) underscore the importance of school autonomy and accountability as panacea for dwindling learners' performance in European secondary schools. The authors advocate in strong terms the need to undertake a cursory analysis of the most important factors affecting education as a means of understanding how the system can change in response to the challenges confronting the sector in terms of poor learners; performance.

In the view of Umansky (2005), the smooth functioning of an educational system is contingent upon a number of complex interacting factors. Vegas and Petrow (2008) note that for an educational system to yield meaningful results, there must be a balanced combination of teacher quality, school curriculum, school environment, home environment as well as other related factors that combined to motivate learners and enhance learners' success.

This chapter features a critique of literature covering school autonomy and learner's performance as a contribution to the on-going debate on the need for improved educational system stemming from the poor performance of learners as reported in literature. The focus of the study unlike several others which concentrated on academic performance, this study is primarily concerned with non-academic performance of learner. Various non-academic dimensions of learner's performance have been highlighted in literature. Kamaruddin (2012) and Farrington, Roderick, Allensworth, Nagaoka, Keyes, Johnson & Fry (2012) harp on the import of character building for learners. The author maintains that building a nation's character

takes much time and should be considered by all as a task that must be consistently pursued. Schools at all levels as a matter of utmost importance should be involved in character building as this is a task that is too important to be left only in the hands of parents. Religious organisations, educational institutions as well as other institutions and organisations should all be involved if the exercise must be successful. Thus, the curriculum of educational institutions must explicitly include character education. Farrington *et al.* (2012) identified three aims of character education as follows:

- For building a foundation for lifelong learning
- For supporting relationships at home, in the community, and also in the workplace
- For developing personal values and virtues that helps individuals to be well integrated into the globalized world.

Following from Farrington's work, character education is linked with the character development dimension of learner's performance that school autonomy is expected to positively enhance going by the postulation of this study.

Studies have shown that capacity building of learners should not be limited to academic outcomes alone considering that non-academic learning outcomes are as important as the academic ones. They are unarguably important predictors of achievement. While academic learning outcomes may or may not be useful for some specific jobs, the non-academic outcomes are invariably applicable to a wide range of professions. It is noteworthy however; that both academic learning outcomes and non-academic learning outcomes are influenced by school autonomy thus, the next section of this study will be concerned with the concept of school autonomy.

This section focuses on the definitions, characteristics, and benefits of school autonomy. The various dimensions of school autonomy will also be discussed. The concept of school autonomy came into limelight arising from the call for school management reform which became imperative as a way forward for enhancement of the efficiency and effectiveness of the educational system across the globe. Nandamuri and Rao (2015) traced the origin of school management reform to the United States of America in the 1980s.

Caldwell (2013) noted that a so-called “second wave” of education reform swept over the United States of America with searchlight of authorities saddled with supervision of educational institutions beamed on the need for schools to undergo an extensive restructuring of their pedagogy, governance, teacher-training and retaining, curriculum, administrative structures, as well as on teaching as a profession. Similar initiative was also adopted by Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom in the 1990s. A few of the developing countries such as Latin America, and South Asia have also adopted the initiative in recent past (Caldwell, 2013).

According to Nandamuri and Rao (2015), scholars have advocated the need to strengthen autonomy of schools as a way of overcoming educational problems. In view of the arguments in favour of school autonomy, several countries including the United States, Canada, the Netherlands, and Sweden have embraced the measures to promote school autonomy in a bid to enhance school effectiveness and efficiency (Cecilia, 2001). By this reform, it is argued that the bureaucratic constraints will be greatly reduced as individual school management will be directly involved in decisions regarding academic, administrative, and financial matters thereby enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational system.

In the light of the foregoing, the various aspects of school autonomy that this study will be concerned with are personnel management, financial, disciplinary decision, pedagogic and accountability autonomy.

2.2 CONCEPTUALISING SCHOOL AUTONOMY

There is no consensus among scholars as to the definition of school autonomy. Different definitions have been advanced for the concept by different scholars. Systems Approach for Better Education Results (2016) sees School autonomy as the decentralization of school management to grant a significant quantum of discretionary powers to the local school management in the interest of improved quality and standard of education. Similarly, Neeleman (2019) equated school autonomy with the freedom of local school management to exercise discretion in taking vital decisions on such matters as which textbooks they like to use, which teacher they want to hire, and how they want to spend their budget.

To Montron (2001); Bush and Gamage (2001), school autonomy is a situation in which authority is devolved away from state education administration towards principals, teachers, and parents with a view to generating greater operational effectiveness and efficiency of the individual school system. the assumption of this definition is that autonomy leads to This definition is however devoid of specificity in terms of the type of authority to be devolved to the downstream segment of the educational system.

The shortcoming of Montrom's definition was partly resolved in the definition of Finningan (2007) who attributed school autonomy to freedom of schools to have discretionary preserve for budgetary decisions. The implication of this approach is that local schools by the autonomy principle are empowered to exercise appreciable quantum of control over budgetary or financial decisions. This is found to enhance learner's outcome in India. Following this position, Ouchi and Segal (2003); Volansky and Friedman (2003); Fullan and Watson (2000) linked improved performance of learners in Latin American schools to the freedom granted the schools to exercise discretional power in decision making.

Agasisti, Catalano, and Sibiano, (2013) defined school autonomy as the ability to exercise discretionary powers to take decisions in matters such as governance, personnel, curriculum, instructional approach, disciplinary issues, financial, admission policies, and structural facilities in connection with the day-to-day administration of a school to enhance the performance of both the school and the learners.

Similarly, another broad conceptualization of school autonomy (which is an improvement of the earlier definitions) was given by Arcia, Patrinos, Porta, and Macdonald (2010). According to these authors, school autonomy is the granting of freedom to schools with a view to enabling them to exercise discretionary powers over decisions on personnel, financial, and pedagogical matters in the interest of the smooth running of a school.

School autonomy according to the dictionary has also been defined as self-governing of schools by local school management. It is in other words the ability of schools to run with little control from others. In the context of other studies, autonomy has been interpreted in a twofold manner. In some studies, it was construed to be the freedom of schools to take actions that are required

to run a school successfully with minimal interventions from external sources (Gawlick, 2008; Helgoy, Homme & Gewirtz, 2007; Lidstrom, 1991).

Other studies in their definitions of school autonomy emphasized the capacity of local schools to act and be responsible for making decisions on a number of issues relating to their governance. They are moves to devolve authority to take specific decisions on pre-determined situations and circumstances (Honig & Rainey, 2012). Further, Neeleman (2019) defined the concept of school autonomy as a school's right of self-government which encompasses the freedom to make discretionary decisions on responsibilities that have been devolved to the local school management.

From the foregoing therefore, school autonomy is the decentralization of authority to the local school administration in such a way that a greater latitude of freedom and discretionary authority is granted to the local school to enhance the smooth running of the activities and operations of the individual school systems. This is in the spirit of school-based management which devolves administrative and management decisions to the individual school leaving the department or ministry of education with formulation of policies and consultations where and when necessary by the respective school management.

2.3 DIMENSIONS OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY

This section deals with the cardinal dimensions of school autonomy that has attracted the attention of several scholars in extant literature. Arcia, Patrinos, Porta, and Macdonald (2010) identified five dimensions of school autonomy which were listed as follows:

- School autonomy in financial decisions
- School autonomy in hiring and firing of employees
- Involvement of school council in financial decisions
- Discretionary powers in assessment of both the school and learners
- Accountability and responsibility for actions and decisions

From the above list, the first indicator identified deals with financial matters. Autonomy with respect to financial matters relates to an increasing latitude of freedom of the local school to take

financial decisions. This is found to enable the schools to prioritise the needs of both the school and the community where it operates in the spirit of corporate social responsibility actions.

The second indicator here relates to exercise of discretionary powers to employ specific individuals either as a teaching or non-teaching staff. This privilege enables the individual school management to employ individuals that share the value system of the school and this is expected to impact positively on the learner's outcomes both academically and non-academically.

The third indicator that is connected with involvement of school council in decisions affecting financial decisions was based on the assumption that involvement of school council in financial decisions will undoubtedly have a positive impact on school's operational efficiency.

The fourth indicator relates to assessment of both the school and the learners' performance. The objectivity and credibility of such assessment will ensure optimality of the performance of both learners and school as a corporate entity. The last indicator is to ensure accountability to parents, government, as well as to the larger society in general.

In their study on school accountability, autonomy, choice, and equity of student achievement: International evidence from program for international students assessment (PISA) 2003, Schutz, West, and Wobman (2007) see school autonomy as comprised budget formulation, staffing, and pedagogic dimensions.

In the words of Farris-Berg, Dirkswager, and Junge (2015), autonomy refers to a situation in which the local school management exercise authority with respect to managing various activities of the school as empowered by the central body. Farris-Berg, *et al.* (2015) identified 15 dimensions of autonomy which are as listed below:

- Pedagogic autonomy- this applies when the local school management exercises authority on decisions affecting learning program and materials. This depends on the educational philosophy, methods of teaching, curriculum design, types of resource materials to be used for teaching and learning, conducive learning environment, and technological readiness.
- Policy formulation autonomy – this is the freedom of the local school management to formulate policy to guide the day-to-day running of the school within

the stipulated state laws and regulations. Such policy includes homework, discipline, dress code, parent and community engagement amongst others.

- Schedule decisions autonomy – this is the freedom of local school management to determine the calendar to be followed by the school with respect to resumption time, examination period, and end time either on a daily basis or at the end of the school term or year.
- Teachers’ work hours autonomy- this is the liberty of a local school management to determine the daily work hours of the teachers and non-teaching workers. This may however be on the basis of a negotiated agreement reached between the local school management and the workers.
- Recruitment autonomy- this is the discretionary freedom of local school management to hire and fire workers in its employ. This may be based on a policy that is existing to guide decisions which may vest such decisions on a committee or team whose selection is not arbitrarily done but following laid down rules and regulations.
- Appointment and promotions decisions- the preserve to choose individuals as a leader for a specific post within the rank and file of the administrative structure of a school. This is also in line with established procedure.
- Professional development autonomy- this relates to the freedom to take decisions on how professional development time and budget is spent both for individuals and the collective group.
- Evaluation autonomy- this is the freedom to choose the process and methods for evaluating employees. This may be by peer evaluation, 360-degree evaluation or other evaluation method considered acceptable to the stakeholders.
- Tenure setting autonomy- this is the autonomy to decide on such tenured issues as service years duration, contract employment duration, leadership tenure and other similar matters.
- Autonomy to terminate or transfer employees- this relates to the discretionary powers of the local school management to terminate the employment of an employee for a just cause or motivate transfer of an employee to another school within the

territory of the arm of government that such school represent in the case of a public school.

- Financial autonomy- this is the exclusive preserve granted local school management in the area of budget preparation and approval. It is concerned with the exercise of control over all financial decisions for a school.
- Compensation decision autonomy- this is concerned with the freedom to decide base pay, allowances, other fringe benefits for employees.
- Staffing pattern autonomy- this is the freedom to decide on the staff mix of employees considering existing regulation with respect to the various categories of employees such as teachers, special education providers, para professionals, and support staff.
- Assessment autonomy- this is the freedom to decide on how to measure learner's achievement. The modality for the examinations in terms of the weight to attach to the various levels of exam that may be determined for the learners to take.
- Promotion criteria autonomy- the freedom to decide what level of proficiency will earn a learner promotion to the next class. The criteria may be school-dependent and not necessarily uniform for all schools.

The above dimensions as identified by Farris-Berg, Dirkswager, and Junge (2015) however were found to have some overlaps for example; promotion criteria, staffing pattern, termination or transfer, and recruitment decisions have some overlaps while overlaps can also be identified in assessment autonomy, and pedagogic autonomy. Further, accountability and disciplinary decision autonomy were not captured in their list of autonomy dimensions. In view of these shortcomings of the dimensions identified by Farris-Berg, Dirkswager, and Junge (2015), more comprehensive dimensions of school autonomy identified by other scholars were also considered and focused upon for this study. These are as outlined hereunder:

2.3.1 Personnel management autonomy

Personnel management autonomy refers to the exercise of freedom in the hiring and firing of employees of an organization. The concept relates to the management of the human resource of an organization. The relevance and importance of personnel management autonomy could be based on the submission of Aide (2007) who maintained that of all the factors of production

namely: men, machine, materials, money, and markets, men is the only animate factor and is responsible for the coordination of the rest four factors.

Thus, men unarguably remained the most valuable of all the factors of production. In this wise, an organization is as good as its employees. To get the best out of all the five factors of production so identified in this study, the human element needs to be properly managed and motivated. Omebe (2011) posit that well managed teachers will always look for better ways of doing their jobs with a view to adding value to their delivery mode thereby improving their efficiency which is consequently reflected in the performance of the learners.

2.3.2 Financial autonomy

Financial autonomy has been defined as the decentralization of financial control over budget allocation and implementation to empower the local school with authority to take decision on financial matters (Nandamuri, 2012). It is the exercise of financial powers to allocate and implement budget provisions as considered appropriate. Di Gropello (2004) described financial autonomy as decentralization of authority to empower local school management an appreciable level of independence in taking decisions on financial matters.

It is a managerial practice that allows local school management to exercise freedom in budget preparation and implementation for the purposes of enhancing accountability for their performance record (Barrera, Fasih, and Patrinos; Patrinos and Horn, 2010). Further, Barrera-Osorio, Fasih, Patrinos, and Santibanez (2009) see financial autonomy as devolution of budget preparation and implementation to local school management. Arcia, MacDonald, and Patrinos (2014) defined financial autonomy as the freedom to exercise control over budget planning and approval as reflected in the increasing degree of local control over operating funds to for the purposes of improving operational efficiency of schools.

2.3.3 Disciplinary decision autonomy

One of the pivotal objects of education is the inculcation of discipline spirit in every learner that passes through the four walls of an institution (Nyabwari, Katola, & Muindi, 2013). This is considered to be critical to the success of learners that received secondary education in an institution. Disciplinary decision has been defined by several scholars in several ways. Nyabwari

et al. (2013) defined disciplinary decision as actions taken on a learner to correct behaviours considered to be abnormal given established rules and regulations of an institution. For Duffy, 1980; and Glenn, 1981; discipline is the action taken on learners to maintain orderliness and self-control in the learners whether they are in or out of the classroom.

Disciplinary decision autonomy is the freedom granted local school management to take disciplinary action of appropriate magnitude on erring learners without recourse to the education ministry. The importance of disciplinary decision autonomy is underscored by Iyer (2008) who identify learners' self-discipline among the top five characteristics of effective schools. Edmonds (1979) in his study on effective schools for the urban poor posit that schools whose principals are disciplinarian are found to be progressive and successful. This view was corroborated by Purkey and Smith (1983) whose study on effective schools reveal that high achieving schools are the ones that maintained consistent learners' discipline.

Nyabwari *et al.* (2013) noted that discipline can be broadly viewed from two perspectives – punitive and redemptive disciplinary measures. In the case of punitive discipline, the emphasis is to imbibe the spirit of self-control in the learners through the exercise of control over the willpower. Redemptive discipline on the other hand achieve self-control in the learners through the harmonious integration of both the willpower and the intelligent capacities. The study reveal that parents generally prefer to trust the training of their wards in such schools where appreciable level of discipline is maintained in the learners.

2.3.4 Pedagogic autonomy

Pedagogy relates to all forms of activities geared toward educating, teaching and instructing learners (Barrera-Osorio, Fasih, Patrinos, & Santibanez, 2009). According to Arcia, MacDonald, and Patrinos (2014), pedagogy can be defined as the form of school management in which the local schools are given decision making authority over activities connected with teaching and learning. The quality and success of a school to a very large extent is contingent on several factors among which pedagogy is prominent. This is because the uniqueness of a school is principally defined by its pedagogic principles (Vegas, 2001; Patrinos. 2011). According to Barrera-Osorio *et al.* (2009), pedagogical elements include such considerations as class size, curriculum and textbooks. Other elements of the pedagogical activities are mode of conduct of

classes by the teachers, the extent to which learners are encouraged to participate in class activities such as active participation or passive participation, structure and mode of assignment and class exercises.

In view of the conceptual clarifications as to what constitutes pedagogy for an institution, pedagogical autonomy thus refers to the freedom and discretionary authority granted to local school management with a view to improving their efficiency and effectiveness (Fry, & Bi, 2013)

Considering the high level of importance of pedagogical factors in shaping the performance of schools and learners, scholars have argued in favour of granting local school more discretionary freedom in pedagogical matters (Vegas, 2001; Arcia, Patrinos, Porta, & MacDonald, 2010; Arcia *et al.*, 2010).

2.3.5 Accountability autonomy

There has been no consensus as to what constitute school accountability in extant literature. In some studies, school accountability is seen as the degree of openness with which a school runs its activities and operations (Irish Department of Education and Skills, 2015). Other scholars see school accountability as the acceptance of responsibility for one's actions. The concept is also seen as the extent to which a school management is compliant with the established rules and regulations that are meant to guide school governance. It is also akin to the transmission of periodical reports to those with oversight functions over a school as and when due. School accountability is also concerned with the linking of rewards and sanctions to specified outcomes in a way that connotes objectivity and transparency (Heim, 1996; Rechebei, 2010).

Accountability autonomy contributes and support the view of a school as a close system. This view is predicated on the assumption that the SWEDENperformance of a system is easier to optimize than that of isolated entities. This view argues that system performance becomes maximized under a situation in which all interacting variables are linked together thereby allowing the system to close the various internal loops. This view suggests that school management activities are reasonable when they contribute to the closure of a system.

School autonomy in the form of its dimension such as personnel management, financial, disciplinary decision, pedagogic, and accountability autonomy is believed to be instrumental to the creation, promotion, and sustenance of enabling environment which ensure performance optimality of both the school as well as the learner. This unarguably inform the initiative from different governments of different countries as seen in the next section of this study which considers evolution of school autonomy.

2.4 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY

The origin of school autonomy can be historically traced to Europe in the nineteenth century. The initiative was advanced in support of a very strong need to promote academic freedom among primary and secondary schools in the interest of enhancement of learners and institutional performance. The initiative was largely predicated on religious and philosophical considerations. This argument in favour of school autonomy has continued to elicit the interest of scholars in the field of education from different nations of the world (Eurydice, 2007; Arcia *et al.*, 2011).

Amongst other nations that adopted the school autonomy initiative is the country of Ireland where the decision to decentralise authority to schools and local communities was undertaken by government for three principal reasons namely: to achieve greater democratic participation by schools and communities in the operational activities of schools, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the school system, and finally to improve the quality of education offered to learners. This was contained in the programme of the government for 2011 – 2016 (Department of Education and Skills, 2015).

In the United Kingdom context, the latitude of discretion given to schools to run and manage their affairs is rather extensive. The system is anchored on a framework that is underpinned by the following elements:

- Autonomy in monitoring and evaluation of learners' and teachers' performance.
- Responsibility to address all forms of concerns that bothers on complaints from diverse stakeholders.

- Involvement of parents, staff, and community representatives in school governance.
- Responsibility to provide parents and the wider community with adequate information about the activities and challenges of the schools (Patrinos, Fasih, Barrera, Garcia-Moreno, Bentaouet-Kattan & Wickramasekera, 2008; Keddie, 2015).

Further to the highlighted framework above on which school-based management was based, it is pertinent to note that the experience with respect to school autonomy varies across countries next section of this study highlights the experience of different countries with respect to school-based management system of education. The rationale for this review of country-specific experience is to trace the evolution of school-based management and the diverse reasons for the adoption of the initiative.

2.5 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SCHOOL AUTONOMY

The various arguments that have been advanced in favor of school autonomy by various scholars were predicated on the diverse advantages that can be attributable to the concept. Several authors have linked school autonomy to varied advantages as reported for various countries in literature which include (although not limited to) the following:

- Enhancement of school efficiency and effectiveness notable through reduction in drop-out rates. Examples are found in countries like Nepal, Mexico, Kenya, and Indonesia (Patrinos, 2014).
- Schools with pedagogical and personnel autonomy were found to record higher student test scores compared with those without such autonomy. Such was found for example in Nicaragua (King & Osler, 2004).
- School autonomy made it possible for schools to respond more speedily to issues that may have negative impact on the smooth running of the school (Allen & Mintron, 2010).

- School autonomy is associated with improved educational outcomes in learners (Bush & Gamage, 2001).
- Studies have shown that school autonomy positively affect student learning and performance (Hahn, Wang, & Yang, 2014; Hanushek, & Wobmann, 2013; Hanushek, & Raymond, 2005).
- School autonomy enhances character formation of learners when compared with schools with less autonomy (Almerico, 2014).
- School autonomy imposes accountability on the leadership or management of concerned institutions (Patrinos, Arcia, & Macdonald, 2015).
- Program on international students' assessment (PISA) scores is higher for schools with higher autonomy than for schools with less autonomy (Patrinos, Arcia, & Macdonald, 2015).
- School autonomy enhances school's response to parents. This is because apart from making governance structure of schools more democratic, devolution of control makes it possible for parents and the local communities to better monitor both the teachers as well as the school with respect to the achievement of the learner's learning outcomes (Galliani, Gertle, & Schargrotsky, 2008; Gunnarson & Orazem, 2009).
- School autonomy also made it possible for school management to select that are considered best suited for their needs as well as that of the learners.' In the US and Australian states where schools have considerable freedom in relation to staffing, Roin & Scileanna (2013) noted that schools are better positioned to identify most appropriate staffing pattern that is required to produce best learner's outcomes.

This section dealt with the benefits of school autonomy and is of much relevance to this study as it serves dual purposes. The section outlines the position of supporters of school autonomy initiative and can serve as a basis for discussion of the findings of the study. Further, this section will also be helpful in drawing the research instrument items for measurement of the constructs of school autonomy. Much as school autonomy is laudable as evidenced from several studies. It

is not without associated drawbacks. The disadvantages of school autonomy as identified by Gunnarson & Orazem (2009) are as follows:

- School autonomy has the capacity to create an avenue for more vocal parents to wield undue influence on schools. This situation predisposes the Principal's role to politicization and consequentially more cumbersome. In this regard, school autonomy can result in a situation whereby education becomes shaped by the wishes of those who are more vocal amongst the stakeholders when such may not actually represent the entire population of the respective stakeholders.
- School autonomy may erroneously suggest that schools need more supports and resources – a situation which may predispose schools to interference from agencies whose incursions in the name of assistance rendering may inadvertently pose governance risks to the school management. Further, devolution of authority may end up encumbering local school management with situations that may be too knotty to be handled at the lower level thus exposing the school management to administrative dilemma.

The advantages of school autonomy highlighted in this study are to serve as yardstick for evaluating the success of school autonomy on implementation while the disadvantages are to prepare the individual school administration for what to guide against in the course of their adoption of school autonomy philosophy.

2.6 COUNTRY SPECIFIC EXPERIENCES WITH SCHOOL AUTONOMY

This section focused on the experience of different countries with respect to the issue of school autonomy. The various countries covered are as follows:

2.6.1 Introduction

The experience of different countries varies with respect to adoption of school autonomy as well as the contributing factors leading to the adoption of the initiative. Different countries record

different levels of adoption as well as diverse outcomes of the initiative. The country specific experiences of different countries with respect to school autonomy were covered in this chapter for two major reasons. Firstly, they will assist in answering the research questions and secondly, they will enhance discussions of the findings of the study. The country specific experiences are as stated hereunder.

2.6.2 The United Kingdom

The UK government is at the forefront of championing autonomy for schools from historical perspectives. Secondary schools are classified into two major types namely – academies and free schools. Academies are schools that are established by the government and are publicly funded. The free schools on the other hand are schools established by parents, teacher, charities, trusts, religious, and such other voluntary groups. Except for mode of establishment, there is not much difference between academies and free school as both are funded in the same way – directly from the central government. The free schools by established process can be upgraded to academy status if so desired by the proprietor(s). one of the conditions for upgrading a free state school to an academy status is dwindling performance. In which case the upgrading is a means of salvaging such schools from total failure and extinction.

The United Kingdom as at February, 2014 has 3,657 academies with 216 free schools in the process of being upgraded to academy status. State schools prior to becoming academies are controlled by the local authority but on reaching the academy status the locus of control changes to the central government. The academies have the preserve to take decisions on personnel and other related matters, set terms and conditions of service including salary levels and scales and other agreement details in line with existing legislation. This discretionary decision allows the school authority to administer pay rates on the basis of individual staff performance records and specific qualification and skills demonstrated.

Upon conversion to academy status, a school will be obliged to provide for itself such other functions that are hitherto provided by the local authority. Such conversion however awards ownership of the grounds and buildings to the school. The new status by implication imposes an obligation to comply with specific financial and legal requirements. It also imposes reporting responsibilities to the school governors.

Both academies and free schools are at liberty to set the terms and conditions guiding employment of their personnel which by implication means that there is room for negotiation with individual applicants on the basis of their skills and qualifications vis-à-vis the requirements of the school. Thus, the payment rates and other conditions of employment of the individual teacher is determined by the respective schools offering them employment.

2.6.3 The Netherlands

According to Kadtonk (2015), the move to gravitate towards school autonomy in The Netherlands dated back to the 1980s. The move started with The Netherlands citizens being given ample freedom to establish schools and with the exclusive preserve to determine how the schools will be governed. With this opportunity, different schools with diverse political, pedagogical, and religious persuasions are formed in The Netherlands. These schools are broadly divisible into two – publicly and privately-owned schools which are otherwise known as independent schools.

The autonomy subsists as long as the schools do not seek funding from the central government otherwise, the autonomy becomes mortgaged. The central government has specified standards for all schools and as long as a school is able to meet those set standards without seeking funding assistance from the central government, they remain autonomous.

Regardless of the autonomy status granted schools in The Netherlands, all schools are subject to supervision and inspection by the central government to affirm that the standards set for the schools are consistently met over time. Aside from the central government oversight function at a secondary level while the primary oversight function is undertaken by the school Board who serves as the legal manager and owner of the school. The school Board has responsibility for the running of the school.

The Board has capacity to hire and fire teachers. All schools in The Netherlands (public or private) report to their respective school boards. A school board may oversee one or more school subject to the mandate. The Netherlands has witnessed a gradual move towards a more participatory management of local schools through an improved parent-teacher interaction as well as increased parent participation on advisory councils to assist school boards in making more informed decisions.

Schools in the Netherlands when compared with other Organisations for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member countries operate a more autonomous system (OECD, 2012). While other schools in the OECD countries has an average of 41% autonomy in key decisions relating to organisations of instructions, personnel and resource management, the Dutch schools exercise up to 86% autonomy in similar decisions (OECD, 2016). Such high level of autonomy exhibited by the Dutch education system was guaranteed by the Dutch constitution in accordance with her principle of freedom of education as granted by the inspectorate of Education under the Minister of Education since 1917 when Dutch schools have been free to choose and follow self-determined pedagogical visions amongst other key decisions. Of all the OECD schools, the Dutch secondary education system was noted to have the most differentiated systemic structure (OECD, 2015).

Under the provision of the freedom of education principle, the school leaders (Principal / Head Teacher / Manager) are appointed and are responsible to the schools' boards (OECD, 2014). The school board exercise oversight functions over the respective secondary school under their watch (OECD, 2016a). The school leaders are responsible for financial administration and for ensuring that teaching and learning align with the school's education goals and standards (OECD, 2014).

2.6.4 Finland

Finland has as its basic principle that all people must have equal access to quality education regardless of their ethnicity, age, wealth, location or other persuasions (World Bank, 2012). Administration of education is done at two different levels in Finland. The Ministry of Education and Culture is saddled with the responsibility of formulating policies on Education while the Finnish Board of Education is responsible for the implementation of the policies (Saarivirta, & Kumpulainen, 2016).

The Board of Education works with the Ministry to develop education objectives, curriculum, and pedagogic details for all levels of education – early childhood, pre-primary, basic, upper secondary and adult education. Administration of education at the local level is done by the local authorities which may be a single municipal authority or joint municipal authorities who are involved in decision making, fund allocation, development of local curricula and recruitment of

personnel. The municipal authority reserves the discretion to delegate decision powers to the schools to the extent it considers desirable.

The individual schools have power to decide on the class size and how to group the learners. The schools are empowered to provide educational services in accordance with their local administrative arrangements and visions as long as the basic functions laid down by the government are covered to the extent that schools are empowered to develop and administer their respective budget, acquisition and recruitment of personnel, exercise discretion on pedagogic matters such as teaching methods to adopt, textbooks to be used and other materials to be acquired for teaching and learning purposes.

2.6.5 Australia

Public schools in Australia were known to have appreciable latitude of autonomy Moradi, Beidokhti, and Fathi (2016). It is worthy of note however, that the degree of autonomy varies across the states in the country. The state of Victoria has the highest degree of autonomy being known as the education state among the various states in Australia. Victoria with Melbourne as its capital city is also the second most populous state in Australia. The schools are usually governed by councils whose membership are elected parents (not less than one third of the members), education department representatives who are made up of education department officials, schools principals, and some teachers (not more than one third of the members), and appointed members of the community. The school councils are accountable to the Minister for Education.

The school council is saddled with such responsibilities as establishment of the broad direction and vision for the respective schools, development and updating of school policies, management of the school resources. Under this arrangement, the school Principal serves as the executive officer of the council and is responsible for providing advice to the council as well as the implementation of its decisions in line with the guidance provided by the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. The Department is involved in the selection of Principal and monitoring of the school outcomes.

2.6.6 Sweden

Hallinger, and Wang (2015) noted that the schools in Sweden are broadly divided in to two categories namely: free schools which were privately owned and managed and public schools which are publicly owned and managed. Policy reforms in favour of school autonomy were initiated in Sweden sometimes in 2008. The initiative motivated for full autonomy for schools in the areas of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. The initiative was driven by the need to improve the dwindling performance records of Swedish learners from PISA records. For example, the 2012 PISA results that was published in 2013 showed that over the past decade the average performance of Swedish learners dropped from a level that was initially above average for the OECD countries to a level below the OECD average in all the three core subjects measured by PISA.

2.6.7 New Zealand

New Zealand has consistently been leading other OECD countries in PISA records covering the three key subject areas – reading, science, and mathematics since 2000 (Irish Department of Education and Skills, 2015). Schools in New Zealand are among the most autonomous schools within the OECD countries (OECD, 2013). Schools in New Zealand operate individually without recourse to districts or local authorities just like the US charter schools that operate independently (Wylie, 2013).

The national curriculum only serves as a framework for the development of the curriculum of the respective schools. Teachers have the exclusive preserve to analyse students and their needs with a view to mapping out pedagogical imperatives to address them. The mechanisms for assessing learners in New Zealand were normally internally developed by individual school. However, in upper secondary education, students' qualifications are assessed both internally by the respective schools and externally by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority based on the national education framework. The clear indication from New Zealand experience suggests that the high level of school autonomy over curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment matters impact the educational system positively.

This section of the study focused on the conceptualization of school autonomy. The section looked at the various dimensions of school autonomy and the evolution of the concept coupled

with the rationales that underpin the initiative. The essence of the review is to have a reference point for evaluation of the Nigerian experience with respect to school autonomy compared to other countries and in the light of extant literature postulations.

While different countries record different experience with respect to the foci and bases of adoption of school autonomy, one common ground that underpinned the initiative in all the countries covered in this section stands out clearly and that is the need to enhance learner's outcomes. This is important for this study as it will enable the findings of the study to be situated in the body of existing knowledge thereby contributing to concept, theory and empirics through the expected findings.

Having discussed the country-specific experiences of school autonomy, it is pertinent to note that the system offers a number of benefits to diverse stakeholders in the educational system. This is the concern of the next section of this study.

2.6.8 Hong Kong

The interest of Hong Kong in education reforms was predicated on the experience of other nations around the world on the issue of enhancing educational outcomes. This reality was hinged on the quest of governments across nations of the world to look for strategies to promote and boost the competitiveness of their nations' workforce to be able to improve their gross domestic product (GDP) as well as enhance their societal development thereby attaining a status of economic prosperity and thus remain competitive on the global landscape (Education Department Bureau, 2015a; 2015b; 2015c; 2015d).

This development stemmed out of the reality of the fact that global competition has extended from economic to education thus leading think-tanks to be saddled with the responsibility of finding ways to be explored so as to improve the educational systems. More so that nations are being attracted to participate in global competitions and comparison of educational outcomes in literacy, mathematics and science through initiatives such as Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), or Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) (Hanushek & Woessman, 2011).

The international comparisons as stated in the foregoing paragraphs involve assessments of the performance of the various countries spanning a period of three decades of experimenting with school-based management (SBM) as a means of school improvement and education reform. These experiments have been conducted in many developed countries such as Australia (Lingard, Hayes & Mills, 2002), Israel (Khalid & Amal, 2016); Canada (Levin, 1992), England (Giles, 1995), USA (Honig & Rainey, 2012; Marsh, 2012).

The experiment was also conducted in a few developing countries as well. Such developing countries where the same experiments were conducted included Argentina (Astiz, 2006), Indonesia (Bandur, 2012), Nicaragua (Rivarola & Fuller, 1999), Mexico (Santibanez, Abreu-Lastra & O'Donoghue, 2014), Pakistan (Retallick, 2005) and South Africa (Jansen, 2001).

The Hong Kong government arising from the claim that school-based management can help to deliver quality education through enhanced school-based management became attracted to the concept at the very least on a theoretical basis if not in practice to start with. Coincidentally, Hong Kong has a traditional administrative philosophy that minimizes government intervention in professional practice. School-based management theorists however emphasized the need for autonomy of schools in matters such as decision making, personnel selection, etc. (Yin, Theodore & Lee, 2016).

In line with the school-based management thesis, Hong Kong adopted a policy on marketisation and decentralization of school management (Walker & Ko, 2011). By this policy, authority to manage schools is to an appreciable extent devolved to the local school level to achieve a status of educational accountability by which schools are held accountable for their actions. The government document initiating school-based management emphasizes two principles which were flexibility and autonomy in daily operations and resources management in accordance with the needs of their students. Secondly, the initiative also emphasized accountability in the use of public funds and also in involvement of all stakeholders in their various activities.

The adoption of school-based management in Hong Kong occurred in four phases which were demarcated by the publication of two policy documents and one legal document on the initiative namely the School Management Initiative (SMI), the Education Commission Report No. 7 (ECR7), and the Amendment of Education Ordinance 2004. The first phase – restricted school

autonomy was a phase during which the schools in Hong Kong unlike schools in most other countries were operated by School Sponsoring Bodies (SSB) which functions like the Local Education Authority in England in that they have restricted form of autonomy over the administration of the schools. This is because schools under this arrangement are subsidized under the Codes of Aid. The SSB have powers to employ, appoint principals and teachers or promote them in line with the qualification and criteria set by the government of Hong Kong.

School autonomy in the name of School-based management in Hong Kong from the foregoing was based on the need for educational accountability and self-evaluation. The specific impacts of school autonomy as initiated in Hong Kong were on the following educational outcomes: school governance and management, teachers' work, school curriculum, and students learning. Yin et al (2016) noted that the adoption of school autonomy by Hong Kong yielded positive outcomes in terms of better academic performance recorded by schools that were having weak results originally, transformation of schools, improved school governance, more flexible organizational structure, and enhanced corporate performance of the individual school.

2.6.9 South Africa

The South African experience with respect to the school autonomy is traceable to the wave of reforms in the political landscape that swept across the country at the end of the apartheid regime of the white-ruled South African Nationalist Party in the 1948 to the early 1990s which led to the series of steps that culminated in the formation of the democratic government in 1994. The end of apartheid witnessed series of reforms in South Africa inclusive of education reforms. Fataar (2008) noted the existence of racial inequality in education which policy reforms aimed at addressing through a reconstruction of the education system. Gumede and Biyase (2016) posited that educational reforms and curriculum transformation were priorities of the Government of National Unity of South Africa considering that education is critical in redressing the injustices of the apartheid colonialism hitherto characterised by inequitable and fragmented educational system. The reforms had seen to the overhauling of such factors as governance, school access, teacher deployment and financial resources amongst others.

2.7.0 The Nigerian experience

The educational system of Nigeria is under the control and management of the Federal Ministry of Education whose mission is to use education as a tool for fostering the development of all Nigerian citizens to their full potentials in the promotion of a strong democratic, egalitarian, prosperous, indivisible, and indissoluble sovereign nation under God. To realise this objective, the Nigerian educational system has witnessed major structural changes in the course of the last thirty years. Before and shortly after Nigerian independence in 1960, the primary and secondary system of education of Nigeria is patterned after the British system having six years of primary education and five years secondary education usually to be followed by two years of higher education at the A Levels before proceeding to acquiring the university education.

In 1973, the educational system was reviewed giving birth to the 6-3-3-4 system with six years primary, three years junior secondary, three years senior secondary, and four years tertiary education which is similar to the American system. The first National Policy on Education was developed and adopted in the year 1982 after which the educational system has witnessed a lot of changes and modifications at various levels. These changes and modifications otherwise known as reforms are meant to engender improvement in quality of the educational system.

The concept of reform has attracted the interest of education scholars across the globe. The term “reform” is etymologically derived from the Latin root “*reformare*” which means “to shape”. The concept connotes actions that are geared at improving an entity by alteration of different activities that relate to that entity, it also implies correction of errors or removal of defects with a view to achieving a higher upgrade of an entity (Yahoo Education, 2007). This definition however is deficient in that it failed to identify who is at the center of the identified activities that informed the reform agenda. This shortcoming was taken care of in the definition of Young and Levin (1999) who sees educational reforms as initiatives of the government aimed at enhancing the quality of the educational system of a country often times driven by the political apparatus of the government rather than by educators or by bureaucrats as justifiable by the need for a break from current practice considering its inherent deficiencies.

In view of these definitions, this study sees reforms as a government-induced changes and modifications target at enhancing the educational system of a country within a particular time

frame. Yusuf and Yusuf (2009) noted that Nigeria after attaining independence on 1st October, 1960 inherited the educational policy bequeathed on her by her colonial masters (the British Government). It was quite a challenge for a country of close to 150 million people with over 250 diverse ethnic groups to operate a centralized educational system as it were let alone deal with issues of educational reform across its territories.

The first notable account of reforming the educational sector of Nigeria dated back to 1959 through a curriculum conference that held in Lagos. Fafunwa (1974) posited that the Lagos curriculum conference of 1959 brought about significant modifications to the country's educational system. The conference recommendations led to the first ever post-independence educational policy that was initiated to meet the local needs of the nation. The national policy on education (Federal Republic of Nigeria, [FRN, 1977] revised 1981, 1988, and 2004 led to a radical departure from the educational policy bequeathed to the country by the British colonialist.

These reforms include Federal Government take-over of regional universities in 1975, the Universal Primary Education Program (UPE) of 1976, the civilian administration of a former Nigerian President – Olusegun Obasanjo initiated a number of significant educational reforms including the granting of license to operate private universities by individuals or bodies corporate toward the end of his 1999 – 2007 regime and also the Universal Basic Education Program (UBE) of 2000 amongst others.

The various reforms were aimed at bringing about significant changes in the educational system and particularly to make the system relevant to the needs of the society as well as to make it to be at par with that of other nations of the world more so that the world is fast becoming a global village. Yusuf & Yusuf (2009) noted that the reforms in their diverse forms covered several aspects of the Nigerian educational system such as grade levels, agencies, educational agencies, administration, curriculum, etc.

The various educational reforms were informed by the dynamics of the political, economic, and social environment (Obioma & Ajagun, 2006). The educational reforms were used as pedestals to facilitate the achievement of the objectives of the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (NEEDS) which were adopted in 2004. According to Obioma and Ajagun (2004), NEEDS have the aims of achieving value re-orientation, poverty reduction, job

creation, and wealth generation as panacea for economic downturn. This is achievable through the implementation of educational reforms that led to shifting of the focus of education from a theoretical orientation to practical and knowledge orientation.

Explicating the rationales for embarking on educational reforms by developed, developing, as well as less developed countries of the world, Bello (2007) highlighted some of the benefits arising from educational reforms include the needs to equip students with requisite knowledge to change their private and professional lives, align education with the needs of the country, pay more attention to science and technology, and make education accessible to most members of the populace.

Other uses of school reforms are as follows: it helps students to acquire needed information and communication technology skills, improve teaching methods and educational practices, enhance financing and management of education, equip schools with adequate resources, improve school assessment system, and prepare the citizenry to be able to cope with the challenges of globalization amongst others.

Whilst Nigeria as a country has initiated several reforms in the education sector, reforms in the area of school autonomy has been largely neglected. Akinduyo (2014) in a study focused on teaching profession in Nigeria noted that the Nigerian government has done but very little in promotion of school autonomy and particularly decried the lack of autonomy by the Nigerian Union of Teachers (NUT). In a similar study, Fareo (2015) argued that one of the banes of education development in Nigeria is non-involvement of teachers in decisions that affects how the schools are run and managed. Again, this is a pointer to the fact that the government reforms as it relates to school autonomy in Nigeria is far from being realized.

Amadioha (2015) in a study centered on analysis of educational reforms in Nigeria noted that some of the reforms include the educational reform of 1889 which was targeted at educational expansion within the southern geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Similarly, from 1900 – 1903, there was a proclamation that introduced the system of assisted schools through government grant which was also targeted at the Southern Nigeria. Furthermore, in 1920 there was a recommendation by the African Education Commission that education should aim at training African leaders. There were other reforms between 1926 and 1929 which saw to the closure of

many illegal schools in the interest of sustaining high standards of the educational system in the country.

2.6.10 Summary

The concept of school autonomy has been reviewed in this chapter from definitional perspectives. The dimensions of school autonomy were also reviewed alongside the individual advantages and disadvantages. It was noted in this study that various authors identified several dimensions of school autonomy. This study argue that the various dimensions of school autonomy can be categorized into five as others forms of autonomy are found either to overlap or discovered to be analogues of any of the five basic dimensions used in this study. The chapter also dwelt on the country-specific experiences of various nations with respect to the adoption of the school autonomy philosophy. The foci of the individual nations for embracing school autonomy were also captured as well as the intensity of the practice of school autonomy. Finally, school autonomy from the Nigerian experience perspective was also covered. The contents of the chapter aligned with the hypotheses and research questions of the study.

2.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes that school autonomy evolved out of the need to improve the economic growth and development of nations across the world. The initiative originated from the United Kingdom after which other countries like the United States of America and other developed economies followed by some developing economies.

In the third chapter of this study, the concept of learner's performance will be reviewed alongside its various dimensions as well as its characteristics. The chapter will also review relevant theories as well as empirical works related to the study.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CONCEPT OF LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, the concept of school autonomy was discussed and conceptualized. The third chapter of this study focused on the conceptual overview of learners' performance. In discussing the learner's performance concept, the study will be concerned with the various dimensions of learner's performance as well as their characteristics and related theories. Specifically, the following dimensions of learner's performance that will be considered in this study are: work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development and social development. These elements of learner's performance are considered having been identified by diverse authors as indicators of learner's performance. In conclusion to the chapter, the possible link between school autonomy and learners' performance will be explored.

The response variable of the study - learner's performance can be construed as the totality of the outcomes that is observable in the learner consequent upon the explanatory variable (School autonomy) and its sub-variables (personnel management autonomy, financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and accountability autonomy) that have been already discussed in chapter two.

Learner's performance in the context of earlier studies can be measured through several dimensions such as work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development, and social development. The dimensions of learner's performance covered in this section serve diverse purposes. The review informed the construction of items on the research instrument used to measure the respective constructs of learner's performance on one hand and also assist in contextualizing the findings of the study on the other hand.

3.2 CONCEPTUALISING LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE

Learners' performance has been conceptualized in various ways by various authors in the literature with various implications for those who are considered as the stakeholders of the educational system namely the learners, the teachers (and school leadership), the parents and guardians as well as the government. In view of the importance of the concept of learners' performance as a pivotal factor on which the growth and economic development of nations across the globe depends, it has attracted the interest of many researchers in recent past. Rahimpour and Zakeri (2010) defined learners' performance as the measure of the ability of learners to accomplish a task with or without the teacher's presence. The focus of this definition is however vague as it relates to task accomplishment without taking cognizance of other more specific measures of learners' performance.

Farooq, Shafiq, and Berthanu (2011) definition of the concept of learners' performance as the extent to which the set goals of educational system has been achieved by the learners is a bit more explicit though but then this definition also lacks clarifications as regards the components or dimensions of the learners' performance concept. PISA (2003) in a more comprehensive definition of learners' performance defined the concept as the achievement of various skills that enable a learner to cope with life challenges. These skills on a broad level include academic and non-academic skills. These definitions have implications for the diverse stake holders of the educational systems in a country such as the learners, teachers and school leadership, the parents or guardians as well as the government.

On the part of the learners, learners' performance is the extent to which a learner had been able to acquire the skills that are needed to be able to fit into the society as a problem solver and as a veritable resource for national development (PISA, 2003). On the part of the teachers and school leadership, these definitions implied that learners' performance is unarguably indicative of the efficiency and effectiveness of the respective schools (Botha, 2010; Boateng, 2012; Lamas, 2015). In the case of the guardians or parents, and government, learners' performance through school effectiveness and efficiency reflects the appropriateness of operational policies and regulations guiding administration of educational system (Goldstein & Woodhouse, 2000).

Learners' performance is pivotal to the growth of any economy (Jimenez, Nguyen and Patrinos, 2012). This is considering the fact that the best resource of any nation that can drive the performance of the economy is the human capital (Patrinos, Macdonald, Parandekar & Klainin, 2012). Learner's performance is the indicator that can be used to gauge the efficiency and effectiveness of the educational system. This is because learner's performance is a reflection of what a learner has been able to achieve as a result of being enrolled for a secondary education either in a publicly or privately-owned institution of learning.

According to Botha (2010), learner's performance can be evaluated on the basis of educational outcomes of the learners that enrolled in an institution of learning. It is on the basis of such outcomes measures that schools can be described as effective or otherwise. Learner's performance (education outcomes) can be measured in several ways according to diverse scholars. Different metrics of measuring learner's performance have been identified by diverse scholars over time. Botha (2010) posited that the test or examination results obtained by learners could be used to evaluate both learner's performance as well as school effectiveness. The dimensions of learner's performance as derived from extant literature were reviewed as in the sections hereunder.

3.3 DIMENSIONS OF LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE

3.3.1 Introduction

This section focused on the dimensions of learners' performance. Learners' performance has several dimensions which are the various ways by which learners' performance can be measured and evaluated. They are the components into which learners' performance can be sub-divided or the constructs by which learners' performance can be measured. Several scholars in the field of education have identified different ways of measuring the performance of a learner. These identified constructs include work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development and social development. Each of these constructs will be reviewed in the sub-sections as presented hereunder.

3.3.2 Work quality

One of the dimensions of learners' performance is work quality (Gebremedhin & Asgele, 2015). Meyer (1992) notes that work quality can be equated with the manner in which work is done by the learner. It is the extent to which a work done is in conformity with expected or established standard. Wiggings (1990) also posits that work quality is the level of compliance of a work done in comparison to established criteria expected for such works.

Several attributes of work quality have been advanced in literature. EL Education (2015) identified those attributes and listed them as follows: organization, use of appropriate colour (in the case of a work that involves designs), effective use of space, creativity deployed in getting the job executed, aesthetic value of the finished work, etc. from the foregoing, work quality can be resolved into different levels such as: excellent, very good, good, fairly good, fair, poor, very poor, and extremely poor. Work quality is largely dependent on the skills and creativity that defines the outcome of a learner.

Wiggins (1990); Meyer (1992) noted that there is a tendency to confuse performance with work quality. The two concepts appear to be synonymous but they are actually varied in their meanings. Performance for example may be subjectively measured as in the case of a student who memorizes his or her lecture notes well and was able to successfully poured the same note down in an exam to score high marks and as such may be viewed to have performed creditably well whereas the same student when it comes to application of the memorized knowledge (a measure of work quality) may record abysmal failure. In this instance therefore, work quality according to Wiggings (1990) is the extent to which a piece of work is based on challenging and engaging tasks which connects eventually the application of head knowledge in the process of solving real life problems.

The quality of work therefore is reflective of how much knowledge has been acquired by a learner as demonstrated in what is being done and how what is being done has been done in line with expectation. In the case of a learner who was asked to write an article, the work quality will be measure by the order of presentation of the article, the content, organisation, neatness, all combined to define the quality of work the individual.

There are several measures that can be adopted to promote learner's work quality. Such measures identified by EL Education (2015) include:

- Involve learners in self-assessment. Self-assessment enabled learners to take responsibility for their learning outcome using the established rubric.
- Engage learners in the assessment of other learners. This activity is meant to prepare them for peer critique. This knowledge will enhance their capacity development through the opportunity to identify and learn from the issues highlighted from their peers work and the associated solutions proffered in the given instance.
- Provision of time to create multiple drafts as improvements of earlier drafts to enhance excellence in their demonstration of top-quality work over time.
- Monitor and encourage learners by regular inspection of what is being done by them compared with what is expected of them in terms of set standards to guide and ensure that the learners understood what is to be done and were able to do it well.
- Pre-planned exhibition of the learner's work to their awareness. The knowledge of showcasing their work to other people (including the public) elicit in the learner the need to care about quality. This also create an excitement in the learner to present top quality work
- Make time for the learner to reflect on their work. It is advantageous to allow learners to ponder on what they have done well as well as an introspection of where they fell short of expectation and what they should do to reach or achieve the set target in subsequent times.

Considering the above submissions, one the indices of evaluating learners' performance is the standard of work quality achieved by the learners. According to EL Education (2015), learners' work quality is seen in the attributes exhibited by the learner such as creativity displayed by the learner in presenting their work. Further, Hobden and Hobden (2019) described learners' work quality as the appropriateness of use of words in writing skills demonstrated in the quantity and quality of written work by the learners.

3.3.3 Affective performance

The affective performance dimension of learners' performance is concerned with the capacity of the learner to effectively control their mood, motivation, and attitude. The concept of affective performance assist learners to build resilience in learning as well as to build up stamina to enable them deal with diverse types of setbacks and difficulties with a view to assist them to bounce back. The skill also helps them (the learners) to persevere in the face of difficulties in a self-regulatory manner.

The affective performance of a learner is highly important as a measure of learner performance as it enables the learners to manage their emotions and keep them under control for effective learning purposes. This element measures how well a learner is able to cope with emotional highs and lows encountered in the process of going through his or her academic pursuit. Affective performance offers a learner several advantages which include the followings:

- It promotes learners' persistence and perseverance
- It enhances learners' focus and concentration
- It builds learners' mental quietness
- It helps learners to overcome distractions
- It attenuates learners' anxiety

Considering the foregoing, learners' affective performance is another measure of learners' performance. It is a measure of how well a learner is able to control his or her mood, motivation and attitude under different circumstances. The extent to which a learner can control his or her emotions, mood and attitude is also a reflection of the learners' outcomes (Kormos & Prefontaine, 2016). By this argument, it is expected that a learner is to exhibit firm control of his or her emotion, mood and attitude given different situations and circumstances to a fairly good and commendable extent. Part of the responsibilities of the teacher is to ensure that the learners are taught to be able to rule over their emotions and mood. The implication of this is that the focus of learning should not only be on cognitive skills acquisition but learning should also focus on affective skills acquisition as well. Such skills will help the learners and make them to be effective not only in their professional life but also in their personal life as well (Cox, 2010). Then we can talk of having a balanced education.

3.3.4 Character formation

One of the key objects of learning is character formation. Almerico (2014) defines character education as the curriculum that is specifically designed with the aim of teaching learners about the quality and traits of good and acceptable character. Such curriculum emphasizes the essential traits needed to build a good character. The author argue that character can best be learned through the pages of high-quality literature coupled with the lifestyle of a mentor to which a learner is closely associated with.

Character education involves a deliberate effort to develop and nurture noble character and cultivate core virtues that make for peaceful coexistence and togetherness of the society (Prestwich, 2004; Tyra, 2012). Such curricula call for teaching learners how to develop the capacity to decide appropriate way and manner of conducts that are acceptable in various situations and circumstances. Such education inculcates in learners the ability to understand moral values and the discretion to do the right things at all times. In the words of Hoge (2002), character education relates to any overt or covert attempt to elicit from a learner desirable individual traits or qualities that are acceptable to the general society.

Variations in the definitions of character education notwithstanding, the content of character education typically align with the core principles and values that are considered to be very important to the proper upbringing of individuals. Such principles and values include the followings: generosity, kindness, honesty, tolerance, trust, integrity, loyalty, fairness, freedom, equality, and respect for and of diversity (Bohlin, Farmer, & Ryan, 2001; Brooks, 2001).

Character formation scholars posit that character education is essential to be implemented right from the elementary and middle school years and beyond as there is no time that character education is not relevant. In other words, the process of character formation is unending albeit the rate of adjustment varies inversely with age. Character education enables learners to become reliable, respectful, responsible, and contributing meaningfully to the progress of the society (Almerico, 2014). Ryan (1999) noted that character formation offers several benefits to the learner, the school, and to the general society. The benefits include the followings:

- It enhances learners' academic achievement
- It promotes learners' communication proficiency

- It improves learners' sense of independence
- It facilitates learners' self confidence
- Character formation contribute to learners' attributes of being good and responsible citizen

Good and advantageous as character formation is, the concept is not without associated challenges that militate against its successful implementation. Such challenges include:

- Scarcity of necessary curriculum materials required to teach it.
- Lack of resourceful and experienced personnel to teach it
- Lack of adequate resources to procure the necessary curriculum materials required to teach it
- Time constraints for planning and implementing successful character education

Teaching of character education within literature content enables learners to come to terms with the reality that such traits as honesty, kindness, respect, and kindness are real and interesting aspects of the world around them. The traits just mentioned are part of the basic elements of character. Different combinations of traits have been identified by different educators in character development literature. Going by the submissions of a panel of twenty education scholars, the following character traits are considered essential for inclusion in a literacy-based character formation curriculum: fairness, citizenship, kindness, honesty and trustworthiness, leadership, integrity, respect, teamwork and cooperation, responsibility, courage, perseverance, caring, compassion, and empathy.

Other scholars like Bialik, Bogan, Fadel, and Horvath (2015) grouped the various character traits into six as supported by other scholars as follows:

- **Mindfulness:** Kabat-Zinn (1990) defined mindfulness as the awareness that results from paying attention to things that happens around a person. It came as a result of meditation which is a form of introspection. It relates to the capacity to demonstrate wisdom, self-awareness, self-actualisation, self-management, observation, consciousness, reflection, empathy, compassion, gratitude, caring, insight, growth, vision, equanimity, presence, happiness, authenticity, interconnectedness, listening, sharing, oneness, interdependence, beauty, acceptance, patience, balance, tranquillity, existentiality, spirituality, cross-

cultural awareness, social awareness, and balance in the course of discharging ones responsibilities and activities.

Hooker and Forder (2008) identified five advantages of mindfulness training which are as follows: it promotes attention and focus, self-management skills, self-acceptance, self-understanding, and memory capacity. From the foregoing, exposure of learners to mindfulness training from about eight years of age could eliminate violence from the world within one generation. Teaching mindfulness traits to learners requires the instructor to practices it in his or her own life as well. This is to lay credence to what is being taught. The misconception that mindfulness is only for professionals should be debunked from the hearts of the learners. Curricular on mindfulness focus on emphasizing awareness of the environment, body movement, or the senses.

- **Curiosity:** this trait is concerned with the exhibition of such virtues as open-mindedness, self-direction, initiative, exploration, motivation, passion, spontaneity, wonder, enthusiasm, and appreciation. Early discussion around curiosity as a character trait date back to early twentieth century when Cicero (1914) defined the concept as an inner craving for knowledge and learning without pecuniary motive. Aristotle (1933) subsequently defined the concept as an innate desire to acquire information.

Lowenstein (1994) posits that curiosity could be evoked by both internal (homeostatic) as well as external (stimulus evoked) drives. Curiosity in line with intuitive model is a natural tendency to seek to understand the world around us. The intensity of the drive however is not the same in all individuals. Curiosity curricula usually focused on concentrating on ways of provoking the curiosity of the learners. This can be done in several ways that challenge the learner's current mental models and orient them to discover their knowledge gap and how to resolve it. Examples can be through presentation of a contradiction or through inquiry-based or problem-based learning.

- **Courage:** this character trait has to do with fortitude, determination, risk-taking, confidence, zest, persistence, confidence, bravery, toughness, inspiration, humour, vigour, energy, cheerfulness, etc. Bialik et al. (2015) defined courage as the ability to act

in a desirable manner under situation of fear, uncertainty, risk, or when vulnerable. It can be seen as a subjective experience in the case of the choice of an individual to overcome fear by acting in an acceptable manner in the face of uncertainty.

There are specific traits that enhance the courage of an individual. Such traits include: openness to experience, conscientiousness, and self-efficacy. Courage is needed by learners to overcome fears, learn new concepts and skills, challenge one another's biases etc. This attribute helps to increase learner's competencies, resourcefulness, confidence and imagination. Four tactics can be used by a teacher in a bid to promote risk taking and develop courage in the learners. The tactics are: the teacher should serve as a role model of risk takers to the learners, treat learner's mistakes as opportunity to learn rather than castigate the learner for making the mistake, adopt grading policies that forgives mistakes and encourage revision, and finally, encourage discussion around mistakes for others to also learn from it and guide against it in subsequent times.

Outside of the school premises, courage can also be acquired informally by learners through learning frameworks which include relationship building, physical challenges and skill acquisition. These informal learning experience coupled with supportive social environment inclusive of culturally proficient role models, is expected to enhance courage in the learners who are seen, heard, and appreciated. Such exposures increase self-efficacy, and encourage learners to make laudable choices social scrutiny and intrapersonal fearful emotions notwithstanding.

- **Resilience:** this character trait is concerned with such values and attributes as grit, resourcefulness, tenacity, spunk, effort, diligence, commitment, self-esteem, stability, self-control, adaptability, confidence, adaptability, dealing with ambiguity, flexibility, self-discipline, etc. Resilience in its most basic form can be defined as an ability or capacity that allow one to overcome obstacles and constraints to a desirable target. It has also been described as a dynamic process that encompasses the ability of some individuals to succeed where several others in their conditions have not.

Simply put, it is the ability to succeed where others in their circumstance(s) are failing. Resilience can be affected by a number of factors which include opportunities for meaningful involvement and participation, communication of ambitious expectations and caring relationships. Resilience thus is primarily concerned with overcoming adverse conditions where others in their conditions have not. Formal approach to teaching of resilience in the classroom takes cognizance of the main factors that promote resilience as earlier mentioned.

The responsibility of the teacher at this point is to create the conducive environment in the classroom that support and promote resilience. This is in view of the fact that learners spend more time in the classroom, when learners feel they are supported and care for by others in the classroom, their trait of resilience will consequently be enhanced. Cefaj (2008) identified seven traits that are essential for boosting resilience as a character trait as follows: care and connection, pro-sociality and support, engagement, inclusivity, collaboration, empowerment, and a focus on learning.

- **Ethics:** Ethics has to do with several character traits such as humaneness, equity, benevolence, altruism, tolerance, consideration, justice, respect, genuineness, integrity, fairness, kindness, inclusiveness, tolerance, acceptance, altruism, loyalty, honesty, truthfulness, authenticity, trustworthiness, consideration, decency, virtue, forgiveness, equality, generousness, charity, civic-mindedness, citizenship, generosity, belonging, devotion, etc. Ethics is a teachable character trait and can be understood or learned from literatures on moral development.

Ethics involved the knowledge of the various stages of moral reasoning such as pre-conventional stage which is made up of obedience and punishment, self-interest orientation; the conventional stage which comprised interpersonal accord and conformity, authority and social order maintaining orientation, and finally, the post-conventional stage which is concerned with social contract orientation and universal ethical principles. It is however worthy of note that the knowledge of ethics does not necessarily lead to

ethical action except when an individual's moral reasoning positively correlate with his or her strength of will.

Ethics can be taught in different ways. Formally, ethics can be taught through the lens of one's professionalism. Several fields of specialization such as business management, law, medicine, etc. do have ethical standard that are required to be adhered strictly to while practicing them. Violation of such ethical standard may lead to withdrawal of the practicing license of such defaulters by their corresponding professional bodies. Informally, ethics can also be taught at homes by parents to their children. Such ethics are often driven by cultural.

- **Leadership:** The leadership attribute is a character trait that relates to such virtues as dependability, abnegation, accountability, responsibility, conscientiousness, reliability, modesty, selflessness, relationship, humbleness, inspiration, self-reflection, organization, mentorship, delegation, heroism, followership, charisma, commitment, followership, leading by example, focus, goal-orientation, results, execution, efficiency, precision, consistency, negotiation, diversity, decorum, socialization, social intelligence, etc. leadership is concerned with the role of an individual who is being followed by others either within an organizational (formal) setting or outside an organization (informal) setting.

Leadership can be viewed from different perspectives such as outlined hereunder:

Traditional view: this view conceives leaders as charismatic, extraordinary, and almost superhero individuals who by their work and activities inspire others – the followers to act in the interest of the common good of the organization or society. This view is consonance with the mechanistic view of organization that sees sub-ordinates as followers and leaders as experts whose aim is to maximize their control thereby motivating their sub-ordinates to act in certain ways to be able to achieve the set goals of the organization.

These character traits are of universal recognition by people from all walks of life and traverses religious and cultural divides. They apply to individuals from different

background regardless of their religious and cultural persuasions. The traits equip a learner to be well behaved in and out of school and to represent his or her community well at any place and at any time (Cengage, 2020). Hence the focus of all meaningful education should also cover character formation as another component of learning outcomes which can also be used to measure learners' performance.

3.3.5 Personal development

Council for the curriculum examinations and assessment (CCEA, 2017) defined personal development as the area of learning that is concerned with empowerment of individuals to develop and enhance their potential and to make informed and responsible decisions throughout their lives. The aim of personal development is to prepare young minds for the challenges of being an adult in a fast-changing environment of a complex society. The concept is concerned children's emotional development, development of moral thinking, health and safety, values and actions, and relationships with other individuals.

Personal development knowledge prepares an individual to become personally, socially, physically, and emotionally effective to lead safe, fulfilled, and healthy life and to become independent, responsible, and confident citizens, making well informed and responsible choices and decisions throughout their lives. Personal development focuses on the development of various aspects of an individual such as knowledge, skills, attitude, relationship, emotional awareness, life skills, values, behaviour that can be utilized within and outside of the classroom.

The collaborative for academic, social, and emotional learning (CASEL, 2003, 2007) identified five competencies that are teachable and considered as foundational for effective personal development. These are:

- Self-awareness which is concerned with the ability to know what one is feeling and thinking by way of having a realistic assessment of one's own abilities and competencies coupled with the individual's sense of self-confidence.
- Social awareness is the proficiency of an individual to understand the feeling and thinking of others such that enhances the capacity to appreciate and interact positively with diverse groups.

- Self-management has to do with the ability of an individual to handle one's emotions in a manner that facilitate rather than interfere accomplishment of tasks, goal setting and accomplishment, perseverance in spite of setbacks and frustrations.
- Relationship skills deals with establishment and maintenance of healthy and rewarding relationships on the basis of clear communication, resistance to inappropriate social pressure, cooperation, seeking help when needed, and negotiating solutions to conflict.
- Responsible decision making which has to do with making choices based on an accurate consideration of all relevant factors and possible outcomes of alternative courses of actions, taking responsibility for one's decisions, and respecting others.

Personal development offers several benefits to the school, the learners, and the community. The benefits to the school are diverse and include the following:

- It promotes and develop a supportive learning environment,
- It creates a more open relationship between the learners and the staff,
- It fosters an inclusive environment where everyone is valued and recognize,
- It promotes a good image for the school.

The benefits of personal development to the learners are as follows:

- It enhances the health and wellness of learners
- It promotes higher standards of achievement of the learners
- It improves learners' self-esteem and self confidence
- It improves learners' skills for keeping safe
- It helps learners to cope with difficult situations
- It sharpens learners' insight for contributing to relationships, family life, local and global community and the environment
- It helps to develop learners' moral thinking, values, and actions.
- It promotes the ability to work effectively with others and to take responsibility for all actions.
- It prepares them for challenge of the turbulent work or business environment
- It creates in the learners an awareness of the value of personal and interpersonal skills required to cope with work complexity

The benefits of personal development to the community are diverse and could be summarized as gaining citizens who:

- Are open to new ideas
- Have a sense of personal and social responsibility
- Are respectful
- Have concern for others
- Are confident, contributing members of the society, and
- Have integrity and moral courage

The implication of the above submission on learners' personal development as another dimension of learners' performance is that part of the focus of learning that both the learners and the teachers and the concerned institutions should bear in mind as a measure of successful education is the learners' personal development index. It is another important dimension that can be used to evaluate learners' performance. The index measures how well a learner is able to identify and develop his or her self-awareness, own identity, and innate talents. This is in line with Maslow (1970) in his postulation on motivational needs which are in a seven levels of hierarchical order with physiological needs for food, drinks, sex and sleep at the bottom of the pyramid while the need for personal development which occurs through the self-actualisation process resides at the top of the pyramid.

3.3.6 Social development

Social development has been defined in several ways by several scholars. Abdi and Guo (2008) defined social development as all forms of technological, economic, emotional, and political and other benevolences that indirectly or directly affect the quality of lives of the people. Huitt & Dawson (2011) see social development as the development of competencies within the social domain purposely to enhance an individual's ability to succeed in school and also to positively enhance mental health, vocational success, and the ability to be a worthy citizen in a democracy. The essence of social development is to ensure better livelihood possibilities in various communities around the globe.

According to Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF, 2015), social development is connected with several traits and abilities such as making friends, paying attention, sharing, expressing

emotions and dealing with challenges successfully. There are three major areas of social development which are as follows:

- Social interaction which deals with the interrelationships within and between groups of people and individuals who could be older, younger or one's peers. The interaction may take different forms such as playing together, taking turns, helping others, and cooperating with other people where and when necessary.
- Emotional awareness is concerned with the ability to recognize and understand how one is feeling and rationale for one's actions vis-à-vis other people's feelings and actions. The concept of emotional awareness is also concerned with how the feelings and actions of one affect self and others.
- Self-regulation is connected with an individual's ability to express one's thoughts, feelings, and behaviours in ways that are considered to be socially acceptable. The concept of self-regulation entails learning to calm down in the event of being angered or excited and persevering with difficult tasks.

Jones, Mark, and Max (2015) posit that social and emotional development of an individual commences from the earliest moment of an individual. Infants do learn from their social interactions with adults who care for them. Infants social development begins with the turning of the heart of infants to their parents' voices or acknowledging their parents' presence either by their smiles or other actions demonstrated from their earliest moments from birth.

Supporting young children helps them to begin to understand the world around them and prepare them for their earliest learning experiences. Jones et al. (2015) argue that children with strong social and emotional foundation are more likely to succeed better in their educational lives than those that lacked such social and emotional foundation right from their earlier days in life. Considering the foregoing, the social development index is another component of learners' performance that is of significant importance to stakeholders in the educational systems.

3.3.7 Summary

This section examined the learners' performance dimensions. Five dimensions of learners' performance were reviewed namely work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development and social development. The implication of each of the dimensions as

measures of learners' performance was established from the learners' angle as well as from other stakeholders' angle. The need to include these dimensions in the foci of educational planners and also for learners to concentrate upon were also stressed. An educational institution can only be seen to have succeeded if the learners being churned out are found to demonstrate appreciable levels of these performance indices in their individual lives.

3.4 THE POSSIBLE LINK BETWEEN SCHOOL AUTONOMY AND LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE

3.4.1 Introduction

School autonomy literature is replete with empirical studies covering dimensions of school autonomy and learner's performance. The review at this section was guided by the study objectives. Studies relating to each of the objectives were reviewed to be able to situate this study in the body of existing knowledge. The studies thus reviewed were captured as presented hereunder.

3.4.2 School autonomy and learners' work quality

This section focused on the review of studies on various dimensions of school autonomy and learners' work quality. In a study by French *et al.* (2014), it was revealed that given the latitude of discretion to hire and train teachers for teaching responsibilities in Boston's public schools in the United States of America led to improvement in the quality of education offered to the learners. The outcomes of the improvement in the quality of education was noted in several ways such as improvement in reading proficiency of the learners.

Similarly, the findings of this study are consistent with those of Bryke *et al.* (2010), Papay *et al.* (2012), Dreyfus, 2013; Ericson, *et al.* (1993) and National Research Council (2010) posited that improved education quality arising from personnel management autonomy or any other school based management initiative led to diverse educational outcomes such as improved content knowledge, receptivity to feedback, writing skills, critical thinking skills, orientation towards social justice and equity, problem-solving strategies, interpersonal skills and oral communication skills which are various measures of learners' work quality (Nostratinia & Razavi, 2016).

The import of personnel management autonomy as an element of the school-based management system cannot be overemphasized. This is because studies have revealed that personnel management autonomy positively correlates with development of affective skills in the learner (Lenos, Muralidharan, & Skur, 2017). The authors noted a learning crisis in which concerns were raised concerning the observed learning disparities of learners across countries. Several factors that could account for such disparities include inability of school management to identify inputs that predict learner outcomes, lack of required instructional materials, incongruence of curricular and realities of educational needs, poor teacher development initiatives, lack of motivation on the part of employers of teachers in the concerned schools among others.

The disparity in performance of schools has been attributed to variation in personnel management of the various schools (OECD, 2012). Studies have revealed variations exist in the management of personnel of private and public schools. The variations basically relate to such practices as wage administration, teacher selection, teacher retention and capacity building (Lenos, Muralidharan, & Skur, 2017; Neeleman, 2018). It was noted by the authors that better managed private schools attract and retain teachers that demonstrated high value-added principles unlike the public schools.

Apart from personnel management autonomy being a critical factor to consider in connection with the learners' work quality, Gebremadhin and Syoum (2015) in a study on assessing quality of education: In perspective with continuous assessment and learners' performance in Adwa college, Ethiopia found that pedagogic system of an institution can largely contribute to enhancement of learners' work quality which is a part of measures of quality of education. The study noted that quality of education is a non-negotiable requirement for socio-economic development, enhancement of economic competitiveness, reduction of inequality and fortification of government institutions of nations across the globe (Dilshad, 2010; Khan, 2011).

Also, private schools are known to reward higher teacher value added compared to public schools. In the same vein, private schools hire and retain high value-added teachers and remove low value-added teachers unlike the public schools that are often indifferent to such characteristics. In sum, private schools are found to be better managed than public schools and are consequently exhibiting better outcomes compared to their public counterparts.

In another study by Bloom, Lemos, Sadun and Reenen (2014), the researchers in a study titled “Does management matter in schools?” collected data on operations and human resources management practices covering over 1,800 schools across eight countries and found that higher management quality is associated with enhanced educational outcomes. This is in line with the argument in favour of school autonomy as advanced by several authors (Wu, Kao, Wu, & Wei, 2019; Honig, & Rainey, 2012; Saha, 2015).

Neeleman (2018) posited that autonomy is about self-governing which is an approach that enables one to function without the control of others. Gawlik, 2008; Helgoy *et al.*, 2007; Lidstrom, 1991 see autonomy as the freedom and capacity to act. Honig and Rainey (2012) described autonomy as the exercise of increased discretion over particular decisions undertaken to administer an organization which in the present case addresses educational system at the secondary level. The exercise of discretionary powers over personnel matters in a secondary education level. Autonomy is exercised to varying degrees across countries and according to OECD (2012) the administration of Dutch schools for example is highly decentralized as up to 86% of key decisions in such matters as instruction, personnel and other resource management whereas the latitude of discretionary decisions of schools in the other OECD countries averaged barely 41%. The studies revealed that the higher the degree of autonomy, the better the learner’s outcomes of which learners work quality is in focus in this section of the study.

The glossary of education reform (2016) posited that the term student work refers to assignments, products, essays, lab results, presentation and such other items that students complete and present to demonstrate what they have learned in the course of their various class activities under the tutelage of the teacher. According to the author, the learner’s quality of work is dependent on several factors such as the design and implementation of the curriculum, the environment in which learning takes place, the resourcefulness of the teacher, the quality and method of teaching among others. The most critical of the various factors highlighted in this section is the resourcefulness of the teacher which to a large extent can be greatly influenced by the latitude of freedom exercised by local school management to hire and fire personnel in the employ of the respective school.

3.4.3 School autonomy and learners' affective performance

Prominent amongst the resources required to effectively run a school is finance (Usman, 2016). This is because financial resources are deployed to virtually every area of the various activities that needed to be embarked upon to keep a school up and running. Rodriguez and Hovde (2002) noted that education policy within the past two decades has been marked by significant emphasis decentralization in its various facets which has contributed concomitantly to improved financial autonomy alongside other forms of autonomy in the name of decentralization on the grounds that the changes will make education more efficient and effective with better and improved outcomes. Arguments in support of financial autonomy were that it will allow for more efficient resource allocation, the initiative is believed also to make greater accountability on the part of school management possible amongst others.

Autonomy in financial matters concerning administration of secondary schools started to gain grounds as far back as 1988 when the Education Reform Act was passed. The Act paved the way for the onset of dramatic changes in the ways the public schools are being financed. With the Act, local schools' control over such activities as standards, policy development, curriculum design and student assessment were greatly enhanced on the one hand while authorities over budget preparation implementation and control, physical planning and personnel management were strengthened (Supanc, 1999).

The practice in the case of English schools has it that individual schools will normally receive fund from the central education system according to established criteria for such sharing of the grand provided for by the central government. Such grounds of allocation include student enrolment, socio-economic factors, etc. The fund so disbursed to the specific school will be administer by the Head Teacher and School governing body of the respective school.

According to Rodriguez and Hovde (2002), financial autonomy was also established in parts of Canada. Edmonton school district of Canada is an example of school autonomy experience from financial perspective. The grant received by the respective school is under the control of the Head Teacher and school governing Board who exercise discretionary powers on the administration of the fund. A study by Education Resource Strategies and Center for Collaborative Education (2014) argued that financial autonomy has a positive association with

learner's outcomes. Additionally, the department of education and skills (2015) argued that schools with autonomy in financial matters are known to record efficiency in the use of their resources.

In a similar study conducted on Western Australian public schools, Hamilton Associates (2015) noted that moves to initiate increased autonomy in public schools in Western Australia dated back to 2009 as a move to transform specific schools to the status of "independent schools". These are schools with enhanced level of independence as such schools were given greater decision-making authority over major aspects of their operations such as staffing and budget being the cardinal objective of the initiative. The study revealed that the general learner's outcomes improved with enhanced autonomy. It was concluded that the increased autonomy granted in personnel and financial matters had successfully created the conditions for improved learner's performance that was recorded.

Suggett (2015) in another study to buttress the earlier studies in support of school autonomy, the author reviewed spectrum of evidence on the effect of school autonomy on learner's academic achievement. His review revealed mixed findings in which some evidence supported the argument in favour of school autonomy while others did not support the argument. The study focused on three dimensions of school autonomy namely finance, personnel and pedagogic. While a few of the earlier studies were against the arguments in support of school autonomy.

Blanchenay *et al.* (2014) for example conducted a research to study the impact of decentralization and governance reforms on the performance of Swedish schools. The study reported a negative impact that was blamed on a lack of a systemic vision for change, the affected municipalities found it hard to adapt to the new system and also due to lack of accountability at the local level. The argument of the study here was that school autonomy cannot produce the expected positive results when it is implemented without accountability on the part of the local school management being guaranteed.

Further, introduction of school autonomy as a change scenario must be planned and well prepared for otherwise, the operators if not well prepared for the change may find it challenging a system to quickly adjust to. Hence, to guarantee its success, there must be adequate consultations and preparation for the exercise.

Raymond (2009) in another study focused on evaluating charter school performance in sixteen states in the US. The results revealed a predominantly negative finding which suggested a negative effect of school autonomy on student's achievement while some indicated neutrality of effect and yet a few others revealed positive effect in the same study. In another study by Hanushek *et al.* (2013) that examined the effect of autonomy on performance using a panel data covering 9 years involving over a million learners in forty-two countries the results indicated that autonomy has a positive effect on performance in developed countries while the effect is negative in developing countries.

This is because developed countries are known to have strong institutions unlike developing countries where the institutions are rather weak. The implication here is that strong institutions have a significant role to play in making autonomy to be effective. It is like a moderating variable that acts like a catalyst that promotes or enhances the rate of a reaction of a combination of chemicals that are combined together.

3.4.4 School autonomy and learners' character formation

According to the Canadian Paediatric Society (2004), discipline can be seen as all forms of activities undertaken on a person for the purpose of getting such individual to be well behaved in the society. It is about imparting knowledge and skills on an individual with the aim of having them behave appropriately in the society. Effectiveness of disciplinary is contingent on a number of factors which include: it must be maintained by an adult who is affectively bonded to the person being disciplined, it must be seen to be fair given the misbehaviour or offence committed, the discipline must promote the development of the individual concerned, it must be self-enhancing and must be consistent with the giver showing the good example to be emulated by the one being subjected to the disciplinary measure.

Discipline as a structure that assist a learner to fit into the real world is the foundation on which a learner's development and self-discipline is premised. The measures aimed at teaching and guiding learners not just about forcing them to adhere strictly to some rules and regulations whose infraction breeds stiff penalty. The goal is to enhance acceptable and appropriate behaviour in a learner and to see to their emotional maturity and development. The discipline is

expected to instil values as well as a healthy conscience and an innate sense of responsibility and self-control.

Ehiane (2014) in a study undertaken to assess the effect of discipline of learners' outcomes using a cross-sectional survey research design found that effective school discipline is required to control students' behaviour and to also promote the learners' academic performance. In an earlier study, discipline is found to help to create a good image of the school in the mind of the learner and also prepares them for the future as well as elimination of disruptive behaviour amongst the learners (Dunham, 1984; Gawe, Jacobs, & Vakalisa, 2001).

In other similar studies, Agbowuro and Daniel (2016); Ofori, Tordzro, Asamoah and Achiaa (2018) noted that most of the social vices could not be unconnected with lack of proper discipline of learners when they are at secondary schools. The study observed that indiscipline negatively impacts other learner's outcomes such as academic performance, values and morality. The spate of indiscipline of learners is found to be higher in public schools compared to private schools as noted by Hahn, Wang, and Yang (2018). The authors argued that private schools have greater autonomy in dealing with cases of indiscipline among learners compared to public schools. The observation is not only true for secondary schools but for higher educational institutions as well.

Learners' character building can be enhanced by other various dimensions of school autonomy apart from disciplinary decision autonomy. In a study by Gotlieb and Noel (2019), the authors noted that character building is a critical responsibility of educational institutions as it was averred that thoughts should be watched as they become words, words should also be watched as they become actions, action become habits, habits become character while character become ones destiny. In view of these implications, the need to mould learners' character cannot be overemphasized.

The study revealed that learners' character can be infused into the school curriculum and thus taken care of by the operating pedagogy of an institution. In another similar study by Marini (2017) on character building, the author observed that the pedagogic process can be used to promote learners' character building. In the study, it was found that character building can be integrated into the individual school pedagogy. This can be made possible by infusing character

education into the curriculum and should also be embedded into the planning, implementation and evaluation parts of the pedagogic process. In addition, studies by Berkowitz and Bier (2004); Branson (2004); Dodds (2016); Krinke (2013); Montonye, Butenhoff and Krinke (2013); Patella (2003); Thompson (2012) noted that learners' character formation can be greatly enhanced by pedagogy of a school.

According to these studies, character building can be integrated into pedagogy through the teachers several action of the teacher which can be summarized as follows: teachers punctuality to classes, starting class activities with prayers which can be assigned to any of the class members that is willing and ready to lead out in such prayers. The other learners should also be prepared to take up such assignments whenever the opportunity affords such arrangement. The teacher is expected to also carry out conscious and routine inspection of the learners for such attributes as neatness, and timeliness of the learners in their school attendance, teachers are also expected to dress decently and neatly as a role model for the learners to emulate. The teacher is to ensure that the learners are taught to learn to greet other people in a courteous manner. The teacher's lesson plan is expected to include character values to be taught to the learners. Then also, the learners ought to be taught to maintain decorum in classes.

3.4.5 School autonomy and learners' personal development

The Department of education and skills (2015) described pedagogic autonomy as the freedom of schools to determine the teaching and learning activities in their respective school. It entails the designing of the curriculum, textbooks approved for use of teachers and learners, mode of instruction, tests and measurements of instructional and learning efficiency with minimal interference from the center. The study however cautioned that the gains of autonomy are contingent upon the exercise of accountability without which autonomy will be counterproductive.

OECD (2011) in a report on international students' assessment noted that in countries where schools have pedagogic autonomy, the learners tend to outperform learners from countries that do not have such autonomy. The study however observed the improvement on learners outcome is subject to the degree of accountability. Empirical evidence suggests that autonomy in areas of

pedagogy, curriculum, assessment and staffing led to improved quality of education. In other words, accountability moderate the effect of pedagogic autonomy on learners' outcomes.

Learning portal (2018) identified three levels of pedagogy as teacher-centered, learner-centered and learning centered pedagogy. The teacher-centered pedagogy is the aspect of teaching and learning. Pedagogic autonomy enables schools to freely make curricular and pedagogical changes that enhance learner's outcomes (Caldwell & Spinks, 2013; Hanushek, et al., 2013). Supporting the argument of these authors, OECD (2014) contended that pedagogic autonomy helps schools to customize the educational process which in turn affects the learning outcomes positively.

Furthermore, OECD (2011) noted that the degree of pedagogic autonomy varies across countries. The study observed that autonomy in making decisions about curricular and assessment is greatest in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Macao-China contrariwise, it is least in Greece, Turkey, Jordan, and Tunisia that were covered by the study. Findings from the study revealed that learners' outcomes increase with pedagogic autonomy and vice versa.

3.4.6 School autonomy and learners' social development

Accountability as a dimension of school autonomy can be defined in several ways. Heim, 1996 sees the concept of accountability as the acceptance of responsibility for one's actions or inactions. This definition however excludes other facets of the concept such as the act of compliance with the established standards of performance and operations as set by the school governing authorities, as noted by Rechebei (2010).

Arcia, MacDonald & Patrinos (2014) in a study on school autonomy and accountability in Thailand. The study concluded that accountability contributes positively to learning outcomes. The study also revealed that school autonomy and accountability allow a school to attain the status of a closed system and performance maximization. Similarly, Botha (2010) in another study school effectiveness identified accountability as one of the contextual factors that contribute to school effectiveness. In the same vein, Arcia (2011) in a study on school autonomy and school accountability in three States in Nigeria noted that accountability is one of the critical factors required for improving performance of teachers and student learning

3.4.7 Summary

The concept of learner's performance has been reviewed in this chapter. The review was approached from definitional perspectives. The dimensions of learner's performance were also covered in the review. It was noted in this study that diverse authors came up with diverse dimensions of learner's performance. The study identified five dimensions of learner's performance drawn from the varied dimensions from diverse authors some of which overlap but were resolved into the main five constructs identified. Four theories that were relevant to the study were also reviewed and the most relevant of the theory being theory of school-based management was the underpinning theory for the study. Finally, earlier studies that are related to the objectives of the study were also reviewed for discussion purposes.

3.5 CONCLUSION

The chapter concludes that learner's performance is the ultimate focus of educational systems across the globe owing to the fact that the best asset that any nation could boast of are the human capital. The quality of human capital in turn depend on the quality of education that is imparted to the populace through the various educational levels. Moreover, all the dimensions of learner's performance are complementary as they jointly define the performance of the learner and as such educational planners ought to lay emphasis on the harmonious achievement of the five dimensions of learner's performance in the interest of the overall success of the educational system.

The fourth chapter of this study will focus on the methodology to be adopted for the study. The research design, population, sampling technique, sample size determination will be projected. The chapter will also present the analytical techniques that will be used to test the hypotheses

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focused on the blueprint of how the data for this studied were collected. The chapter covered such aspects of the study such as the research design, population of study, sample size and its determination, sampling technique adopted for the study, the design of research instrument used for the study, reliability and validity of the instrument and the analyses of the data collected for the study.

An extensive literature review focusing on conceptualizing school autonomy and learners' performance have been presented in chapters two and three respectively in this study. In the second chapter, the concept of school autonomy (with specific emphasis on definitions, characteristics, benefits and challenges), the dimensions of school autonomy (with reference to personnel management, financial, disciplinary decision, pedagogic and accountability) were covered. The chapter also covered five theories that are relevant to the study (theory of action, theory of the autonomy of the individual, theory of school-based management and theory of decentralization). The chapter also reviewed how the study variables have been measured in earlier study as a precursor to the basis for the chosen approach for measuring the variables in this study. The chapter was concluded with a review of the country specific experiences with regard to school autonomy practice in nine different countries of the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Finland, Australia, Sweden, New Zealand, Hong Kong and Nigeria.

In the third chapter, the concept of learners' performance was reviewed. The chapter focused on the dimensions of learners' performance with specific emphasis on five (Work quality, Affective performance, Character formation, Personal Development, Social development). The chapter closed with a review of the possible link between school autonomy and learners' performance. On the basis of the discussions of the earlier chapters and particularly, the empirical and theoretical reviews, this chapter will focus on the methodology that the study has adopted. In the methodology discourse, the emphases of the chapter were the research design, research paradigm and approach, the research questions and hypotheses were also revisited. Further, the chapter also discussed population, sample size determination, sampling technique, instrument for data

collection, validity and reliability of the research instrument, the pilot study, procedure for data collection, analytical techniques adopted for the study, ethical consideration and summary.

4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

4.2.1 Introduction

This section focused on the description of the method that was adopted for collection of the data used for this study. This will enable the researcher to answer the research questions that were generated for this study thereby achieving the set objectives. McCombes (2020) posited that research design is the framework for planning how a research is to be conducted and executed. It involves making such decisions as regards the type of data needed for the study, the research domain and the timescale within which the research plan is to be executed, the participants expected to participate in the study, the variables of the study and the hypotheses to be tested (where applicable), the approach to be followed to gather the data required for the study as well as the methods that will be adopted for analyses of the data that will be gathered for the study.

Similarly, Joubert, Hartell, and Lombard (2016) described research design as the strategy planned to be implemented for the investigation of a research problem to be resolved by a study. In the light of the foregoing, to be able to address the problem of the study, we need to collect data on the study variables and to be able to do this, a cross sectional research design was adopted. This design requires administration of copies of a validated research instrument in the form of a self-developed questionnaire to the estimated sample size of the study. The next section will be devoted to the research paradigm and approach.

4.2.2 Research paradigm and approach

Research paradigm had been defined in several ways by diverse scholars over time. Cresswell (2007) defined a research paradigm as the broad assumptions that underpin the conduct of a research project. Further, Cresswell (2012) expatiated that the assumptions generally deal with the nature of knowledge, truth or reality and how they can be obtained. The assumptions basically deal with the nature of knowledge, truth or reality and how these can be obtained are

referred to as ontology and epistemology respectively. Epistemology originated from the Greek word *episteme* which by interpretation is known as knowledge. Stables (2017) noted that epistemology and ethics have some connections as both are relevant to the understanding of the philosophy of education. Whilst epistemology is concerned with the questions relating to knowing what you need to know. The focus of epistemology is on how to access the knowledge that you are seeking to acquire. Ethics on the other hand is concerned with the issues of what is right. In other words, ethics considers the circumstances that determine what may be considered to be right and acceptable and may not be considered to be right and acceptable.

Furthermore, Tan (2006) opined that the focus of epistemology is to provide an explanation to the age-long question of what constitute nature, origin and scope of knowledge. As a philosophical project, epistemology formulates the explanation to resolve such concerns of philosopher over the years around nature origin and scope of knowledge. The author further contended that by epistemology considerations, a claim to have genuine knowledge in any area should be backed by a readiness to offer and disseminate the same knowledge to other people accordingly.

Ethics on the other hand as a philosophical discipline originated in ancient Greece the earliest known proponent being Aristotle. Ethics is concerned about the thought of man and his actions. The evolution of ethics is marked with some shifts in the field of knowledge. Two of the more prominent shifts being heteronomous ethics and autonomous ethics. These shifts are also related to universalism and relativism (Neves, 2016). Rich noted that there is sometimes a disagreement among people as to what is right and what is wrong thus giving some impressions that suggests that the concept of right and wrong can be a matter of personal opinion.

Ethics according to its original use is conceived to be a branch of philosophy that is connected with what constitutes ideal human behaviour and ideal way of life. According to Aristotle, behaviour are considered to be ideal are such that lead to a high level of happiness and wellbeing of the society. Application of sound ethical practice requires that one should not allow emotion to overtake good reasoning to ensure that decisions reached at all times are guided by the rules of ethics. Ethics is usually guided by the codes of conduct that are endorsed by a society. Billington (2003) identified a number of features that are associated with the concept of ethics as follows:

- No one can avoid having to make moral or ethical decision since decisions made by an individual ultimately will affect other people either closely or remotely connected with the individual.
- No morality is outright private as other people are usually involved in one's decisions
- One's decision affects the self-esteem of other individual(s).
- One's decision affects the well-being of other people.
- Definite conclusions may not be reached in any debate centered on ethics.

Brannigan and Boss (2001) noted that issues of ethical thinking, reasoning and valuing gravitate across a continuum bounded by two extreme positions otherwise classified as ethical perspectives. These positions are ethical relativism and ethical objectivism. While ethical relativism is concerned with the belief that ethics and morality may vary among persons and societies. Two shades of ethical relativism are ethical subjectivism and cultural relativism. While ethical subjectivism held that people have a preserve to create their own morality and that there is no objective morality but individual views and opinions to which they may be entitled, the belief of people as to what is good or bad as well as what is right or wrong may be dependent on how they feel at a particular point in time.

In other words, what is viewed as being wrong by one person may be viewed as alright by another depending on variations in individual's opinions and feelings. These differences of opinions and views are acceptable to ethical subjectivism philosophy. Cultural relativism on the other hand according to Pence (2000) thrives on the argument that moral evaluation is closely connected with the experience, beliefs and behaviours of a specific culture consequently, what is viewed as being wrong in one culture may be acceptable in another. Ethical objectivism however is the notion that there are globally acceptable moral principles.

The aforementioned discourse relates to paradigm as they are connected with decisions and views about information that are generated in the course of carrying out a study. According to De Vos, Strydom, Fouche and Delpont (2012), paradigm refers to an approach of collecting and interpreting information gathered through collected data as guided by a set of legitimized assumptions. Additionally, Rehman and Alharthi (2016) defined a paradigm as the belief system and underpinned by a theoretical framework based on specific assumptions. The authors

identified four components of a research paradigm as epistemology, ontology, methods and methodology. The understanding of these components and their application guides a researcher's understanding of the reality of the world and its study.

Epistemology is concerned with the study of the nature of knowledge and the approach undertaken to acquire and validate it (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Epistemological questions help a researcher to debate the possibility and desirability of subjectivity, objectivity, validity, causality and generalisability (Patton, 2002). Ontology according to Richards (2003) is concerned with the nature of what we believe to be reality in terms of what we can know about it and how it exists. Such realities lead a researcher to ask questions about the kinds of realities that exist. In the case of methodology, Ellen (1984) described it as a systematized and theory-based approach that guides a researcher in the effort to produce data and information.

In other words, it is the process, strategy, action plans or design that guides one decision on a type of research method to adopt for a study. The focus of methodology is the approach that a researcher will follow in doing his or her study (Grix, 2004). It guides the decisions of a researcher in the areas of the type of data that is required for the study, the research instrument that will be most appropriate to be used in view of the purpose to be achieved by the study. Methods relate to such concerns as how data will be collected and analysed.

Having discussed the elements and assumptions of research paradigms (approaches that can be adopted when doing a research), it is important to look at the types of these research paradigms that exist. Rehman and Alharthi (2016) identified three types of research paradigms as positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. Positivism according to Richards (2003) is the branch of philosophy that was popularized by the French philosopher Auguste Comte. It assumes that reality is not dependent on humans but is governed by circumstances that are completely beyond humans. Positivist methodology leans on experimentation approach and is usually connected with development of hypotheses formulated to model the effect of a criterion variable on a response variable. Empirical supports are sought to situate the findings of a study following positivist approach (Cohen, et al., 2007). This approach essentially aimed at measuring, predicting, controlling, and establishing causality. The approach also helps to establish a theory or formulate new one depending on the outcome of the study on the causality relationships between two or more interacting variables. Furthermore, positivist research usually made use of

numerical data to proxy characteristics of desired phenomenon consistent with positivist epistemology postulations (Gall, Gall and Borg, 2003). A major criticism of positivist paradigm however is that it is not ideal for studying individual and social phenomena considering that emotional changes may invalidate the findings. This criticism has been mitigated however by the application of appropriate theories to anchor such studies.

Interpretivism as a second paradigm arose out of the criticisms of the positivist paradigm (Grix, 2004). The interpretivist paradigm accommodates the existence of different interpretations for the same phenomena as may be logically argued and interpreted by the researchers. The goal of the paradigm is not to discover universal, context and value free knowledge and truth the focus contrariwise is the understanding and interpreting of social events that they interact with. In this regard, interpretive methodology aims at understanding of social events from the perspectives of the subjects rather than from the researchers' perspectives. Interpretivist usually collect qualitative data from the participants over an appreciably long time period and follows generally inductive approach to analyse the data so generated (Cohen, et al., 2007).

Critical theory as a research paradigm originated from the studies of twentieth century scholars who have affiliation with the institute of social research in Frankfurt thereby conferring the identity "Frankfurt school" on them. Notable amongst the proponents of the critical theory school are Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Erich Fromm and Jürgen Habermas. The assumption of the school is that reality actually exists but that the reality has been shaped by a combination of political, cultural, religious, ethnic and gender factors. The critical theory related research is not just aimed at understanding or explaining society but more importantly to change it (Patton, 2002). Critical methodology adopts a dialogic and dialectical approach and requires the researcher to engage the respondents in a dialogue that aimed at changing their outlook on social systems with a view to understanding what is wrong with the system and how to improve it ultimately (Kincheloe, 2008).

Considering the foregoing, this study followed the positivist paradigm for the following reasons: Firstly, the study is focused on determining the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. This is supposedly through a cause and effect relationship which is consistent with the assumptions of the paradigm as discussed earlier. Secondly, the study will test the hypothesized statements to

determine the extent of truism of the predictive power of the criterion variable and sub variables on the response variable and its sub variables which also aligned with the provisions of the positivist paradigm. Thirdly, the use of a questionnaire as a research instrument which is in the form of a numeric measure to measure the constructs of the study variables (school autonomy dimensions and learners' performance dimensions) being supported by the positivist paradigm is the third consideration for adopting this paradigm.

Moreover, the choice of the positivist paradigm for this study is consistent with the view of Neuman (2011) that argued that positivism paradigm allows a researcher to collect quantitative data through a survey in consonance with the plan of this study.

4.2.3 Objectives of the research

The objective of the study was to identify, define, explore and explain the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' performance in the Egbeda local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria (see chapter 1.7 on page 13). The main objective of the study led to the specific objectives which were as listed hereunder (see page 13 of chapter 1):

- determine the effect of school personnel management autonomy on learner's work quality in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- establish the effect of school financial autonomy on learner's affective performance in Egbeda local government schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- assess the effect of school disciplinary decision autonomy on learner's character formation in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- examine the effect of school pedagogic autonomy on learner's personal development in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria.
- investigate the effect of school accountability autonomy on learner's social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools of Oyo State, Nigeria?

4.2.4 Research problem

The research problem was formulated and stated in chapter 1 (see 6th paragraph of section 1.4). Arising from the formulated problem, the following question was raised: Which practices could

promote learner's performance in Egbeda local government schools of Oyo state, Nigeria? (see page 11).

4.2.5 Specific research questions and hypotheses for the study

The literature review conducted in chapters 2 (conceptual framework) and 3 (theoretical framework) featured the dimensions of the criterion variable (school autonomy) and associated sub variables (personnel management autonomy, financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and accountability autonomy on one hand as well as the response variable (learners' performance and the associated sub variables (learners' work quality, learner's affective performance, learners' character formation, learners' personal development and learners' social development) on the other hand.

The sub research questions and corresponding hypotheses formulated in chapter 1 are listed as follows:

- **RQ 1:** What effect has school personnel management autonomy on learner's work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria? The aim of this research question is to determine if it is possible for school autonomy dimensions to remarkably affect learners' work quality.
- **H₀1:** School autonomy dimensions have no significant effect on work quality of secondary school learners.
- **Experimental hypothesis:** School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on the work quality of secondary school learners
- **RQ 2:** What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on the affective performance of secondary school learners? The aim of this question is to assess if the effect of school autonomy on learners' affective performance is statistically significant.
- **H₀2:** School autonomy dimensions have no significant effect on learners' affective performance.

- **Experimental hypothesis:** School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learners' affective performance of secondary school learners
- **RQ 3:** What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' character formation? The aim of this question was to establish if the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' character formation of secondary school learners will be statistically significant.
- **H₀3:** School autonomy dimensions do not have statistically significant effect on learners' character formation of secondary school learners
- **Experimental hypothesis:** School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on character formation of secondary school learners.
- **RQ 4:** What effect has school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development? The aim of this question is to ascertain if the effect of school autonomy dimensions on secondary school learners' personal development is statistically significant.
- **H₀4:** The effect of school autonomy dimensions on personal development of secondary school learners is not statistically significant.
- **Experimental hypothesis:** School autonomy dimensions have statistically significant effect on secondary school learners' personal development.
- **RQ 5:** What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development of secondary school learners? The aim of this question is to establish if the effect of school autonomy dimensions on secondary school learners' social development is statistically significant.
- **H₀5:** School autonomy dimensions have no significant effect on secondary school learners' social development.
- **Experimental hypothesis:** The effect of school autonomy dimensions on secondary school learners' social development is statistically significant.

4.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLING

4.3.1 Study population

Asiamah, Mensah & Oteng-Abayie (2017) defined population generally as the group of individuals that exhibit comparable characteristics that qualify them to participate in a research exercise. According to the authors, a population is a critical element in the research process as the credibility of a research to a large extent depends on the population selected for a study.

The authors identified three types of population namely general, target and accessible population. The general refers to the totality of elements that share the desired characteristics that are relevant to the study. The target are the portion of the total population that the researcher prefers to draw his or her sample from while the accessible population are the ones that the researcher will be able to reach as the others may be unavoidably unavailable to participate in the study. Similarly, Majid (2018) defined population as the individuals that satisfied the eligibility criteria and as such are qualified to participate in a study by virtue of characteristics desired by the researcher in line with the set objectives to be achieved by the research.

There are 72 secondary schools in the Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria that represents the population of the study. These 72 schools comprised 30 public schools and 42 private schools. The lists of the public and private schools covered by this study are as shown in the tables 4.1 and 4.2 below:

Table 4.1 PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN EGBEDA LOCAL GOVERNMENT OF OYO STATE

S/N	NAME OF SCHOOL	ADDRESS
1	UDGS Snr	Old Ife Road
2	UDGS Jnr	Old Ife Road
3	BPA Iwo Road	Along Monatan, Iwo Road,
4	BPA Iwo Road Jnr	Along Monatan, Iwo Road,
5	BPHS Iwo Road	Academy Area
6	CHS Alakia Isebo Snr	Along Alakia/Isebo Road
7	CHS Alakia Isebo Jnr	Along Alakia/Isebo Road
8	Christ Ang. Sec. Schl.	Akinfenwa, Hope Area
9	CHS, Olukeye-Asejire	Olukeye Asejire
10	CSS Bioku	Bioku Olode Area
11	CSS Ogungbade	Ogungbade Area
12	CHS Egbeda	Egbeda Area
13	CHS Owobaale	Egbeda-Erunmu Area
14	CSS Adeggbayi	Behind Arolat Filling Station, Adeggbayi
15	CSS Olaogun	Olaogun B/S Old road
16	Idi-Ito High School	Erunmu Area
17	SDA Erunmu	Erunmu-Lalupon Road
18	CHS Alalubosa	Behind Nigerian Breweries
19	CHS Ogungbade	Ogungbade Area
20	CHS Osegere	Osegere Village
21	CHS Alarere	Behind Toun Hospital, New Ife Road
22	CSS Kumapayi	Kumapayi, Olodo Area
23	CHS Kumapayi	Kumapayi, Olodo Area
24	CGS Olodo Snr.	Olodo Bank Area
25	CGS Olodo Jnr.	Olodo Bank Area
26	Ilupeju CGS Alugbo-Oluwo	After Erunmu Market near Ayede
27	CCHS Ayede	Ayede via Erunmu

28	CGS Akinlumo	Behind Olodo Bank
29	CHS Wakajaye Ajagba	Wakajaye Area
30	CHS Kasumu Ajia	Kasumu Ajia Area

Table 4.2 PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN EGBEDA LOCAL GOVERNMENT OF OYO STATE

S/N	NAME OF SCHOOL	ADDRESS
1	Providence High School	Egbeda, Along Ife-Ibadan Express Road
2	Sow the Seed College	Olosan Area, Isebo
3	Morning Star College	Olode Iyana Agbala
4	Achievers Comprehensive College	Oluwakeeyin B/S Adegbayi
5	Amazing Grace College	Alarere Area
6	Samuel Memorial College	Saw Mill, Oke Koto Area
7	Stars Comprehensive College	Saw Mill, Oke Koto Area
8	Al-Hayyu Model College	Akingbade Old Ife Road
9	Ibadan City Model College	Iyana Church, Iwo Road Area
10	Delayo International College	Aba Ode, Alakia Area
11	Deril Academy	Opposite Bola Ige International Market
12	Bethel Comprehensive College	Isebo Alakia Area
13	Tim Carol International College	Salawu B/S Alakia Road
14	Ore Ofe Oluwa College	Jagun Area, Old Ife Road
15	God is Able College	Wofun Area, Iwo Road
16	Thy Will College	Isebo Area
17	Victop College	Eleyele Wakajaye Area
18	Educational Legal College	Olukunle Olodo Area
19	Fazil-L-Omar Ahmadiyya College	Adeleye Village
20	Global College	Iyana Church Area
21	Olive Branch College	Opposite Bola Ige International College
22	Prince International College	Adogba Monatan Area
23	Steadfast Comprehensive College	Shop Mesan Along Iyana Church
24	BOMAC High School	Olubadan Estate
25	Blessed Comprehensive College	Hope Road, Akinfenwa
26	Spring of Wisdom	Otolowa Wakajaye
27	Todebim Private School	Balogun Amosun

28	De-Lords Model College	Focus Area, Molade
29	Temidire Oxford	Onibu Ore Area
30	David Joel College	Oke Ayotuntun Oki
31	East Gate Secondary School	Opeyemi Opposite Bola Ige, New Ife Road
32	Olatundun College	Olatundun B/S Alakia Area
33	Christ Life College	Ola Ogun Area
34	God's Vission Academy	Ife Olu Behind Airport Quarters
35	Sure Foundation High School	Aba TITI, Along Ife Road
36	Goshen High School	Opposite Nigerian Breweries, New Ife Road
37	Prime College	Wakajaye Area
38	Utmost College	Behind Urban Day Grammar School
39	Lasting Glory Comprehensive School	Erunmu Area
40	Graceland Pivotal College	Idi Obi Along IGEM Road
41	Regina James	Ojo Yeye Area, Olodo
42	Mount Sinai College	Adegbayi Area

4.3.2 Sample selected for the study

A sample was chosen from the population considering the topic of study, namely the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance of secondary school learners. The sample (participants of choice) are qualified to respond appropriately to the question items on the research instrument considering the following attributes possessed by the study sample-

- Level of education – the minimum level of education is a Bachelor's degree.
- Exposure – the participants are versed in the teaching profession with more than ten years of experience.
- Administrative level – the participants are on the management cadre of their profession.

In view of the above attributes of the targeted participants, they have the required knowledge, experience and exposure to enable them provide required information to assist the researcher to

achieve the objectives of the study. The selection of schools to be used for the study was based on years of approval (in the case of private secondary schools) and year of establishment in the case of public secondary schools. In both cases, the baseline year was 10 years. The implication of this is that only public schools that have been in existence for at least ten years and private schools that have been approved for ten years were selected for the study.

Such schools would have graduated at least four sets of senior secondary school certificate leavers and seven sets of junior secondary school certificate leavers. This is because the educational system in Nigeria is 6 – 3 – 3 – 4 (six years in the primary school, three years in the junior secondary school, three years in the senior secondary school, and at least four years in the University depending on the course of choice at the University level). Thus, a minimum of ten years is considered sufficient to enable the participants respond appropriately to the questions in the research instrument.

The sample that will be used for this study are 72 school principals, 158 vice-principals and 125 HoDs from the population of 72 secondary schools in the Egbeda local government areas of Oyo State of Nigeria. The total sample or number of participants in this study is therefore 355 ($n = 72 + 158 + 125 = 355$).

4.3.3 Sampling method used

Total enumeration method type of purposive sampling technique was used for the study. This is because the population is not too large to be covered by the study. This is consistent with the argument of Yamoah (2016); Mujere (2016). Selection of the participants was based on their duties and responsibilities in the respective secondary schools covered by the study. Those that were selected were the Principals, Vice Principals and HoDs. These categories of workers are management staff and are better exposed to how the schools are managed *vis-à-vis* government policies guiding the operations of the schools.

4.4 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

A research instrument is used for the purpose of collection of data required by a researcher (Annum, 2017). To be able to serve the purpose adequately, the instrument needed to be validated through the validity and reliability tests (Maree, 2012). I will use close-ended questionnaires as data collection instrument in this study.

The instrument used for data collection in this study was a structured close ended questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed following the Likert format. The response scale however unlike the Likert scale which is five-point the response scale in the case of this study is a six-point type. The 6 point is preferred considering that the scale has higher discrimination and reliability compared to the five-point scale (Chomeya, 2010). The questionnaire was designed to measure the constructs of the main variables of the study – school autonomy dimensions and learners’ performance dimensions.

The data collected on the dimensions of the main variables will be subjected to descriptive and inferential analyses respectively to enable the researcher answer the research questions and also achieve the objectives of the study judging from the results of the hypotheses tested. The outcomes of the analyses will be used to determine the effect of the school autonomy dimensions on the effect of the learners’ performance dimensions. The questionnaire will be used based on the advantages it offers. According to Rahman (2017), the advantages of using questionnaire for a study include:

- It provides deeper insights into issues being studied.
- It offers appreciable flexibility of information gathering.
- Findings can be generalised to the population.

Other benefits identified by Brink (2007) include:

- It is a relatively cheap source of data, participants’ anonymity can be guaranteed
- It makes it possible to gather data from a large number of participants.

Consequently, the questionnaire was the research instrument used in this research. The 344 copies of the questionnaire titled “SCHOOL AUTONOMY AND LEARNERS’ PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE” were validated before administration to the study population.

The instrument was administered to the Principals, Vice Principals, and Heads of Departments in the schools covered by the study. The participants were requested to fill and return the questionnaire using an envelope provided for the exercise. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part is the demographic section containing questions on gender, years of experience, salary grade level, highest academic qualification school category and location. The second part was devoted to the independent main variable – school autonomy. The variable has the following constructs: pedagogic autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, personnel management autonomy, financial autonomy and accountability autonomy.

The third part of the questionnaire is the dependent main variable with the following constructs: affective skills achievement, personal development, work quality, character formation and social development. A total of seven questions were raised for the demographic section while a total of fifty-four questions were raised for the constructs with response scale ranging between strongly disagree (SD = 1) to strongly agree (SA = 6). The respondents were asked to tick their responses to the questions raised as considered most appropriate by them. The questionnaire design was informed by the conceptual, empirical and theoretical literature as reviewed in chapters two and three.

4.5 PILOT TESTING

Having presented the questionnaire to my supervisor for his approval, the approved questionnaire was then pilot tested using schools with similar characteristics in the neighbouring local government within the Ibadan metropolis in line with Fraser, Fahlman Arscott and Guillot (2018). Also, considering that the confidence interval of this study is 95% and that the probability of a type 1 error is 5% (level of significance) 10% of the sample size was used for the pilot test as recommended by Sorzano, Tabas-Madrid, Nunez, Fernandez-Criado, Naranjo (2017). The essence of the pilot test is threefold. Firstly, the pilot test help to affirm the wording of the questions is fairly well understood by the participants, fairness of the time projected for filling the questionnaire. Secondly, it helps to establish the construct validity as well as the reliability of the instrument on the small scale before administering to the entire sample size. This will minimise the cost of having to correct any error(s) detected at the pilot testing level.

The feedback from the pilot test indicated that the time projected needed to be increased from 10 to fifteen minutes. This was the only issue that arose and was consequently sorted.

4.6 ETHICAL ISSUES RELATING TO THE STUDY

As a precursor to data collection, I first obtained the permission of the Egbeda Local Government Education Authority and the Principals of the schools selected for the study. Thereafter, the copies of the questionnaire were hand delivered to each of the participants in envelopes with which they are to return the filled questionnaires. Two letters were attached to the questionnaires one to inform the participants of the purpose of the study and the other was the letter of permission from the Education Ministry to conduct the study.

In line with the ethical requirements of the University of South Africa, no one will be forced or coerced into participating in this study. Decision to participate is at the discretion of the participants who are also free to withdraw from the exercise should they wish to withdraw at any point in the course of the study without suffering any form of sanction or intimidation of any kind. In keeping with the ethical requirements of the University, the approval of the UNISA College of Education Ethics Review Committee has been secured before proceeding with this chapter.

The copies of the questionnaire will be administered to the participants who gave the time for collection of the filled copies of the questionnaire. The next section of this research report will feature data analyses and presentation.

4.7 DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

4.7.1 Data analysis

After retrieving the copies of the filled questionnaire, they will be prepared for analyses. Without analyses the data cannot convey any meaning hence analyses will help to summarise the data and bring meaning out of them in line with the set objectives. An analysis of the data gathered will be done against the background of the study to bring meaning to the data collected (Angelov & Principe (2016). Moreover, according to Maree (2012) data analyses provides the basis for

hypotheses testing and help to achieve objectives set for a study. The data analysis will make summarising of data and interpretation of findings a possible.

Before proceeding with the analyses of the data, the data will be subjected to the diagnostic tests. The essence of the diagnostic tests (pre-estimation tests) is to ensure that the assumptions on which the inferential analyses are based were not violated in any way which will lead to spurious results. To avoid these challenges, the tests will be carried out to affirm that such assumptions of normality, linearity, heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity assumptions were not violated by the dataset. The data in this study will thereafter be analysed in two phases. In the first phase descriptive analyses will be performed on the data.

The descriptive statistics that will be used for the study are as follows: Mean, Median, Mode, Skewness, Kurtosis, Standard Deviation, Standard Error of the Mean, Standard Error of Skewness, etc. The descriptive statistics will help the researcher to answer the research questions as suggested by Suhr (2013)

At the inferential statistics level, the analyses that will be carried out are the ANOVA, Multiple linear regression etc. The inferential analyses will be needed to test the hypotheses as recommended by Ireland (2010); Kolawole and Sekumade (2017).

4.7.2 Data presentation

After the data analyses as discussed earlier, the results will be presented starting with the descriptive statistics. These will include the frequency tables for the various sections of the instrument – the demographic, independent variable and its constructs and the dependent variables and its constructs as well. This order of data presentation follows the approach of Simonsohn, Simmons and Nelson (2015).

4.8 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The validity and reliability of a research instrument are attributes that are of critical relevance to the accuracy of the results produced through the use of the instrument. In other words, the quality of the results obtained by the use of a research instrument is dependent on the quality of the research instrument itself. In view of this salient reality, it was recommended that every

instrument be subjected to validity and reliability test to ensure that such instrument is fit for purpose (Taherdoost, 2016).

Specifically, validity according to Taherdoost (2016) has four parts – criterion, face, content and construct. The criterion validity otherwise known as concrete validity measures the relatedness of a measure to an outcome. The face validity is the extent to which the outline of the instrument conforms to the expected structural standard for an instrument in line with what is to be measured. The construct validity measures the extent of divergence and convergence of the items for measuring each construct on the instrument. On the whole, validity generally is a measure of the fitness of the instrument for the intended purpose. The validity test was ascertained in two steps. In the first test, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test statistics for the constructs were greater than the minimum threshold of 0.5 thereby suggesting that the sample size used for the pilot testing is adequate. Also, the values of the Bartlett's test statistics obtained were above 40 for all the constructs of the study and *p-values* less than 0.05 which indicated that there were no redundant items in the instrument. Given the KMO and Bartlett test results, the data set were good enough for the exploratory factor analysis which was then conducted with AVE extraction method. The statistics for the constructs were above the 0.5 minimum threshold which indicated that the instrument is fit for purpose following Hulin, Cudeck . Netemeyer, Dillon, McDonald and Bearden, 2001; Netemeyer, 2003).

4.9 RESEARCHER ROLE AND COMPETENCY

In keeping with the ethics of research, the researcher dissociated herself from the study to avoid being biased. The questionnaire administered for data collection was a six-point Likert type of questionnaire. The relevance of informed consent will be covered in the next section of this report.

4.9.1 Informed consent

The informed consent is part of the ethical requirement of the University of South Africa and it relates to the measure of the concessionary volition of the participants to take part in a study. It defends their rights of privacy. By this requirement, no participant will be forced or compelled to

participate in a research work. Their permission will have to be secured before they can be expected to participate. The purpose of the study, their role, estimated duration of participation or involvement, assurance of anonymity and confidentiality of their responses, how their responses will be kept and for how long how the study will benefit them and how they will be able to access the outcome of the study together with the permission of the University of South Africa to conduct the study will be duly explained to the participants. The relevance of assuring anonymity and confidentiality will be covered in the next section of this report.

4.9.2 Anonymity and confidentiality

Anonymity deals with the need to ensure that the participants will not be traced to their responses in any way. Part of the measures to ensure this requirement is the fact that such private information like their names, contact numbers, email addresses, residential addresses will not be required on the research instrument. The identity of the schools will also be coded to avoid specific responses being traced to a particular school. The information to be supplied will be strictly used for academic purposes and not for any other purpose inimical to the purpose for which the information was supplied. Issues of ethical measures and contribution will be discussed in the section that follows.

4.9.3 Ethical measures and contributions

In keeping with the requirements of ethical measures and contributions, the researcher attached information sheet to each of the copies of the questionnaire to provide participants with adequate information concerning the purpose of the study and their role. The information sheet also explained to the participants what the information supplied will be used for and how they will be treated. The researcher's contact details will be made available on the information sheet for the participants to contact the researcher if and when necessary

4.10 SUMMARY

The methodological aspects of this study have been covered in this chapter. The chapter focussed on the research instrument and the measures of validating the instrument. Issues relating to pilot study and analytical tools to be used were also covered. Finally, the ethical provisions that the study will observe were all spelt out. The fifth chapter will be devoted to the interpretation and

discussion of the results of the analyses of the quantitative data collected based on the cross-sectional survey method adopted.

In the next chapter the research report focussed on the presentation of data, analyses of the data retrieved from the field work, answering of the research questions, test of research hypotheses and discussion of the findings of the study.

CHAPTER 5: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter focussed on the research methodology adopted for the study. The quantitative method enabled the researcher to access the data required for the study from a fairly large number of respondents made up of 72 School Principals, 158 Vice Principals and 125 Heads of Departments that were purposely selected from 72 secondary schools across the Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. The data gathered assisted in the answering of the research questions of the study as to how school autonomy could enhance learners' performance in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools of Oyo State in Nigeria.

In the second chapter of this study, the research focussed on conceptualisation of school autonomy. In reviewing of the concept emphasis were placed on definitions, characteristics, challenges and benefits of the concept. The chapter also identified the dimensions of school autonomy as personnel management, financial, disciplinary decision, pedagogic and accountability. Four theories were also reviewed in the chapter namely: theory of action, theory of the autonomy of the individual, theory of school-based management and theory of decentralization.

Measurement of the variables identified was also covered in the chapter to provide a basis for the approach of measurement adopted for the variables in this study. Finally, the chapter covered the experience of diverse countries with respect to the concept of school autonomy. Nine countries were covered as follows: United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Finland, Australia, Sweden, New Zealand, Hong Kong and Nigeria.

The third chapter focussed on the learners' performance concept. Five dimensions of learners' performance were reviewed as follows: Work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development and social development. The chapter concluded with a review of the possible link between school autonomy and learners' performance. The fourth chapter concentrated on the methodology adopted for the study with specific emphasis on the research design, research paradigm as well as research questions and hypotheses. The chapter also captured study population, sample size determination and sampling technique. The chapter

closed with data collection instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument, pilot study, data collection procedure, analytical technique and ethical consideration.

5.2 THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE RESEARCHER TO THE SUBJECTS

The research participants in the study comprised School Principals, Vice Principals and Head of Departments drawn from selected secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. The participants gave their true and fair view of their opinions on the dimensions of school autonomy and learners' performance going by the items used for the variables measured in this study. The research design adopted enabled the researcher to obtain unbiased responses from the respondents as the researcher distanced herself from the study to avoid wielding any form of influence on the responses of the respondents. This was made possible by use of the six point Likert type scale and a covering letter explaining the aim of the study and instructional guidelines to guide the respondents on how to fill the instrument that accompanied each copy of the questionnaires.

5.3 DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected with the use of a six-point Likert type scale to measure the experience of Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments in the schools selected for the study. The instrument has three major parts. The first part is the biographical information section which focussed on personal attributes of the respondents as follows: Age, Years of experience, Salary grade level, Highest academic qualification, Status, Geographical location of school and Type of school. The collated data is presented, analysed, and interpreted in this chapter. Analysis of the biographic characteristics of respondents was carried out firstly, followed by the descriptive analysis of research variables, then the empirical analysis and test of hypothesis, and discussion of the findings.

In the interest of better resolution of the analyses, the data set were analysed in three batches. The first batch focused on the private secondary schools while the second batch focused on the public schools and finally the third batch combined the data for both private and public

secondary schools together. This enabled the researcher to compare results between the two groups.

5.4 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The data that were collected using the research instrument were in three parts namely: Biographical information (A), Independent variable (B) and Dependent variable (C) sections respectively. The items under each of the three sections were numbered following the individual sections notations (A, B or C). The section covering the descriptive statistics of this study presents the summary of the various data that were collected using the research instrument as outlined in the tables hereunder.

5.4.1 Respondents' Biographic Characteristics (Private Schools)

These are the individual personal attributes of the respondents. The attributes covered are as follows: Gender, Years of teaching experience, Salary grade level, Highest academic qualification, Position in the school, and the geographical location of the school. These details for all the respondents that participated in the study are as captured in tables 5.1 (private secondary schools), 5.2 (public secondary schools) and 5.3 (private and public secondary schools).

Table 5.1 - Biographic Characteristics of the Respondents from Private Schools

Variable		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	28	33.3
	Female	56	66.7
	Total	84	100.0
Years of teaching experience	21-30	44	52.4
	30-35	40	47.6
	Total	84	100.0
Salary grade level	GL 15	43	51.2
	GL 16	41	48.8
	Total	84	100.0
Highest academic qualification	First degree	63	75.0
	Master degree	21	25.0
	Total	84	100.0
Position in the school	Principal	42	50.0
	Vice principal	42	50.0
	Total	84	100.0
Geographical location of school	Rural Area	54	64.3
	Urban Area	30	35.7
	Total	84	100.0

Source: Author's computation of Field Survey Data (2020)

From the private secondary schools, more female respondents 66.7% (n=56) participated in the survey than their male counterparts 33.3% (n=28). Also, majority of the respondents 52.4% (n=44) have taught for 21-30 years compared to 47.6% (n=40) of the respondents with 30-35 years of teaching experience. Similarly, 51.2% (n=43) of the respondents are on grade level 15, while 48.7% (n=41) are on grade level 16. Furthermore, 75% (63) of the respondents have just a first degree, while 25% (n=21) also possess a Master degree. Additionally, 50% (n=42) of the respondents are vice principals while the other 50% (n=42) are principals in private secondary

schools. Lastly, 64.3% (n=54) of the respondents belong to private secondary schools in rural areas, while the other 35.7% (n=30) are from schools in urban areas.

Table 5.2 - Biographic Characteristics of the Respondents from Public Schools

Variable		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	71	27.0
	Female	192	73.0
	Total	263	100.0
Years of teaching experience	11-20	122	46.4
	21-30	113	43.0
	30-35	28	10.6
	Total	263	100.0
Salary grade level	GL 14	122	46.4
	GL 15	113	43.0
	GL 16	28	10.6
	Total	263	100.0
Highest academic qualification	First degree	187	71.1
	Master degree	76	28.9
	Total	263	100.0
Position in school	Principal	27	10.3
	Vice principal	113	43.0
	HOD	123	46.8
	Total	263	100.0
Geographical location of school	Rural Area	200	76.0
	Urban Area	63	24.0
	Total	263	100.0

Source: Author's computation of Field Survey Data (2020)

Of the 263 respondents from public secondary schools, female respondents accounted for 73% (n=192) more than male respondents 27% (n=71). Also, 46.4% (n=122) of the respondents possess 11-20 years teaching experience, 43% (n=113) have 21-30 years' experience in teaching, while 10.6% (n=28) of the respondents have 30-35 years of teaching experience. In a similar vein, 46.4% (n=122) of the respondents are on grade level 14 salary, 43% (n=113) are on grade level 15, while 10.6% (n=28) of the respondents are on grade level 16. Furthermore, 71.1% (187) of the respondents have just a first degree, while 28.9% (n=28) also possess a Master degree. Additionally, 10.3% (n=27) of the respondents are principals, 43% (n=113) are vice principals, while the other 46.8% (n=123) are HODs in public secondary schools. Lastly, majority 76% (n=200) of the respondents belong to public secondary schools in rural areas compared to 24% (n=63) in public secondary schools located in urban areas. The statistics in tables 4.1 and 4.2 indicated that both private and public secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government were dominated by female teaching staff with 67% and 73% respectively.

Table 5.3 - Biographic Characteristics of the Respondents from Combined Sample

Variable		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	99	28.5
	Female	248	71.5
	Total	347	100.0
Years of teaching experience	11-20	122	35.2
	21-30	157	45.2
	30-35	68	19.6
	Total	347	100.0
Salary grade level	GL 14	122	35.2
	GL 15	156	45.0
	GL 16	69	19.9
	Total	347	100.0
Highest academic qualification	First degree	250	72.0
	Master degree	97	28.0
	Total	347	100.0
Position in school	Principal	69	19.9
	Vice principal	155	44.7
	HOD	123	35.4
	Total	347	100.0
Geographical location of school	Rural Area	254	73.2
	Urban Area	93	26.8
	Total	347	100.0
Type of school	Public	168	48.4
	Private	179	51.6
	Total	347	100.0

Source: Author's computation of Field Survey Data (2020)

Overall, more female respondents 71.5% (n=248) participated in the survey than male respondents 28.5% (n=99), majority of the respondents (45.2%, n=157) have 21-30 years of

teaching experience, while majority of the respondents (45%, n=156) are on salary grade level 15. Additionally, majority of the respondents (72%, n=250) have first degree only, are predominantly vice principals (44.7%, n=155), while majority of the respondents (73.2%, n=254) are in schools located in rural areas.

Summarily, the biographic information indicates an adequate representation of respondents in the survey in terms of gender, salary, experience, academic qualification, rank, and geographical location. However, the findings also show that private secondary schools have more experienced and high earning respondents than public secondary schools, while public secondary schools have more qualified, but less ranked respondents. Additionally, more public secondary schools' respondents participated in the survey and are largely located in rural areas, compared to private secondary schools.

It is worthy of note that from the statistics presented, the public schools are better staffed and also with more experienced workers compared to private schools.

5.4.2 Descriptive Statistics of School Autonomy Dimensions

This section focussed on the summaries of the five dimensions of school autonomy that were captured in this study. These dimensions are as follows: Pedagogic autonomy (tables 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively), disciplinary decision autonomy (tables 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively), personnel management autonomy (tables 5.10, 5.11 and 5.12 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively), financial autonomy (tables 5.13, 5.14 and 5.15 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively) and accountability autonomy (tables 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively).. These dimensions were presented separately for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools covered by the study as shown in the tables hereunder.

5.4.2.1 Pedagogic Autonomy

Table 5.4 - Pedagogic Autonomy of Private Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has significant capacity to take decision on curriculum content for different subjects being taught to learners	--	--	--	5 (6.0)	39 (46.4)	40 (47.6)	1.58 0.60
My school has significant capacity to take decision on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners	--	--	--	40 (47.6)	32 (38.1)	12 (14.3)	2.33 0.71
My school has significant capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners' performance	--	--	--	26 (31.0)	53 (63.1)	5 (6.0)	2.25 0.55
My school has significant capacity to take decision on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners	--	--	-	11 (13.1)	73 (86.9)	--	2.13 0.33
My school has significant capacity to take decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners	--	--	--	29 (43.5)	73 (86.9)	6 (7.1)	2.27 0.58
Average Mean							2.11

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.4 above indicates that generally, private secondary schools lack pedagogic autonomy ($\bar{x}=2.11$). Specifically, findings showed that private secondary schools lack significant capacity to take decision on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners ($\bar{x}=2.33$), lack significant capacity to take decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners ($\bar{x}=2.27$), lack significant capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners'

performance ($\bar{x}=2.25$), lack significant capacity to take decision on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners ($\bar{x}=2.13$) also lack significant capacity to take decision on curriculum content for different subjects being taught to learners ($\bar{x}=1.58$).

Table 5.5 - Pedagogic Autonomy of Public Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has significant capacity to take decision on curriculum content for different subjects being taught to learners	--	--	--	18 (6.8)	104 (39.6)	141 (53.8)	1.53 0.62
My school has significant capacity to take decision on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners	--	--	--	53 (20.2)	175 (66.5)	35 (13.3)	2.07 0.57
My school has significant capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners' performance	--	--	--	122 (46.4)	124 (47.1)	17 (6.5)	2.40 0.60
My school has significant capacity to take decision on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners	--	--	--	106 (40.3)	157 (59.7)	--	2.40 0.49
My school has significant capacity to take decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners	--	--	--	89 (33.8)	121 (46.0)	53 (20.2)	2.14 0.72
Average Mean							2.10

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Similar to the situation of private secondary schools, table 5.5 above indicates that generally, public secondary schools also lack pedagogic autonomy ($\bar{x}=2.10$). Specifically, findings showed

that public secondary schools lack significant capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners' performance or on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners ($\bar{x}=2.40$), lack significant capacity to take decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners ($\bar{x}=2.14$), lack significant capacity to take decision on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners ($\bar{x}=2.07$), and also lack significant capacity to take decisions on curriculum content for different subjects being taught to learners ($\bar{x}=1.53$). Just like the case of private schools, the public schools also rated their pedagogic autonomy very low.

Table 5.6 - Pedagogic Autonomy of Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has significant capacity to take decision on curriculum content for different subjects being taught to learners	--	--	--	23 (6.6)	143 (41.2)	181 (52.2)	1.54 0.61
My school has significant capacity to take decision on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners	--	--	--	93 (26.8)	207 (59.7)	47 (13.5)	2.13 0.62
My school has significant capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners' performance	--	--	--	148 (42.7)	177 (51.0)	22 (6.3)	2.36 0.59
My school has significant capacity to take decision on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners	--	--	--	117 (33.7)	230 (66.3)	--	2.34 0.47
My school has significant capacity to take decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners	--	--	--	118 (34.0)	170 (49.0)	59 (17.0)	2.17 0.69
Average Mean							2.10

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.6 shows that overall, schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State (private & public) lack pedagogic autonomy ($\bar{x}=2.10$). Specifically, findings showed that all secondary schools lack significant capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners' performance ($\bar{x}=2.40$), or lack significant capacity to take decisions on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners ($\bar{x}=2.34$), lack significant capacity to take

decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners ($\bar{x}=2.17$), lack significant capacity to take decisions on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners ($\bar{x}=2.13$), and also lack significant capacity to take decisions on curriculum content for different subjects being taught to learners ($\bar{x}=1.54$).

The findings show that neither private secondary schools nor public secondary schools have pedagogic autonomy ($\bar{x} = 2.10$ for both private and public schools) which usually rests with educational authorities in the country.

5.4.2.2 Disciplinary Decision Autonomy

Table 5.7 - Disciplinary Decision Autonomy of Private Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has significant capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to education authority	38 (45.2)	23 (27.4)	23 (27.4)	--	--	--	5.18 0.83
Cases of learner's misdemeanour are promptly dealt with by my school authority without recourse to the education authority	34 (40.5)	44 (52.4)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.33 0.58
Where necessary, my school authority has capacity to suspend an erring learner summarily	33 (39.3)	46 (54.8)	5 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.50 0.61
My school authority has capacity to dismiss unrepentant learner whenever the situation so warrants	47 (56.0)	32 (38.1)	5 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.54 0.71
Average Mean							5.38

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As seen in table 5.7 above, generally, private secondary schools have disciplinary decision autonomy (\bar{x} =5.38). This is because, private secondary schools have the strong capacity to dismiss an unrepentant learner whenever the situation so warrants (\bar{x} =5.54), the strong capacity to suspend an erring learner summarily (\bar{x} =5.50), the capacity to promptly deal with cases of learner's misdemeanour without recourse to the education authority (\bar{x} =5.33), and the capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to education authority (\bar{x} =5.18).

Table 5.8 - Disciplinary Decision Autonomy of Public Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has significant capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to education authority	--	--	--	--	227 (86.3)	36 (13.7)	1.86 0.34
Cases of learner's misdemeanour are promptly dealt with by my school authority without recourse to the education authority	--	--	--	123 (46.8)	88 (33.5)	52 (19.8)	2.27 0.77
Where necessary, my school authority has capacity to suspend an erring learner summarily	--	--	--	35 (13.3)	176 (66.9)	52 (19.8)	1.94 0.57
My school authority has capacity to dismiss unrepentant learner whenever the situation so warrants	--	--	--	35 (13.3)	124 (47.1)	104 (39.5)	1.74 0.67
Average Mean							1.95

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.8 above shows that generally, public secondary schools lack disciplinary decision autonomy ($\bar{x}=1.95$). Specifically, public secondary schools lack the capacity to promptly deal with cases of learner's misdemeanour without recourse to the education authority ($\bar{x}=2.27$), lack the capacity to suspend an erring learner summarily ($\bar{x}=1.94$), lack the capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to education authority ($\bar{x}=1.86$), and also lack the capacity to dismiss an unrepentant learner whenever the situation so warrants ($\bar{x}=1.74$).

Table 5.9 - Disciplinary Decision Autonomy of Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has significant capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to education authority	38 (11.0)	23 (6.6)	23 (6.6)	--	227 (66.4)	36 (10.4)	2.67 1.51
Cases of learner's misdemeanour are promptly dealt with by my school authority without recourse to the education authority	34 (9.8)	44 (12.7)	6 (1.7)	123 (35.4)	88 (25.4)	52 (15.0)	3.01 1.50
Where necessary, my school authority has capacity to suspend an erring learner summarily	33 (9.5)	46 (13.3)	5 (1.4)	35 (10.1)	176 (50.7)	52 (15.0)	2.76 1.56
My school authority has capacity to dismiss unrepentant learner whenever the situation so warrants	47 (13.5)	32 (9.2)	5 (1.4)	35 (10.1)	124 (35.7)	104 (30.0)	2.65 1.74
Average Mean							2.77

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.9 above shows that generally, schools (private and public) in partially lack disciplinary decision autonomy ($\bar{x}=2.77$). This is because schools partially lack the capacity to promptly deal with cases of learner's misdemeanour without recourse to the education authority ($\bar{x}=3.01$), partially lack the capacity to suspend an erring learner summarily ($\bar{x}=2.76$), partially lack the capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to education authority ($\bar{x}=2.67$), and also partially lack the capacity to dismiss an unrepentant learner whenever the situation so warrants ($\bar{x}=2.65$).

Overall, the findings above suggest that private secondary schools have greater disciplinary decision autonomy ($\bar{x} = 5.38$) than public secondary schools ($\bar{x} = 1.95$).

5.4.2.3 Personnel Management Autonomy

Table 5.10 - Personnel Management Autonomy of Private Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school authority has capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands	56 (66.7)	17 (20.2)	11 (13.1)	--	--	--	5.54 071
My school has capacity to fix remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate	40 (47.6)	38 (45.2)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.40 0.62
My school has capacity to right size the workforce as may be considered needful	39 (46.4)	40 (47.6)	5 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.40 0.60
My school can influence the personnel to be recruited into the service of the school	28 (33.3)	50 (59.5)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.26 0.58
My school has power to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties	56 (66.7)	28 (33.3)	--	--	--	--	5.67 0.47
Average Mean							5.45

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.10 above shows that generally, private secondary schools have personnel management autonomy ($\bar{x}=5.45$). This is traceable to the fact that private secondary schools have the strong capacity to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties ($\bar{x}=5.67$), have the strong capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands ($\bar{x}=5.54$), have the capacity to fix remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate ($\bar{x}=5.40$), have the capacity to

right-size the workforce as may be considered needful ($\bar{x}=5.40$), and can also influence the personnel to be recruited into the service of the school ($\bar{x}=5.26$).

Table 5.11 - Personnel Management Autonomy of Public Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school authority has capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands	--	--	--	54 (20.5)	87 (33.1)	122 (46.4)	1.74 0.77
My school has capacity to fix remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate	--	--	--	18 (6.8)	88 (33.5)	157 (59.7)	1.47 0.62
My school has capacity to right size the workforce as may be considered needful	--	--	--	--	122 (46.4)	141 (53.6)	1.46 0.50
My school can influence the personnel to be recruited into the service of the school	--	--	--	35 (13.3)	123 (46.8)	105 (39.9)	1.73 0.68
My school has power to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties	--	--	--	--	123 (46.8)	140 (53.2)	1.47 0.50
Average Mean							1.57

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As shown in table 5.11 above, generally public secondary schools lack autonomy of personnel management ($\bar{x}=1.57$). This is because public secondary schools lack the capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands ($\bar{x}=1.74$), lack the capacity to influence the personnel to be recruited into the service of the school ($\bar{x}=1.73$), lack the capacity to fix

remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate ($\bar{x}=1.47$), lack the power to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties ($\bar{x}=1.47$), and lack the capacity to right-size the workforce as may be considered needful ($\bar{x}=1.46$).

Table 5.12 - Personnel Management Autonomy of Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school authority has capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands	56 (16.1)	17 (4.9)	11 (3.2)	54 (15.6)	87 (25.1)	122 (35.2)	2.66 1.79
My school has capacity to fix remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate	40 (11.5)	38 (11.0)	6 (1.7)	18 (5.2)	88 (25.4)	157 (45.2)	2.42 1.79
My school has capacity to right size the workforce as may be considered needful	39 (11.2)	40 (11.5)	5 (1.4)	--	122 (35.2)	141 (40.6)	2.42 1.77
My school can influence the personnel to be recruited into the service of the school	28 (8.1)	50 (14.4)	6 (1.7)	35 (10.1)	123 (35.4)	105 (30.3)	2.59 1.65
My school has power to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties	56 (16.1)	28 (8.1)	--	--	123 (35.4)	140 (40.3)	2.48 1.86
Average Mean							2.51

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As shown in table 5.12 above, schools (private and public) partially lack autonomy of personnel management ($\bar{x}=2.51$). Specifically, schools partially lack the capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands ($\bar{x}=2.66$), partially lack the capacity to influence the

personnel to be recruited into the service of the school ($\bar{x}=2.59$), partially lack the power to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties ($\bar{x}=2.48$), partially lack the capacity to fix remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate ($\bar{x}=2.42$), and partially lack the capacity to right-size the workforce as may be considered needful ($\bar{x}=2.42$).

Overall, the findings suggest that private secondary schools have greater personnel management autonomy than public secondary schools.

5.4.2.4 Financial Autonomy

Table 5.13 - Financial Autonomy of Private Secondary Schools

Items	SA	A	PA	PD	D	SD	\bar{x}
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	SD
My school has capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time	34 (40.5)	38 (45.2)	12 (14.3)	--	--	--	5.26 0.69
My school has significant capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school	38 (45.2)	46 (54.8)	--	--	--	--	5.45 0.50
My school has capacity to implement budget approved for running the school	32 (38.1)	52 (61.9)	--	--	--	--	5.38 0.48
My school has significant control over its budget	32 (38.1)	52 (61.9)	--	--	--	--	5.38 0.48
My school has a discretionary control over fund raising decisions	40 (47.6)	44 (52.4)	--	--	--	--	5.48 0.50
Average Mean							5.39

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As shown in table 5.13 above, generally private secondary schools have financial autonomy ($\bar{x}=5.39$). Specifically, private secondary schools have discretionary control over fund raising decisions ($\bar{x}=5.48$), have significant capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school ($\bar{x}=5.45$), have the capacity to implement budget approved for running the school ($\bar{x}=5.38$), have significant control over their budget ($\bar{x}=5.38$), and have capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time ($\bar{x}=5.26$).

Table 5.14 - Financial Autonomy of Public Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time	52 (19.8)	105 (39.9)	106 (40.3)	--	--	--	4.79 0.74
My school has significant capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school	53 (20.2)	210 (79.8)	--	--	--	--	5.20 0.40
My school has capacity to implement budget approved for running the school	52 (19.8)	140 (53.2)	71 (27.0)	--	--	--	4.93 0.68
My school has significant control over its budget	52 (19.8)	105 (39.9)	106 (40.3)	--	--	--	4.79 0.74
My school has a discretionary control over fund raising decisions	105 (39.9)	70 (26.6)	88 (33.5)	--	--	--	5.06 0.85
Average Mean							4.95

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.14 above indicates that generally, public secondary schools have financial autonomy ($\bar{x}=4.95$). This is so because public secondary schools have significant capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school ($\bar{x}=5.20$), have discretionary control over fund raising decisions ($\bar{x}=5.06$), have the capacity to implement budget approved for running the school ($\bar{x}=4.93$), have significant control over their budget ($\bar{x}=4.79$), and have the capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time ($\bar{x}=5.26$).

Table 5.15 - Financial Autonomy of Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school has capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time	86 (24.8)	143 (41.2)	118 (34.0)	--	--	--	4.91 0.76
My school has significant capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school	91 (26.2)	256 (73.8)	--	--	--	--	5.26 0.44
My school has capacity to implement budget approved for running the school	84 (24.2)	192 (55.3)	71 (20.5)	--	--	--	5.04 0.66
My school has significant control over its budget	84 (24.2)	157 (45.2)	106 (30.5)	--	--	--	4.94 0.73
My school has a discretionary control over fund raising decisions	145 (41.8)	114 (32.9)	88 (25.4)	--	--	--	5.16 0.80
Average Mean							5.06

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.15 above shows that schools (private and public) have financial autonomy ($\bar{x}=5.06$). Specifically, schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State have significant capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school ($\bar{x}=5.26$), have discretionary control over fund raising decisions ($\bar{x}=5.16$), have the capacity to implement budget approved for running the school ($\bar{x}=5.04$), have significant control over their budget ($\bar{x}=4.94$), and have the capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time ($\bar{x}=4.91$).

Overall, the findings show that private secondary schools have a slightly higher financial autonomy than public secondary schools.

5.4.2.5 Accountability Autonomy

Table 5.16 - Accountability Autonomy of Private Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school is transparent in decision making processes	40 (47.6)	38 (45.2)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.40 0.62
My school welcomed constructive criticisms from both staff and learners on how the school is being managed	34 (40.5)	45 (53.6)	5 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.35 0.59
My school is prudent in financial matters	29 (34.5)	55 (65.5)	--	--	--	--	5.35 0.47
There is periodical meeting to determine how funds are spent in the school	56 (66.7)	23 (27.4)	5 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.61 0.60
There is significant transparency in the financial administration of the school	28 (33.3)	50 (59.5)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.26 0.58
Average Mean							5.39

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As shown in table 5.16 above, generally, private secondary schools have accountability autonomy ($\bar{x}=5.39$). This is so because private secondary schools very regularly hold periodical meetings to determine how funds are spent in the school ($\bar{x}=5.61$), are transparent in decision making processes ($\bar{x}=5.40$), welcome constructive criticisms from both staff and learners on how

the school is being managed ($\bar{x}=5.35$), are prudent in financial matters ($\bar{x}=5.35$), and are significantly transparent in the financial administration of the school ($\bar{x}=5.26$).

Table 5.17 - Accountability Autonomy of Public Secondary Schools

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school is transparent in decision making processes	35 (13.3)	87 (33.1)	141 (53.6)	--	--	--	4.60 0.71
My school welcomed constructive criticisms from both staff and learners on how the school is being managed	53 (20.2)	106 (40.3)	104 (39.5)	--	--	--	4.81 0.74
My school is prudent in financial matters	53 (20.2)	124 (47.1)	86 (32.7)	--	--	--	4.87 0.71
There is periodical meeting to determine how funds are spent in the school	70 (26.6)	88 (33.5)	105 (39.9)	--	--	--	4.87 0.80
There is significant transparency in the financial administration of the school	36 (13.7)	139 (52.9)	88 (33.5)	--	--	--	4.80 0.65
Average Mean							4.79

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.17 above shows that generally, public secondary schools have accountability autonomy ($\bar{x}=4.79$). Specifically, private secondary schools very regularly hold periodical meetings to determine how funds are spent in the school ($\bar{x}=4.87$), are prudent in financial matters ($\bar{x}=4.87$), welcome constructive criticisms from both staff and learners on how the school is being

managed ($\bar{x}=4.81$), are significantly transparent in the financial administration of the school ($\bar{x}=4.80$), and are transparent in decision making processes ($\bar{x}=4.60$).

Table 5.18 - Accountability Autonomy of Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
My school is transparent in decision making processes	75 (21.6)	125 (36.0)	147 (42.4)	--	--	--	4.79 0.77
My school welcomed constructive criticisms from both staff and learners on how the school is being managed	87 (25.1)	151 (43.5)	109 (31.4)	--	--	--	4.94 0.75
My school is prudent in financial matters	82 (23.6)	179 (51.6)	86 (24.8)	--	--	--	4.99 0.69
There is periodical meeting to determine how funds are spent in the school	126 (36.3)	111 (32.0)	110 (31.7)	--	--	--	5.05 0.82
There is significant transparency in the financial administration of the school	64 (18.4)	189 (54.5)	94 (27.1)	--	--	--	4.91 0.67
Average Mean							4.93

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

From table 5.18, generally, schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State (private and public) have accountability autonomy ($\bar{x}=4.93$). This is traceable to the fact that schools very regularly hold periodical meetings to determine how funds are spent in schools ($\bar{x}=5.05$), are prudent in financial matters ($\bar{x}=4.99$), welcome constructive criticisms from both staff and

learners on how the school is being managed ($\bar{x}=4.94$), are significantly transparent in the financial administration of the school ($\bar{x}=4.91$), and are transparent in decision making processes ($\bar{x}=4.79$).

Overall, the findings showed that accountability autonomy is higher in private secondary schools ($\bar{x} = 5.39$) than in public secondary schools ($\bar{x} = 4.79$).

5.4.3 Descriptive Statistics of Learners' Performance

This section focussed on the summaries of the five dimensions of learners' performance that were captured in this study. These dimensions are as follows: Affective skills achievement (tables 5.19, 5.20 and 5.21 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively), personal development (tables 5.22, 5.23 and 5.24 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively), work quality (tables 5.25, 5.26 and 5.27 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively), character formation (tables 5.28, 5.29 and 5.30 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively) and social development (tables 5.31, 5.32 and 5.33 for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools respectively).. These dimensions were presented separately for private, public and combined private and public secondary schools covered by the study as shown in the tables hereunder.

5.4.3.1 Affective Skills Achievement

Table 5.19 - Affective Skills Achievement of Private Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
The average learner in my school has impressive capacity for sustained attention	23 (27.4)	40 (47.6)	21 (25.0)	--	--	--	5.02 0.72
The average learner in my school has appreciable speed of information processing	49 (58.3)	23 (27.4)	12 (14.3)	--	--	--	5.44 0.73
The average learner in my school demonstrate high cognitive flexibility	23 (27.4)	49 (58.3)	12 (14.3)	--	--	--	5.13 0.63
The average learner in my school demonstrates high level of self – control	27 (32.1)	51 (60.7)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.25 0.57
Learners in my school have highly impressive working memory	38 (45.2)	40 (47.6)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.38 0.61
Learners in my school have highly impressive capacity for pattern recognition	21 (25.0)	57 (67.9)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.18 0.54
Average Mean							5.23

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.19 above indicates that generally, private school learners have strong achievements in affective skills (\bar{x} =5.23). This is so because in private secondary schools, the average learner has

appreciable speed of information processing ($\bar{x}=5.44$), learners have highly impressive working memory ($\bar{x}=5.38$), the average learner demonstrates high level of self-control ($\bar{x}=5.25$), learners have highly impressive capacity for pattern recognition ($\bar{x}=5.18$), the average learner demonstrates high cognitive flexibility ($\bar{x}=5.13$), and the average learner has impressive capacity for sustained attention ($\bar{x}=5.02$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for private secondary schools being $(2.11+5.38+5.38+5.45+5.39+5.39) / 5 = 4.74$ while the average mean for affective skills achievement for learners in the private secondary schools is 5.23. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that affective skill achievement of learners in the private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question one on the part of private secondary schools.

Table 5.20 - Affective Skills Achievement of Public Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
The average learner in my school has impressive capacity for sustained attention	17 (6.5)	105 (39.9)	141 (53.6)	--	--	--	4.53 0.61
The average learner in my school has appreciable speed of information processing	34 (12.9)	106 (40.3)	123 (46.8)	--	--	--	4.66 0.69
The average learner in my school demonstrate high cognitive flexibility	17 (6.5)	69 (26.2)	177 (67.3)	--	--	--	4.39 0.60
The average learner in my school demonstrates high level of self – control	--	122 (46.4)	141 (53.6)	--	--	--	4.46 0.50
Learners in my school have highly impressive working memory	51 (19.4)	105 (39.9)	107 (40.7)	--	--	--	4.79 0.74
Learners in my school have highly impressive capacity for pattern recognition	35 (13.3)	121 (46.0)	107 (40.70)	--	--	--	4.73 0.68
Average Mean							4.59

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As seen in table 5.20 above, generally, public secondary school learners have strong achievements in affective skills ($\bar{x}=4.59$). Specifically, in public secondary schools, learners have highly impressive working memory ($\bar{x}=4.79$), learners have highly impressive capacity for pattern recognition ($\bar{x}=4.73$), the average learner has appreciable speed of information

processing ($\bar{x}=4.66$), the average learner has impressive capacity for sustained attention ($\bar{x}=4.53$), the average learner demonstrates high level of self-control ($\bar{x}=4.46$), and the average learner demonstrates high cognitive flexibility ($\bar{x}=4.39$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for public secondary schools being $(2.10+1.95+1.57+4.95+4.79) / 5 = 3.07$ while the average mean for affective skills achievement for learners in the public secondary schools is 4.59. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that affective skill achievement of learners in the public secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question one on the part of public secondary schools.

Table 5.21 - Affective Skills Achievement of Learners in Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
The average learner in my school has impressive capacity for sustained attention	40 (11.5)	145 (41.5)	162 (46.7)	--	--	--	4.65 0.67
The average learner in my school has appreciable speed of information processing	83 (23.9)	129 (37.2)	135 (38.9)	--	--	--	4.85 0.77
The average learner in my school demonstrate high cognitive flexibility	40 (11.5)	118 (34.0)	189 (54.5)	--	--	--	4.57 0.69
The average learner in my school demonstrates high level of self – control	27 (7.8)	173 (49.9)	147 (42.4)	--	--	--	4.65 0.61
Learners in my school have highly impressive working memory	89 (25.6)	145 (41.8)	113 (32.6)	--	--	--	4.93 0.76
Learners in my school have highly impressive capacity for pattern recognition	56 (16.1)	178 (51.3)	113 (32.6)	--	--	--	4.84 0.67
Average Mean							4.74

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.21 shows that school learners in Egbeda local government of Oyo State (private and public) have strong achievements in affective skills ($\bar{x}=4.74$). This is so because in all secondary schools, learners have highly impressive working memory ($\bar{x}=4.93$), the average learner has appreciable speed of information processing ($\bar{x}=4.85$), learners have highly impressive capacity

for pattern recognition ($\bar{x}=4.84$), the average learner has impressive capacity for sustained attention ($\bar{x}=4.65$), the average learner demonstrates high level of self-control ($\bar{x}=4.65$), and the average learner demonstrates high cognitive flexibility ($\bar{x}=4.57$). Considering the statistics in tables 5.19 and table 5.20, it is apparent that affective skill is better achieved in private schools ($\bar{x} = 5.23$) compared to the public schools ($\bar{x} = 4.59$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for both public and private secondary schools being $(2.10+2.77+2.51+5.06+4.93) / 5 = 3.47$ while the average mean for affective skills achievement for learners in both public and private secondary schools is 4.74. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that affective skill achievement of learners in both public and private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question one on the part of both public and private secondary schools.

5.4.3.2 Personal Development

Table 5.22 - Personal Development of Private Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school have articulated plan for their future	45 (53.6)	39 (46.6)	--	--	--	--	5.54 0.50
Learners in my school are able to manage their feelings	43 (51.2)	35 (41.7)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.44 0.62
Learners in my school develop their self-confidence progressively	29 (34.5)	43 (51.2)	12 (14.3)	--	--	--	5.20 0.67
Learners in my school have impressive self-awareness skills	24 (28.6)	43 (51.2)	12 (14.3)	--	--	--	5.21 0.56
Learners are progressive in their spiritual development	39 (46.4)	34 (40.5)	11 (13.1)	--	--	--	5.33 0.70
Learners have impressive personal hygiene	28 (33.3)	50 (59.5)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.26 0.58
Learners' physical development is impressive	40 (47.6)	39 (46.4)	2 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.42 0.60
Average Mean							5.34

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As seen in table 5.22 above, generally, private secondary school learners place high in personal development ($\bar{x}=5.34$). Specifically, in private secondary schools, learners have well-articulated plans for their future ($\bar{x}=5.54$), learners are able to manage their feelings ($\bar{x}=5.44$), learners' physical development is impressive ($\bar{x}=5.42$), learners are progressive in their spiritual development ($\bar{x}=5.33$), learners have impressive personal hygiene ($\bar{x}=5.26$), learners have impressive self-awareness skills ($\bar{x}=5.21$), and learners develop their self-confidence progressively ($\bar{x}=5.20$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for private secondary schools being $(2.11+5.38+5.38+5.45+5.39+5.39) / 5 = 4.74$ while the average mean for personal development for learners in the private secondary schools is 5.34. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that personal development of learners in the private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question two on the part of private secondary schools.

Table 5.23 - Personal Development of Public Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school have articulated plan for their future	52 (19.8)	123 (46.8)	88 (33.5)	--	--	--	4.86 0.71
Learners in my school are able to manage their feelings	70 (26.6)	87 (33.1)	106 (40.3)	--	--	--	4.86 0.80
Learners in my school develop their self-confidence progressively	53 (20.2)	121 (46.0)	89 (33.8)	--	--	--	4.86 0.72
Learners in my school have impressive self-awareness skills	18 (6.8)	139 (52.9)	106 (40.3)	--	--	--	4.67 0.60
Learners are progressive in their spiritual development	17 (6.5)	52 (19.8)	194 (73.8)	--	--	--	4.33 0.59
Learners have impressive personal hygiene	17 (6.5)	120 (45.6)	126 (47.9)	--	--	--	4.59 0.61
Learners' physical development is impressive	35 (13.3)	122 (46.4)	106 (40.3)	--	--	--	4.73 0.68
Average Mean							4.70

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.23 above shows that generally, public secondary school learners also place high in personal development ($\bar{x}=4.70$). Specifically, in private secondary schools, learners have well-articulated plans for their future ($\bar{x}=4.86$), learners are able to manage their feelings ($\bar{x}=4.86$), learners develop their self-confidence progressively ($\bar{x}=4.86$), learners' physical development is impressive ($\bar{x}=4.73$), learners have impressive self-awareness skills ($\bar{x}=4.67$), learners have impressive personal hygiene ($\bar{x}=4.59$), and learners are partially progressive in their spiritual development ($\bar{x}=4.33$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for public secondary schools being $(2.10+1.95+1.57+4.95+4.79) / 5 = 3.07$ while the average mean for personal development of learners in the public secondary schools is 4.70. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that personal development of learners in the public secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question two on the part of public secondary schools.

Table 5.24 - Personal Development of Learners in Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school have articulated plan for their future	97 (28.0)	162 (46.7)	88 (25.4)	--	--	--	5.03 0.73
Learners in my school are able to manage their feelings	113 (32.6)	122 (35.2)	112 (32.3)	--	--	--	5.00 0.80
Learners in my school develop their self-confidence progressively	82 (23.6)	164 (47.3)	101 (29.1)	--	--	--	4.95 0.72
Learners in my school have impressive self-awareness skills	42 (21.1)	193 (55.6)	112 (32.3)	--	--	--	4.80 0.63
Learners are progressive in their spiritual development	56 (16.1)	86 (24.8)	205 (59.1)	--	--	--	4.57 0.75
Learners have impressive personal hygiene	45 (13.0)	170 (49.0)	132 (38.0)	--	--	--	4.75 0.67
Learners' physical development is impressive	75 (21.6)	161 (46.6)	111 (32.0)	--	--	--	4.90 0.72
Average Mean							4.85

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.24 indicates school learners in private and public secondary schools place high in personal development ($\bar{x}=4.85$). This based on the fact that in all secondary schools, learners have well-articulated plans for their future ($\bar{x}=5.03$), learners are able to manage their feelings ($\bar{x}=5.00$), learners develop their self-confidence progressively ($\bar{x}=4.95$), learners' physical development is impressive ($\bar{x}=4.90$), learners have impressive self-awareness skills ($\bar{x}=4.80$), learners have impressive personal hygiene ($\bar{x}=4.75$), and learners are progressive in their spiritual development ($\bar{x}=4.57$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for both public and private secondary schools being $(2.10+2.77+2.51+5.06+4.93) / 5 = 3.47$ while the average mean for personal development of learners in both public and private secondary schools is 4.85. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that personal development of learners in both public and private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question two on the part of both public and private secondary schools.

5.4.3.3 Work Quality

Table 5.25 - Work Quality of Private Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school give highly impressive answers to questions asked in class	30 (35.7)	54 (64.3)	--	--	--	--	5.36 0.48
Learners in my school are hardworking	39 (46.4)	45 (53.6)	--	--	--	--	5.46 0.50
Learners in my school write comprehensive note during class sessions	18 (21.4)	61 (72.6)	5 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.15 0.50
Learners in my school hardly make mistakes in their assignments	40 (47.6)	38 (45.2)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.40 0.62
Learners' works are well organized	56 (66.7)	28 (33.3)	--	--	--	--	5.67 0.47
Average Mean							5.40

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As seen in table 5.25 above, generally, private secondary school learners have strong work quality ($\bar{x}=5.40$). Specifically, in private secondary schools, learners' works are very well organized ($\bar{x}=5.67$), learners are hardworking ($\bar{x}=5.46$), learners hardly make mistakes in their

assignments ($\bar{x}=5.40$), learners give highly impressive answers to questions asked in class ($\bar{x}=5.36$), learners write comprehensive notes during class sessions ($\bar{x}=5.15$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for private secondary schools being $(2.11+5.38+5.38+5.45+5.39+5.39) / 5 = 4.74$ while the average mean for learners' work quality in the private secondary schools is 5.40. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' work quality in the private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question three on the part of private secondary schools.

Table 5.26 - Work Quality of Public Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school give highly impressive answers to questions asked in class	35 (13.3)	139 (52.9)	89 (33.8)	--	--	--	4.79 0.65
Learners in my school are hardworking	35 (13.3)	69 (26.2)	159 (60.5)	--	--	--	4.53 0.71
Learners in my school write comprehensive note during class sessions	35 (13.3)	122 (46.4)	106 (40.3)	--	--	--	4.73 0.68
Learners in my school hardly make mistakes in their assignments	--	70 (26.6)	193 (73.4)	--	--	--	4.27 0.44
Learners' works are well organized	35 (13.3)	104 (39.5)	124 (47.1)	--	--	--	4.66 0.70
Average Mean							4.53

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.26 above shows that, generally, public secondary school learners have strong work quality ($\bar{x}=4.53$). This is shown by the fact that, in public secondary schools, learners give highly impressive answers to questions asked in class ($\bar{x}=4.79$), learners write comprehensive notes during class sessions ($\bar{x}=4.73$), learners' works are well organized ($\bar{x}=4.66$), learners are hardworking ($\bar{x}=4.53$), and learners occasionally make mistakes in their assignments ($\bar{x}=4.27$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for public secondary schools being $(2.10+1.95+1.57+4.95+4.79) / 5 = 3.07$ while the average mean for learners' work quality in the public secondary schools is 4.53. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' work quality in the public secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question three on the part of public secondary schools.

Table 5.27 - Work Quality of Learners in Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school give highly impressive answers to questions asked in class	65 (18.7)	193 (55.6)	89 (25.6)	--	--	--	4.93 0.66
Learners in my school are hardworking	74 (21.3)	114 (32.9)	159 (45.8)	--	--	--	4.76 0.78
Learners in my school write comprehensive note during class sessions	53 (15.3)	183 (52.7)	111 (32.0)	--	--	--	4.83 0.66
Learners in my school hardly make mistakes in their assignments	40 (11.5)	108 (31.1)	199 (57.3)	--	--	--	4.54 0.69
Learners work are well organized	91 (26.2)	132 (38.0)	124 (35.7)	--	--	--	4.90 0.78
Average Mean							4.79

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

An assessment of table 5.27 above indicates that, generally, learners in both private and public secondary schools have strong work quality ($\bar{x}=4.79$). Specifically, learners give highly impressive answers to questions asked in class ($\bar{x}=4.93$), learners' works are well organized ($\bar{x}=4.90$), learners write comprehensive notes during class sessions ($\bar{x}=4.83$), learners are hardworking ($\bar{x}=4.76$), and learners hardly make mistakes in their assignments ($\bar{x}=4.54$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for both public and private secondary schools being $(2.10+2.77+2.51+5.06+4.93) / 5 = 3.47$ while the average mean for learners' work quality in both public and private secondary schools is 4.79. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' work quality in both public and private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question three on the part of both public and private secondary schools.

5.4.3.4 Character Formation

Table 5.28 - Character Formation of Private Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school are very courteous in their interactions with other people	38 (45.2)	24 (28.8)	22 (26.2)	--	--	--	5.19 0.82
Learners in my school are law abiding	34 (40.5)	44 (52.4)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.33 0.60
Learners in my school are always polite to other people	56 (66.7)	22 (26.2)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.60 0.62
You will hardly hear of bullying among learners in my school	45 (53.6)	33 (39.3)	6 (7.1)	--	--	--	5.46 0.63
Learners in my school are very kind in their dealings with other people	29 (34.5)	44 (52.4)	11 (13.1)	--	--	--	5.21 0.66
Learners in my school are very helpful	35 (41.7)	44 (52.4)	5 (6.0)	--	--	--	5.36 0.59
Average Mean							5.35

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As seen in table 5.28 above, generally, private secondary school learners are associated with good character ($\bar{x}=5.35$). Specifically, in private secondary schools, learners are always very polite to other people ($\bar{x}=5.60$), are hardly associated with bullying ($\bar{x}=5.46$), are very helpful ($\bar{x}=5.36$), are law abiding ($\bar{x}=5.33$), are very kind in their dealings with other people ($\bar{x}=5.21$), and are very courteous in their interactions with other people ($\bar{x}=5.19$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for private secondary schools being $(2.11+5.38+5.38+5.45+5.39+5.39) / 5 = 4.74$ while the average mean for learners' character formation in the private secondary schools is 5.35. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' character formation in the private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question four on the part of private secondary schools.

Table 5.29 - Character Formation of Public Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school are very courteous in their interactions with other people	--	104 (39.5)	159 (60.5)	--	--	--	4.40 0.49
Learners in my school are law abiding	35 (13.3)	87 (33.1)	141 (53.6)	--	--	--	4.60 0.71
Learners in my school are always polite to other people	35 (13.3)	35 (13.3)	193 (73.4)	--	--	--	4.40 0.71
You will hardly hear of bullying among learners in my school	--	122 (46.4)	141 (53.6)	--	--	--	4.46 0.50
Learners in my school are very kind in their dealings with other people	53 (20.2)	104 (39.5)	140 (53.2)	--	--	--	4.80 0.72
Learners in my school are very helpful	35 (13.3)	88 (33.5)	140 (53.2)	--	--	--	4.60 0.71
Average Mean							4.54

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

In table 5.29 above, the data shows that generally, public secondary school learners are associated with good character ($\bar{x}=4.54$). This is traceable to the fact that, in public secondary schools, learners are very kind in their dealings with other people ($\bar{x}=4.80$), are very helpful

($\bar{x}=4.60$), are law abiding ($\bar{x}=4.60$), are hardly associated with bullying ($\bar{x}=4.46$), are always polite to other people ($\bar{x}=4.40$), and are very courteous in their interactions with other people ($\bar{x}=4.40$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for public secondary schools being $(2.10+1.95+1.57+4.95+4.79) / 5 = 3.07$ while the average mean for learners' character formation in the public secondary schools is 4.54. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' character formation in the public secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question four on the part of public secondary schools.

Table 5.30 - Character Formation of Learners in Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners in my school are very courteous in their interactions with other people	38 (11.0)	128 (36.9)	181 (52.2)	--	--	--	4.59 0.68
Learners in my school are law abiding	69 (19.9)	131 (37.8)	147 (42.4)	--	--	--	4.78 0.75
Learners in my school are always polite to other people	91 (26.2)	57 (16.4)	199 (57.3)	--	--	--	4.69 0.86
You will hardly hear of bullying among learners in my school	45 (13.0)	155 (44.7)	147 (42.4)	--	--	--	4.71 0.68
Learners in my school are very kind in their dealings with other people	82 (23.6)	148 (42.7)	117 (33.7)	--	--	--	4.90 0.75
Learners in my school are very helpful	70 (20.2)	132 (38.0)	145 (41.8)	--	--	--	4.78 0.75
Average Mean							4.74

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Table 5.30 above shows that generally, learners in private and public secondary schools are associated with good character ($\bar{x}=4.74$). This is evidenced by the fact that, in all secondary schools, learners are very kind in their dealings with other people ($\bar{x}=4.90$), are very helpful ($\bar{x}=4.78$), are law abiding ($\bar{x}=4.78$), are hardly associated with bullying ($\bar{x}=4.71$), are always

polite to other people ($\bar{x}=4.69$), and are very courteous in their interactions with other people ($\bar{x}=4.59$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for both public and private secondary schools being $(2.10+2.77+2.51+5.06+4.93) / 5 = 3.47$ while the average mean for learners' character formation in both public and private secondary schools is 4.74. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' character formation in both public and private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question four on the part of both public and private secondary schools. However, the findings showed that character formation in private secondary schools learners is better ($\bar{x} = 5.35$) than in public secondary schools learners ($\bar{x} = 4.54$).

5.4.3.5 Social Development

Table 5.31 - Social Development of Private Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners are socially adjusted	28 (33.3)	39 (46.4)	17 (20.2)	--	--	--	5.13 0.72
Learners have well-coordinated social groups	32 (38.1)	40 (47.6)	12 (14.3)	--	--	--	5.24 0.68
Learners have mutual trust for one another	28 (33.3)	40 (47.6)	16 (19.0)	--	--	--	5.14 0.01
Learners' inter-group cohesion is high	17 (20.2)	56 (66.7)	11 (13.1)	--	--	--	5.07 0.57
Level of gender discrimination among learners is very low	38 (45.2)	46 (54.8)	--	--	--	--	5.45 0.50
Average Mean							5.20

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

Data in table 5.31 above shows that generally, private secondary school learners are socially developed ($\bar{x}=5.20$). Specifically, in private secondary schools, the level of gender discrimination among learners is very low ($\bar{x}=5.45$), learners have well-coordinated social

groups ($\bar{x}=5.24$), learners have mutual trust for one another ($\bar{x}=5.14$), learners are socially adjusted ($\bar{x}=5.13$), and learners' inter-group cohesion is high ($\bar{x}=5.07$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for private secondary schools being $(2.11+5.38+5.38+5.45+5.39+5.39) / 5 = 4.74$ while the average mean for learners' social development in the private secondary schools is 5.20. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' social development in the private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question five on the part of private secondary schools.

Table 5.32 - Social Development of Public Secondary School Learners

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners are socially adjusted	--	88 (32.7)	177 (67.3)	--	--	--	4.33 0.47
Learners have well-coordinated social groups	--	122 (46.4)	141 (53.6)	--	--	--	4.46 0.50
Learners have mutual trust for one another	--	105 (39.9)	158 (60.1)	--	--	--	4.40 0.49
Learners' inter-group cohesion is high	--	157 (59.7)	106 (40.3)	--	--	--	4.60 0.49
Level of gender discrimination among learners is very low	52 (19.8)	104 (19.8)	107 (40.7)	--	--	--	4.79 0.75
Average Mean							4.51

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

As shown by the data in table 5.32 above shows that generally, public secondary school learners are socially developed ($\bar{x}=4.51$). This is supported by the fact that in public secondary schools, the level of gender discrimination among learners is very low ($\bar{x}=4.79$), learners' inter-group cohesion is high ($\bar{x}=4.60$), learners have well-coordinated social groups ($\bar{x}=4.46$), learners have mutual trust for one another ($\bar{x}=4.40$), and learners are socially adjusted ($\bar{x}=4.33$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for public secondary schools being $(2.10+1.95+1.57+4.95+4.79) / 5 = 3.07$ while the average mean for learners' social development in the public secondary schools is 4.51. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' social development in the public secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question five on the part of public secondary schools.

Table 5.33 - Social Development of Learners in Schools (Private & Public)

Items	SA F (%)	A F (%)	PA F (%)	PD F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	\bar{x} SD
Learners are socially adjusted	28 (8.1)	125 (36.0)	194 (55.9)	--	--	--	4.52 0.64
Learners have well-coordinated social groups	32 (9.2)	162 (46.7)	153 (44.1)	--	--	--	4.65 0.64
Learners have mutual trust for one another	28 (8.1)	145 (41.8)	174 (50.1)	--	--	--	4.58 0.63
Learners' inter-group cohesion is high	17 (4.9)	213 (61.4)	117 (33.7)	--	--	--	4.71 0.55
Level of gender discrimination among learners is very low	90 (25.9)	150 (43.2)	107 (30.8)	--	--	--	4.95 0.75
Average Mean							4.68

KEY: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, PA=Partially Agree, PD= Partially Disagree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

*****Decision Rule: If average mean is ≤ 1.49 = strongly disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = partially disagree; 3.5 to 4.49 = partially agree; 4.5 to 5.49 = agree; 5.5 to 6 = strongly agree**

The table 5.33 data above shows that generally, school learners in private and public secondary schools are socially developed ($\bar{x}=4.68$). Specifically, in public secondary schools, the level of gender discrimination among learners is very low ($\bar{x}=4.95$), learners' inter-group cohesion is high ($\bar{x}=4.71$), learners have well-coordinated social groups ($\bar{x}=4.65$), learners have mutual trust for one another ($\bar{x}=4.58$), and learners are socially adjusted ($\bar{x}=4.52$).

Considering the statistics in the above tables, the grand mean for the school autonomy dimensions for both public and private secondary schools being $(2.10+2.77+2.51+5.06+4.93) / 5 = 3.47$ while the average mean for learners' social development in both public and private secondary schools is 4.68. Given the decision rule established above, the descriptive statistics indicated that learners' social development in both public and private secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government could hardly be affected by school autonomy dimensions. This answers the research question five on the part of both public and private secondary schools.

Overall, the findings suggest that learners from private secondary schools are more developed socially ($\bar{x} = 5.2$) than learners in public secondary schools ($\bar{x} = 4.51$).

5.5 Empirical Analysis

The hypotheses of the study are tested in this sub-section using multiple regression analysis. The dependent variables measuring learners' performance are affective skills achievement (ASA), personal development (PD), work quality (WQ), character formation (CF), and social development (SD), while the independent variables are pedagogic autonomy (PA), disciplinary decision autonomy (DDA), personnel management autonomy (PMA), financial autonomy (FA), and accountability autonomy (AA).

The empirical analysis begins with various data treatment and diagnostic tests to ascertain the natural attributes of the variables. The diagnostic tests results were reported in tables 4.34, 4.35 and 4.36 for the private, public and the combined private and public secondary schools datasets.

Table 4.34 - Descriptive Statistics of the Variables (Private Secondary Schools' Data)

VARIABLE	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS	KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOVA		SHAPIRO-WILK	
			Statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.
ASA	-2.237	5.166	.288	.000	.701	.000
PD	.452	-.748	.192	.000	.918	.000
WQ	.478	-.387	.169	.000	.919	.000
CF	.287	-.868	.177	.000	.924	.000
SD	-.337	-.412	.194	.000	.921	.000
PA	-.260	-.222	.229	.000	.921	.000
DDA	-.114	-.700	.117	.006	.944	.001
PMA	-.665	.198	.240	.000	.888	.000
FA	.106	-.977	.159	.000	.929	.000
AA	-.177	-1.061	.179	.000	.927	.000

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The skewness of the variables was measured. This is to determine the asymmetry of the distribution of the series around its mean. From the table above, two of the dependent variables (ASA and SD) and four of the independent variables (PA, DDA, PMA, and AA) are negatively skewed, implying that the distributions of each of the variables have long tails to the left. However, the dependent variables - PD, WQ, and CF, as well as FA are all positively skewed implying that there's a high tendency of having extreme positive values for all these variables, and the distributions of these variables all have long tails to the right. However, work quality (WQ) has the longest tail, implying that it has more extreme larger values.

The kurtosis of the variables was also measured. This is to determine the peakedness or flatness of the distributions of each of the variables. The table shows that only ASA is leptokurtic as its kurtosis value is greater than 3, implying that the distribution of affective skills achievement is peaked relative to the normal distribution. On the other hand, the distributions of the other variables are all platykurtic since each of their individual kurtosis values are less than 3, implying that the distributions of each of the variables are flat relative to the normal distribution.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnova and Shapiro-Wilk normality tests were employed to determine whether the distributions of each of the variables are normally distributed. The null hypothesis stipulates the acceptance of the null hypothesis of normal distribution (i.e. skewness = 0) if the p-value of the test statistics are greater than 0.05. From the table above, both the Kolmogorov-Smirnova and Shapiro-Wilk tests suggest that all the variables do not follow the normal distribution, hence confirming the low skewness values of each of the variables.

Table 5.35 - Descriptive Statistics of the Variables (Public Secondary Schools' Data)

VARIABLE	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS	KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOVA		SHAPIRO-WILK	
			Statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.
ASA	.437	-.802	.126	.000	.929	.000
PD	.274	-.147	.137	.000	.903	.000
WQ	1.094	.505	.211	.000	.848	.000
CF	.989	.146	.205	.000	.877	.000
SD	.140	-1.236	.166	.000	.910	.000
PA	.369	-1.236	.256	.000	.263	.000
DDA	-.263	-.862	.149	.000	.263	.000
PMA	.140	-1.731	.224	.000	.263	.000
FA	.328	-.984	.162	.000	.263	.000
AA	.529	-.313	.155	.000	.263	.000

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

From table 5.35 above, only disciplinary decision autonomy (DDA) is negatively skewed, implying that the distribution of the variable has a long tail to the left. On the other hand, all the other variables are all positively skewed implying that there's a high tendency of having extreme positive values for all these variables, and the distributions of these variables all have long tails to the right. However, work quality (WQ) also has the longest tail, implying that it has more extreme larger values.

The table also shows that the distributions of all the variables are each platykurtic as their individual kurtosis values are each less than 3, implying that the distributions of the variables are flat relative to the normal distribution. Additionally, both the Kolmogorov-Smirnova and

Shapiro-Wilk tests suggest that all the variables do not follow the normal distribution, hence confirming the low and negative skewness values of each of the variables.

Table 5.36 - Descriptive Statistics of the Variables (All Schools' Data)

VARIABLE	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS	KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOVA		SHAPIRO-WILK	
			Statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.
ASA	.051	-1.301	.149	.000	.927	.000
PD	-.092	-.618	.115	.000	.936	.000
WQ	.412	-1.017	.152	.000	.923	.000
CF	.345	-1.190	.176	.000	.918	.000
SD	.385	-.557	.154	.000	.942	.000
PA	.233	-1.043	.214	.000	.903	.000
DDA	1.085	-.444	.329	.000	.765	.000
PMA	1.018	-.603	.330	.000	.754	.000
FA	.069	-1.046	.143	.000	.941	.000
AA	.140	-.830	.125	.000	.943	.000

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

Table 5.36 depicts that only personal development (PD) is negatively skewed in the combined schools' data, implying that the distribution of each of the variable has a long tail to the left. However, all the other variables are all positively skewed implying that there's a high tendency of having extreme positive values for all these variables, and the distributions of these variables all have long tails to the right. However, Personnel Management autonomy (PMA) has the longest tail, implying that it has more extreme larger values.

The table shows that the distributions of all the variables are each platykurtic as their kurtosis values are each less than 3, implying that the distributions of each of the variables are flat relative to the normal distribution. The Kolmogorov-Smirnova and Shapiro-Wilk tests both suggest that all the variables do not follow the normal distribution, hence confirming the low skewness values of each of the variables.

5.5.1 Test of Hypothesis One

To test hypothesis one, the study estimates the following model:

$$WQ = \beta_0 + \beta_1PA + \beta_2DDA + \beta_3PMA + \beta_4FA + \beta_5AA + \mu_t$$

Evidence from Private Secondary Schools

Table 5.37 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner’s Work Quality

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.542	.908		.597	.552
PA	.286	.131	.260	2.182	.032
DDA	.337	.075	.515	4.523	.000
PMA	.184	.070	.253	2.630	.010
FA	-.166	.102	-.206	-1.633	.107
AA	.436	.097	.578	4.478	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Learners’ Work Quality R ² = 0.391; Adj. R ² = 0.352; F (5, 341) = 10.031, p = 0.000					

Source: Researcher’s Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$WQ = 0.542 + 0.286*PA + 0.337*DDA + 0.184*PMA - 0.166*FA + 0.436*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's work quality in private secondary schools. The result shows that PA, DDA, PMA, and AA each have significantly positive effects on the work quality (WQ) of learners in private secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05. However, financial autonomy (FA) exhibited a negative and insignificant effect on work quality of the learners as its coefficient is negative and the p-value greater than 0.05. Furthermore, accountability autonomy (AA) had the biggest significant positive effect on WQ, influencing it by about 44%, whereas DDA increased WQ by 34%, PA increased WQ by 29%, PMA increased WQ by 18%, while FA caused WQ to decline by 17%. Only the effect of FA on WQ is not consistent with theory both in sign and significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($Adj R^2$) value is 0.352, and suggests that about 35% of the variations in the work quality of learners in private secondary schools were explained by the independent variables. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's work quality in private secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 10.031 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than the 0.05 critical value.

Evidence from Public Secondary Schools

Table 5.38 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Work Quality

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.142	.315		.450	.653
PA	-.069	.071	-.036	-.974	.331
DDA	.417	.041	.330	10.140	.000
PMA	-.021	.040	-.021	-.520	.604
FA	.414	.054	.398	7.621	.000
AA	.369	.038	.416	9.795	.000

b. Dependent Variable: Work Quality

$r^2 = 0.753$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.748$; $F(5, 341) = 156.534$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$WQ = 0.142 - 0.069*PA + 0.417*DDA - 0.021*PMA + 0.414*FA + 0.369*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's work quality in public secondary schools. From the result, DDA, FA, and AA each have significantly positive effects on the work quality (WQ) of learners in public secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05. However, pedagogic autonomy (PA) and personnel management autonomy (PMA) both exhibited negative and insignificant effects on the work quality of the learners as shown by their negative coefficients and individual p-values greater than 0.05. Furthermore, DDA had the biggest significant positive effect on WQ, influencing it by about 42%, whereas FA increased WQ by 41%, AA increased WQ by 37%, while PA and PMA caused WQ to decline by 7% and 2%

respectively. The effects of each of PA and PMA on WQ are not consistent with theory both in sign and significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination (Adj R²) of the model is 0.748, and suggests that about 75% variations in the work quality of learners in public secondary schools are explained by the independent variables. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner’s work quality in public secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 156.534 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from All Schools (Private & Public)

Table 5.39 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner’s Work Quality

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.909	.288		3.155	.002
PA	-.067	.065	-.030	-1.032	.303
DDA	.184	.031	.480	6.011	.000
PMA	-.038	.028	-.113	-1.330	.184
FA	.326	.048	.278	6.794	.000
AA	.397	.038	.404	10.386	.000
c. Dependent Variable: Work Quality					
r ² = 0.764; Adj. r ² = 0.761; F (5, 341) = 221.357, p = 0.000					

Source: Researcher’s Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$WQ = 0.909 - 0.067*PA + 0.184*DDA - 0.038*PMA + 0.326*FA + 0.397*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's work quality in all secondary schools. From the result and similar to the result from public secondary schools, DDA, FA, and AA each have significantly positive effects on the work quality (WQ) of learners in all schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05. However, pedagogic autonomy (PA) and personnel management autonomy (PMA) both exhibited negative and insignificant effects on the work quality of the learners in all secondary schools as shown by their negative coefficients and individual p-values greater than 0.05. Furthermore, AA had the biggest significant positive effect on WQ of learners in all secondary schools, influencing it by about 40%, while FA increased WQ by about 33%, DDA increased WQ by 18%, while PA and PMA caused WQ to decline by 7% and 4% respectively. The effects of each of PA and PMA on WQ are not consistent with theory both in sign and significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($\text{Adj } R^2$) of the model is high at 0.761, and suggests that about 76% variations in the work quality of learners in all secondary schools are explained by the independent variables. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's work quality in all secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 221.357 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Overall, the results show that school autonomy has a far greater positive effect on the work quality of private secondary school learners than on public secondary school learners' work quality. This is because while only financial autonomy impacted negatively on the work quality of private secondary school learners, personnel management autonomy and pedagogic autonomy negatively affected the work quality of learners in public secondary schools. Combined however, the lack of pedagogic autonomy and personnel management autonomy are threats to the work quality of learners in schools in Egbeda local government area of Oyo State.

On evidence from all three results, the null hypothesis one is rejected and the conclusion is that school autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria. The implication of this result is that school autonomy dimensions have statistically significant effect on learners work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. This finding is consistent

with EL Education (2015) that posited that learners work quality can be enhanced through adoption of appropriate pedagogic initiatives.

Similarly, the study of French, Miles and Nathan (2014) revealed that learners from schools with personnel autonomy demonstrate better work quality than schools without such autonomy. Furthermore, the outcome of this study also aligned with the outcomes of similar studies by Lenos, Muralidharan, & Skur, 2017; Neeleman, 2018. Moreover, Hsieh and Hsieh (2019) also found that learners’ work quality is also enhanced by pedagogic autonomy. Neelman (2018) in another similar study found that school autonomy promotes educational outcomes.

5.5.2 Test of Hypothesis Two

To test hypothesis two, the study estimates the following model:

$$ASA = \beta_0 + \beta_1PA + \beta_2DDA + \beta_3PMA + \beta_4FA + \beta_5AA + \mu_t$$

Evidence from Private Secondary Schools

Table 5.40 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner’s Affective Performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.752	.707		2.478	.015
PA	.157	.102	.102	1.541	.127
DDA	-.308	.058	-.335	-5.305	.000
PMA	.893	.055	.877	16.379	.000
FA	.535	.079	.473	6.755	.000
AA	-.549	.076	-.519	-7.241	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Skills Achievement
 $r^2 = 0.812$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.800$; $F(5, 341) = 67.375$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher’s Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$ASA = 1.752 + 0.157*PA - 0.308*DDA + 0.893*PMA + 0.535*FA - 0.549*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's affective performance in private secondary schools. The result shows that PMA, and FA each have significantly positive effects on the affective skills achievement (ASA) of learners in private secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05 while PA exhibited a positive but insignificant effect on ASA.

However, disciplinary decision autonomy (DDA) and accountability autonomy (AA) each exhibited negative but significant effects on affective skills achievement of the learners as their individual coefficients are negative and the p-value greater than 0.05. Furthermore, PMA had the biggest significant positive effect on ASA, influencing it by about 89%, while FA increased ASA by 54%, PA increased ASA by 16% but not significantly. On the other hand, both DDA and AA caused ASA to decline by 31% and 54% respectively and significantly. The effect of PA on ASA is not consistent with theory insignificance, while the negative individual effects of DDA and AA on ASA contradict theory in sign.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination (Adj R²) value is very high at 0.800, and suggests that 80% variations in the affective skills achievement of learners in private secondary schools were explained by the independent sub-variables. Thus the model has a very good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's affective performance in private secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 67.375 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from Public Secondary Schools

Table 5.41 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Affective Performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.966	.446		4.413	.000
PA	.282	.100	.168	2.807	.005
DDA	.156	.058	.142	2.673	.008
PMA	.060	.056	.071	1.075	.284
FA	.710	.077	.786	9.234	.000
AA	-.393	.053	-.512	-7.391	.000

b. Dependent Variable: Affective Skills Achievement
 $r^2 = 0.343$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.331$; $F(5, 341) = 26.870$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$ASA = 1.966 + 0.282*PA + 0.156*DDA + 0.060*PMA + 0.710*FA - 0.393*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's affective performance in public secondary schools. From the result, PA, DDA, and FA each have significantly positive effects on the affective skills achievement (ASA) of learners in public secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their individual coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05 while PMA exhibited a positive but insignificant effect on ASA. However, accountability autonomy (AA) exhibited a negative and insignificant effect on the affective skills achievement of the learners as shown by its negative coefficient and p-value greater than 0.05. Furthermore, FA had the biggest significant positive effect on ASA, influencing it by 71%, whereas PA increased ASA by 28%, DDA increased ASA by 16%, PMA

insignificantly increased ASA by 6%, while AA caused ASA to decline by 39%. The effect of AA on ASA is inconsistent with theory both in sign and significance, while the effect of PMA on ASA is inconsistent with theory in significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination (Adj R²) of the model is fairly good at 0.331, and suggests that about 33% variations in the affective skills achievement of learners in public secondary schools is explained by the independent variables, hence the model has a fairly good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's affective performance in public secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 26.870 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from All Schools (Private & Public)

Table 5.42 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Affective Performance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.180	.369		8.619	.000
PA	.184	.084	.094	2.202	.028
DDA	-.064	.039	-.190	-1.637	.103
PMA	.227	.036	.773	6.274	.000
FA	.518	.061	.502	8.431	.000
AA	-.372	.049	-.432	-7.603	.000
c. Dependent Variable: Affective Skills Achievement					
$r^2 = 0.500$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.492$; $F(5, 341) = 66.085$, $p = 0.000$					

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$ASA = 3.180 + 0.184*PA - 0.064*DDA - 0.227*PMA + 0.518*FA - 0.372*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's affective skills achievement in all secondary schools. From the result, PA, PMA, and FA each have significantly positive effects on the affective skills achievement (ASA) of learners in all schools combined as shown by the positive signs of their individual coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05. However, DDA exhibited a negative and insignificant effect on ASA while AA exhibited a negative but significant effect on the affective skills achievement of the learners in all secondary schools. Furthermore, FA had the biggest significant positive effect on ASA of learners in all secondary schools, influencing it by about 52%, while PMA increased ASA by about 28%, and PA increased ASA by 18%, while DDA and AA caused ASA to decline by 6% and 38% respectively. The effect of DDA on ASA is not consistent with theory both in sign and significance, while the effect of AA on ASA is not consistent with theory in sign.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($\text{Adj } R^2$) of the model is 0.492, and suggests that about 49% variations in the affective skills achievement of learners in all secondary schools were explained by the independent sub-variables, hence the model has a fairly good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's affective performance in all secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 66.085 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Overall, the results show that school autonomy has a far greater positive effect on the affective performance of learners in public secondary schools than on learners in private secondary schools. This is because while disciplinary autonomy remains a threat to the affective performance of learners in all secondary schools, the learners in private secondary schools are also negatively affected by accountability autonomy. Combined, the lack of accountability autonomy is a bane to the affective performance of learners in schools in Egbeda local government area of Oyo State.

On evidence from all three regression results, the null hypothesis two is rejected and the conclusion is that school autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's affective performance in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria. This finding is consistent with the finding of Sugget (2015) that also found that school autonomy has a significant effect on learners' performance.

5.5.3 Test of Hypothesis Three

To test hypothesis three, the study estimates the following model:

$$CF = \beta_0 + \beta_1PA + \beta_2DDA + \beta_3PMA + \beta_4FA + \beta_5AA + \mu_t$$

Evidence from Private Secondary Schools

Table 5.43 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Character Formation

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-1.765	.551		-3.203	.002
PA	.548	.080	.561	6.879	.000
DDA	.209	.045	.360	4.624	.000
PMA	.300	.043	.464	7.047	.000
FA	.077	.062	.108	1.254	.214
AA	.519	.059	.774	8.770	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Character Formation

$r^2 = 0.715$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.697$; $F(5, 341) = 39.186$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$CF = -1.765 + 0.548*PA + 0.209*DDA - 0.300*PMA + 0.077*FA + 0.519*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's character formation in private secondary schools. The result shows that all the variables except FA each had significantly positive effects on the character formation (CF) of learners in private secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05 while FA exhibited a positive but insignificant effect on CF. However, the

intercept of the regression model is negative, and indication that should school autonomy change, the character formation of the students in private secondary schools would decline. Furthermore, FA had the biggest significant positive effect on CF, increasing it by about 55%, whereas AA increased CF by 52%, PMA increased CF by 30%, DDA increased CF by 21%, and FA increased CF by 8%. The effect of FA on CF is inconsistent with theory in significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($Adj R^2$) value is of the model is 0.697, and suggests that about 70% variations in the character formation of learners in private secondary schools is explained by the independent variables, hence the model has a good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's character formation in private secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 39.186 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from Public Secondary Schools

Table 5.44 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Character Formation

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.005	.193		.025	.980
PA	.022	.043	.013	.517	.605
DDA	.047	.025	.040	1.866	.063
PMA	-.119	.024	-.131	-4.890	.000
FA	.353	.033	.367	10.610	.000
AA	.592	.023	.724	25.682	.000
b. Dependent Variable: Character Formation $r^2 = 0.891$; $Adj. r^2 = 0.889$; $F(5, 341) = 421.431$, $p = 0.000$					

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$CF = 0.005 + 0.022*PA + 0.047*DDA - 0.119*PMA + 0.353*FA + 0.592*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's character formation in public secondary schools. From the result, FA and AA had significantly positive effects on the character formation (CF) of learners in public secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05 while PA and DDA had positive but insignificant effects on CF. As noted, PMA exhibited a negative and insignificant effect on the character formation of the learners as shown by its negative coefficient and p-value greater than 0.05. Furthermore, of the positive coefficients, AA had the biggest significant positive effect on CF, increasing it by about 59%, whereas FA increased CF by 35%, DDA increased CF by 5% insignificantly, PA increased CF by 2% insignificantly, while PMA caused CF to decline by 12%. The effect of PMA on CF is not consistent with theory both in sign and significance, while the individual effects of DDA and PA on CF are not consistent with theory in significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($Adj R^2$) of the model is very high at 0.889, and suggests that about 89% variations in the character formation of learners in public secondary schools is explained by the independent variables, hence the model has a very good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's character formation in public secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 421.431 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from All Schools (Private & Public)

Table 5.45 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Character Formation

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.326	.187		1.740	.083
PA	.058	.042	.028	1.378	.169
DDA	.065	.020	.179	3.287	.001
PMA	.036	.018	.115	1.985	.048
FA	.257	.031	.230	8.238	.000
AA	.551	.025	.590	22.198	.000

c. Dependent Variable: Character Formation

$r^2 = 0.890$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.889$; $F(5, 341) = 553.982$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$CF = 0.326 + 0.058*PA + 0.065*DDA + 0.036*PMA + 0.257*FA + 0.551*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's character formation in all secondary schools. From the result all the school autonomy variables except PA each have significantly positive effects on the character formation (CF) of learners in all schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05. PA on the other hand exhibited a positive but insignificant effect on character formation of the learners. Furthermore, AA had the biggest significant positive effect on CF of learners in all secondary schools, increasing it by 55%, while FA increased CF by about 26%, DDA increased CF by 7%, PA increased CF by 6%, and PMA increased CF by 4%. The individual effect of PA on CF is inconsistent with theory in significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($\text{Adj } R^2$) of the model is very high at 0.889, and suggests that about 89% variations in the character formation of learners in all secondary schools are explained by the independent variables. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's character formation in all secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 553.982 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Overall, the results show that school autonomy has a far greater positive effect on private secondary school learners than on public secondary school learners. This is because while school autonomy variables improve the character formation of private secondary school learners, personnel management autonomy causes the character formation of public secondary school learners to decline. Combined, school autonomy improves the character formation of learners in schools in Egbeda local government area of Oyo State.

On evidence from all three results, the null hypothesis three is rejected and the conclusion is that learner's character formation is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. This finding aligns with those of Agbowuro and Daniel (2018), Ofori, Tordzro, Asamoah and Achiaa (2018); Hahn, Wang, and Yang (2018) who noted in their various studies that learners character formation is greatly affected by school autonomy. They noted in their studies that learners from public secondary schools with less autonomy often exhibit low level of discipline compared to their counterparts from private secondary schools with higher autonomy. This was further corroborated by Gotlieb and Noel (2019), who noted that character building is a critical responsibility of educational institutions.

5.5.4 Test of Hypothesis Four

To test hypothesis four, the study estimates the following model:

$$PD = \beta_0 + \beta_1PA + \beta_2DDA + \beta_3PMA + \beta_4FA + \beta_5AA + \mu_t$$

Evidence from Private Secondary Schools

Table 5.46 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Personal Development

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.136	.721		.189	.851
PA	.789	.104	.786	7.572	.000
DDA	.214	.059	.356	3.601	.001
PMA	-.033	.056	-.050	-.594	.555
FA	.128	.081	.173	1.583	.117
AA	.350	.077	.508	4.525	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Personal Development

$r^2 = 0.540$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.510$; $F(5, 341) = 18.283$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$PD = 0.136 + 0.789*PA + 0.214*DDA - 0.033*PMA + 0.128*FA + 0.350*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on the personal development of learners in private secondary schools. The result shows that PA, DDA, and AA each have significantly positive effects on the personal development (PD) of learners in private secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05. However, FA had a positive but insignificant effect on PD while PMA exhibited a negative and insignificant effect on personal development of the learners as its coefficient is negative and the p-value greater than 0.05. Furthermore, PA had the biggest significant positive effect on PD, influencing it as high as about 79%, whereas AA increased PD by 35%, DDA increased PD by 21%, while FA increased PD by 13% although insignificantly

and PMA caused PD to decline by 3%. The effect of PMA on PD is not consistent with theory both in sign and significance, while the effect of FA on PD is not consistent with theory in significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination (Adj R²) value of the model is 0.510, and suggests that 51% variations in the personal development of learners in private secondary schools is explained by the independent variables. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner’s personal development in private secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 18.283 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from Public Secondary Schools

Table 5.47 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner’s Personal Development

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.326	.447		.730	.466
PA	.160	.101	.084	1.595	.112
DDA	.091	.058	.073	1.561	.120
PMA	-.067	.056	-.070	-1.200	.231
FA	.684	.077	.665	8.882	.000
AA	.119	.053	.136	2.236	.026
b. Dependent Variable: Personal Development					
$r^2 = 0.492$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.482$; $F(5, 341) = 49.723$, $p = 0.000$					

Source: Researcher’s Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$PD = 0.326 - 0.160*PA + 0.091*DDA - 0.067*PMA + 0.684*FA + 0.119*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's personal development in public secondary schools. From the result, FA and AA each have significantly positive effects on the personal development (PD) of learners in public secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05. However, PA and DDA exhibited positive but insignificant effects on the personal development of the learners as shown by individual p-values greater than 0.05, while PMA exhibited a negative and insignificant effect on PD as shown by its sign and p-value greater than 0.05.

Furthermore, FA had the biggest significant positive effect on PD, influencing it by about 68%, whereas AA increased PD by 12%, while PA and DDA insignificantly increased PD by 16% and 9% respectively, while PMA caused PD to decline by 7%. The effect of PMA on PD is not consistent with theory both in sign and significance, while the effects of PA and DDA on PD are not consistent with theory in significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($\text{Adj } R^2$) of the model is 0.482, and suggests that 48% of the variations in the personal development of learners in public secondary schools are explained by the independent variables, hence the model has a fairly good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's personal development in public secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 49.723 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from All Schools (Private & Public)

Table 5.48 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner’s Personal Development

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.501	.343		1.461	.145
PA	.225	.078	.110	2.895	.004
DDA	.071	.036	.201	1.945	.053
PMA	.016	.034	.052	.470	.639
FA	.602	.057	.558	10.530	.000
AA	.121	.045	.135	2.671	.008

c. Dependent Variable: Personal Development

$r^2 = 0.604$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.599$; $F(5, 341) = 104.177$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher’s Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$PD = 0.501 + 0.225*PA + 0.071*DDA + 0.016*PMA + 0.602*FA + 0.121*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner’s personal development in all secondary schools. From the result PA, FA, and AA each have positive and significant effects on the personal development (PD) of learners in all secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their individual probability values less than 0.05. However, DDA and PMA each exhibited positive but insignificant effects on the personal development of the learners in all secondary schools as shown by their positive coefficients but individual p-values greater than 0.05.

Furthermore, FA had the biggest significant positive effect on PD of learners in all secondary schools, influencing it by about 60%, whereas PA increased PD by about 23%, and AA increased PD by 12%, while DDA and PMA caused PD to insignificantly increase by 7% and 2% respectively. The effects of each of DDA and PMA on PD are not consistent with theory in significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination (Adj R^2) of the model stands at 0.599, and suggests that about 60% variations in the personal development of learners in all secondary schools are explained by the independent variables, hence the model has a good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's personal development in all secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 104.177 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Overall, the results also show that school autonomy has a far greater significant positive effect on private secondary school learners than on public secondary school learners. This is because more school autonomy variables exhibited insignificant effects on the personal development of public secondary school learners than on the personal development of public secondary school learners. When combined however, DDA and PMA exhibit insignificant effects on the personal development of learners in schools in Egbeda local government area of Oyo State.

On evidence from all three results, the null hypothesis four is rejected and the conclusion is that learner's personal development is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. This outcome agrees with the finding of Caldwell & Spinks, 2013; Hanushek, et al., 2013); OECD (2014) who noted in their respective studies that school autonomy in its various forms affect learners outcomes of which personal development is a part.

5.5.5. Test of Hypothesis Five

To test hypothesis five, the study estimates the following model:

$$SD = \beta_0 + \beta_1PA + \beta_2DDA + \beta_3PMA + \beta_4FA + \beta_5AA + \mu_t$$

Evidence from Private Secondary Schools

Table 5.49 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Social Development

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	4.642	1.532		3.029	.003
PA	-.341	.221	-.196	-1.542	.127
DDA	-.502	.126	-.483	-3.983	.000
PMA	.574	.118	.498	4.854	.000
FA	.399	.172	.312	2.323	.023
AA	-.244	.165	-.204	-1.485	.142

a. Dependent Variable: Social Development

$r^2 = 0.310$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.266$; $F(5, 341) = 7.011$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$SD = 4.642 - 0.341*PA - 0.502*DDA + 0.574*PMA + 0.399*FA - 0.244*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's social development in private secondary schools. The result shows that PMA and AA each have significantly positive effects on the social development (SD) of learners in private secondary schools as shown by the positive signs of their coefficients and their probability values less than 0.05 while DDA exhibited a negative but significant effect on SD. On the other hand, PA and AA each exhibited negative and insignificant effects on the social development of the learners as their individual coefficients are negative and their p-values greater than 0.05.

Furthermore, PMA had the biggest significantly positive effect on SD, influencing it by about 57% whereas FA increased SD by about 40%, PA would significantly reduce SD, while PA and AA caused SD to decline by 34% and 24% respectively. The effects of PA and AA on SD are not consistent with theory both in sign and significance, while the effect of DDA on SD is not consistent with theory in sign.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($Adj R^2$) value is 0.266, and suggests that about 27% variations in the social development of learners in private secondary schools are explained by the independent variables. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's social development in private secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 7.011 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from Public Secondary Schools

Table 5.50 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner's Social Development

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	4.567	.468		9.768	.000
PA	.036	.105	.025	.345	.730
DDA	.052	.061	.054	.848	.397
PMA	.185	.059	.250	3.153	.002
FA	-.104	.081	-.132	-1.290	.198
AA	-.001	.056	-.001	-.018	.986
b. Dependent Variable: Social Development					
$r^2 = 0.053$; $Adj. r^2 = 0.034$; $F(5, 341) = 2.863$, $p = 0.016$					

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$SD = 4.567 + 0.036*PA + 0.052*DDA + 0.185*PMA - 0.104*FA - 0.001*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner's social development in public secondary schools. From the result, only PMA had a significant and positive effect on the social development (SD) of learners in public secondary schools as shown by the positive sign of its coefficient and its probability value less than 0.05. On the other hand, PA and DDA exhibited positive but insignificant effects on SD while FA and AA exhibited negative and insignificant effects on SD.

Furthermore, while PMA significantly increased SD by about 19%, PA and DDA insignificantly increased SD by 4% and 5% respectively. FA and AA however caused SD to decline by 10% and 0.1% respectively. The individual effects of PA and DDA on SD are not consistent with theory in significance, while the individual effects of FA and AA are not consistent with theory in sign and significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($Adj R^2$) of the model is very low at 0.034, and suggests that only 3% variations in the social development of learners in public secondary schools is explained by the independent variables, implying that the independent variables do not sufficiently explain changes in the dependent variable. However, the entire model is still significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's social development in public secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 2.863 and with a significant p-value of 0.016 which is less than 0.05.

Evidence from All Schools (Private & Public)

Table 5.51 - School Autonomy Dimensions and Learner’s Social Development

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	4.718	.393		11.992	.000
PA	.026	.089	.014	.289	.773
DDA	-.052	.042	-.157	-1.237	.217
PMA	.236	.039	.824	6.114	.000
FA	-.111	.066	-.111	-1.700	.090
AA	.005	.052	.006	.098	.922

c. Dependent Variable: Social Development

$r^2 = 0.402$; Adj. $r^2 = 0.394$; $F(5, 341) = 45.926$, $p = 0.000$

Source: Researcher’s Computation using SPSS version 23

The estimated multiple regression result is given as:

$$SD = 4.718 + 0.026*PA - 0.052*DDA + 0.236*PMA - 0.111*FA + 0.005*AA$$

The regression result above shows the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learner’s social development in all secondary schools. From the result and similar to the result from public secondary schools, only PMA has a significantly positive effect on the social development (SD) of learners in all secondary schools as shown by the positive sign of its coefficient and its probability value less than 0.05. However, PA and AA exhibited positive but insignificant effects on SD while DDA and FA exhibited negative and insignificant effects on SD as shown by the signs of their coefficients and their individual p-values greater than 0.05.

Furthermore, AA significantly increased SD by about 24%, while PA and AA increased SD by 3% and 1% respectively, although, insignificantly. However, DDA and FA insignificantly caused SD to decline by 5% and 11% respectively. The effects of each of PA and AA on SD are not consistent with theory in sign, while the effects of each of DDA and FA are not consistent with theory in sign and significance.

Additionally, the coefficient of multiple determination ($Adj R^2$) of the model is 0.394, and suggests that 39% variations in the social development of learners in all secondary schools are explained by the independent variables, hence the model has a fairly good fit. Also, the entire model is significant in explaining the impact of school autonomy dimensions on learner's social development in all secondary schools as depicted by the F-Statistic value of 45.926 and with a significant p-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Overall, the results also show that school autonomy has a far greater significant positive effect on private secondary school learners than on public secondary school learners. This is because more school autonomy variables exhibited insignificant effects on the social development of public secondary school learners than on the personal development of public secondary school learners. Combined however, PMA exhibited significant positive effect on the social development of learners in both schools in Egbeda local government area of Oyo State.

On evidence from all three results, the null hypothesis five was rejected and the conclusion is that school autonomy dimensions have a significant effect on learner's social development in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria. This finding is in line with the thesis of Nneji (2015) who argued that pedagogic autonomy has significant effect on learners' social development.

His study noted that western education as handed down to African countries has offered little help to the growth of the learners social development considering that the resource materials that could be considered more relevant to the development of the learners emotional minds that are relevant to the African setting were grossly lacking and has consequently affected the social development of the learners adversely. Further, in another related study, Husakli and Ekisi (2018) submitted that the school apart from being a platform for learning of diverse subject matters is also a place where learners are expected to develop social and communication skills.

Their study found that school autonomy enhanced the quality of social skills that learners acquire while studying in the schools.

5.6 SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

This study explored the effect of school autonomy dimensions (pedagogic autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, personnel management autonomy, financial autonomy and accountability autonomy) on learners' performance dimensions (affective skills achievement, personal development, work quality, character formation and social development) in secondary schools of Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State in the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Table 5.52 presents the summary of the quantitative findings of the study.

Table 5.52 Summary of Findings from Hypotheses Tested

Hypothesis	Results	Decision
H₁: School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria	Adj. $R^2 = 0.761$ F (5, 341) = 221.357 p = 0.000	H ₁ was not rejected
H₂: School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's affective performance in Egbeda local government schools in Oyo State, Nigeria	Adj. $R^2 = 0.492$ F (5, 341) = 66.085 p = 0.000	H ₁ was not rejected
H₃: Learner's character formation is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria	Adj. $R^2 = 0.889$ F (5, 341) = 553.982 p = 0.000	H ₁ was not rejected
H₄: Learner's personal development is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria	Adj. $R^2 = 0.599$ F (5, 341) = 104.177 p = 0.000	H ₁ was not rejected
H₅: School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State Nigeria	Adj. $R^2 = 0.394$ F (5, 341) = 45.926 p = 0.000	H ₁ was not rejected

5.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter covered the collection and analyses of data collected for the study. The respondents comprised Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments of both private and public secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. The descriptive statistics were used to answer the research questions bothering on the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' performance dimensions while multiple linear regression analyses were used to analyse the data collected to test the five hypotheses which were in line with the research questions of the study. A validated six points Likert type scale self-structured questionnaire was used to collect the data for this study.

Chapter six will present the findings and summary of the study. Recommendations emanating from the findings regarding the approach to be taken by relevant stakeholders in the educational system to optimally exploit the potentials of school autonomy initiative to enhance learners' performance dimensions will also be covered in the sixth chapter

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This study explored the effect of school autonomy on the performance of learners in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. The rationale for the study stemmed from the need to propose strategies for enhancement of learners' performance in secondary schools across various Nigerian States with specific emphasis on Egbeda Local Government in particular. The sixth chapter of the study covered the research findings which included findings from extant literature as reviewed in chapter two which focussed on contextualisation of school autonomy and also chapter three which was devoted to contextualisation of learners' performance as well as the empirical findings of the study which was the focus of chapter five.

The sixth chapter also covered recommendations based on the findings of the study as well as the limitations of the study and their respective mitigation approaches. The chapter also covered suggestions for further studies by way of extending the frontiers of knowledge in the direction of this study. The findings of the study revealed how the various dimensions of school autonomy affect the diverse dimensions of learners' performance. The recommendations emanating from the findings of the study also gave specific stakeholders corresponding responsibilities in the interest of enhancement of the performance of the secondary school learners.

6.2 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The study on the effect of school autonomy on learners in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools of Oyo State was presented in six chapters. The rationale for the study (see Chapter 1.2) was predicated on the need to enhance learners' performance in view of diverse challenges confronting the educational sector across several nations of the world with Nigeria not being an exception. Such challenges include poor educational quality, learners' indiscipline, and poor learners' performance amongst others. Considering how pivotal the role of education is in nation building, the attention of scholars had been drawn to the need to address the diverse issues confronting the development of education in the various nations of the world to enhance

efficiency and effectiveness of the education system thereby improve the performance of learners in the secondary schools of Oyo State of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

The study provides stakeholders in the education system with insights into how to adopt the school autonomy initiative and deploy its varied dimensions to promote the performance dimensions of learners in the Egbeda Local Government area of Oyo State. In the course of carrying out this study, five research questions were formulated. The main research question was, “What effect has school autonomy on learners’ performance in secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria”.

Arising from the main research question, five specific research questions were consequently formulated as follows (see chapter 1.5): the first sub-research question was, “What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners’ affective skills achievement in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria?”

To be able to answer this research question, a number of items were used to measure the constructs of school autonomy and other items were also developed to measure the first construct of learners’ performance – learners’ affective skills achievement.

For the school autonomy dimensions, such items developed to measure them include capacity of the school to exercise discretionary powers to decide on content of the curricular for different subjects, teaching methodology, and method of evaluation of learners (amongst others – see appendix I). The items were to be answered on a six point Likert type scale which ranged from Strongly Disagree (1 point), Disagree (2 points), Partially Disagree (3 points), Partially Agree (4 points), Agree (5 points) to Strongly Agree (6 points).

After measuring the five dimensions of school autonomy in that manner, then the first dimension of learners’ performance (learners’ affective skills achievement) was also measured using literature based indices such as learners’ capacity for sustained attention, speed of information processing, self-control and working memory using the same 6 points response scale as already adopted for the measurement of the school autonomy dimensions as expressed earlier..

This was followed by the second sub-research question which was stated as follows: “What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners’ personal development in Egbeda local

government schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?” Since the school autonomy dimensions have been already measured, the construct to be measured to be able to answer this second research question is the learners’ affective performance. The approach also followed the earlier approach for measuring the earlier constructs measured. The indices used to measure learners’ personal development are: articulated plan for learners’ future, management of learners’ feelings, learners’ self-awareness skills, spiritual development level, learners’ persona hygiene and learners’ physical development.

The third sub-research question was, “How is learners’ work quality affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria? The items used to measure this constructs are learners approach to answering questions posed in class, learners’ tenacity with their work, quality of note taking by learners, learners’ writing accuracy and learners’ work organisation.

The fourth sub-research question was, “What effect has school autonomy on learners’ character formation?” To be able to answer this research question, the learners’ character formation construct was measured using the following indices: learners’ courtesy, learners’ compliance with established regulations, learners’ decorous, learners’ kindness and learners’ attitude toward helping others.

The final sub-research question was, “What is the effect of school autonomy on learners’ social development?” In order to answer the fifth sub-research question, we measured learners’ social development construct using the following items: learners’ social adjustment level, learners’ social groups coordination, learners’ mutual trust for one another, learners’ inter group cohesion and learners’ level of gender discrimination among genders.

The first chapter of this study focused on the framework that guided the study. The chapter covered the motivation for the study (see chapter 1.2), background to the study (see chapter 1.3), statement of the problem (see chapter 1.4), the research questions and sub-questions addressed by the study (see chapter 1.5), hypotheses formulation (see chapter 1.6), the main objectives and sub-aims of the study (see chapter 1.7), contribution of the study (see chapter 1.8), and the research design adopted for the study (see chapter 1.9). The chapter also delineated the basis of

the research questions and associated objectives the types of data required for the study, the sources of those data, who will be responsible for collection and how the data will be collected to be able to address the concern of the study which centered on school autonomy and learners' performance in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria.

Chapter two of this study covered the conceptualisation of school autonomy. The review of literature revealed the dimensions of school autonomy such as autonomy in financial decisions, in hiring and firing of employees, in criteria and mode of assessment of learners, in responsibility for actions taken or not taken, in what to teach the learners and how to teach what to teach amongst others. Theories that are relevant to the study which focused on school autonomy and learners performance were reviewed. These are theory of financial autonomy, pedagogic theory, theory of discipline, behaviourist model and accountability theory.

The third chapter focused on the conceptualisation of learners' performance and its possible link with school autonomy. The literature review showed dimensions of learners' performance to include learners' work quality, affective performance, character formation, personal development and social development. The chapter further reviewed empirical works in line with the study research questions and objectives to enhance discussion of the study in chapter five. The empirical works reviewed were school autonomy and learners' work quality (see chapter 3.4.2), school autonomy and learners' affective performance (see chapter 3.4.3), school autonomy and learners' character formation (see chapter 3.4.4), school autonomy and learners' personal development (see chapter 3.4.5) and school autonomy and learners' social development (see chapter 3.4.6).

Chapter four covered the research methodology that was adopted for the study. The chapter discussed the research paradigm and approach followed by the study (see chapter 4.2.2). Being a quantitative study, the positivist paradigm was adopted for the study as supported by Neuman (2011). Also, the cross-sectional survey research design was adopted for data collection in line with the research questions and objectives. This approach enabled me to collect data with a six point Likert type scale questionnaire from the sample that was used for the study which

comprised Secondary school Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of the various Departments of the schools selected for the study (see chapter 4.7.2).

The chapter also covered validity, reliability of the research instrument which established its fitness for purpose (see chapter 4.8). Issues relating to ethical considerations in line with the UNISA policy on approach and guidelines and principles followed when data collection is required from human participants (see chapter 4.9).

Chapter five was focused on analyses of data collected from the respondents. The analyses helped me to answer the research questions (see chapter 1.5), it assisted to test the formulated hypotheses for the study (see chapter 1.6) and also helped to achieve the objectives as outlined in chapter one (see chapter 1.7). The datasets collected from the secondary schools selected for the study from Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria were sorted on the basis of type of school. The datasets were sorted first into two namely: private secondary schools dataset and public secondary schools dataset.

This is to enable the researcher to do a comparative analysis of the outcomes of the data analyses for a clearer understanding and appreciation of how school autonomy dimensions affected learners' performance in the different types of schools covered by the study. The analyses proceeded in three parts as presented as follows: The first sets of analyses focused on private schools covered by the study, the second sets focused on public secondary schools while the third set of analyses focused on both private and public secondary schools combined in the analyses. These analyses revealed the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' performance as contained in chapter one of this study.

The biographical analyses presented in frequency tables showed that there are more female than male respondents in the private and public schools covered by the study. The implication of this is that teaching as a profession is more preferable to female than to male. The teaching experience statistics revealed that there were no respondents in the 11-20 years of experience category in the private school unlike in the public schools. The implication here is that the public schools have better staff mix by cadre than private schools which puts the public schools at an advantage in terms of efficiency of service delivery. The salary grade level statistics also

revealed that the private schools have none of the respondents at level 16 unlike the public that has a considerable number of the respondents on grade level 16.

This implies that staff motivation is higher in the public secondary schools compared to their private counterparts. The statistics on academic qualification and status showed that the public secondary schools covered by the study have Heads of Departments while the Vice Principals in the private schools doubled as the Heads of Departments for the private schools which has the implication that career progression is poor in the private schools compared to the public schools. The statistics on rural and urban location of schools revealed that more schools are located within the rural areas more than the urban areas. This suggested that the populace and land mass are more in the rural than in the urban.

The descriptive statistics were used to answer the research questions of the study. The grand mean statistics in the school autonomy dimensions tables were compared with the average means of each of the learners' performance constructs to answer each of the five research questions of the study.

The inferential analyses were preceded by diagnostic tests to affirm the fitness of the data for the multiple linear regression analyses. The Skewness, Kurtosis, Kolmogorov-Smirnova and Shapiro-Wilk tests were carried out to affirm that the datasets were good enough to be subjected to multiple linear regression analytical technique (see chapter five table 5.34)

After the diagnostic tests, the data set were subjected to inferential analyses in three parts as was done in the case of the descriptive analyses. The analyse were carried out with analyses of dataset extracted for private secondary schools, followed by analyses of the public school dataset and finally analyses of both private and public secondary schools combined for the study. The results of the inferential analyses were used for the hypotheses tested. The outcomes of the hypotheses tested were presented in the next section of this report.

6.3 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

6.3.1 INTRODUCTION

The findings that emanated from the study were summarised as presented in the net section of this thesis. The analyses that resulted in the findings were guided by the sub-research questions

of the study (see chapter 1.5). Since the analyses for each of the sub-research questions were done in three steps, the results enabled the researcher to compare the findings as it relates to private and public type of secondary schools covered by the study.

The discussion of the findings made it possible for the researcher to compare to compare the conceptual, theoretical and empirical findings of the study as presented in chapter five. This made it possible to find the nexus between the directions of the literature compared to the direction of the results obtained after analyses of the research data in chapter five which enabled the researcher to provide informed recommendations arising from the findings arising from the analyses of the effect of school autonomy dimensions on the dimensions of learners' performance in secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria in order to enhance performance of learners in the secondary schools of the Egbeda Local Government of the State.

6.3.2 Findings in relation to research sub-question one

Re-statement of research sub-question one:

What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria?

The first research sub-question one was aimed at determining the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' work quality in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. The theoretical review of literature in chapter two (see chapter 2.2.7) indicated that there is a nexus between school autonomy and learners' work quality. Theory argue in favour of school autonomy dimensions having a positive effect on learners' work quality thus enabled the researcher to formulate question items that were used to test the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' work quality using a six points Likert type questionnaire.

The question items used to measure the school autonomy dimensions were captured in the section B of the questionnaire (see appendix I). The school autonomy dimensions were measured from the responses of the Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments of the secondary schools covered by the study within Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State,

The findings of the hypothesis one tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners work quality to varying extents in private secondary schools with the following coefficients (Pedagogic autonomy = 0.286; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.337; Personnel management autonomy = 0.814; Financial autonomy = - 0.166; Accountability autonomy = 0.436; see table 5.37) . These statistics showed that accountability autonomy had the highest effect on learners' work quality followed by disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy, personnel management autonomy and financial autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a significant effect on learners' work quality with F-statistics = 10.031, Adj R² = 0.352 and p = 0.000.

In the case of the public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis one tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners work quality to varying extents in public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.417; Financial autonomy = 0.414; Accountability autonomy = 0.369; Pedagogic autonomy = - 0.069; Personnel management autonomy = - 0.021; see table 5.38). These statistics showed that disciplinary decision autonomy had the highest effect on learners' work quality followed by financial autonomy, accountability autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and personnel management autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a significant effect on learners' work quality with F-statistics = 156.534, Adj R² = 0.748 and p = 0.000. This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have higher effect on learners' work quality in public secondary schools compared to private secondary schools.

In the case of the data for the combined private and public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis one tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners work quality to varying extents in both private and public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Accountability autonomy = 0.397; Financial autonomy = 0.326; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.184; Pedagogic autonomy = - 0.067; Personnel management autonomy = - 0.038; see table 5.39). These statistics showed that accountability autonomy had the highest effect on learners' work quality followed by financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and personnel management autonomy in that order.

On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a significant effect on learners' work quality with F-statistics = 221.357 Adj R² = 0.761 and p = 0.000. This revealed

that school autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learners' work quality in both private and public secondary schools hence the hypothesis one was not rejected. This finding is consistent with both theoretical and empirical reviews in chapter two.

In view of the findings of this study with respect to hypothesis one, it is recommended that the education authorities should make policy provision to make school management more accountable for the running of their various schools given that the accountability autonomy statistics is the highest at 0.397 coefficient. The authorities will only be engaged in monitoring their level of compliance with expectations.

6.3.3 Findings in relation to research sub-question two

Re-statement of research sub-question two:

Re-statement of the second research sub-question

What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' affective performance in Egbeda local government schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

The second research sub-question was aimed at determining the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' affective performance in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. The theoretical review of literature in chapter two (see chapter 2.2.7) indicated that learners' affective performance can be affected by school autonomy dimensions. Theory argue in favour of school autonomy dimensions having a positive effect on learners' affective performance thus enabled the researcher to formulate question items that were used to test the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' affective performance using a six points Likert type questionnaire.

The question items used to measure the school autonomy dimensions were captured in the section B of the questionnaire (see appendix I). The school autonomy dimensions were measured from the responses of the Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments of the secondary schools covered by the study within Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State,

The findings of the hypothesis two tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners' affective performance to varying extents in private secondary schools with the following coefficients (Personnel management autonomy = 0.893; Accountability autonomy = - 0.549; Financial autonomy = 0.525; Disciplinary decision autonomy = - 0.308; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.157; see table 5.40). These statistics showed that personnel management autonomy had the highest effect on learners' affective performance followed by accountability autonomy, financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy and pedagogic autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a significant effect on learners' affective performance with F-statistics = 67.375, Adj. R^2 = 0.800 and p = 0.000.

In the case of the public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis two tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners affective performance to varying extents in public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Financial autonomy = 0.710; Accountability autonomy = - 0.393; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.282; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.156; Personnel management autonomy = 0.060; see table 5.41). These statistics showed that financial autonomy had the highest effect on learners' work quality followed by accountability autonomy, pedagogic autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy and personnel management autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a significant effect on learners' affective performance with F-statistics = 26.870, Adj. R^2 = 0.331 and p = 0.000. This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have higher effect on learners' affective performance in public secondary schools compared to private secondary schools.

In the case of the data for the combined private and public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis two tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners affective performance to varying degrees in both private and public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Financial autonomy = 0.518; Accountability autonomy = - 0.372; Personnel management autonomy = 0.227; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.184; Disciplinary decision autonomy = - 0.064; see table 5.42). These statistics showed that financial autonomy had the highest effect on learners' affective performance followed by accountability autonomy, personnel management autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and disciplinary decision autonomy in

that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a significant effect on learners' affective performance with F-statistics = 66.085 Adj. $R^2 = 0.492$ and $p = 0.000$.

This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learners' affective performance in both private and public secondary schools hence the hypothesis one was not rejected. This finding is consistent with both theoretical and empirical reviews in chapter two.

In view of the findings of this study with respect to hypothesis two, it is recommended that the education authorities should make policy provision to enhance the financial autonomy of school management this will enable the individual local school to exercise discretionary powers to be able to prioritise their expenditure decisions in line with their pressing needs considering that financial autonomy had the highest regression coefficient.

The authorities will only be engaged in monitoring their level of compliance with procedural steps to guide such decisions.

6.3.4 Findings in relation to research sub-question three

Re-statement of research sub-question three:

Re-statement of the third research sub-question

How is learners' character formation affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

The third research sub-question was aimed at determining the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' character formation in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. The theoretical review of literature in chapter two (see chapter 2.2.7) indicated that learners' character formation can be affected by school autonomy dimensions. Theory argue in favour of school autonomy dimensions having a positive effect on learners' character formation thus enabled the researcher to formulate question items that were used to test the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' character formation using a six points Likert type questionnaire.

The question items used to measure the school autonomy dimensions were captured in the section B of the questionnaire (see appendix I). The school autonomy dimensions and learners' character formation were measured from the responses of the Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments of the secondary schools covered by the study within Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State,

The findings of the hypothesis three tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners' character formation to varying extents in private secondary schools with the following coefficients (Pedagogic autonomy = 0.548; Accountability autonomy = 0.519 Personnel management autonomy = 0.300; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.209; Financial autonomy = 0.077; see table 5.43). These statistics showed that pedagogic autonomy had the highest effect on learners' affective performance followed by accountability autonomy, personnel management autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy and financial autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a combined significant effect on learners' character formation with F-statistics = 39.186, Adj R^2 = 0.697 and p = 0.000.

In the case of the public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis three tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners character formation to varying extents in public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Accountability autonomy = 0.592 Financial autonomy = 0.353; Personnel management autonomy = - 0.119; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.047; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.022; see table 5.44). These statistics showed that accountability autonomy had the highest effect on learners' work quality followed by financial autonomy, personnel management autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy and disciplinary decision autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a significant effect on learners' character formation with F-statistics = 421.431, Adj R^2 = 0.891 and p = 0.000. This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have higher effect on learners' character formation in public secondary schools compared to private secondary schools.

In the case of the data for the combined private and public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis three tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners character formation to varying degrees in both private and public secondary schools with the

following coefficients (Accountability autonomy = 0.551; Financial autonomy = 0.257; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.065; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.058; Personnel management autonomy = 0.036; see table 5.45). These statistics showed that accountability autonomy had the highest effect on learners' character formation followed by financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and personnel management autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a combined significant effect on learners' character formation with F-statistics = 553.982 Adj R² = 0.889 and p = 0.000. This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learners' character formation in both private and public secondary schools hence the hypothesis three was not rejected. This finding is consistent with both theoretical and empirical reviews in chapter two.

In view of the findings of this study with respect to hypothesis three and considering that the coefficient of disciplinary decision autonomy was next highest following accountability and financial autonomy dimensions, the study recommends that the secondary school education authorities should grant secondary school management appreciable quantum of disciplinary decision covering both staff and students. A situation where most disciplinary decisions on students and staff reside with the education authorities is not in the best interest of the progress of the school and particularly will not make disciplinary decisions to be effective if the local schools do not have the requisite mandate to apply disciplinary measures to staff and students without recourse to the education ministry for ratification and implementation.

6.3.5 Findings in relation to research sub-question four

Re-statement of research sub-question four:

Re-statement of the fourth research sub-question

What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

The fourth research sub-question was aimed at determining the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. The theoretical review of literature in chapter two (see chapter 2.2.7.4)

indicated that learners' personal development can be affected by school autonomy dimensions. Theory argue in favour of school autonomy dimensions having a positive effect on learners' personal development thus enabled the researcher to formulate question items that were used to test the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development using a six points Likert type questionnaire.

The question items used to measure the school autonomy dimensions and learners' personal development were captured in the section B of the questionnaire (see appendix I). The school autonomy dimensions and learners' personal development constructs were measured from the responses of the Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments of the secondary schools covered by the study within Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State,

The findings of the hypothesis four tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners' personal development to varying extents in private secondary schools with the following coefficients (Pedagogic autonomy = 0.789; Accountability autonomy = 0.350; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.214; Financial autonomy = 0.128; Personnel management autonomy = - 0.033; see table 5.46). These statistics showed that pedagogic autonomy had the highest effect on learners' affective performance followed by accountability autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, financial autonomy and personnel management autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a combined significant effect on learners' personal development with F-statistics = 18.283, Adj R^2 = 0.510 and $p = 0.000$.

In the case of the public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis two tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners affective performance to varying extents in public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Financial autonomy = 0.684; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.160; Accountability autonomy = 0.119; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.091; Personnel management autonomy = - 0.067; see table 5.47). These statistics showed that financial autonomy had the highest effect on learners' work quality followed by pedagogic autonomy, accountability autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy and personnel management autonomy in that order.

On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a combined significant effect on learners' affective performance with F -statistics = 49.723, $Adj R^2 = 0.482$ and $p = 0.000$. This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have higher effect on learners' affective performance in public secondary schools compared to private secondary schools.

In the case of the data for the combined private and public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis four tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners personal development to varying degrees in both private and public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Financial autonomy = 0.602; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.225; Accountability autonomy = 0.121; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.071; Personnel management autonomy = 0.0016; see table 5.48). These statistics showed that financial autonomy had the highest effect on learners' personal development followed by pedagogic autonomy, accountability autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy and personnel management autonomy in that order.

On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a joint significant effect on learners' affective performance with F -statistics = 104.177 $Adj R^2 = 0.599$ and $p = 0.000$. This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have combined significant effect on learners' personal development in both private and public secondary schools hence the hypothesis four was not rejected. This finding is consistent with both theoretical and empirical reviews in chapter two.

In view of the findings of this study with respect to hypothesis four, the results showed that the regression coefficient of pedagogic autonomy is next to that of financial autonomy in enhancing learners' personal development. In view of this result, it is recommended that the regulators of secondary school education should grant the individual local secondary school management improved pedagogic autonomy as this will give them the opportunity to decide on what to teach, how to teach and evaluate the learners performance in line with their available resources and capability. This will enhance the learners' personal development.

6.3.6 Findings in relation to research sub-question five

Re-statement of research sub-question five:

Re-statement of the fifth research sub-question

What effect has school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

The fifth research sub-question was aimed at determining the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development in Egbeda Local Government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. The theoretical review of literature in chapter two (see chapter 2.2.7.5) indicated that learners' social development can be affected by school autonomy dimensions. Theory argue in favour of school autonomy dimensions having a positive effect on learners' social development thus enabled the researcher to formulate question items that were used to test the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development using a six points Likert type questionnaire.

The question items used to measure the school autonomy dimensions and learners' social development were captured in the section B of the questionnaire (see appendix I). The school autonomy dimensions and learners' social development constructs were measured from the responses of the Principals, Vice Principals and Heads of Departments of the secondary schools covered by the study within Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State.

The findings of the hypothesis five tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners' social development to varying degrees in private secondary schools with the following coefficients (Personnel management autonomy = 0.574; Disciplinary decision autonomy = - 0.502; Financial autonomy = 0.399; Pedagogic autonomy = - 0.341; Accountability autonomy = - 0.244; see table 5.49). These statistics showed that personnel management autonomy had the highest effect on learners' social development followed by disciplinary decision autonomy, financial autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and accountability autonomy in that order.

On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a combined significant effect on learners' social development with F-statistics = 7.011, Adj R^2 = 0.266 and p = 0.000.

In the case of the public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis five tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners social development to varying extents in public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Personnel management autonomy = 0.185; Financial autonomy = - 0.104; Disciplinary decision autonomy = 0.052; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.036; Accountability autonomy = - 0.001; see table 5.50). These statistics showed that personnel management autonomy had the highest effect on learners' social development followed by financial autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and accountability autonomy in that order.

On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a combined significant effect on learners' affective performance with F-statistics = 2.863, Adj. R^2 = 0.034 and p = 0.016. The f-statistics revealed that school autonomy dimensions have higher effect on learners' social development in private secondary schools compared to public secondary schools.

However, in the case of the data for the combined private and public secondary schools, the findings of the hypothesis five tested revealed that each of the school autonomy dimensions affected learners social development to varying degrees in both private and public secondary schools with the following coefficients (Personnel management autonomy = 0.236; Financial autonomy = - 0.111; Disciplinary decision autonomy = - 0.052; Pedagogic autonomy = 0.026; Accountability autonomy = 0.005; see table 5.51).

These statistics showed that personnel management autonomy had the highest effect on learners' social development followed by financial autonomy, pedagogic autonomy and accountability autonomy in that order. On a combined note, all the school autonomy dimensions do have a joint significant effect on learners' social development with F-statistics = 45.926; Adj. R^2 = 0.394 and p = 0.000. This revealed that school autonomy dimensions have combined significant effect on learners' social development in both private and public secondary schools hence the hypothesis four was not rejected. This finding is consistent with both theoretical and empirical reviews in chapter two.

In view of the findings of this study with respect to hypothesis five, the study recommends that regulatory authorities should make policy provision that will empower local school with greater discretionary hiring and firing powers considering that personnel management coefficient is the highest among the various school autonomy dimensions with respect to its effect on learners' social development.

6.3.7 Conclusion

In view of the findings from both the literature and empirics coupled with the findings of this study, it is evident that school autonomy dimensions have remarkable positive effect on the dimensions of learners' performance covered by this study. By virtue of the findings of this study also, the main and sub-research questions set out in chapter 1.5 have been answered. This means that the goal of determining the effect of school autonomy dimensions on dimensions of learners' performance had been consequently achieved. The next section of this thesis contained the recommendations flowing from each of the sub-research questions of the study.

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STUDY

6.4.1 Introduction

This section of thesis enabled me to provide informed recommendations arising from the findings of the study through the answers that were provided to each of the sub-research questions covered by this study. The recommendations were submitted as panacea to promote and improve learners' performance by adoption of the school autonomy initiative.

6.4.2 Recommendation with respect to sub-research question one: What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' work quality in secondary schools in Egbeda local government of Oyo State in Nigeria?

In relation to sub-research question one, the study found that school autonomy affected learners' work quality in both private and public secondary schools. However, the effect is higher in public secondary schools compared to private secondary schools. When both schools are

combined, the results indicated that for both secondary schools, accountability autonomy is the school autonomy dimension with the highest coefficient than the other dimensions of school autonomy. Thus, it is recommended that the education authorities should make policy provision that will engender an atmosphere where accountability of the local schools is encouraged.

By this arrangement, level of accountability of the individual school authority will be improved and when the school Principals are held accountable the better the learners' work quality that can be elicited from the learners. The implication of this recommendation is that school Principals will be made to be more accountable for the activities of the school and when that happens, the Principals will be obliged to take firmer grip of the management of the school activities as this will promote learners' work quality accordingly.

6.4.3 Recommendation with respect to sub-research question two: What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' affective performance in Egbeda local government schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

With regard to the second sub-research question, the findings showed that school autonomy has greater effect on learners' affective performance in private secondary schools compared to public secondary schools. However, the combined private and public secondary schools data analyses revealed that school autonomy dimensions had considerable effect on secondary schools learners' affective performance. The dimension with the highest coefficient amongst all the dimensions covered is financial autonomy.

The implication of this finding is that the higher the financial autonomy granted to the management of secondary schools, the higher the affective performance of the learners. Thus in view of these findings, the study recommends that policy regulators of secondary education system should make policy provision that will grant local school management appreciable level of financial autonomy as this has been found to boost learners affective performance.

6.4.4 Recommendation with respect to sub-research question three: How is learner's character formation affected by school autonomy dimensions in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

The results of the analyses of data relating to the third sub-research question showed that school autonomy dimensions have considerable effect on learners' character formation secondary schools. The study found that while school autonomy affected learners' character formation in both private and public secondary schools, the results showed that the effect is more public secondary schools compared to the private secondary schools.

Moreover, the findings further revealed that apart from accountability and financial autonomy that were found to enhance learners' work quality and learners' affective performance respectively, disciplinary decision autonomy was found to have remarkable contribution to learners character formation in both private secondary schools as well as public secondary schools hence, the study recommends that the secondary schools education authority should be granted increased disciplinary decision autonomy by the secondary school regulatory authority as this will boost learners' character formation in line with theoretical framework presented in chapter two

6.4.5 Recommendation with respect to sub-research question four: What is the effect of school autonomy dimensions on learners' personal development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

The results of the analyses in line with sub-research question four showed that while school autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learners personal development in secondary schools, the effect is more in the case of public secondary schools learners compared to their private secondary schools counterparts (see tables 5.46 & 5.47). However, the results further revealed that school autonomy dimensions have considerable effect on personal development of learners in both private secondary schools as well as private secondary schools. Aside from the contribution of accountability, financial autonomy dimensions, pedagogic autonomy was the next highest predictor of learners' personal development in both private and public secondary schools (see table 5.48).

In view of these findings, the study recommends that the Ministry of Education and Local education authority should support a review of pedagogic policy to enable local school to have higher discretionary powers in matters of pedagogic responsibilities such as what to teach, how to teach, how to evaluate and resourceful materials to adopt. The responsibility of the regulatory authorities will be in the form of ensuring that the measures being taken are up to required standard.

6.4.6 Recommendation with respect to sub-research question five: What effect has school autonomy dimensions on learners' social development in Egbeda local government secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria?

The results of the analyses in line with sub-research question five showed that while school autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learners social development in secondary schools, the effect is more in the case of public secondary schools learners compared to their private secondary schools counterparts (see tables 5.46 & 5.47). However, the results further revealed that school autonomy dimensions have considerable effect on personal development of learners in both private secondary schools as well as private secondary schools. Aside from the contribution of accountability, financial and pedagogic autonomy dimensions, personnel management autonomy had a significant effect on the personal development of learners in both private and public secondary schools (see table 5.48).

In view of these findings, the study recommends that the Ministry of Education and Local education authority should support a review of personnel management policy to enable local school to have higher discretionary powers in matters of personnel management responsibilities such as recruitment, motivational drives and capacity building. This step will enhance the personal development of the learners in both private and public secondary schools accordingly.

6.5 CONTRIBUTION AND MAIN OUTCOMES OF THE STUDY

6.5.1 Introduction

In the course of working through the data that were gathered in chapter 5, it was apparent that the findings and recommendations from this study can be structured and used for the enhancement of the various dimensions of learners' performance in line with school autonomy theories. All the five dimensions of school autonomy were found to jointly affect each of the five dimensions of learners' performance covered by this study. However, the relative effect of each of the school autonomy dimensions on each of the learners' performance dimensions vary. The implication of this is that application of the school autonomy dimensions should be selectively done depending on which of the learners' performance dimensions is to be prioritised. The next section will focus on the contribution of the study to extant knowledge.

6.5.2 Contribution to knowledge

This study contributes significantly to knowledge in four main ways namely conceptual, theoretical, empirical and methodological contributions.

6.5.2.1 Conceptual contribution

This study contributes to concept in two main ways. Firstly, the study in combining five dimensions each for school autonomy separately and also for learners' performance separately gave rise to a conceptual assemblage of dimensions of the two main variables of the study namely school autonomy and learners' performance. This is a significant contribution as many of the previous studies have not so assemble these dimensions in this manner but match the variables on a one-to-one basis.

Secondly, this study also made significant contribution to concept through the research instrument that was self-developed for the purpose of collecting the data that were required to measure each of the five constructs of the main dependent and main independent variables respectively. This research instrument (see appendix I) outlined the question items that were

developed from the review of literature on each of the items that were used to measure each of the five respective constructs of the main study dependent and independent variables. This instrument will be available on request for other researchers who may be interested in similar study but under a different set of conditions as may be desirable.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part (biographic section had seven items as follows: gender, years of experience, salary grade level, highest academic qualification, status (position in school), geographical location of school and type of school.

The second section contained the question items for measuring each of the five constructs of the school autonomy dimensions and each of the five constructs of learners' performance as follows: the first construct of school autonomy captured on the instrument is pedagogic autonomy. Pedagogic autonomy is the extent to which local school authority can decide on the curriculum, method of teaching and evaluation and promotion criteria without recourse to the secondary school regulatory authority.

The items developed for its measurement are numbers eight to 12 which are capacity to take decision on curriculum content for different subjects, capacity to take decision on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners, capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners' performance, capacity to take decision on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners and capacity to take decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners.

The second construct of school autonomy is disciplinary decision autonomy. This is the capacity of the local school authority to discipline any student for any unbecoming attitude. The items used to measure this construct are: capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to the education authority, capacity to deal with cases of learner's misdemeanour unilaterally, authority to suspend an erring learner and capacity to dismiss unrepentant learner. The third school autonomy construct is personnel management autonomy which deals with the capacity of the school based management to exercise discretionary power over employment and personnel related matters. This construct was measured with the following items: capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands, capacity to fix remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate, capacity to right size the workforce as may be

considered needful, capacity to influence the personnel to be recruited into the service of the school and power to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties.

The fourth construct of school autonomy is financial autonomy. This is the discretionary powers of local school authority to raise funds and expend same as considered needful. The items used to measure this construct are as follows: capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time, capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school, capacity to implement budget approved for running the school, control over budget planning and discretionary control over fund raising decisions.

The fifth dimension of school autonomy covered by the research instrument is accountability autonomy. This autonomy is concerned with the extent to which the local school authority is accountable for the process of running their respective school. To measure this construct, the following items were used. Transparency of the decision making process, approach to handling of criticisms from both staff and learners on how the school is being managed, prudence in financial matters, regularity of periodical meetings to jointly determine how funds are spent in the school and transparency in the financial administration of the school.

The next aspect of the questionnaire is the dependent variable section with its dimensions. The dependent variable has five constructs that were used to measure it. These constructs and their individual measuring items are as follows: the first dimension of learners' performance is learners' work quality. This construct measures how organised are the learners in putting their thoughts across either in writing or otherwise. The items used to measure learners' work quality are as follows: how impressive are learners' answers to questions asked in class, how hardworking are learners?, comprehensiveness of learners' class notes during class sessions, preponderance of mistakes in learners' work and learners' work organisation.

The second construct of learners' performance is learners' affective performance. This construct measures how emotionally stable are the learners. Emotional stability is critical to the success of a learner and as such is considered very relevant to this study. The items used to measure the learners' affective performance construct are as follows: capacity for sustained attention, speed of information processing, cognitive flexibility, level of self – control, memory capacity and articulated plan for their future.

The third construct of learners' performance captured in the questionnaire is learners' character formation. This is about attitude to life as an attribute that is pivotal to the progress that a learner can possibly record with time. This construct was measured using the following items: courteous in interactions with other people, compliance with rules and regulations, politeness in dealing with people, decency in conducts within and out of school, kindness in dealing with people and learners' readiness to help others.

The fourth construct of learners' performance measured by the instrument is learners' personal development. This construct measures the level of maturity demonstrated by the learners in the course of interacting with other people. This attribute is germane to anyone who hoped to make remarkable progress in life. The items used to measure this construct are as follows: articulated plan for the future, ability to manage own feelings, level of self-confidence, level of self-awareness, level of spiritual development, personal hygiene level and Learners' physical development.

The fifth dimension of learners' development measured by the instrument is learners' social development. This is a measure of how well the learner gets along with other people. This is a critical factor that can significantly determine the level of progress a learner can make. This is because on a general note man is a social being and as such need to learn to get along well with others to progress steadily in life. This construct was measured by the following items: level of social adjustment, involvement in group coordination, level of trust for group members and contribution to group cohesion, discriminatory tendency.

6.5.2.2 Theoretical contribution

The contribution of this study to theory is established through its agreement with each of the theories reviewed in this study. This is evident in the comparison of the dictates of the theories reviewed which posit that school autonomy dimensions individually and collectively affect each of the learners' performance dimensions. This theoretical position was corroborated by the findings of the study that affirmed that school autonomy dimensions affect learners' performance dimensions by virtue of which all the five hypotheses of this study were sustained as none of them was rejected as summarised in table 6.1 hereunder.

Table 6.1 Summary of hypotheses tested

S/N	Hypothesis	Results	Decision
1	School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's work quality	Adj. $r^2 = 0.761$; $F(5, 341) = 221.357$, $p = 0.000$	Hypothesis not rejected
2	School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's affective performance	Adj. $r^2 = 0.492$; $F(5, 341) = 66.085$, $p = 0.000$	Hypothesis not rejected
3	Learner's character formation is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions	Adj. $r^2 = 0.889$; $F(5, 341) = 553.982$, $p = 0.000$	Hypothesis not rejected
4	Learner's personal development is significantly affected by school autonomy dimensions	Adj. $r^2 = 0.599$; $F(5, 341) = 104.177$, $p = 0.000$	Hypothesis not rejected
5	School autonomy dimensions have significant effect on learner's social development	Adj. $r^2 = 0.394$; $F(5, 341) = 45.926$, $p = 0.000$	Hypothesis not rejected

The outcome of the tested hypotheses summarised in the above table affirmed the theoretical contribution of the study.

6.5.2.3 Empirical contribution

This study contributes to empirics through each of the findings in respect of each sub-research question and hypothesis. This study presented five findings that emanated from the data analyses results as reported in chapter five. Other researchers that considered the findings of this study relevant to their work will be able to review the findings of this study on the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance of secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria and alongside other similar or necessary empirical studies that may have to be reviewed by such researchers.

Furthermore, this study also contributes to empirics as it contributes to the stock of studies in the area of school autonomy and learners' performance in secondary schools in a developing country like Nigeria. Many of the previous studies in this regard have rather focussed on countries outside of Africa (Sholderer, 2017; Maching & Vermolt, 2011; OECD, 2013; OECD, 2011) whilst this study is one of the few that were focussed in a country Africa – Nigeria hence the study contributes to empirical knowledge.

6.5.2.4 Methodological contribution

This study also contributes to methodology by its novel approach of disaggregating the main variables of the study while many of the earlier studies took the aggregated approach (Steinberg, 2014; Sholderer, 2017); this approach has the limitation of lacking the capacity to reveal relative effect of the various dimensions of school autonomy on the respective dimensions of learners' performance. This limitation was resolved in this study as it took the disaggregated approach in dealing with the main study variables – school autonomy and learners' performance. Data were consequently collected on each of the dimensions of both main variables and the data were analysed accordingly in line with the study objectives thereby making it possible to report on the relative effect of the school autonomy dimensions on each of the learner performance dimensions. This is a significant methodological contribution of the study to the body of knowledge. The next section of this thesis will focus on how this study can be extended by other researchers whose interests are in this area of knowledge.

6.6 AVENUES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This section proposed ways by which this study can be extended by future researchers. In view of the critical role of education in national growth and development, the need for further research in this focus area cannot be overemphasised. Some of the areas that future studies can be carried out are as follows:

- This study focussed on five dimensions of school autonomy as well as five dimensions of learners' performance. Future studies can be targeted at other dimensions of the main variables apart from the ones covered in this study. Examples of such other dimensions include – cognitive and meta-cognitive performance as other measures of learners' performance.

- While this study focused on the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance, future studies can be focused on school autonomy and school performance in which case, rather than focusing on learners as the response variable, the focus is on the schools instead.
- It was not part of the objectives of this study to assess the possibility of environmental factors influencing the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance. Future studies may include this as part of the study objectives to reveal if and how environmental factors could influence the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance.

6.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study had some limitations which the researcher had to work around thereby mitigating their effect on the robustness of the results obtained. These limitations are as stated hereunder:

- Few of the participants were not initially interested in the study until they get to know the benefits which their school could get from the outcome of the study.
- Some of the participants were not able to return the questionnaire at the appointed time but the researcher had to return to follow up with them several times to get the questionnaire returned.
- A few of the question items on the questionnaire had to be reworded for simplicity and ease of participants understanding.

6.8 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study was undertaken purposely to investigate the effect of school autonomy on learners' performance in secondary schools in Egbeda Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. The study identified five dimensions for each of the two main study variables. The dimensions identified for school autonomy were: pedagogic autonomy, personnel management autonomy, disciplinary decision autonomy, financial autonomy and accountability autonomy while for learners' performance the dimensions identified were: learners' affective performance, learners' work quality, learners' character formation, learners' personal development and learners' social development. The study discovered that the school autonomy dimensions used in the study jointly affected each of the five dimensions of learners' performance. Thus this study concluded

that stakeholders in the educational system should institute policy provisions in support of enhanced school autonomy in the interest of better learners' performance.

REFERENCES

- Achinstein, B. (2002). Conflict amid community: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, 104 (3) 421 – 455.
- Adepoju, T. L. (1998). Managing educational change in Nigeria. Guba's two-dimensional change strategy. *Mimeograph*. Department of Educational Foundation and Management. Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo.
- Agasisti, T., Catalano, G., Sibiano, P. (2013). Can schools be autonomous in a centralized educational system? *International Journal of Educational Management System*, 27(3), 292-310.
- Agbowuro, C., & Hayatu, S. J. (2014). Universal basic education (UBE) in Nigeria: Problems and prospects in learning basic science in the upper basic: A case study of Kajuru Local Government Area of Kaduna State. *International Journal of Educational Prospect*, 4(5): 44–53.
- Aja-Okorie, U. (2016). Teachers' personnel management as determinants of teacher productivity in secondary schools in Delta State. Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 4 (8) 13 – 23.
- Ajayi, K. (1997). *Instructional supervision and practices in primary schools: Effective management of primary education*. Ajayi and Sokan (1997) Ed., Ibadan, Adeose T.C.S. Bodija, Nigeria.
- Akbar, T., Asrar, M., Younes, M., & Chisti, A. F. (2018). Capturing the effect of parental involvement on their children academic achievement. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322765817_Capturing_the_effect_of_Parental_Involvement_on_their_children_Academic_Achievement
- Akinduyo, T. E. (2014). Teaching profession in Nigeria: Issues problems and prospects. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(11), 1-3.
- Alabi, A.O. & Okemakinde, T. (2010). Effective planning as a factor of educational reform and innovation in Nigeria. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences* 2(6) 316 – 321.

- Ali, A.A., Dada, I.T., Isiaka, G.A., & Salmon, S.A. (2014). Types, causes and management of indiscipline acts among secondary school students in Shomolu local government area of Lagos State. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 8(2), 254 – 287.
- Allen, A. & Mintrom, M. (2010). Responsibility and school governance. *Educational Policy*, 24(3), 439-464
- Allen, A. & Plank, D.N. (2005). School board election structure and democratic representation. *Educational Policy* 19(1), 510-527.
- Altbach, P. (2015). Higher education and the WTO: Globalization run amok. Retrieved from: https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=related:UZUNuulRRCgJ:scholar.google.com/&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5
- Alves, A. F., Gomes, C. M. A., Martins, A., & Almeida, L. S. (2017). Cognitive performance and academic achievement: How do family and school converge? *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, 10(1), 49-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejeps.2017.07.001>
- Alves, A. F., Gomes, C. M. A., Martins, A., & da Silva, A. L. (2017). Cognitive performance and academic achievement: How do family and school converge? *European Journal of Educational Psychology*, 10(2), 49–56.
- Amadioha, W. S. (2015). Analysis of educational reforms in Nigeria in the 21st century: A case study of Federal Government Colleges in Rivers State. Distance Learning Project Report. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Angelov, P., & Principe, J. (2016). Empirical data analysis: A new tool for data analytics. Paper presented at the International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics – SMC 2016, October 9-12, 2016, Budapest, Hungary.
- Annum, G. (2017). Meaning of research. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/36865594/RESEARCH_INSTRUMENTS_FOR_DATA_COLLECTION_Updated_on_May_28,_2020.
- Arcia, G. & Macdonald, K., & Patrinos, H. (2014). School Autonomy and Accountability in Thailand: A Systems Approach for Assessing Policy Intent and Implementation (August

- 1, 2014). *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7012*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2486937>
- Arcia, G. & Macdonald, K., & Patrinos, H. (2014). School autonomy and accountability in Thailand: A systems approach for assessing policy intent and implementation (August 1, 2014). *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7012*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2486937>
- Arcia, G. (2010). *School Autonomy and Accountability in Context: Application of Benchmarking Indicators in Selected European Countries*. Consulting report, Human Development Network, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Arcia, G. (2014). *Incentives and accountability in education: A literature review*. Task order 20: Measurement and research support to education strategy goal 1. Education data for decision making (EdData II) project. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.
- Arcia, G., & Belli, H. (1999). *Rebuilding the social contract: School autonomy in Nicaragua*. LCSHD paper 40. Department of Human Development, Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Arcia, G., & Patrinos, H. A. (2012). *Thailand school autonomy and accountability. Country report 2012. System assessment and benchmarking for education results (SABER)*, Human Development Network. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Arcia, G., Harry, P., Emilio P., & Kevin, M. (2010). *School Autonomy and Accountability, Regulatory Institutional Framework, Benchmarking Education Systems for Results*, Human Development Network. The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Arcia, G., Macdonald, K., & Patrinos, H. A. (2014). *School autonomy and accountability in Thailand: A systems approach for assessing policy intent and implementation*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Arcia, G., Macdonald, K., Patrinos, H., & Porta, E. (2011). *School autonomy and accountability. System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results. World Bank education strategy paper*.

- Arcia, G., Macdonald, K., Patrinos, H., & Porta, E. (2011). School autonomy and accountability: System assessment and benchmarking for education results. *World Bank education strategy paper*.
- Arcia, G., Patrinos, H. A., Porta, E., & Macdonald, K. (2011). School autonomy and accountability in context: Application of benchmarking indicators in selected European countries. Washington, DC: Benchmarking Education Systems for Results, Human Development Network, World Bank.
- Arcia, G., Patrinos, H., Porta, E. & Macdonald, K. (2010). School Autonomy and Accountability in Context: Application of Benchmarking Indicators in Selected European Countries. World Bank, Washington, DC. Retrieved from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/21548>.
- Asiamah, Mensah & Oteng-Abayie (2017). General, target, and accessible population: Demystifying the concepts for effective sampling. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(6), 1-17.
- Astiz, M. F. (2006). School autonomy in the province of Buenos Aires, Argentina: Evidence from two school districts. *Comparative Education*, 42(2), 203-223.
- Baah-Boateng, W. (2013). Determinants of unemployment in Ghana. *African Development Review*, 25(4), 385-399.
- Baah-Boateng, W. (2013). Human capital development: The case of education as a vehicle for Africa's economic transformation. *Legon Journal of International Affairs and Diplomacy*, 7(1), 31-55.
- Bandur, A. (2012). School-based management developments and partnership: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(2), 316-328.
- Barnett, K., McCormick, J., & Conners, R. (2001). Transformational leadership in schools—panacea, placebo or problem? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39 (1), 24-46.
- Barrera, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibañez, L. (2009). Decentralized decision-making in schools: The theory and evidence on school-based management. Washington, DC: World Bank.

- Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibáñez, L. (2009). Decentralized, decision-making in schools: The theory and evidence on School-Based Management. Washington: The World Bank. *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development*.
- Barth, R. S. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi delta kappan*, 82 (6), 443-449.
- Bello, M. Y. (2007). On the need for reforms in the Nigerian education sector. Daily Triumph [On-line]. Retrieved 23rd of November, 2007, from <http://www.triumphnewspapers.com/on25102007.html>.
- Berlin, I. (1969). *Four essays on liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1976). *The restructuring of social and political theory*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Bernstein, R. J. (Ed.). (1985). *Habermas and modernity*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Billington, R. (2003). *Living philosophy: An introduction to moral thought* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Routledge-Taylor & Francis Group
- Blake N, Smeyers P, Smith, R & Standish P 2003. *The Blackwell guide to the Philosophy of Education*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Boateng, C. (2012). Evolving conceptualization of leadership and its implication for vocational technical education. *World Journal of Education*, 2(4), 45-54.
- Boko, S. H. (2002). *Decentralisation: Definitions, theories and debate*. In: Decentralisation and debate in Africa, Boston, MA, Springer.
- Botha, R. J. (2010). School effectiveness: conceptualizing divergent assessment approaches. *South African Journal of Education*, 30(4) 605 – 620

Botha, R.J. (2010). School effectiveness: conceptualizing divergent assessment approaches. *South African Journal of Education*, 30 (4) 605 – 620

Boudreaux, M. (2017). Principals' dispositions regarding their autonomy in site-based school management. *National Forum*, 35(4), 2-16. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316255456_Principals'_Dispositions_Regarding_Their_Autonomy_in_Site-Based_School_Management/citations

Brannigan, M. C., & Boss, J. A. (2001). *Healthcare ethics in a diverse society*. Mountain view, CA: Mayfield.

Braslavsky, C. (2001). School autonomy and evaluation: *Quarterly review of comparative education*, 31 (4) 1 – 10.

Brink, H. (2007). *Fundamentals of research methodology for health care professionals*. 2nd ed. Cape Town: Juta & Company Ltd.

Bryk, A., Sebring, P.B., Allensworth, E., Lupescu, S., & Easton, J.Q. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bush, T. and Gamage, D. (2001) Models of self-governance in schools: Australia and the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Education Management* 15(1): 39-44.

Caldwell, B. J. (2014). *Impact of school autonomy on student achievement in 21st century education: a review of the evidence*. Educational Transformations.

Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (2013). Leading the self-transforming school. Asian Leadership Roundtable, 2-12. Retrieved from: https://www.eduhk.hk/apclc/roundtable2013/paper/ALR2013_Caldwell%20Paper.pdf

Caldwell, B.J. (2013). *School – based management and school effectiveness*, New York, Routledge.

Caldwell, B.J. and Spinks, J.M. (2013), *The Self-Transforming School*, Routledge, London.

- Canadian Pediatric Society (2004). Effective discipline for children. *Pediatric Child Health*, 9(1), 37-41.
- Carroll, J. B. (1993). *Human cognitive abilities: A survey of factor-analytic studies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cengage (2020). Character formation. Retrieved from www.encyclopedia.com
- Chegg Tutor (nd). Total population sampling. Retrieved from: <https://www.statisticshowto.com/total-population-sampling/> on May 28, 2020
- Cheng, Y. C., Theodore, J. K., & Lee, T. H. (2016). School autonomy, leadership and learning: A reconceptualization. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(20), 177-196.
- Cheng, Y.C., & Greany, T. (2016). Guest editorial. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(7), 1166-1170. Accessed on 30/12/2018 from <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2016-0050>
- Chomeya, R. (2010). Quality of psychology test between Likert scale 5 and 6 points. *Journal of Social Sciences* 6(3), 399-403.
- City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2016). Instructional rounds in education. Retrieved from <https://www.gufs.org/cms/lib011/NY02214395/Centricity/Domain/4/DRAFT%20DISTRICT%20PRIORITIES%202016-2019.pdf>
- Claver, F., Martinez-Aranda, L. M., Conejero, M., & Gil-Arais, A. (2020). . Motivation, discipline, and academic performance in physical education: A holistic approach from achievement goal and self-determination theories. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01808>

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, D.C.; US Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics
- Cox, K. (2010). Affective skills: General tips and guidelines. Bossier Parish Community College. Retrieved from www.southplainscollege.edu
- Cresswell, J. W. (2012). *Education research : Planning, conducting, and evaluating qualitative and quantitative research*. Upper Saddle River, N.J. Prentice Hall
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*, 4th ed. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Crocker, A. G., Mercier, C., Lachapelle, Y., Brunet, A., Morin, D., & Roy, M. E. (2006). Prevalence and types of aggressive behaviour among adults with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of intellectual disability research*, 50(9), 652-661.
- Denscombe, M. (1998). *The Good Research Guide*. Buckingham. Open University Press
- Department of Education & Skills (2015). Advancing school autonomy in the Irish system research paper. Accessed from <https://www.education.ie/>information>
- Department of Education and Skills (2015). Advancing school autonomy in the Irish school system – a consultation paper. Retrieved from <https://www.education.ie/en/Schools-Colleges/Information/Advancing-School-Autonomy-in-Ireland/School-Autonomy-Consultation-Paper.pdf>
- Diaeldin, O., Conor, O., Mark, B., & Yousef, J. (2017). Factors that impact attrition and retention rates for accountancy diploma students: Evidence from Australia. *Business Education & Accreditation*, 9(1), 91-113
- Di Gropello, E. (2004). *Education decentralization and accountability relationships in Latin America*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3453, Washington DC.
- Di Gropello, E. (2006). *A Comparative Analysis of School-Based Management in Central America*. World Bank Working Paper No. 72, Washington DC.

- Dilshad, M.R.(2010): Assessing quality of teacher education: A student perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 30(1), 85-97.
DOI:10.2139/ssrn.2694998
- Dreyfus, S.E. (2013). The five-stage model of adult skill acquisition. *The Bulletin of Science, Technology, and Society*, 33, 5-6, 177-181.
- Dunham, V (1984). *Stress in teaching*. London, Croom Helm.
- Dworkin, G. (2001). *The theory and practice of autonomy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Education Department Bureau [EDB]. (2004). *Education (Amendment) Ordinance 2004*. HKSAR: Printing Department.
- Education Department Bureau [EDB]. (2015a). *Performance Indicators for Hong Kong Indicators*. Retrieved on Aug 1, 2015 from <http://www.edb.gov.hk/en/schadmin/sch-quality-assurance/performance-indicators/esda/index.html>
- Education Department Bureau [EDB]. (2015b). *E-platform for School Development and Accountability (ESDA)*. Retrieved on Aug 1, 2015 from <http://www.edb.gov.hk/en/schadmin/sch-quality-assurance/performanceindicators/esda/index.html>
- Education Department Bureau [EDB]. (2015c). *E-platform for School Development and Accountability (ESDA)*. Retrieved on Aug 1, 2015 from <http://www.edb.gov.hk/en/schadmin/sch-quality-assurance/performanceindicators/apaso2/index.html>
- Education Department Bureau [EDB]. (2015d). *Tools and Data for School Self-evaluation Booklet*. Retrieved on Aug 1, 2015 from <http://edb.gov.hk/attachment/en/schadmin/sch-quality-assurance/performanceindicators/SSE-SSE%20Tools-2015%20English.pdf>
- Education Resource Strategies & Center for Collaborative Education (2014). A Report prepared for The Boston Foundation and Boston Public Schools.

- Ehiane, O. S. (2014). Discipline and academic performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 3(1), 181-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v3-i1/758>
- EL Education (2015). Creating high quality work in EL education schools: Multilevel support. Retrieved from: <https://eleducation.org>
- EL Education (2015). Differentiated Projects and Products in EL Education Schools. Retrieved from eleducation.org/uploads/downloads/ELED-DifferentiatedProjectsProductsELSSchools-115.pdf
- Elger, D. (2007). *Theory of performance*. In S. W. Beyerlein, C. Holmes, & D. K. Apple, (Eds.), *Faculty guidebook: A comprehensive tool for improving faculty performance* (4th ed.). Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Ellen, R. F. (1984). *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100, 3, 363-406.
- Fagbamiye E.O (2004). *Management of Primary Secondary Education in Nigeria*. Ibadan; NAEP Publications.
- Fagbamiye, E.O (2004). *Providing Cost – Effective Education for Nigerians in the 21st Century. Management of Primary and Secondary Education in Nigeria*, Ibadan; NAEP Publications.
- Fareo, D. O. (2015). Professionalisation of teaching in Nigeria: Strategies, prospects, and challenges. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(3), 190-196.
- Farooq, M. S., Shafiq, M., & Berhanu, G. (2011). Factors affecting students' quality of academic performance: A case of secondary school level. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 7(2), 1-14.

- Farrington, C. A., Roderick, M., Allensworth, E. Nagaoka, J. Keyes, T.S., Johnson, D.W. & Fry, G. W., & Bi, H. (2013). The evolution of educational reform in Thailand: The Thai educational paradox. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(3), 290–319.
- Fataar, A. (2008) Education Policy Reform in Postapartheid South Africa: Constraints and Possibilities. In: Wan G. (eds) *The Education of Diverse Student Populations. Explorations of Educational Purpose*, vol 2. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8204-7_6
- Fraser, J., Fahlman, D. W., Arscott, J., & Guillot, I. (2018). Pilot testing for feasibility in a study of student retention and attrition in online undergraduate programs. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 19(1), 260-278.
- French, D., Miles, K. H., & Nathan, L. (2014). *The Path Forward: School Autonomy and Its Implications for the Future of Boston's Public Schools*. The Boston Foundation. from <https://www.edglossary.org/student-work/>
- Fullan, M. & Watson, N. (2000). The influence of school environment on student's academic performance. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Galliani, S., Gertle, P., & Schargrodsy, E. (2008). School Decentralization: Helping the Good Get Better, But Leaving the Poor Behind. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(10-11), 2106-2120
- Gawe, N., Jacobs, M., Vakalisa, N. (2001). *Teaching and learning dynamics: A participative approach*. Johannesburg: Heinemann
- Gawlik, M. A. (2008). Breaking loose. Principal autonomy in charter and public schools. *Educational Policy*, 22(6), 783–804.
- Gebremedhin, M. A., & Asgele, B. (2015). Assessing quality of education: In perspective with continuous assessment and learners' performance in Adwa college, *Ethiopia. Developing Country Studies*, 5(9), 1-9.
- Giles, C. (1995). School-based planning: Are UK schools grasping the strategic initiative. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 9(4), 4-7.

Glossary of Education Reform (2014). Retrieved from: <https://www.edglossary.org/learner/>

Glossary of Education Reform (2016). Student work. Retrieved: November 19, 2019

Gotlieb, M., & Noel, B. (2019). Character development in a multilingual international school and its use of self-assessment tools. *Sino US English teaching*, 16(9), 379-375.

Greany, T., & Cheng, Y. C. (2016). International study of school autonomy and learning: An introduction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(7), 1166-1170.

Griffin, P., Care, E., & McGaw, B. (2012). *The changing role of education and schools*. In *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills*. Springer Netherlands.

Grix, J. (2004). *The Foundations of Research*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Gumede, V., & Biyase, M. (2016). Educational reforms and curriculum transformation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Environmental Economics*, 7(2), 69-76. DOI: 10.21511/ee.07(2).2016.7

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1966). Knowledge and interest. *Inquiry*, 9(4), 285-300

Habermas, J. (1973). *Theory and practice*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Haertel, G. D., Walberg, H. J., & Weinstein, T. (1983). Psychological models of educational performance: A theoretical synthesis of constructs. *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 75-91.

- Hahn, Y., Wang, L. C., & Yang, H. (2018). Does greater school autonomy make a difference? Evidence from a randomized natural experiment in South Korea. *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 161, pp. 15–30.
- Hahn, Y., Wang, L. C., & Yang, H.-S. (2014). Does greater school autonomy make a difference? Evidence from a randomized natural experiment in South Korea. Department of Economics discussion paper 48/14, Melbourne: Monash University
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. (2015). Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale. Accessed on 30/12/2018 from https://www.google.com.ng/search?ei=pAIpXPemB_H2xgPJrJ-wDA&q=Assessing+Instructional+Leadership+with+the+Principal+Instructional+...+By+Philip+Hallinger%2C+Wen-Chung+Wang&oq=
- Hanushek, E. A. (2002). Publicly provided education. *Handbook of public economics*, 4, 2045-2141.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Raymond, M. E. (2005). Does school accountability lead to improved student performance? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24(2), 297–327.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2011). The economics of international differences everywhere? Panel estimates from PISA. *Journal of Development Economics*, 104, 212-232.
- Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2002). Inferring program effects for special populations: Does special education raise achievement for students with disabilities? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84(4), 584-599.
- Hanushek, E.A., Link, S. and Woessmann, L. (2013), “Does school autonomy make sense everywhere? panel estimates from PISA”, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 104, September, pp. 212-232.
- Harbaugh R. J. (2005), *Examining the correlates of effective schools present in an intermediate school: A case study*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Immaculate University, Pennsylvania

- Heim, M. (1996). *Accountability in education: A primer for school leaders. Research into practice series, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning*. Honolulu: Hawaii Department of Education.
- Heim, M. (1996). *Accountability in Education: A primer for school leaders. Research into Practice Series, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning*. Honolulu: Hawaii Department of Education.
- Helgøy, I., Homme, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2007). Local autonomy or state control? Exploring the effects of new forms of regulation in education. *European Educational Research Journal*, 6(3), 198–202.
- Hobden, P., & Hobden, S. (2019). Learners written work: An overview of quality, Quantity and Focus in South African Primary Schools. In: Spaul, N., Jansen, J.(eds.)*South African Schooling: The enigma of inequality, Policy implications of research in Education*, vol. 10, Springer, Cham
- Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Strasbourg, France
- Hollenbeck, L. (2008). Cognitive, Affective, and Meta-Cognitive Skill Development through Instrumental Music: A Positive Impact on Academic Achievement. *Online Submission*.
- Honig, M. I., & Rainey, L. R. (2012). Autonomy and school improvement: What do we know and where do we go from here? *Educational Policy*, 26(3), 465-495. DOI: 10.1177/0895904811417590
- Hooker, K. & Fodor, I. (2008). Teaching mindfulness to children. *Gestalt Review*, 12(1), 75-91.
- Hsieh, H., & Hsieh, H. (2019). Undergraduates out-of-class learning: Exploring EFL students' autonomous learning behaviours and their usage of resources. *Education Science*, 9(159), 1-15 doi:10.3390/educsci9030159
- Hulin, C., Cudeck, R., Netemeyer, R. G., Dillon, W. R., McDonald, R. & Bearden, W. (2001). Measurement. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 10(1, 2), 55-69.
- Huitt, W. & Dawson, C. (2011). Social development: Why it is important and how to impact it. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/socdev.pdf>

- Ilonen, S. & Heinonen, J. (2018). Understanding affective learning outcomes in entrepreneurship education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 32(6), 391-404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950422218805177>
- Ireland, C. (2010). Inferential statistics and hypothesis testing. *Experimental statistics for agriculture and horticulture*. Wallingford, CABI. Chapter 11, 62-70. DOI: 10.1079/9781845935375.0062
- Israel, G. D. (2013). *Determining sample size*. University of Florida, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Iyer, M. G. (2008). Current views of the characteristics of school effectiveness in the context of national secondary schools.
- James, K. Y., Cheong, C. T., & Tai, H. L. (2016), "The development of school autonomy and accountability in Hong Kong: multiple changes in governance, work, curriculum, and learning", *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30 (7) 1 – 25.
- Jansen, J. D. (2001). On the politics of performance in South African education: Autonomy, accountability and assessment. *Prospects*, 31(4), 553-564.
- Joubert, I., Hartell, C., & Lombard, K. (2015). *Narvosing – 'n gids vir die beginnervorsers*, South Africa, Van Schaik Publishers
- Kadtong, M.L. (2015). School-based management in the operations and performance of elementary schools. *Proceedings Journal of Education, Psychology, and Social Sciences Research*. Accessed on 30/12/2018 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323949891_School-Based_Management_in_the_Operations_and_Performance_of_Public_Elementary_Schools.
- Kamaruddin, S. A. (2012). Character Education and Students Social Behaviour. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6 (4), 223-230.
- Kashy-Rosenbaum, G., Kaplan, O., & Israel-Cohen, Y. (2018). Predicting academic achievement by class-level emotions and perceived homeroom teachers' emotional support. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55(7), 770-782. DOI: 10.1002/pits.22140

- Keane, J. (2016). Theory of action: Positive impact on teaching and learning. Retrieved from <https://www.gettingsmart.com/2016/11/hold-vif-blog-series-1/>
- Keddie, A. (2015). School autonomy, accountability and collaboration: a critical review. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 47(1), DOI: 10.1080/00220620.2015.974146
- Khan, M.M. (2011): Student's perspective of service quality in higher learning institutions; An evidence-based approach. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(11),
- Khalid, A., & Amal, A. (2016) School-based management: Arab education system in Israel. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(2), 191-208. DOI: 10.1108/JEA-09-2014-0118
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy*. London, England: Springer.
- Kingdom, E.O. & Maekae, J. (2013). The role of education in national development: Nigerian experience. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(28), 312 – 320.
- Kiragu, J.W., King'oina, J.O. & Migosi, J.A. (2013). School based management prospects and challenges: A case of public secondary schools in Murang'a south district, Kenya. *International Journal of Asian Sciences*, 3(5) 1166 – 1179.
- Kolawole, A. O., & Sekumade, A. (2017). Hypotheses and hypotheses testing. Ph.D. Agricultural Economics seminar paper presented at Ekiti State, University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.28299.39202
- Kormos, J., & Prefontaine, Y. (2016). Affective factors influencing performance: French learners' appraisals of second language speech talks. *Language Teaching Research*, 21(6), 699-716. doi.org/10.1177/1362168816683562
- Laerd Dissertation (nd). Sampling. Retrieved from: <https://googleweblight.com/i?u=http%3A%2F%2Fdissertation.laerd.com%2Fpurposeful-sampling.php&geid=NSTNR> on May 28, 2020

- Lamas, H. A. (2015). School performance. *Propositos y Representaciones*, 3(1), 313-386.
- Lee, J. (2012). The effects of the teacher-student relationship and academic press on student engagement and academic performance. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 53(1), 330-340.
- Lenos, R., Muralidharan, K., & Scur, D. (2017). Personnel management and school productivity: Evidence from India. *Paper presented at Empirical Management Conference of the World Bank*.
- Lenos, R., Muralidharan, K., & Scur, D. (2017). Personnel management and school productivity: Evidence from India. *Paper presented at Empirical Management Conference of the World Bank*.
- Levin, B. (1992). School-based management. *Canadian School Executive*, 11(9), 30-32.
- Lidström. (1991). *Discretion. An art of the possible. Education committees in the Swedish system of government*. Umea: Department of Political Science, University of Umea.
- Liu, M. & Chi, M. (2012). Investigating learner affective performance in web-based learning by using entrepreneurship as a metaphor. *Educational Technology and Society*. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholars.org>
- MacBeath, J. (2006). New relationship for old inspection and self-evaluation in England and Hong Kong, *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 34(2), 2-18
- Maching, S. & Vermolt, J. (2011). Changing school autonomy: Academy schools and their introduction to England education. Center for the economics of education. Retrieved from: <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED529842>
- Magwa, S. & Ngara, R. (2014). Learner indiscipline in Schools. *Review of Humanities*, 3 (2) 79 – 88.
- Majid, U. Research fundamentals: Study design, and sample size. *URNCSST Journal* 2(1), 1-7. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.26685/urncst.16>

- Maree, J.G. 2012. *Complete your thesis or dissertation successfully: Practical guidelines*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Marsh, J. (2012). The micro-politics of implementing a school-based bonus policy: The Case of New York City's Compensation Committees. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34(2), 164-184.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd Edition), New York, Harper & Row.
- McCombes, S. (2020). How to create a research design. Retrieved from www.scribbr.com
- Mertkan, S. & Sugrue, C. (2014). 'Building Institutional Capacity: More Accountability than Autonomy?', *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, 27(2), 331-343.
- Messick, S., & Associates. (1976). *Individuality in learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Michavila, F., & Martinez, J.M. (2018). Excellence of universities versus autonomy, funding, and accountability. *European Review*, 26(1), 48-56.
- Mintrom, M. (2001). Educational governance and democratic practice. *Educational Policy*, 15(5), 615-643.
- Moradi, M. Beidokhti, A. & Fathi, K. (2016). Comparative comparison of implementing school-based management in developed countries in the historical context to practice. *International Education Studies*, 9(9), 191-198
- Mitsopoulos, M. S., & Pelagidis, T. (2008). Comparing the administrative and financial autonomy of higher education institutions in 7 EU countries. *Intereconomics*, 43(5), 282-288
- Mujere, N. (2016). Sampling in research. Retrieved from: DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-0007-0.ch006
- Murphy, J. (1997). *Restructuring through school-based management*. London, Routledge.

- Nandamuri, P., & Rao, K. (2012). An Analysis of the Impact of Professional Training on the Performance of Teachers. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 6(3), 20–27.
- Nandamuri, P.P. & Rao, K.V. (2015). Autonomy in school management – A policy perspective. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com.ng/search?site=&source=hp&btnG=Search&q=Autonomy+in+School+Management-A+Policy+Perspective>
- National Research Council (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academic Press.
- Nbina, J. B. (2012). Analysis of poor performance of senior secondary school students in Nigeria. *African Research Review*, 6(4), 324-334.
- Neeleman, A. (2018). The scope of school autonomy in practice: An empirically based classification of school interventions. *Journal of Educational Change*, 20(1), 31-55.
- Neeleman, M. B, M. (2019). School autonomy in practice: School intervention decision-making by Dutch secondary school leaders. A PhD Dissertation submitted to Maastrich University.
- Netemeyer, F. Y. (2003). *Scaling procedures: Issues and implications*. United Kingdom: Sage Publication.
- Neuman W. L (1997). *Social research methods; qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Neuman, W.L. 2011. *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 7th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Neves, M. P. (2016). Ethics as a philosophical discipline. *Encyclopedia of Global Bioethics*, Dordrecht, Springer Science Business Media. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-05544-2_177-1
- Nneji, B. U. (2015). Learner autonomy in educational institutions and the challenges of (Human) development in Nigeria and Africa. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, 5(2), 19-28.

- Nostratinia, M., & Razavi, F. (2016). Writing complexity, accuracy and fluency among EFL learners' degree of creativity. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(5), 1043-1052.
- Nurajizah, U., Windyariani, S., & Setiono, S. (2018). Improving students' metacognitive awareness through implementing learning journal. *Journal Pendidikan Biologi Indonesia*, 4(2), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22219/jpbi.v4i2.5788>
- Nyabwari, B. G, Katola, M. T., & Gitome, J. W. (2013). Impact of discipline on academic performance of pupils in public schools. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 2(1),
- O'Connor, M. C., & Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43 (5), 971-990.
- Obanya, P. (2004). *The dilemma of education in Africa*. Heinemann Educational Books (Nig.) Plc. Ibadan.
- Obioma G, Ajagun GA (2006). Establishing new assessment standards in the context of curriculum change. Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Conference of the International Association for Educational Assessment (IAEA) held at the Grand Copthorne Hotel, Singapore on 21 – 26th May, 2006
- OECD (2011). School autonomy and accountability: Are they related to students' performance? *Program on International Students Assessment in Focus*.
- OECD (2011). School autonomy and accountability: Are they related to student performance? Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisainfocus/48910490.pdf>
- OECD (2012). *Public and private schools: How management and funding relate to their socio-economic profile*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD (2013). PISA 2012 Results: What Makes Schools Successful (Volume IV). PISA. OECD Publishing. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/pisa-2012results-what-makes-a-school-successful-volume-iv_9789264201156-en.

- Ofori, K. N., Tordzro, G., Asamoah, E., & Achiaa, E. (2018). The effects of indiscipline on academic performance of junior high school students in the Fanteakwa district of Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(21), 109-117.
- Ojo, B.J. (2007). Supervision and quality assurance strategies in education: implication for educational policy. *African Research Review*, 1 (2), 87 – 97.
- Olanipekun, S, S., Aina, J. K. (2014). Improving students’ academic performance in Nigerian schools: The role of teachers. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 1(2), 1-6.
- Olufemi, o. t., Adediran, A. A., & Oyediran, W. O. (2018). Factors affecting students academic performance in colleges of education in South West Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 6(10), 43-56.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development (2015). Education at a glance. Retrieved on 30/12/2018 from www.oecd.org.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development. (2012). *Education at a glance 2012: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development. (2014b). *Measuring innovation in education: A new perspective*. Educational Research and Innovation, OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development. (2014b). *Measuring innovation in education: A new perspective*. Educational Research and Innovation, OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development. (2014c). *Talis 2013 results: An international perspective on teaching and learning*. OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development. (2015). *Education policy outlook 2015: making reforms happen*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development. (2016a). *Netherlands 2016: Foundations for the future*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic, Cooperation and Development. (2016b). *PISA 2015 results (Volume II): Policies and practices for successful schools*. Paris:

- Ouchi, W.G. Cooper, B. S., & Segal, L.G. (2003). Power to the principals: Decentralization in three large school districts. UCLA Andersen school working paper.
- Patrinós, A., Fasih, T., Barrera, F., Garcia-Moreno, V. A., Bentaouet-Kattan, R., Baksh, S., & Wickramasekera, I. (2008). What is school based management? Retrieved on 12/4/18 from: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079934475/547667-1145313948551/what_is_SBM.pdf
- Patrinós, H. A. & Robin. H. (2010). Benchmarking Education Systems for Results: PowerPoint Presentation, Human Development Network, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Patrinós, H. A. (2011). School-based management. In B. Bruns, D. Filmer, & H. A. Patrinós (Eds.), *Making schools work: New evidence on accountability reforms* (pp. 87–140). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Patrinós, H. A. (2012). *Strengthening education quality in East Asia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Patrinós, H. A., Macdonald, K., S. Parandekar, S., & Klainin, S. (2012). Learning outcomes in Thailand: What can we learn from international assessments? Report 64801-TH. Human Development Network, East Asia and the Pacific Region. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Patrinós, H. A., Velez, E., & Wang, C. Y. (2013). Framework for the reform of education systems and planning for quality. Policy research working paper 6701, Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Patrinós, H. A. (2014). School autonomy and accountability. Retrieved from: https://olc.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/Session%201%20SDP%20SAA_What%20Policies%20Matter%20in%20SAA_0.pdf
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pence, G. (2000). *A dictionary of common philosophical terms*. New York, N. Y. Mc Graw-Hill. Pennsylvania

- Powers, B.A. & Knapp, T.R. (2006). *Dictionary of nursing theory and research*, New York, NY: Springer.
- Prestwich, D.L. (2004). Character education in America's schools. *School Community Journal*, 14(1), 139- 150.
- Rahman, S. (2017). Advantages and disadvantages of using qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods in language “testing and assessment” research: A literature review. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6(1), 102-112.
- Rechebei, E. (2010). *Accountability and Reality. Who Should Do What? And Who Should Be Accountable? Research into Practice Series*, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning. Honolulu: Hawaii Department of Education.
- Rechebei, E. (2010). *Accountability and Reality. Who Should Do What? And Who Should Be Accountable? Research into Practice Series*, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning. Honolulu: Hawaii Department of Education. WPS7012
- Rehman, A. A., & Alharthi, K. (2016). An introduction to research paradigms. *International Journal of Educational Investigation*, 3(8), 51-59
- Retallick, J. (2005). *Managing school success: A case study from Pakistan. Leading & Learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.tbf.org/~media/TBFOrg/Files/Rep>
- Rivarola, M., & Fuller, B. (1999). Nicaragua's experiment to decentralize schools: Contrasting views of parents, teachers, and directors. *Comparative Education Review*, 43(4), 489-521.
- Rodriguez, A. & Hovde, K. (2002). *The challenges of school autonomy: Supporting Principals. LCSHD Paper Series No. 77*
- Romer, P. M (1990). Endogenous technological Change. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98 (5) 71-102.

- Rugutt, J. K., & Chemosit, C. C. (2005). A study of factors that influence college academic achievement: A structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 5(1), 66-90
- Rutter, M. (1983). School effects on pupil progress: Research findings and policy implications. *Child Development*, 54 (1) 1-29.
- Ryan, K. (1999). Mining the values in the curriculum. *National Education Association*, Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org>
- Saarivirta, T., & Kumpulainen, K. (2016). School autonomy, leadership and student achievement: reflections from Finland", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 30 Issue: 7, pp.1268-1278, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2015-0146>
- Sachai, G. (2015). Teacher's positive influence on learner's character formation. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 6(2), 49-52.
- Sachar, G. (2015). Teacher's positive influence on learner's character formation. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 6 (2) 49 – 52.
- Saha, L. J. (2015). Educational sociology. *International Encyclopedia of the social and Behavioral Sciences* (2nd Edition).
- Saito, F. (2001). Decentralisation theories revisited: Lessons from Uganda. *Ryukoku RISS Bulletin. No. 31*
- Salas-Pilco, S.Z. (2013). Evolution of the framework for 21st century competencies, *Knowledge Management & e-Learning: An International Journal (KM&EL)*, 5 (1), 10-24.
- Saleem, F., Naseem, Z., Ibrahim, K., Hussain, A. & Azeem, M. (2012). Determinants of School Effectiveness: A study at Punjab level. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 2 No. 14 [Special Issue - July 2012]*
- Sammons, P., Mortimore, P. and Thomas, S. (1996). Do schools perform consistently across outcomes and areas?
- Santibañez, L., Abreu-Lastra, R., & O'Donoghue, J. L. (2014). School based management effects: Resources or governance change? Evidence from Mexico. *Economics of Education Review*, 39, 97-109.

- Schütz, G., West, M. R., & Wöbmann, L. (2007). *School Accountability, Autonomy, Choice, and the Equity of Student Achievement: International Evidence from PISA 2003*.
- OECD (2017). Education Working Papers, No. 14. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved on Aug 1, 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/246374511832>
- Semali, L. M., & Vumilia, P. L. (2016). Challenges facing teachers' attempts to enhance learners' discipline in Tanzania's secondary schools. *World Journal of Education*, 6(1), 50 – 67.
- Sharma, H. L., & Ranjan, P. (2018). Relationship of cognitive styles with academic achievement among secondary school students. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, IT and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 55-60.
- Sholderer, O. (2017). Making education work: School autonomy and performance. *East European Quarterly*, 45(1-2), 27-56
- Simba, N. O., Agak, J. O., & Kabuka, E. K. (2016). Impact of indiscipline on academic performance of pupils in public primary schools in Muhoroni sub-county, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(6), 164 – 173.
- Simba, N.O., Agak, J.O., & Kabuka, E.K. (2016). Impact of Discipline on Academic Performance of Pupils in Public Primary Schools in Muhoroni Sub-County, Kenya. *British Journal of Education*, 4(8), 13-23.
- Simonsohn, U., Simmons, J. P., & Nelson, L. D. (2015). Specification curve: Descriptive and inferential statistics on all reasonable specifications. Retrieved from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/63bd/e6023d16d8d816fb2cbe9461b7b45e27fe84.pdf?_ga=2.226043283.848222691.1590751609-1470470900.1565815229
- Sorzano, C. O. S., Tabas-Madrid, D., Nunez, F., Fernandez-Criado, C., & Naranjo, A. (2017). Sample size for pilot studies and precision-driven experiments. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318124999_Sample_Size_for_Pilot_Studies_and_Precision_Driven_Experiments South Africa, Van Schaik Publishers
- Stables, A. (2017). Epistemology of education. *Education Sciences*, 7(44), 1-3.
- Stanley, E.O. (2014). Discipline and academic performance: A study of selected secondary schools in Lagos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 3 (1) 181 - 194

Steinberg, M. P. (2014). Does greater autonomy improve school performance? Evidence from a regression discontinuity analysis in Chicago. *Education finance and Policy*, 1(9), 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00118

Steinberg, M. P. (2014). Does greater autonomy improves school performance? Evidence from a discontinuity analysis in Chicago. Association for education, finance and policy. DoI: 10.1162/EDFP_a_00118

Suhr, D. (2013). Answering your research questions with descriptive statistics. Retrieved from: https://www.lexjansen.com/wuss/2010/analy/2969_5_ANL-Suhr1.pdf on May 29, 2020.

Supanc, P. (1999). Education Reform in England: A Web-Based Overview. World Bank Report

Systems Approach for Better Education Results (2016). School autonomy and accountability. Education Global Report of the World Bank Group. Retrieved from [wbfiles.worldbank.org<hdn>brief](http://wbfiles.worldbank.org/hdn/brief)

Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument: How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 5(3), 28-36. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3205040

Tan, C. (2006). *Knowledge and inquiry: An introduction to epistemology*, Crawford, Lachian.

Terry, M. M. & John, E C. (1990). *Politics markets and America's schools*. Washington. Brookings Institution Press.

The Young Adult Learners Partnership (2003). Explaining personal and social development. Retrieved from: <https://www.education.gov.uk>publications>

- Thompson, W.G. (2002). The effect of character education on student behaviour. A Doctoral Dissertation Presented to the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis of East Tennessee State University.
- Tyra, C. (2012). Bringing books to life: Teaching character education through children's literature. *Rising Tide*, 5, 1-10.
- Ugbogbo, H.E., Akwemoh, M.O., & Omoregie, C.B., (2013). The role and challenges of education in national development (The Nigeria Experience). *Journal of Education and Social Research*, 3(10), 25-30.
- Umansky, I. (2005). What Have We Learned? Revisiting the Education Production Function as a Tool for Understanding Education Quality in Latin America. Latin America and the Caribbean Region, Human Development Department. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- United Nations Development Programme (2000). Decentralised governance: A synthesis of nine case studies
- United Nations Development Programme and German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) (2000). The UNDP role in decentralization and local governance.
- US Agency for International Development (2000). USAID's experience in decentralization and democratic local governance (USAID Center for Democracy and Governance). Retrieved from <http://www.usaid.gov/democracy/techpubs/pnach302.pdf>
- Usakli, H., & Ekici, K. (2018). Schools and social emotional learning. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 4(1), 69-80.
- Usamn, Y. D. (2016). Educational resources: An integral component for effective school administration in Nigeria. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(13), 27-37.
- Vazquez, B. M. (2015). Pedagogy for autonomy in FLT: An exploratory analysis on it's implimentation through case studies. *Porta Linguarim* 23(1), 59-74

- Vegas, E., & Petrow, J. (2008). *Raising Student Learning in Latin America. The challenge for the 21st century*. The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Vijaya, R. (2016). Parental involvement and academic achievement among high school students, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(12), 1-3
- Vincent-Mancrin, S., Kaakkäinen, K., Pfothauer, St., Atkinson, A., Jacotin, G. & Rimini, M. (2014). *Measuring Innovation in education: A new perspective*. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), OECD. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Volansky, A. & Friedman, I.A. (2003). *School based management: An international perspective*. Jerusalem, Ministry of education.
- Walker, A., & Ko, J. (2011). Principal leadership in an era of accountability: A perspective from the Hong Kong context. *School Leadership & Management*, 31(4), 369-392.
- Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 249-294.
- Wara, E., Aloka, P. J. O., & Odongo, B. C. (2018). Relationship between cognitive engagement and academic achievement among Kenyan secondary school students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 61-72. DOI: 10.2478/mjss-2018-0026
- World Bank. (2012). *Finland : School Autonomy and Accountability. Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) country report;2012*. Washington, DC. © World Bank. Retrieved from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/17510>
License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.
- Wu, W-H., Kao, H-Y., Wu, S-H., and Wei, C-W. (2019). Development and evaluation of affective domain using student's feedback in entrepreneurial massive open online courses.
- Wylie, C., (2013). *Secondary schools in 2012: Main findings from the NZCER national survey*. Wellington: NZCER
- Yahoo Education (2007). Reform – Dictionary definition and pronunciation[On-line]. Retrieved 23rd of November, 2007, from <http://education.yahoo.com/reference/dictionary/entry/reform>.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (No. HA29 Y2 1967).

Yamoah, E. E. (2016). What condition justify studying the entire population instead of selecting a sample. Retrieved from:
https://www.researchgate.net/post/What_conditions_justify_studying_the_entire_population_instead_of_selecting_a_sample

Yin, J. K., Theodore, C. C., & Lee, T. H. (2015). The development of school autonomy and accountability in Hong Kong: multiple changes in governance, work, curriculum, and learning. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(7),

Yin, J. K., Theodore, C. C., & Lee, T. H. (2016). The development of school autonomy and accountability in Hong Kong: multiple changes in governance, work, curriculum, and learning. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(7), 1-26.

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affect student achievement. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf

Young, J., & Levin, B. (1999). The origin of educational reforms: A comparative perspective. *Can. J. Educ. Admin. Policy*, 2 [On-line]. Retrieved 23rd of May, 2019, from <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/younglevin.html>.

Yusuf, M. O., & Yusuf, H. T. (2009). Educational reforms in Nigeria: The potentials of information and communication technology (ICT). *Educational Research and Review*, 4(5), 225230.

Zhu, M., Urhahne, D., & Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2017). The longitudinal effects of teacher judgement and different teacher treatment on students' academic outcomes. ``

Zikmund, W.G. (2000). *Business research methods*, 6th Ed. Oklahoma State University, Dryden Press.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

I, _____ (participant's name) hereby affirm that the student researcher has told me about the nature, procedure, potential benefits and anticipated inconvenience of participation in this study.

I have read and understood the content of the information sheet relating to the study (or had it explained to me). I have also had sufficient time to ask questions and I voluntarily accepted to participate in the study.

I understand that my participation is at my discretion and that I am free to withdraw at any time without attracting any form of penalty or intimidation. I am aware that the findings of the study will be anonymously processed into a research report, journal publications and or conference proceedings.

I have been assured that I will receive a signed copy of the informed consent agreement.

Name & Surname of participant

Signature of participant

Date:

Name and Surname of researcher

Signature of researcher

Date:

27/01/2020

The Zonal Inspector of Education
Ibadan Less City Zone
Ministry of Education,
Ibadan, Oyo State

Dear Sir,

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN EGBEDA LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF OYO STATE.

I, Monilola Mary BINUYO (Mrs.) am doing a research under the supervision of Prof. R.J.N. Botha, a research Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Management towards a PhD degree at the University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa. We have funding from UNISA Division of Student Funding for research essentials. We are requesting your permission to collect data from the private and public schools in Egbeda Local Government needed for the study.

The study will entail gathering of data on school autonomy and learner's performance. The benefits of the study will be as outlined hereunder.

The outcome will be of value to the Education Ministry as it will indicate areas of policy directions to enhance education outcomes in both public and private secondary schools in the State. The benefit to the parents will be in form of improved performance of their wards and the outcomes will also promote a closer and more impactful relationship with the management of their wards' schools. To the society, the outcome will promote a saner society for all to live in.

Considering that the participants are non-vulnerable adults coupled with the fact that the information required are non-sensitive, risk is involved. There will be no reimbursement or any incentive for participation in the research. Feedback procedure to participants will be made available on request through the researcher email address: monilolabinuyo@yahoo.com

Yours sincerely,

Monilola Mary BINUYO (Mrs.)
Student Researcher
Department of Education Management
University of South Africa

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

I, _____ (participant's name) hereby affirm that the student researcher has told me about the nature, procedure, potential benefits and anticipated inconvenience of participation in this study.

I have read and understood the content of the information sheet relating to the study (or had it explained to me). I have also had sufficient time to ask questions and I voluntarily accepted to participate in the study.

I understand that my participation is at my discretion and that I am free to withdraw at any time without attracting any form of penalty or intimidation. I am aware that the findings of the study will be anonymously processed into a research report, journal publications and or conference proceedings.

I have been assured that I will receive a signed copy of the informed consent agreement.

Name & Surname of participant

Name and Surname of researcher

Signature of participant

Signature of researcher

Date:

Date:

SCHOOL AUTONOMY AND LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A (DEMOGRAPHIC DATA)

Please read the question carefully and tick the response that best represents your answer to the underlisted questions.

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----|
| 1. Gender | Female | = 1 |
| | Male | = 2 |
| 2. Years of teaching experience | 1 - 5 years | = 1 |
| | 6 - 10 years | = 2 |
| | 11 - 20 years | = 3 |
| | 21 - 30 years | = 4 |
| | 30 – 35 years | = 5 |
| 3. Salary Grade Level | GL 12 | =1 |
| | GL 13 | =2 |
| | GL 14 | =3 |
| | GL 15 | =4 |
| | GL 16 | =5 |
| 4. Highest academic qualification | B.Ed. degree | = 1 |
| | Master degree | = 2 |
| | Doctoral degree | = 3 |
| 5. Position in school | Principal | = 1 |
| | Vice Principal | = 2 |
| | HoD | = 3 |
| 6. Geographical location of your school | Rural area | = 1 |
| | Urban area | = 2 |
| 7. Type of school | Private Secondary school | = 1 |
| | Public Secondary school | = 2 |

SECTION B (CONSTRUCTS DATA)

INSTRUCTION: Choose the number that describes your feeling or opinion on each of the questions in this section. The numbers have the following meaning:

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Partially disagree
- 4 = Partially agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly agree

PEDAGOGIC AUTONOMY

8. My school has significant capacity to take decision on curriculum content for different subjects being taught to learners

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

9. My school has significant capacity to take decision on teaching methodology to be adopted for teaching the learners.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

10. My school has significant capacity to take decisions on the method of evaluating learners' performance.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

11. My school has significant capacity to take decision on designing learning objectives for each subject to be taught to learners.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

12. My school has significant capacity to take decision on text materials to be used for teaching the learners.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

DISCIPLINARY DECISION AUTONOMY

13 My school has significant capacity to take disciplinary measures against any erring learner without recourse to education authority.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

14 Cases of learner’s misdemeanour are promptly dealt with by my school authority without recourse to the education authority

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

15 Where necessary, my school authority has capacity to suspend an erring learner summarily

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

16 My school authority has capacity to dismiss unrepentant learner whenever the situation so warrants.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AUTONOMY

17 My school authority has capacity to recruit qualified teachers whenever the situation so demands.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

18 My school has capacity to fix remuneration of teachers as deemed appropriate.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

19 My school has capacity to right size the workforce as may be considered needful.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

20 My school can influence the personnel to be recruited into the service of the school.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

21 My school has power to suspend a staff who is found wanting in his / her duties.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

FINANCIAL AUTONOMY

22 My school has capacity to plan a budget considered appropriate to run the school from time to time.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

23 My school has significant capacity to approve a budget considered appropriate for running the school.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

24 My school has capacity to implement budget approved for running the school.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

25 My school has significant control over its budget

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

26 My school has a discretionary control over fund raising decisions

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

ACCOUNTABILITY AUTONOMY

27 My school is transparent in decision making processes.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

28 My school welcomed constructive criticisms from both staff and learners on how the school is being managed.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

29 My school is prudent in financial matters.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

30 There is periodical meeting to determine how funds are spent in the school

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

31 There is significant transparency in the financial administration of the school

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

AFFECTIVE SKILLS ACHIEVEMENT

32 The average learner in my school has impressive capacity for sustained attention

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

33 The average learner in my school has appreciable speed of information processing

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

34 The average learner in my school demonstrate high cognitive flexibility

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

35 The average learner in my school demonstrates high level of self – control.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

36 Learners in my school have highly impressive working memory

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

37 Learners in my school have highly impressive capacity for pattern recognition

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

38 Learners in my school have articulated plan for their future

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

39 Learners in my school are able to manage their feelings

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

40 Learners in my school develop their self-confidence progressively

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

41 Learners in my school have impressive self-awareness skills

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

42 Learners are progressive in their spiritual development

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

43 Learners have impressive personal hygiene

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

44 Learners' physical development is impressive

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

WORK QUALITY

45 Learners in my school give highly impressive answers to questions asked in class.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

46 Learners in my school are hardworking.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

47 Learners in my school write comprehensive note during class sessions.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

48 Learners in my school hardly make mistakes in their assignments

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

49 Learners work are well organised

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

CHARACTER FORMATION

50 Learners in my school are very courteous in their interactions with other people.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

51 Learners in my school are law abiding.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

52 Learners in my school are always polite to other people.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

53 You will hardly hear of bullying among learners in my school.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

54 Learners in my school are very kind in their dealings with other people.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

55 Learners in my school are very helpful.

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

56 Learners are socially adjusted

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

57 Learners have well-coordinated social groups

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

58 Learners have mutual trust for one another

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

59 Learners' inter-group cohesion is high

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

60 Level of gender discrimination among learners is very low

Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree
--------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------

PS. Please place your questionnaire in the envelope provided.

Thank you for your participation and co-operation in completing this questionnaire