

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

In Nigeria, just as in other countries of the world, there is increasing emphasis on improving schools so that young people in the schools be equipped with quality knowledge and skills to function effectively in life. Achieving excellence in schooling, like all fields of human endeavour, requires a commitment to continuous improvement and quality assurance. Comparable emphasis is also evident in the contributions of leadership to the implementation of virtually all initiatives aimed at improving students' learning and the quality of schools (Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), 2014). At the secondary school level, principals are entrusted with the leadership of schools and are, therefore, in many ways, responsible for improving schools. Researchers have linked effective principal leadership to school improvement (Elliott & Clifford, 2014; Nwangwa & Omotere, 2015; Valiant, 2015).

School improvement refers to planned educational change that enhances students' learning outcomes as well as the school's capacity for leading change. Taole (2013) described school improvement as educational changes that promote students' outcomes and strength as well as the schools

capacity for change. Similarly, Seifert and Hartnell-Young (2015) defined it as the outcome of a set of processes, managed from within the school and targeted both at goal attainment, pupil achievement and the school's ability to manage change. School improvement can also be seen as efforts dedicated to improving student learning by accelerating the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders. According to these definitions, the purpose of school improvement is to impact positively on the relationship between the teaching and learning process and the conditions that support it. For the purposes of this study, school improvement is defined as planned, systematic and sustained positive changes in learning outcomes and other related conditions in schools. It involves those changes that occur daily and in ways that cumulatively, over time, lead to positive growth in a school or school system. It is thus an outcome of all effective school processes, especially principals' leadership with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.

There is compelling evidence that the principal is the most decisive factor in school improvement to the extent that if one wants to improve schools, one must improve the principals first (Orr, 2011; Olowoselu & Bello, 2015; Rahabav, 2016). In the light of this, OECD (2014) stated that the most important issue that school leaders need to focus on, refine and apply is the

school improvement process. A comprehensive report by the Wallace Foundation (2014, p. 4) recommended that for focused school improvement to occur, principals should be provided with varied, current and useful data to identify areas of improvement. This could be done using an innovative technique known as Multi-Source Feedback (MSF).

Multi-Source Feedback (MSF) relies on obtaining feedback from multiple sources in order to identify one's strengths and weaknesses, and on that basis, improve one's performance. Berk (2013) defined MSF as a process whereby a subject (the recipient) is rated on his/her performance by people who know something about his/her work (the raters). Coderman (2014) described MSF as a technique that attempts to generate information on individual performances and development based on assessments given by others who are significant in organizations. The assessors can include subordinates, peers, supervisors and managers and in some cases, customers or clients. This is usually in addition to the person being assessed, completing a self-assessment on performance. According to Kio (2015) each source can provide a different perspective on the individual's knowledge, competencies, attributes and other job relevant characteristics and thus help to build up a richer, and more complete and accurate picture than could be obtained from any one source. In this study, MSF is described

as a technique whereby a principal's leadership for school improvement is evaluated by external supervisors and his/her subordinates such as staff of the Ministry of Education, Post-Primary Schools Service Commission, vice-principals, teachers, non-tutorial staff, parents, students, alumni, and even the principals themselves. The feedbacks from such evaluation are then made available to the principals to guide them in improving their performances and ultimately, improving the schools.

MSF has been described as an innovation in human resource management, which, if well implemented, will lead to the achievement of optimal results in organizations (Cheng, 2014; Sargeant, 2015). According to the Corporate Leadership Council (2011), as with every other innovation, a major parameter for the success of MSF is acceptability. Acceptability refers to whether staff considers MSF as something they are willing to meaningfully utilize within the workplace setting. When organizational members accept MSF, they are likely to use it for higher-quality decisions, more effective practices, and, in turn, improved outcomes for schools. This suggests that efforts to evaluate MSF recipients' acceptance of the process before the process is initiated is beneficial.

Within the issue of acceptability, some pertinent issues to consider are the relevance, goals for MSF, rater sources, domains and feedback utilization.

Relevance is the extent to which organizations would consider MSF useful and important to their specific contexts or circumstance. In this study, the focus would be on whether MSF would be seen as being important to school improvement. The goals are the purposes of the MSF, whether it would be acceptable to be used for performance appraisal, professional development, resource allocation or school ranking. The rater sources are the acceptable groups that would be required to provide information on MSF. In terms of domain identification, Corporate Leadership Council (2011) stipulated that it involves identification of acceptable dimensions of leadership competencies which MSF should address. There is also need to identify the periods for accessing feedback and how the feedback obtained would be utilized in mounting development programmes for improvement. The variables of relevance, goals, rater sources, domains, and feedback utilization would be investigated in this study.

Studies have shown that MSF aids in building a unified common interest between managers and subordinates towards achieving set objectives, positively changing things, challenging and modifying existing practices to suit the needs of their work environment. It also increases the sense of importance and value of collaboration in school tasks, thereby stimulating staff to surpass their own interests and direct themselves to the interests of

school improvement (McCarthy, 2014; O'Brien, McNamara & O'Hara, 2015; Clifford & Ross, 2016). Studies have also shown that a large number of schools in China, Japan, Germany, South Africa and United Kingdom have effectively used MSF to evaluate the quality of their provision, the strengths of the schools and where improvements are needed (Maher, 2009; Botha & Triegaardt, 2014; Seifert & Hartnell-Young, 2015).

The researcher is motivated to investigate the acceptability of MSF for improved management of secondary schools in Anambra State for various reasons. One is that the Federal Ministry of Education (FME, 2010) laid emphasis on school self-evaluation designed to help individual schools measure the extent they are fulfilling their responsibilities and improving their performance. MSF is one of the prescribed techniques for school self-evaluation through which principals can bring significant improvements in their schools. The Roadmap for the Nigerian Education sector (FME, 2009) recommended multiple sources of feedback on school processes as one of the turnaround strategies for educational improvement. Also at the end of a summit on improving education in Nigeria, the FME (2013) noted that:

The Ministry of Education is dissatisfied with the current secondary evaluation systems and will develop new ones that will provide multiple sources of feedback for school improvement. School improvement is a large agenda for change and it can only succeed if we accurately and comprehensively measure school leadership and processes (p. 4).

In Anambra State, principal evaluation are mainly based on the performance of teachers during appraisal by the external supervisor. However, the vice-principals, teachers and other stakeholders are not given the opportunity to assess their principals' performance directly. But the fact is that the ever-changing role of the principal has created a position of leadership so complex that traditional methods of evaluation or feedback can no longer provide enough data to develop required skills (OECD, 2014; Ehren, Perryman & Shackleton, 2015; Ofoegbu & Obiweluzor, 2015; Rahabav, 2016). Considering that vice-principals and teachers are under the daily leadership of the principal and have the most regular interaction with the principals, their feedback should provide highly valuable information to a principal.

Meanwhile the issue of improvement in schools is still a problem in the State as manifested in inadequate facilities, examination malpractices, poor quality of learning, community apathy to school affairs and poor job performance of some staff among others. Many studies have continued to report falling standards of academic achievement and discipline, lack of effective evaluation, monitoring, inspection and supervision in the areas of human relationships, personnel, facilities, equipment and infrastructure

(Modebelu & Onyali, 2014; Mbonu, 2015). The situation in these secondary schools need improvement by principals.

Moreover, principals in the State are appointed based on experience. The assumption is that their prior knowledge and experience have adequately prepared them to significantly improve the schools they lead. But prior knowledge and experience are never enough (Ikediugwu, 2008; National Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA, 2008), Ehren, et al, 2015; Okorie & Usulor, 2016). There are always emerging administrative responsibilities and commitment that may crop up every now and then. Concomitant to this is that hardly can any principal, male or female, succeed in realizing the objectives and goals of secondary school education without obtaining robust and multiple sources of feedback from vice-principals, teachers or any other acceptable sources on the specific areas that actually require improvement. It is important to note that an aspect of MSF has already being implemented in some tertiary institutions in Nigeria through students' evaluation of teachers. However, its use in secondary schools is yet to fully commence.

In the developed world, multi-source feedback is considered mostly relevant and used by 90% of educational organisations in the United States and United Kingdom and in 85% of Australia's top performing schools

(Asumeng, 2013; Brutus, 2006). It thus appears that in the efforts of various countries for school improvement, the application of MSF to school leaders is often accepted as being crucial to their success. Whether the same can be said of Nigeria is an issue for research. Moreover, given the popularity of the MSF system in the U.S. and Europe, scholars have raised concerns on the transferability of multi-source feedback to other cultures, especially in developing countries. Babalola (2013) specifically noted that the Nigerian government is often quick to adopt innovations from western countries without recognizing that, Nigerian and Western cultures have been seen to differ in terms of cultural characteristics. Some of such innovations were sometimes forced on schools and when results were disappointing, principals and teachers were blamed. In a cultural dimension, Thai managers were generally found to be more likely than American managers to accept and utilize MSF from subordinates (Ermgonchai, 2008).

However, Ermgonchai in the same study also found that acceptability and utilization of rater sources for MSF are dependent on gender in that American female managers accept MSF from subordinates while Thai female managers accept from their supervisors and peers. Georgescu and Stănculescu (2012) found that male managers in Australia resisted MSF more than females because males considered it as a threat to their authority.

Williams and Alawiye (2014) also reported that while novice principals in England preferred that MSF be used for professional development, experienced principals indicated that it is better used for appraisals. Also the preferred leadership domains for MSF differed by gender and experience of principals. This implies that gender and experience of participants might influence their acceptance of MSF. Since Nigeria in general and Anambra State in particular have a culture different from Thai, America and England, for any adaptation to be effective, the acceptability of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers was deemed worthy of empirical investigation in this study. In view of the above, the study is motivated by the need to investigate the acceptability of multi-source feedback on principals for improved management of secondary schools in Anambra State.

Statement of the Problem

In Anambra State, it appears that incumbent principals of public secondary schools rarely receive systematic and structured constructive feedback that could enable them realize whether their actions are consistent with intentions or expectations for improving their schools. In some cases, principals' source of feedback remains oral and negative reports from the members of the team from Post Primary School Service Commission or

hearsay from staff and students and such feedback are seldomly used for school improvement. Structured feedback is seldomly obtained from staff, students and other stakeholders. This is paradoxical in the sense that, it is the teachers' assessment of the principal's leadership, that relates to effective teaching practices and student achievement, which are some indicators of school improvement. Hence, principals appear to face enormous difficulties in improving secondary schools. Their difficulties are manifested in reports of high failure rate of senior secondary school students in external examinations and other behavioral problems, dilapidated facilities; low levels of community involvement and poor quality of teaching. These problems persist despite increased awareness of the importance of principals' leadership in school improvement. Perhaps, if principals were to receive acceptable and structured feedback from stakeholders on the progress or limitation of their leadership to school improvement, it would provide highly valuable information to guide the principals in building on leadership strengths, identifying areas for improvement, making such improvements and consequently improving their schools.

An important way of obtaining such feedback is to utilize Multi Source Feedback (MSF). MSF is currently the most popular technique used in

several secondary schools around the globe to obtain information from many sources such as subordinates, peers, and supervisors (For example vice-principals, Staff of Ministry of Education, parents, teachers, students and principals themselves) to gather evidence about the quality of the principals' practices in order to identify areas of strength and weaknesses. It is expected that when feedback information about a principal's leadership is collected from multiple sources, including principals, teachers, staff of Education agencies, parents and even students, it would provide a robust data to guide school improvement. It is important that before MSF could be institutionalized in Nigerian secondary schools, its relevance and acceptability need to be determined. Therefore, it is the concern of this study to determine the level of acceptance of Multi-Source Feedback (MSF) on principals by the vice principals, teachers and even the principals themselves in terms of relevance, MSF goals, rater sources, school domain, period and developmental programme to be mounted for improvement of public secondary schools in Anambra State.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study is to investigate the level of acceptance of Multi-Source Feedback (MSF) on secondary school principals in Anambra

State for improved management of secondary school. Specifically, this study sought to:

1. Ascertain the extent principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that obtaining MSF on principals is relevant for school improvement,
2. Determine goals the principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF on principals should serve for school improvement,
3. Ascertain the rater sources that are acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers for providing credible MSF on principals,
4. Find out the school improvement domains which the principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF on principals should cover,
5. Determine the periods that principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF should be obtained on the principals,
6. Identify the development programmes principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that should be mounted for principals as a result of feedback from MSF,
7. Find out the extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers based on gender,
8. Determine extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers with various years of experience.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study would be significant to principals, vice-principals, teachers, students, Anambra State Post Primary Schools Services Commission, Ministry of Education, and future researchers.

Principals would benefit from the findings because it might help them to use it to identify their strengths and weaknesses and areas for improvement. The findings of this study might also motivate principals to utilize feedback from MSF to engage in personal development efforts like furthering their education, attending professional seminars, workshop or seeking mentoring from colleagues for school improvement.

The findings would also guide principals, vice-principals and teachers in deciding on the period to be use in obtaining multi- sources of information for school improvement. The study would enable the principals, vice principals and teachers to identify the rater sources acceptable for the credibility of multi source information on principals. The study would also help the principals, vice principals and teachers to identify the goal which MSF will serve for school improvement.

Vice principals and teachers would also benefit from the findings because MSF will give them the opportunities to evaluate their principals using a

structured system rather than the prevalent hearsay in schools. Since these staff are close to the principals, they can be trained to offer a better and unbiased overall assessment of their principals' daily leadership practices and dispositions, and their feedback could facilitate school improvement.

Students could also benefit from the findings since all the actions taken to improve schools have the ultimate aim of improving learning outcomes for students. Therefore, the outcome of its implementation might provide school principals with multiple sources of data with which to provide a better response to students learning needs. Implementation of a range of improvement strategies based on priorities identified through MSF can lead to improvement in a school and ultimately enhance students' achievements in schools.

The Anambra State Post Primary Schools Services Commission (ASPPSSC) could benefit from the findings. The exposure of secondary school principals, vice-principals and teachers in Anambra State to MSF acceptance might provide empirical information on the basis of which the ASPPSSC could intensify efforts to introduce MSF to secondary schools, or not. The ASPPSSC may also see the need to use MSF to evaluate school improvement efforts so that that they would organize seminars, workshops

and lectures for principals' who were found to exhibit serious leadership inadequacies through MSF.

The Anambra State Ministry of Education would also benefit from the findings of the study. The information on acceptability of MSF could inspire them to consider initiating MSF in the secondary schools. Findings would also guide them in making policies and implementation guidelines on the goals, rater sources, school domains, periods and development programmes to be mounted for principals as a result of MSF. These could drive the capacity of principals to improve their schools.

The findings would also serve as a springboard for future researchers. Findings would also contribute to the advancement of knowledge on MSF in developing the education sector. Finally, the findings would add to the bulk of existing knowledge on MSF and might also serve as a source of literature for future researchers who may be interested in MSF and its possible applications to school improvement.

Scope of the Study

This study covered all the principals, vice-principals and teachers in public secondary schools in the six education zones of Anambra State. The content was delimited to determining the extent of acceptability of MSF for

improved management of secondary school in terms of relevance, MSF goals, rater sources, school domains, periods and development programmes to be mounted as a result of feedback from MSF. The acceptability of MSF was also examined based on respondents' gender and years of experience.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent do secondary school principals, vice-principals and teachers in Anambra State Secondary School accept MSF on principals as relevant to school improvement?
2. What goals do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF on principals should serve for school improvement?
3. Which rater sources are acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers for providing credible MSF on principals for school improvement?
4. Which school improvement domains do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF on principals should cover?
5. What periods do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF would be obtained on the principals?

6. Which development programmes do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept should be mounted for principals' school improvement as a result of MSF?
7. What is the extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers based on gender?
8. What is the extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers based on their years of experience?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at the 0.05 significant level:

1. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the extent they accept MSF on principals for school improvement.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the principals, vice-principals and teachers on the goals they accept that MSF on principals should serve for school improvement.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the rater sources to provide credible MSF on principals for school improvement.

4. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of school improvement domains that MSF on principals should cover.
5. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of periods that MSF would be obtained on the principals.
6. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the development programmes to be mounted for principals' school improvement as a result of MSF.
7. Gender is not a significant factor in the extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers.
8. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the extent of overall acceptance of MSF by the principals, vice-principals and teachers with various years of experience.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher reviewed related works on multi-source feedback, principals and school improvement. The review is organized as follows:

Conceptual Framework

- Multi-Source Feedback

- Acceptability

- School Improvement

Theoretical Framework

- Multi Source Feedback Theory

- Systemic Change Theory

Theoretical Studies

- Parameters for Acceptability of MSF

- Theoretical Model for MSF

- Goals and Benefits of MSF

- Disadvantages of Multi-Source Feedback

- Principles for the Construction of Multisource Feedback Programmes

- School Improvement Features

- School Improvement Domains

- Principals' Leadership Responsibilities for School Improvement

- Partners in School Improvement

Empirical Studies

- Studies on MSF in Educational Organizations

- Studies Related to Principals and School Improvement

- Studies Related to Principals' Development for School Improvement

Summary of Reviewed Literature

Conceptual Framework

Multi-Source Feedback

Multi-source feedback is a process of systematic assessment from subordinates, peers, supervisors, and customers, all done to solicit perceptions about an individual's performance. Dalessio (2008) stated that multisource feedback, also known as 360 degree or multi-rater feedback, refers to appraisals of a person, usually a manager, that are derived from two or more distinct categories of individuals, such as supervisors, peers, subordinates, customers--from either within or outside the organization--and suppliers. Dalessio also noted that indeed, in many instances, the participants are also encouraged to evaluate their own behavior and performance. These assessments are primarily utilized to facilitate the development of leaders. Maher (2009) described multi-source feedback as a procedure that relies upon feedback from peers, subordinates, supervisors, and others within the evaluate's circle of involvement. Hooijberg and Lane (2009) gave an elaborate description of multi-source feedback that covers both the sources and objectives by stating that:

Multi-source or 360 degree evaluation process is a human resource methodology that is frequently used for both employee appraisal and employee development. It is a multi-source feedback, a performance-appraisal data collected from 'all around' an employee his or her peers, subordinates, supervisors, and sometimes, from internal and external customers. Its main objective usually is to assess improvement and development needs and to provide competence-related information (p.18).

Egbe and Baker (2012) defined MSF as a self-assessment and multi-directional method of obtaining assessment data and using feedback as a means for improving a person's performance. To them, it is an approach in which a person's 'job behaviors' and 'outcomes' are rated anonymously by persons who are most knowledgeable about his or her work—those hierarchically above, below, and on the same level as the employee—to furnish different perspectives. The intent is to link feedback received to the organization's goals and initiatives and to the employee's professional career development. The forgoing definitions align with that of Guilleux (2010) who stated that in multi-source feedback, data on the performance of an individual are collected systematically from a number of stakeholders and are used for improving performance. A similar definition came from the Doherty (2013) as:

Multi-source or 360 degree feedback is a process whereby an individual (the recipient) is rated on their performance by people who know something about their work (the raters). This can include direct reports, peers and managers and in some cases customers or clients, in fact anybody who is credible to the individual and is familiar with their work can be included in the feedback process. This is usually in addition to completing a self-assessment on performance. The resulting information is presented to the individual with the aim of helping them to gain a better understanding of their skills and development areas. Each source can provide a different perspective on the individual's skills, attributes and other job relevant characteristics and thus help to build up a richer, more complete and accurate picture than could be obtained from any one source (p.2).

The emphasis on this definition is that the individual performance of the recipient of MSF is the object of the scrutiny. Hence, MSF is a process that seeks to ensure a holistic understanding of an individual's performance as a way of helping the person to improve. In a related definition, Donnon, Ansari, Al Khalifa, Darwish and Violato, (2014) described multi-source feedback as a useful mechanism used to give feedback to an employee from multiple sources, including subordinates, peers, supervisors, as well as a self-assessment, and in some cases customers and suppliers. In the words of Cheng (2014) "it seeks to use information gained from other sources to provide a fuller picture of employees' performances. Similarly, when this technique is used in employee development, it augments employees' perceptions of training needs with those of the people with whom they interact (p.4).

The foregoing definitions indicate that multi-source feedback system is a method used to assess the job performance of employees and leaders in an organization on the basis of classified feedback received from individuals who work with them. In the context of principals, multi-source feedback typically, is where an individual principal's staff (vice principals and teachers), peers, supervisors and students are invited to provide scores on a range of questions relevant to the principal's leadership performance. This

invariably entails receiving confidential feedback primarily from significant people in the workplace (e.g., supervisors, peers, subordinates). Hence, anyone who comes into contact with the leader, is in a position to provide the feedback. Even the employee's or manager's self-ratings are taken into consideration. The principal (ratee) also provides "self" scores against which the perceptions of others are compared. Essentially, MSF may have at least four components that include self-appraisal, superior's appraisal, subordinate's appraisal, students' appraisal and peer's appraisal. In other words, data on the principal's activities, competencies and skills are collected from those who knew the principal best, which could include students, subordinates, bosses, supervisors and peers. The aim is to use the results from these components to provide feedback to the principals on where and why improvements are needed in schools.

Acceptability

Acceptability has been variously defined. Egbe and Baker (2012) defined it as the willingness to utilize an innovation so as to secure certain benefits and in the confidence that it is being properly controlled. It is a situation of demonstrable willingness within a user group to employ a practice, tool or strategy for the tasks it is designed to support. Huddleson (2012) opined

that acceptability is the extent to which something is considered to be fair, reasonable, appropriate, and consistent with expectations of its need.

In the context of MSF, Ford (2013) described acceptability of MSF as whether the users agree with its propositions and whether they believe that MSF is relevant, applicable and will result in positive outcomes. According to the Corporate Leadership Council (2011), acceptability of MSF is dependent on its relevance, goals, rater sources, domains, periods and feedback utilization. It is only when these issues are accepted that MSF will be expected to yield expected results in 4schools.

Acceptability is important in MSF because it is an innovation in the school improvement landscape. For this innovation to thrive, it is important that it is acceptable to those it is meant to serve. Studies have shown that application of MSF might depend on its acceptance by leaders as beneficial to their job improvement efforts (Atwater et al, 2012; Kio, 2015, Clifford & Ross, 2016). For instance, Bailey and Austin (2011) and Smither and London (2011) stressed that for MSF to yield desired results, the ratees and raters must accept it. Such acceptance is capable of inspiring school leaders to use MSF results to focus on developing the organization's capacity to innovate. Various researches have linked school improvement with the

acceptance of constructive feedback concerning leadership (French, 2014; Fullan, 2007; Gülşen, 2014). In the absence of such acceptance, goal accomplishment and school improvement are never guaranteed. Acceptance plays an indispensable role in the effectiveness of reforms in an educational institution, right from the setting of goals to accomplishment of goals.

Based on the preceding definitions and descriptions, acceptability is defined in this study as the level of acceptance of MSF as a viable principal evaluation system in secondary schools. It refers to whether teachers, principals and vice-principals accept that MSF is relevant to principals' tasks, the goals that MSF should serve in schools, the rater sources for credible MSF, the school domains to focus MSF on, the periods for obtaining MSF as well as the development programmes to be mounted for principals as a result of MSF to inform principals' performance in school improvement. Hence, the present study is to determine the extent of acceptability of MSF for school improvement.

School Improvement

School improvement has received much attention in organizational development. According to Zmuda, Kuklis and Kline (2004) school improvement means making schools better places for learning. This relies on changes at both school level and within classrooms, which in turn

depend on schools being committed to fulfilling the expectations of children and their parents. Adelman and Taylor (2006) conceptualized school improvement as the ability of a school to make some progress towards realizing educational objectives in the areas of academic achievement, acquisition of appropriate life skills and competencies and the manifestation of a disciplined sense of citizenship. FME (2009) defined school improvement as a growth process aimed at raising the performance of schools from where they are to a high performing schools with high performing students. To these authors, it involves the processes which principals as school leaders engage in to sustain and build their schools' future and competitive advantage in response to constant changes in their environment. In a similar angle, American Association of School Administrators (2010) described it a process of growth of a school from the point it is currently in. School improvement is tightly linked to identifying and managing processes designed to make schools more successful and competitive. All these processes are focused, and they attempt to provide solutions to help management obtain commitment to change and improve productivity with the least resistance.

For the Australian Capital Territory (ACT, 2009), school improvement is best understood as a move in schools towards improved task

accomplishment by staff, academic achievement by students, good school climate and effective co-ordination of these by administrators. Further, Levin, (2012) defined school improvement as “every form of growth or stage of development in the life-cycle of a school that promotes, encourages and assists the expansion of knowledge and expertise required to optimize success in the attainment of school goals” (p. 83). Similarly, Su (2013) referred to school improvement as the process of altering specific practices and policies in order to improve teaching and learning. In short, the main target of school improvement is an activity targeted at improving teaching and learning so that better students’ achievement will be exhibited. The focal concern of school improvement is to enable students to achieve better results. In a related definition, Childers (2013) presented school improvement as focusing on growth in school programme. The author referred to school improvement program as a systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools. Similarly, Skalde and Pont (2013) stated that school improvement is a process that helps to make certain adjustments or changes for better to the teaching-learning activities or tasks that are directly or indirectly related to the instructional practices in school.

Another definition of school improvement is from Wilkey (2013) who noted that school improvement is a continuous institutional process rather than a sporadic set of activities or isolated projects. To him, school improvement should not be considered as something that one begins once and takes a rest somewhere in between the activities. Therefore, sustainability is said to be an aspect of school improvement. Bouchamma, Basque and Marcotte (2014) and Elliott and Clifford (2014) expressed related view that school improvement is the ability of a school to raise the standard of their school climate and school environment with particular reference to improved academic achievement, student and staff discipline, improved physical facilities, committed work force and general quality of teaching and learning. Harrelson (2014) also described school improvement as a process of enhancing the quality of teaching with the dynamics of organizational change, in effect generating a blend between instructional and organizational effectiveness.

Many of the definitions of school improvement suggest the raising of standards of performance of both staff and students in schools. (Ehren, Perryman & Shackleton, 2015; Ko, Hallinger & Walker, 2015; Valiant, 2015). School improvement is also seen in terms of the ability of a school to meet challenging targets for growth usually specified by the management

bodies. The emphasis is on raising performance standards and achieving excellence in education. For the purposes of the present study, school improvement refers to a systematic growth in schools processes and products. It involves changes focused not only on teaching/learning activities but also on procedures to support these teaching and learning processes.

Theoretical Framework

In this section, some theories that are related to the present study are described. These theories are multi source feedback theory and systemic change theory.

Multi Source Feedback Theory

The multisource feedback theory for this study was developed by Fletcher and Bailey (2003). The theory is based on the assumption that MSF has the likelihood of influencing how accurately a manager or leader is aware of his or her co-workers' perceptions of his or her strengths, weaknesses, skills, personality and/or abilities. The theory presented leadership behavior as goal directed. The theory suggests that in order to achieve goals, people use feedback to evaluate their performance relative to their goals. The theory also states that in organizations there is a great likelihood that the greater the acceptability of sources of MSF, the more successful the leader will be.

There is also a great likelihood that in most organizations, MSF is to be used for behavioural change and not for criticisms. Therefore, when aiming at employee or organizational development, it is specific employee behavior that should be appraised. The theorists added that since behavioural change is the driver of organizational improvement, MSF is used for (a) administrative purposes (e.g., decisions about promotions, remuneration, or dismissal), (b) employee development, (c) assessment of potential, and (d) research purposes.

Fletcher and Bailey (2003) stated that it is also important that organizations clearly determine the goals and objectives of the multi-source feedback approach before it is adopted. Failure to do this can lead to the process trying to achieve numerous objectives which can often be conflicting. To provide direction, MSF instruments must be specific and concrete in order to provide rich and detailed data (Fletcher & Bailey, 2003). In addition, for MSF to be of use to managers as an improvement tool, the feedback derived from these tools must accurately reflect dimension-level performance. The dimensions of domains that are used in the appraisal and the feedback must be changeable so that they will stimulate the expected behavioural change. By stating the domains for MSF, principals will be helped to focus on improving the relevant areas.

Further, Fletcher and Bailey (2003) proposed a principle of objectivity that practitioners should apply when they design a multisource feedback programme. They stressed that acceptance of MSF is essential and should be based on three objective principles, namely:

- The principle of confidentiality means that the executive should not know who of his designated respondents gave him a specific rating or provided a particular comment. Quality feedback instruments are designed in such a way as to protect the anonymity of the ratings and comments.
- The Exploration Principle means that the data which the executive will eventually receive in the MSF is not an award, a diagnosis or a label of any kind. It is input for self-exploration and experimentation.
- The Gratitude Principle suggests that the executive has to be grateful to the people who help him become more successful. Providing feedback to the executive, if taken seriously, takes time and sometimes has an emotional toll on the respondents. Therefore, the executive should not forget to thank his raters (p. 7).

The MSF theory is relevant to the present study for three main reasons. Firstly, as the performance information on principals is gathered from a variety of sources, it provides direction; creates a more balanced view of the

principals as the feedback is coming from a number of different perspectives. Secondly, the increased number of feedback sources provide the principals with an increased amount of information about their performance. These will show them the areas of improvement to focus their efforts. Thirdly, the feedback provided from several raters when compared to the ratees own assessment makes the ratee (principal) more self-aware, which is the realisation of the discrepancies between how the principal sees his/her self and how the raters (vice-principals and teachers) see them and is fundamental to the multi-source approach. It is this self-awareness, along with a commitment to change and improvement that is a key component in developing individuals in organisations. Hence, if developing and growing school leaders are to become priorities for the 21st century, then educational organizations should reconsider past practice and integrate multi source feedback in leadership development programs and evaluation processes. To do this requires an acceptance of MSF, which is the focus of this study. However, this theory did not directly provide the components for school improvement, hence the need for the systemic change theory.

Systemic Change Theory

This theory was developed by Adelman and Taylor (2007). The theory bothers on the general functions, major tasks, activities, and phases related

to systemic change for school improvement to occur. They noted that school improvement is all about change and advanced four components necessary for school improvement as:

1. Nature and scope of focus.
2. Phases of the change process
3. Key facets for change.
4. Creating readiness for systemic change.

Nature and scope of focus: Adelman and Taylor (2007) stated that school improvement may encompass introducing one or more interventions, developing a demonstration at a specific site, or replicating a prototype on a large scale. The nature and scope of focus raise such questions as:

- What specific functions will be implemented and sustained?
- Will one or more groups/sites/organizations be involved?
- What is the intent for making changes?

Phases of the change process: Adelman and Taylor (2007) explained that whether the focus is on establishing a prototype at one site or replicating, the systemic changes can be conceived in terms of four overlapping phases: (a) creating readiness—increasing a climate/culture for change through enhancing the acceptance, motivation and capability of a critical mass of stakeholders; (b) initial implementation— carrying out change in stages

using a well-designed infrastructure to provide guidance and support; (c) institutionalization—ensuring there is an infrastructure to maintain and enhance productive changes; and (4) ongoing evolution and creative renewal—using mechanisms to improve quality and provide continuing support in ways that enable stakeholders to become a community of learners who creatively pursue renewal.

Adelman and Taylor (2007) specified that sustainability and scale-up processes must address each of the major phases of systemic change as outlined. Again, the intended nature and scope of focus shape the costs and the degree of importance assigned by policymakers with respect to ensuring that effective systemic changes are designed, implemented, sustained, and taken to scale.

Key facets for change: Further, Adelman and Taylor (2007) stated that whatever the nature and scope of the work, the various facets require careful planning based on sound conditions and fundamentals. Key facets include; articulation of a clear, shared vision for the work; ensuring there is a major policy commitment from all participating partners; negotiating partnership agreements; designating leadership; enhancing/developing an infrastructure based on a clear articulation of essential functions (e.g., mechanisms for governance and priority setting, steering, operations,

resource mapping and coordination; strong facilitation related to all mechanisms); redeploying resources and establishing new ones; building capacity (especially personnel development and strategies for addressing personnel and other stakeholder mobility); and establishing standards, evaluation processes, and accountability procedures.

Creating readiness for systemic change: Any move toward substantive systemic change should begin with activity designed to create readiness by enhancing a climate/culture for change. Anderson and Taylor (2007, p. 59) extracted the following points as most relevant to enhancing readiness for change:

- A high level of policy commitment that is translated into appropriate resources, including leadership, space, budget, and time.
- Incentives for change, such as mobilization for acceptance of change, intrinsically valued outcomes, expectations for success, recognition, and rewards.
- Procedural options from which those expected to implement change can select those they see as workable.
- A willingness to establish conditions and processes that facilitate change efforts,
- Accomplishing change in stages and with realistic time lines.

- Providing progress feedback.
- Institutionalizing support conditions to maintain and evolve changes and to generate periodic renewal.

This theory by Adelman and Taylor (2007) provides another justification for this study. By implication, this theory supports the present interest in acceptability as a key to the successful implementation of a reform such as MSF. MSF is an innovation for school improvement and as Adelman and Taylor have shown, its effective implementation depends on determining its nature and focus, the phases, the key facets and conditions necessary for it to thrive. On the other hand, school improvement obviously needs to begin with a clear framework and map for what changes are to be made. It should be equally obvious that there must be a clear framework and map for how to get from “here to there,” especially when the improvements require significant systemic change. And, in both cases, there is a need for collective assessment of existing strengths and weaknesses by all those who are affected by school improvement.

Moreover, principals as managers have many duties, and the primary one is improving the school organization and the employees in these changing times of increasing pressures. It is also clear that schools could be better improved when principals utilize feedback from various stakeholders to

improve their managerial skills and abilities. Given that principals have been receiving only feedback from supervisors from ministry of education and state post primary school boards; to what extent will they accept to use feedback from teachers, students and parents? How will the feedback inform structured and unstructured school improvement by the principals? What domains of leadership would principals accept to be subjected to MSF for school improvement by principals? With all this in mind, this study focuses on exploring issues relevant to acceptability of MSF by principals for school improvement.

Theoretical Studies

This section contains relevant sub-headings that discuss the views and opinions of previous authors on MSF, school improvement and principals school improvement responsibilities.

Parameters for Acceptability of MSF

In this section, the parameters for determining acceptance of MSF are discussed. These parameters are relevance, sources, goals, domain identification and feedback utilization.

Relevance: Hjørland (2010) defined relevance as pertinence and the ability of something to satisfy the needs of something else. Ofojebe (2010) described relevance as related to the matter at hand and at the same time

explained that relevance is concerned with practical and especially social applicability of something. For Childs (2006), relevance is mainly related to the question of whether an innovation accurately matches real or perceived interests to justify its adoption. The author linked the issue of relevance to the question of context-based learning and meaningfulness of innovations. Dipali and Maulik (2014) described it as the quality of being considered useful and important for use.

Relevance of MSF is associated with whether it is considered timely, useful, has predictive value, and is going to make a difference to a decision maker. Labaree (2008) also stated that relevance of school improvement practices can be evaluated based on the following two key success criteria:

Suitability: This deals with the overall rationale of the practice. The key point to consider is whether the practice would address the key strategic issues and areas underlined by the schools.

Feasibility: which is concerned with whether the resources required to implement the practice are available, can be developed or obtained.

Resources include funding, people, time and information (p. 422)

According to Earley, Higham, Allen, Howson, Nelson, Rawar, Lynch, Morton, Mehta and Sims (2012), a practice for school improvement is considered relevant if it is capable of developing and maintaining a viable

fit between an organization's objectives and its changing opportunities. McCauley and Moxley (2013) pointed out that the practice is capable of assisting in forming a strategic vision of where the school needs to head, so as to provide long-term direction, deliberate what kind of enterprise the company is trying to become, and infuse the organization with a sense of purposeful action.

Based on the foregoing, relevance is seen as the state of something having some kind of clear connection to issues and problems in the field of educational practice, particularly if it promises to be useful to practitioners who are trying to deal with these issues and resolve these problems. In this sense, relevance begs the question, useful to whom and for what? The relevance of MSF to school improvement is seen as whether principals, vice-principals and teachers will consider MSF fit and worthy of being used to improve schools.

Rater Sources: The participants in a MSF process are also important because they provide the ratings of an individual's performance and rater sources affect acceptability of feedback. According to Dipali and Maulik (2014), the acceptability of feedback from a source increases as the dimension being evaluated is more relevant to that source. Maher (2009) specified that ideally, raters in MSF include employees, peers, subordinates,

supervisors, and others within the evaluatee's circle of involvement. McCauley and Moxley (2013) advised that data should be collected from 'all around an employee: his or her peers, subordinates, supervisors, and sometimes, from internal and external customers.

However, not all persons in a rates environment can provide credible ratings and managers may not accept some rater sources for personal reasons. Raters at different organizational levels experience varying aspects of the leader's performance, because one would expect those with more exposure to rate the person more accurately because they acquired more information. Doherty (2013) warned that sometimes, all the raters--the subordinates, supervisors, peers, and customers, for example--provide similar feedback to one another and to the participants themselves. Subordinate ratings are affected by the goal of the multisource system. Furthermore, self-ratings can be unreliable, suffering from leniency, social desirability bias and/or inflation (Eberlein, Ludwig & Nafziger, 2010). If not properly administered, multi-rater feedback might cause unnecessary tension among employees. In other instances, some pronounced discrepancies are observed (McCauley & Moxley, 2013). These discrepancies affect the utility of multisource feedback. It is important to include only acceptable groups as raters.

Hence, to increase acceptability of MSF, Egbe and Baker (2012) stated that the characteristics of the rater source, such as the credibility of the raters is essential to ensure comprehensive, unbiased and ethical ratings. Dipali and Maulik (2014) advised that only those that know the organization too well, those who work closely with the manager and those that will be directly affected by feedback results will be included as raters. Because direct reports work very closely with their supervisors and in many cases do not feel comfortable disclosing how they feel about their supervisor, the confidential multi-rater feedback is likely to be an excellent outlet (Atwater et al, 2012). Ferris, Spence, Brown and Heller (2012) also stated that to respect the self-esteem of the ratee, it is important to allow them indicate the groups (not individual) that would be included in MSF. So the present study would also answer the question of who are the groups to take part in MSF school improvement?

Goals: It is also essential to determine the purposes and goals which MSF is going to serve in an organization. It is important that organizations clearly determine the objective of the multi-source feedback approach before it is adopted. Failure to do this can lead to the process trying to achieve numerous objectives which can often be conflicting (Grissom & Loeb, 2009). A study conducted by Fletcher and Bailey (2003) found that

80 percent of respondents were dissatisfied with their appraisals mainly due to the lack of clarity of goals and multiplicity of objectives. It is therefore necessary for organisations to limit and clearly define their goals and objectives in order to reduce dissatisfaction in the appraisal system as a whole. If the schools set appropriate goals, and have developed the capacity to implement their intentions, this feedback process is more likely to enhance subsequent positive behavior (Smither, London, & Reilly, 2005). Bracken and Rose (2011) stated that it is important for researchers and practitioners to ask, “What goals will MSF serve for it to be beneficial” (p. 184). A determination of the goals will provide focus, direction and result-orientation to schools.

Domain Identification: Another issue in MSF is the determination of the domains to be included in MSF. The domains are to be operationally defined so that raters understand what they are rating. Also Loosbrock (2014) noted that the acceptability factor of the feedback recipient to the feedback is based upon the “dimension” on which the feedback provider is rating. A degree of the feedback recipient’s attention to the feedback provider’s comments is likely contingent on the particular dimension that the rater is evaluating. As observed by Coderman (2014), not all performance dimensions (i.e., competencies) are equal in cognitive

complexity, experience requirements, and emotional involvement. Some areas of performance are harder to improve than others. The nature of the performance dimension may directly impact on the feedback effectiveness, in that feedback recipients likely will make more improvement on easier performance dimensions than harder ones. Further, the nature of the performance dimension may interact with other factors to influence feedback effectiveness indirectly. This implies the need to clearly identify the facets, attributes, qualities, competencies, or dimensions of schools that need to be assessed through MSF.

Previous studies tend to focus overlapping dimensions (Gajek, 2009; Smither, et al, 2005; Zenger, & Folkman, 2014). Common dimensions in these studies relate to innovations in leadership, school structure and social networks, purposes and goals, quality of financial management, quality of human resource management, quality of instructional facilities, and quality of students outcomes. The present study requires the principals and teachers to determine the aspects of their schools that would be exposed to MSF.

Feedback: How to generate and utilize the feedback from MSF is also crucial. These includes the periods for administering MSF, how to collate and make feedback known to recipients and how to ensure that the feedback

is put into use (Atwater, Ostroff, Yammarino & Fleenor, 2012). Generally, feedback that is more accessible--that is readily recalled weeks or months after the information is presented--should be more likely to shape the subsequent behavior and performance of the participant. On the other hand, a feedback that is not accessible and cannot be readily recalled may not affect behavior.

For maximum benefits of MSF to be derived, Cheng (2014) advised that the feedback should be used to provide developmental programmes such as training, mentoring, exceptional programmes and executive coaching to recipients. Earlier, Maher (2009) recommended that when a leader receives feedback from MSF, it is important to create, with the help of a coach, a personal development plan with target goals. When examining the feedback, it may be effective to examine areas where there is a large discrepancy between perceptions of others and self-perceptions. In examining strategies for improving schools possibly, Asumeng (2013) stipulated that feedback would bring out only the areas of needed improvement and will be used to evolve communities of practice in schools. The Commonwealth Department of Education (2012) outlined that feedback from MSF will be used to train leaders to ensure that “leaders create cultures of high expectations, provide clarity about what teachers are

to teach and students are to learn, establish strong professional learning communities and lead ongoing efforts to improve teaching practices” (p.5). The bottom line here is that it is not enough to collect MSF data, data collected must be put into use. This raises other questions in this study which are: at what periods will MSF be obtained and what development programmes will be mounted for principals as a result of feedback from MSF?

Theoretical Model for MSF

A theoretical model for multi-source feedback and performance improvement was proposed by Smither, London & Reilly (2005). In this model, they theorized that eight factors play a role in behavioral change and performance improvement following multi-source feedback. These eight factors fall into four different categories:

1. Characteristics of the feedback itself, such as self-other agreement as well as the favorability of the feedback based on perceived relevance;
2. Characteristics of the feedback recipient, such as self-efficacy and goal orientation
3. Characteristics of the rater source, such as the credibility of the raters, and

4. The nature of the performance dimension or leadership competency managers select to improve performance (Smither et al, 2005, p.15).

They explained that the nature of the performance dimension itself appears likely to directly or indirectly influence feedback effectiveness. This is because not all performance dimensions (i.e., competencies) are equal in cognitive complexity, experience requirements, and emotional involvement. Some areas of performance are harder to improve than others. The nature of the performance dimension may directly impact on the feedback effectiveness, in that feedback recipients likely will make more improvement on easier performance dimensions than harder ones. Further, the nature of the performance dimension may interact with other factors to influence feedback effectiveness indirectly.

Further, Smither et al (2005) were of the opinion that perceived relevance of the MSF to the individual's current role affects performance improvement based on the logic that the perceived importance is related to feedback salience. They gave example of the indirect effects of the nature of the performance dimension on feedback effectiveness as its relationship with self-other agreement. Self-other agreement was found to be influenced by performance dimension rating difficulty.

Further, Smither et al noted that the credibility of rater source also may interact with the performance dimension. For example, a rating on the competency "developing direct reports" is likely to be perceived more credible from direct reports than from other rater sources (e.g., the boss and peers) (Smither et al., 2005, p.23).

Consequently, the objective of MSF should include the descriptions of the performance dimension to be subjected to MSF. It is predicted that feedback recipients will make more improvement on relatively easier-to-develop leadership competencies than on harder ones. Smither et al observed that while logically sound, performance dimensions have not been empirically examined; since the performance dimensions appear to be an obvious factor that influences feedback effectiveness, it is included as a variable in the present study. In addition, the variables of relevance, rater sources and MSF goals are also investigated in this study. Hence, Smither et al's model has provided a viable anchor for the present study.

Goals and Benefits of Multi-Source Feedback

The benefits of MSF are many to both individuals and organisations. The insights gained from MSF is so immense that when successful leaders look back over their careers, they are able to point to key experiences and insights, and what they learned from those experiences and insights that

changed the way they managed (Atwater, Waldman & Brett, 2012). Donnon et al (2014) reported MSF has gained widespread acceptance for both formative and summative assessment of professionals, and is seen as a trigger for reflecting on where improvements are required. Hence, MSF seems to serve many purposes discussed subsequently.

Developmental and promotional goals: MSF can be used to develop an employee's skills without directly affecting employment status. For example, multi-rater feedback can be used as a promotional tool where, once the feedback is gathered from everyone, it can be used to evaluate the participant receiving the feedback to either promote or demote the employee (Ferguson, Wakeling & Bowie, 2014). In the USA, MSF is primarily utilized to facilitate the development of managers and leaders (Atwater et al, 2012). It can also be used as a promotional tool where once the feedback is gathered from everyone, it can be used to evaluate the participant receiving the feedback to either promote or demote the employee (Raghunadhan & Sequeira, 2013). In Australia, it is also used to determine the pay and promotion of individuals (Australian Capital Territory, 2009).

However, Pollack and Pollack (2005) found that managers valued MSF for developmental purposes but did not see it as suitable for pay and promotion

decisions. Bettenhausen (2010) similarly found a more positive response for the developmental and not promotional use of peer and upward feedback. Others (Fletcher, 2007; McCauley & Moxley, 2013) have reported that organizations introducing 360 degree feedback for appraisal purposes have in many cases dropped it within 2 years, and focused on its developmental purposes. Hence, it seems that MSF feedback is most successful when used for development purposes rather than for promotional purposes.

Another benefit of MSF for developmental purposes is that when used as a developmental tool, feedback is made known to the individual receiving the feedback. The owners of the data determine who will see the data and how it will be used (Dipali & Maulik, 2014; McCauley & Moxley, 2013). Rater anonymity is very important as it improves the likelihood that rater responses will be truthful. The developmental purpose of the multi-rater feedback is to assist each individual to understand his/her strengths and weaknesses, set goals, and lead to individual development. The multi-rater feedback should not be shared with bosses for promotional purposes, but rather used as an improvement tool. Based on the data, initiatives for development in the areas of weaknesses are commenced (Atwater et al, 2012). Indeed, Debebe and Reinert (2014) found that raters who think their

ratings will remain anonymous will more likely respond honestly than those raters who think their responses will be shared with those being rated.

Benefits to Organisations: Multi-source feedback is beneficial at the organization level in many ways. First of all, companies use multi-source advice to introduce organizational culture change, to enhance two-way communication and to encourage positive attitude toward learning; for example, to foster working culture on participative leadership, empowerment, customer service, quality focus, re-engineering, competency-based rewards and team-based rewards (Asumeng, 2013; Atwater & Waldman, 2012). Secondly, multi-source feedback is used as a tool to help sustain focused behavioral change in majority of employees that leads to organizational effectiveness (Conway, & Huffcut, 2013). Thirdly, it is used to align employee performance expectations with corporate values (Bracken & Rose, 2011). In this aspect, it can call attention to the important performance dimensions neglected by managers of organizations. For instance, it is effective in uncovering undesirable characteristics about staff, thus increasing discussion between employees and management of the organisation about undesirable work behavior.

Fourthly, companies use multi-source feedback to increase employee competencies on changing needs at work, i.e. an increased span of control,

more knowledgeable workers, practices of project management and teamwork (Donnon, Al- Ansari, Samah, & Claudio, 2013). In the fifth way, multi-source feedback is used to improve employee relations on different aspects, for instance, career development, fair reward decisions, accurate performance measures, valid performance measures, non-performance, diversity management, and legal protection (Su, 2014). Ultimately MSF improves the culture of organizations and the performance of managers.

Generally, studies show that organizational performance will improve once a multi-rater feedback is completed and managers trained on their weaknesses (Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Donnon et al, 2014). It creates an explicit link between individual performance and the organization's strategic goals (Cheng, 2014). Ermongkonchai (2008) found that multi-rater feedback ratings were positively related to retail store outcomes, such as revenue, gross margin, and sales of accessories and service contracts in a sample of store managers. However, upward feedback ratings of bank branch managers correlated significantly with customers' states intentions to remain customers. Furthermore, Gajek (2009) found that managers who received more favorable multi-rater feedback had lower turnover and higher service quality in their workgroups.

It is possible that introducing a multi-rater feedback to an organization by itself sends the message to those in the organization that improvement in performance should be the outcome and as a result, people are motivated to try harder to improve the competencies measured in a questionnaire. Therefore, just the idea of implementing a multi-rater feedback might have a positive effect on an organization and its employees.

Benefits for Individuals: At individual level, a survey report on the use of multi-source feedback indicated that 92 % of users find the report useful for self-development (Loosbrock, 2014). Also Asumeng (2013) reported further benefits to serve individual needs. Firstly, multi-source feedback is perceived by employees as being fair, accurate, and credible and motivating. Secondly, multi-source feedback is applicable to all professions. Thirdly, it creates employee accountability and service to all stakeholders. Fourthly, multi-source feedback is an effective system to encourage employees' participation.

One of the most important researches on the contributions of multi-source feedback was conducted by Edwards and Ewen (1996). They found that participants' skills increased after receiving multi-source feedbacks which identify their strengths and weaknesses for development. In addition, a raise in self-awareness from multiple perspectives caused individuals to improve

themselves and their organizations. This aligns with London and McFarland (2010) who maintained that multi-source feedback improves individual goals, skill development, behavior and performance through self-image re-evaluation moderated by schemas, task self-efficacy, and impression management. Fletcher and Bailey (2003) also stated that multi-source feedback provides significant benefits to be used with training and developing individuals.

Reliable and Valid Performance Improvement Tool: Studies have indicated that multi-source feedback has improved reliability and validity of performance appraisal, such as central tendency and leniency errors (Patel, Sharma, West, Bates, Davies & Abdel-Tawab, 2011). Sargeant (2015) indicated that it encourages employees' participation and improves overall appraisal satisfaction, and at the same time, provides self-assessment ratings as reliable measures of behaviors. More importantly, the use of average ratings by subordinates has shown to have acceptable predictive validity of future performances (Ermongkonchai, 2008). Donnon, et al, (2013) had also shown that MSF provided a reliable and objective source of information for improvement in different organizations.

MSF has also been associated with professional development and improved competency of medical directors and managers of medical facilities

(Ferguson, Wakeling & Bowie, 2014). As a result of the multi-rater feedback, participants might increase their learning potential and skill development. Similarly, Gajek (2009) found that multisource feedback increases individual self-awareness, and as part of a strategic organizational process can promote managerial development through:

1. Increased understanding of the behaviors required to improve both individual and organizational effectiveness
 2. More focused development activities, built around the skills and competencies required for successful organizational performance
 3. Increased involvement of people at all levels of the organization
 4. Increased individual ownership for self-development and learning
 5. Increased familiarity with the implications of cultural or strategic change
- (p. 21)

From the exploration of the benefits of MSF, it is apparent that MSF has been found to provide a more reliable and valid assessment of management behavior and performance. Feedback from MSF could lead to (a) personal changes that spark the principals to search for new perspectives in their management; (b) external events, awareness that MSF would be used to assess them, so they need to explore opportunities to expand their managerial capabilities; (c) changes in the managers' work practices and environment to accommodate the interests of others; and (d) planned and structured developmental interventions such as workshops and seminars for

managerial development of principals. By utilizing MSF, school principals can identify the skills necessary for their leaders to develop the people and the organization they lead. Once these skills are identified, leadership training can be implemented to promote an effective managerial development in schools. As a result, the organization, leaders, employees, customers, and stakeholders should reap the expected benefits of (1) improved employee performance, (2) improved organizational performance, (3) student satisfaction, (4) improved employee morale, (5) stakeholder profits, and (6) leadership success.

Disadvantages of Multi-Source Feedback

Multi-Source Feedback has some disadvantages. For example, using multi-rater feedback for promotional purposes is not beneficial for many reasons. When participants in the multi-rater feedback assume that their input will affect a coworker or their own career, they are more likely to manipulate the feedback to their own advantage (Conger & Toegel, 2003). Another disadvantage is that when the multi-rater feedback is used for promotion or pay increases, the raters do not feel safe and might not be honest in their ratings. When used for appraisal purposes, the participants focus on getting good ratings, and it is more challenging to identify weaknesses (Nowack,

2009). This form of evaluation is not likely to lead to developmental improvement for the employee receiving the feedback.

Multi-source feedback can affect the interpersonal behavior of managers. After they receive negative feedback, for example, managers sometimes demonstrate less commitment and support to their subordinates (Doherty, 2013). Multisource feedback, especially if unfavorable, can obviously provoke a host of negative attitudes or emotions. Negative feedback, for example, has been shown to elicit anger or discouragement, which can affect subsequent improvement and performance (Bracken, & Rose, 2011).

Some research shows that multi-rater feedback may not necessarily lead to positive outcomes. The feedback offered by the employees to the recipient may not always be truthful (Georgescu & Stănculescu, 2012). If the feedback is not truthful and thus not valid, it is difficult to gather any information from it that can be of use to the recipient of the feedback or the organization as whole. Furthermore, self-ratings can be unreliable, suffering from leniency, social desirability bias and/or inflation (Corderman, 2014). If not properly administered, multi-rater feedback might cause unnecessary tension among employees.

Furthermore, there is little evidence that multi-rater feedback consistently results in behavior change or performance improvement. Atwater and

Waldman (2012) found that only half of leaders receiving feedback improved significantly. Smither, London, Vasilopoulos, Reilly, Millsap, and Salvemini (2011) also failed to find evidence of changes in self-evaluations six months following the initial upward feedback. Furthermore, Smither, London and Richmond (2005) demonstrated that providing individuals with feedback did not automatically lead to performance improvements for everyone. Although, the recipient showed improvement in performance on the average, there was a great deal of variability among recipient scores. Some recipients scored very poorly on performance as a result of the multi-rater feedback and some scored very well. Thus, although a comparison of group averages of pre and post feedback scores may show overall improvements, not every individual is likely to make improvements.

Given the disadvantages of MSF, it is clear that it can lead to either positive change or resistance to improvements in organizations. To increase its positive results, it is important that participants accept it. Also, how well the feedback works depends on the utilization of the feedback. This explains why feedback utilization is also being investigated in this study.

Principles for the Construction of Multisource Feedback Programmes

MSF is based on several principles discussed below:

Item development: The development of items for MSF is important. MSF instruments should be designed to be both intentionally transformative and informative. Given the patterns in professional development reviewed by Atwater and Waldman (2012), principals' appraisal instruments that are not developmentally informed will be primarily informative and haphazardly transformative. Hence, the instrument will be designed to reflect useful information domains of principals' practices. Reports will usually present the average of scores given by managers, direct reports, and peers in order to protect raters' anonymity. There will also be typically an overall score. The validity and reliability of the instrument will also be determined. Loosbrock (2014, p. 36) recommended using secondary sources to review literature and ensuring that:

1. Multisource feedback should, at least initially be introduced merely to facilitate development and not for pay increase or promotion.
2. The number of items should be comprehensive. It may range from 60 to 100, although longer instruments are sometimes administered
3. Items should depict tangible behaviors, such as "Developing and implementing goals targeted at improving test scores"

4. Five or six point scales should be applied, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, for example.
5. Generally, ratings should be anonymous

In addition, the instruments used for feedback may be designed specifically to reflect the competencies and/or behaviors that a specific organization wants to develop in its staff. In this case, participants will be advised that this is a company-specific tool reflecting the organization's leadership or competence model. In the context of leadership development programs or coaching interventions, particularly those delivered by independent education providers (e.g., business schools) and/or external coaches, well-established independent feedback instruments that are not tied to one specific organization are often used. In this case, the focus of the instrument is usually on generally accepted competencies, behaviors, or traits found in successful management executives through thorough research. Examples of such instruments are Manfred Kets de Vries's Global Executive Leadership Inventory (GELI) ¹ or James Kouzes and Barry Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) ².

How to rate: Careful selection of the raters in 360-degree feedbacks are crucial to the success and usefulness of the collected data (Donnon et al, 2014). Therefore, school leaders should be careful not to choose raters who

they know will give positive and/or biased feedback. In addition, raters should receive some training on how to evaluate individuals effectively; common biases such as halo effects, central tendency, and other distortions should be discussed (Brutus, 2006). Participants should be instructed to rate themselves, partly to prevent the common assumption that all of the responses were anticipated. After they receive a report, the participants should be granted an opportunity to share their feedback with raters and seek suggestions--an activity that significantly, albeit modestly, enhances improvement over time (Smither, et al, 2011).

In addition, using MSF that is transformative requires an attention to the various sources of ratings (ways of knowing) which the principals would consider acceptable. It is only when principals accept and reflect on such feedback that they could use them to transform schools. Otherwise, the feedback would remain mere information (Conway & Huffcut, 2013). Hence, Berger (2011) suggested that acceptable sources of perspective taking, offer a simpler, more accessible way to usher in transformation. Hence, the central premise underlying the use of MSF is that by utilizing acceptable multiple rater sources, the amount of relevant, valid information provided to ratees is increased and utilized to facilitate transformation.

Identification of the Key Facets to Measure: A variety of approaches has been applied to uncover the facets for measurement. The key facets reflect the domains, attributes, qualities, competencies, or dimensions that need to be assessed. The common domains culled from DeNisi and Sonesh (2010); Edwards, Elliott, Iszatt-White and Schedlitzki (2013) and Smither, et al (2011) relate to:

- Communication, both oral and written, as well as listening
- Planning and organizing, personal adaptability and motivation.
- Delegation, participation, and empowerment,
- Conflict management and cultivating teamwork,
- Motivating others, people development, coaching, and support
- Problem analysis,
- Occupational and technical knowledge,
- Financial and quantitative skills,
- Fairness, integrity, respect, and appreciation of diversity,
- Personal organization and time management,
- Commitment to quality and customer satisfaction,
- Reporting of feedback.

Typically, participants receive a report that presents the average rating they received on each item. Sometimes, the ratings of each category, such as subordinates and peers, are presented separately. In addition, discrepancies between self and other ratings are highlighted. To ascertain whether these ratings are favorable or unfavorable, norms may be reported. That is, the average ratings of other managers, in the same industry, nation, or

organization, may be presented. Furthermore, a list of recommendations might be presented. These recommendations might be derived from the comments or remarks of raters. Alternatively, these recommendations might be generated by consultants after an analysis of the ratings.

School Improvement Features

There are some features that have been associated with school improvement. A set of these features was derived from Hallinger and Heck (2010). They outlined these features based on the results of a comprehensive review of successful schools in the United Kingdom. They espoused some features that drive successful school improvement initiatives. These features involve:

1. Using the school as the centre of the change,
2. Planning and managing improvement to take place over several periods,
3. Changes focused not only on teaching/learning activities but also on leadership procedures to support these teaching and learning processes,
4. The harnessing and synchronising of the roles of teachers, school heads, governors, parents, support staff and local authorities to the processes of school improvement (p. 21).

Supporting this, Levin (2012) added that school improvement is aimed at education reform strategies and, in turn, getting results through some

features. The author stated that rapidly improving schools, and schools that produce unusually good outcomes given their student intakes and circumstances, tend to have a number of features in common. These features are:

1. They pursue an explicit improvement agenda – they know what they want to improve and they know how they will monitor success.
2. The staff of the school work together as a team, supporting each other and with a clear focus on improving the quality of teaching and learning in the school.
3. Efforts are made to use multiple data sources to identify and understand the learning needs of students in the school and to use available human and physical resources to address those needs.
4. The school builds relationships with parents and others outside the school in support of its improvement agenda.
5. Early (about a year) in a new principal's incumbency a multi-source review of the principals' performances can provide a 'point in time' summary and a road map for school improvement work.
6. After a principal's extended leave, a MSF review is useful as a way of mapping improvement and identifying areas for future focus.

7. Mid-contract, a principal may choose to invite MSF to undertake a review to allow for big picture planning in teaching and learning.
8. Near the end of a principal's contract, a MSF review is useful as an overarching recording of weaknesses and recommended practices (p. 25).

The author also noted that if there has been a significant change in the leadership team, schools report that a MSF review is extremely worthwhile to bind a team through focusing on improvement. In addition, schools entering a new strategic planning cycle will find that review can be instrumental in establishing the leadership, teaching and learning goals for the overall plan. According to Seifert and Hartnell-Young (2015), certain frameworks of improvement programmes flow necessarily from this concept of improvement:

1. Vision: without a concept of where we are trying to get to, the verb "to improve" has no meaning;
2. Monitoring: we must know where we are now in relation to the vision;
3. Planning: how will we get from where we are towards where we want to be?
4. Performance indicators: to track progress over time in respect of the aspects we monitor (p.44).

Thus a focus on obtaining multiple data on trends in schools vision and pupils' academic performance is inevitable. In a related dimension, Wagner and Kegan (2011) noted that schools which succeeded “against the odds” in improving against a background of significant pupil and community disadvantage shared the following characteristics:

- A leadership stance which embodies (in its leadership team) and builds a team approach,
- A vision of success couched in academic terms and including a view of how to improve,
- Careful use of targets and improvement of the physical environment,
- Common expectations about behaviour and success,
- Investment in good relations with parents and the community,
- Transformational leadership in the leadership team, offering the possibility of change and school-wide emphasis on teaching and learning,
- Commitment to staff development and training,
- Use of performance data to guide decisions, targets and tactics,
- Teamwork both within staff groups (collaborative planning, effective communication) and with stakeholders (involvement of teachers, pupils, parents in decision-making),
- Early and determined action based on constructive feedback,
- Simultaneous action at whole-school (leadership), teacher and classroom levels,
- Balance of support and pressure for staff and community

- Internal and external processes, top-down and bottom-up, must be coordinated.

In formulating any improvement strategy, schools are encouraged to learn from the research into effective school improvement programmes (Ehren, et al, 2015; Ko, et al, 2015; Valiant, 2015). The basic issues running through these features are data collection, collaborative environment, and targeting students' achievement. Student achievement is likely to be greatest where teachers and administrators work together, in small groups and school-wide, to identify sources of student success and then struggle collectively to implement school improvement. It is envisaged that data from MSF will provide valuable sources that will help principals to focus on these issues.

School Improvement Domains

School improvement domains are the performance areas that are critical to effectively lead a school in improving student achievement and school resources. These domains are mostly outlined as the performance indicators are intended to provide clarity and specificity about the skills, beliefs, and knowledge a principal needs to demonstrate effective leadership in improving student achievement (Elliott & Clifford, 2014; School Improvement Maryland, 2014; Wahlstrom, Louis, Leithwood & Anderson, 2010). In Nigeria, FME (2010) categorized the activities for school

improvement into several domains and stressed that the assessment of schools will be made against these four domains as long as school improvement is concerned.

Domain 1: Teaching-Learning: This includes instructional leadership, teachers' initiative and efforts, students' efforts and expected behavior, and curriculum related issues. As has been mentioned by FME, greater emphasis was given to this domain by the implementing schools, as it is the key contributing area to the success of a school. The school leadership and management also take responsibility to have a strategic role in ensuring the success of teaching and learning, keeping the student environment and involving parents and the community to contribute to the effectiveness of school strategies to ensure success. Included under this are the quality of teaching, learning and assessment, and curriculum.

Domain 2: School Leadership and Management: Included under this are actions to be taken by the school leadership and management to implement school improvement program in the school. These are designing school vision in collaboration with school improvement committee, preparing strategic planning and getting ready to bring about change, effective utilization of resources, promoting the participation of stakeholders in school improvement program, innovativeness and self-critical tendency of

the school management. Also FME (2010) added issues in promoting collaborative problem solving and open communication, use of information and communications technology, collecting, analyzing, and using data to identify school needs, implementing and monitoring the school improvement plan, and establishing a clear focus on attaining student achievement goals.

Domain 3: Safe and Healthy School Environment: This domain includes student focus, student empowerment, and how well students are supported. It embraces activities done by teachers and the school principal to keep the school environment safe and healthy for students. These activities include principal's willingness to support students and help them to become independent and responsible citizens and his trend to create a safe, supportive and welcoming educational environment for all students. In addition, the principal's practice of setting clear directions for the school and his/her effort to keep the beauty of school fences and campus are the major activities needed to be done by the school principal in his/her effort to keep safe student environment. Also included is the degree to which positive learning attitudes are promoted; how well are students supported to become independent and responsible; and the presence of safe education environment. In addition, consistent and regular student attendance,

adequate facilities and learning classes for students, attractiveness and the beauty of school fences and campus, and teachers' expectations of all students were all assessed here.

Domain 4: Community Involvement: This domain of school improvement includes effectiveness of school strategies to support parents and caretakers in helping their children to learn; how well parents and caretakers are actively involved in school events, and existence of community involvement policy in the school (FME, 2010). Generally, the following are issues need to be addressed here: the presence of effective strategies in school to support parents and guardians, efforts made by the principal to invite parents and guardians to school so that they can be actively involved in school affairs, accessibility of communication to all parents, efforts made to get financial and material supports from the community; the presence of community involvement policy which encourages the community to support and participate in school life. Whether school principal designs school vision in collaboration with staff, Parents-Teachers' Association (PTA), community and students is important (p.13-15).

The aforementioned domains are the key to school improvement in which Nigerian secondary schools are currently targeting. A close look at these domains will show that school leaders are expected to possess an all-

encompassing knowledge of teaching and learning towards the creation and design of educational programs that promote academic rigor and excellence; while maintaining safe learning environments and positive school cultures where social justice can flourish.

At this point, it is necessary to present some international domains to show that Nigeria is actually on the right track. One example is from Australia, where Seifert and Hartnell-Young (2015) outlined nine inter-related domains of a National School Improvement Tool applied in schools in Australia. These domains are:

1. An explicit improvement agenda,
2. Analysis and discussion of data,
3. A culture that promotes learning,
4. Targeted use of school resources,
5. An expert teaching team,
6. Systematic curriculum delivery,
7. Differentiated teaching and learning,
8. Effective pedagogical practices,
9. School-community partnerships.

Implicit in these domains and the earlier one in Nigeria is that both cover the combination of three concepts identified by OECD (2014) as

constituting the foundation for positive improvement results. These concepts are: meaningful teamwork; clear, measurable goals; and the regular collection and analysis of performance data. By implication, principals must lead their schools through the goal-setting process in which student achievement data is analyzed, improvement areas are identified and actions for change are initiated. This process involves working collaboratively with staff and school community to identify discrepancies between current and desired outcomes, to set and prioritize goals to help close the gap, to develop improvement and monitoring strategies aimed at accomplishing the goals, and to communicate goals and change efforts to the entire school community. Principals must also ensure that staff development needs are identified in alignment with school improvement priorities and that these needs are addressed with appropriate professional learning opportunities.

The domains are similar to those used and tested in England, the USA, Canada and Australia (American Association of School Administrators, 2010; Australian Capital Territory 2009; Bouchamma, Basque & Marcotte, 2014; Earley et al, 2012; Spillane, 2013). But the question which the present study addresses is, will the school leaders and teachers accept that all of these domains will be included in MSF for school improvement?

Principals' Leadership Responsibilities for School Improvement

Over the last two decades, the importance of principals' leadership responsibilities to school improvement has become an increased area of research. Study after study has placed the spotlight directly on principals for maintaining school safety, changing school culture and climate and ultimately improving student achievement and learning (Adebunmi & Saheed, 2014; Center for the School of the Future, 2012; Taole, 2013; Wagner, 2011). Specifically, the Federal Ministry of Education (2013) rightly stated that great schools do not exist apart from great leaders. In addition, the Road Map for Education (FME, 2009, p.28) emphasized the need to “empower school leaders to take responsibility and ownership for school improvement so that they can bring about development in their own schools”. In specific terms, Arikewuyo (2009) viewed the functions of the principal as follows:

1. Providing leadership for curriculum development;
2. Providing leadership for instruction improvement;
3. Creating an environment conducive for the realization of human potentials;
4. Influencing the behavior of staff members; and
5. Supervising instructional activities in the school system. (p.74).

In a comprehensive description of the increasing responsibilities of principals in school improvement, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 2013) stated that:

In today's climate of heightened expectations, principals are in the hot seat to improve teaching and learning. They need to be educational visionaries; instructional and curriculum leaders; assessment experts; disciplinarians; community builders; public relations experts; budget analysts; facility managers; special program administrators; and expert overseers of legal, contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives. They are expected to broker the often-conflicting interests of parents, teachers, students, district officials, unions, and state and federal agencies; and they need to be sensitive to the widening range of student needs. Although the job description sounds overwhelming, at least it signals that the field has begun to give overdue recognition to the indispensable role of and mounting demands on principals (p.1).

The observation of the NASSP aligns well with the views of Hess and Kelly (2005), who described the demanding expectations and responsibilities of school leaders this way:

School leaders are the front-line managers, the small business executives, the battlefield commanders charged with leading their team to new levels of effectiveness. In this new era of accountability where school leaders are expected to demonstrate bottom line results, and use data to drive decisions, the skills and knowledge of principals matter more than ever...school improvement rests to an unprecedented degree on the quality of school leadership (p. 2).

Over the last decade, the importance of principals leadership to continuous school improvement and increased student achievement has become a well-trod plank on the platform of educational reformers seeking an elixir for all

that ails public education (Elliott & Clifford, 2014; Egboka, Ezeugbor & Enueme, 2015; Hardman, 2011; Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Hopkins & Harris, 2011; Valiant, 2015). Jarvis, Gulati, Mcririck and Simpson (2013) also pointed out that school leaders are expected to possess an all-encompassing knowledge of teaching and learning towards the creation and design of educational programs that promote academic rigor and excellence, while maintaining safe learning environments and positive school cultures where social justice can flourish.

In 2011, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) created a joint committee to develop a framework for principal evaluation that can guide the improvement of professional practice that leads to increased student learning. The framework includes six key domains of leadership responsibility for school improvement that fall within a principal's sphere of influence:

- Professional growth and learning,
- Student growth and achievement,
- School planning and progress,
- School culture,
- Professional qualities and instructional leadership,
- Stakeholder support and engagement.

Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) reported a meta-analysis of over 5000 studies of factors affecting student achievement. From that Meta-analysis, 21 principal responsibilities along with 66 behaviors were identified that have reinforced an understanding of the complex and necessary role of the principal. That study found that principal leadership matters and that the application of leadership responsibilities is significantly correlated with higher student achievement. Waters, et al, also argue that leadership is more than just possessing knowledge about schools and education. They stated that:

Effective leaders understand how to balance pushing for change, while at the same time protecting aspects of culture, values and norms worth preserving. They know which policies, practices, resources and incentives to align and how to align them with organizational priorities. They know how to gauge the magnitude of change they are calling for and how to tailor their leadership strategies accordingly. Finally, they understand and value the people in the organization. They know when, why and how to create learning environments that support people, connect them with one another and provide the knowledge, skills and resources they need to succeed (p. 2).

Successful school leaders influence student achievement through the support and development of effective teachers, and through the implementation of effective organizational practices (Ehren, et al 2015; Goldring, Mavrogordato & Haynes, 2014; Normansell, 2011). In another

report, the Wallace Foundation (2011, p.4) identified five key responsibilities of principals for school improvement:

- Shaping a vision of academic success for all students, one based on high standards.
- Creating a climate hospitable to education in order that safety, a cooperative spirit and other foundations of fruitful interaction prevail.
- Cultivating leadership in others so that teachers and other adults assume their part in realizing the school vision
- Improving instruction to enable teachers to teach at their best and students to learn at their utmost.
- Managing people, data and processes to foster school improvement.

The report identified an important qualification about those key responsibilities:

Each of these five tasks needs to interact with the other four for any part to succeed. It is hard to carry out a vision of student success, for example;

If the school climate is characterized by student disengagement, or teachers don't know what instructional methods work best for their students, or test data are clumsily analyzed. When all five tasks are well carried out, however, leadership is at work to improve schools (Wallace Foundation, 2011, p. 5).

Also, since the duties of an educational leader varied widely, school administrators were required constantly to change gears and tasks at a rapid

pace with little time for concentration and reflection (Condon & Clifford, 2012; Khan & Khan, 2014; Levin, 2012; Mbonu, 2015). Further, school leaders were required to face a wide array of challenges and to serve in a large range of roles (Ofojebe, 2010, Uzoechina, 2013). Further, Day, Sammons, Leithwood, Hopkins, Gu, Brown and Ahtaridou (2011) determined that four categories of core practices that led to successful school leadership for school improvement. These practices were building vision and setting directions, understanding and developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing teaching and learning. More specifically, Pont (2014) explained that building a vision included making sure the vision was shared, fostering the acceptance of group goals and demonstrating expectations for high performance. For Doss (2014), understanding and developing people included building knowledge and skills of teachers as well as building teacher dispositions that allow for the application of the knowledge and skills. Redesigning the organization included building collaborative cultures, restructuring the organization, and building relationships with parents and the community. Included in managing teaching and learning was staffing the school, providing teacher support, monitoring school activity, and insulating the staff from distractions.

Day et al (2011, p. 51) identified six responsibilities critical in the practice of leadership, these are:

- (1) Identifying and articulating a vision;
- (2) Fostering the acceptance of group goals;
- (3) Providing individualised support;
- (4) Intellectual stimulation;
- (5) Providing an appropriate model; and
- (6) High performance expectations.

The preceding discussion indeed supports the fact that principals have a large responsibility to improve schools. Principals as school leaders improve teaching and learning indirectly and most powerfully through their influence on staff motivation, commitment, and working conditions. However, the drive for school improvement is not only limited to the efforts of principals. It needs the endeavor of all who are engaged in the school improvement programme. So who are the individuals taking part in school improvement? What roles do they play in the school improvement programme? The following sections shortly present these issues.

Partners in School Improvement

To be successful, leaders need perspective on how their behavior is impacting those around them. Everyone involved in or interested in the

work of the school has a role to play in the process of improvement planning (OECD: 2012). If the school self-assessment process using MSF and improvement planning is to be successful, it must involve all school partners. The most effective school improvement results when principals; teachers; students, through school councils and other groups; parents and other community members work together as a team (FME, 2010; Goldring, et al, 2014). Generally, for a successful and effective school improvement process the involvement of all the stakeholders needs to be meaningful. The major ones are discussed below:

Principals are the key players in the school improvement process as they have access to the larger school system, a claim to organizational and historical authority, and the pressure to meet teacher, parent, and student expectations (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). They build trust, focus on the school, convene and sustain the conversation, and insist on the implementation of policy and practice. As long as there are schools that need to be improved or improvements that need to be sustained, the role of the principal will be important. Education research shows that most school variables, considered separately, have at most small effects on learning. Creating the conditions under which that can occur is the job of the principal (Condon & Clifford, 2012; Wallace Foundation, 2011). This is to

say that school principals are key figures that coordinate all resources and different activities in schools, which lead to school improvement.

Teachers are the prime and foremost actors in the teaching learning process, which is the core element of school improvement. School improvement is the job of principals and teachers. Edwards, Elliott, Iszatt-White and Schedlitzki (2013) pointed that if school improvement is the focus, “it is neither teachers alone nor principals alone who improve schools, but teachers and principals working together” (p.11). French (2014) stated that in school activities, teachers are involved in different management positions, besides teaching, and this means that they should be equipped and empowered, if the aim of the school is to bring about improvement or change for better. For instance, teachers play roles in different sections and school committee positions like PTA, School improvement committee, Department head, PTA, school discipline committee, school improvement committee (SIP), co-curricular committee, etc. As collectively indicated by Ekundayo (2010), Grissom and Loeb (2011) and Nwangwa and Omotere (2015), improvement towards effectiveness will have to lean upon teachers’ willingness to adopt a different cultural, as well as organizational, view on their own profession. It is clear that school improvement is mainly determined by teachers’ classroom effectiveness, which brings the

teaching/learning process into the center of the improvement process. By implication, the involvement of teachers in the process of MSF assessment leading to school improvement will be most effective where MSF is acceptable to the teachers.

Student happens to be a major factor for school improvement. There is a growing awareness among students and educators that young people can and should play a crucial role in the success of school improvement (Australian Capital Territory 2009; Ofoegbu, Clark & Osagie, 2013; Wallace Foundation, 2011). Fullan (2007) explained that a number of recent accounts have featured educators refuting the misconception that engaging students as partners in school change is about making students happy, pacifying unruly children, or letting kids run the school. But researchers show that when educators work with students in schools – as opposed to working for them – school improvement is positive and meaningful for everyone involved (Scott & Norris, 2014; Silva, White & Yoshida, 2011; Wahlstrom et al, 2010).

Schools in different countries have their own mechanisms to involve students in different school activities (Goldring, et al, 2014; Normansell, 2011). In Maryland, a local school board has engaged students as full voting members of the school board for more than 25 years. In California, a

group of students led a district-wide evaluation of their teachers, curriculum, facilities, and students. In Nigeria, students evaluate lecturers in Universities (Inko-Tariah, 2013; Nakpodia, 2011). Moreover, school is an example of an experience that students have in common; and yet, despite experts' calls for meaningful student involvement, there is no widespread effort to engage students in school improvement. As Fullan (2007) wrote, "When adults think of students, they think of them as potential beneficiaries of change... they rarely think of students as participants in a process of school change and organizational life." Meaningful student involvement authorizes students and adults to form powerful partnerships to improve schools (p.4).

As for the parents, National Policy on Education (2004) requires parents involvement policies that include a variety of actions and processes. This is because children benefit academically when parents and educators work together. They also feel safe when they observe their parents working with the school community at school. If parents are regularly involved in school activities, students feel safe on their lesson, they will be punctual to school, develop a positive attitude to the school and the school community.

The contribution of parents ranges from parents involvement in the instruction of their own children, at one extreme, to direct participation in

school decision making, at the other. This can empower the final result of students, at which the school improvement is targeted. No matter the student population, involving parents primarily in the instruction of their own children is most likely to contribute to children's learning (Duze, 2012).

To ensure parents are informed about and involved in their children's education, schools must improve their partnerships with parents. A good way to do this is to involve parents in the improvement process (FME, 2009). For instance, schools benefit when they include parents in the decision-making process. When parents provide their opinions and preferences regarding issues under consideration, they are more likely to buy-in to school policies and initiatives (Pansiri & Bulawa, 2013). When parents are aware of the complexities of running a school, they are often more supportive. Additionally, parents can help the school reach out to other parents, share ideas, and gather input because they have informal access through extra-curricular activities and neighborhood connections. To achieve their school improvement objectives, schools need to have parent involvement policies and engage parents in different school improvement duties, which enable them to win the attention of students and gain the willingness of parents.

Community involvement has been a central theme in educational reform. Today, community involvement has taken on renewed significance in configurations and discussions of school improvement (Pinto, 2014; Richard, 2014). In the previous times, community involvement was considered as gaining financial or material support from the community. But today, financial or material support is one aspect of community involvement in education. It goes beyond the mere seeking of benefit from the community. It is rather a mutual benefit between the two, community and school. Among the other activities of community members at the school level are participating in different management positions (for example PTA, School Governing Boards etc.), contributing their effort and ideas, teaching students about the tradition/culture or history of the local people and other things

The role of the wider community in school improvement should be given high emphasis, particularly for a country like Nigeria, where the decentralized education system is being made practical with the intent of involving the community in decision-making at school level (Nwaka, 2010). To ensure parents are informed about and involved in their children's education, schools must improve their partnerships with parents. A good way to do this is to involve parents in the improvement process.

Evidence has suggested that school improvement can be achieved if a school has a commitment to its community. By developing a deep and a mutual relationship with people and organizations in the local community, a school gains not only information, knowledge and support but also a sense of moral purpose. Put differently, in order to envisage their school improvement schemes, schools need to actively involve communities in the process of school evaluation.

In summary, the active involvement of different partners in school improvement activities is opportunity for more democratic and participatory approaches in principals' strive for building stronger school improvement scheme in their schools. Attempting to meet this goal in the absence of active participation of the aforementioned bodies is to become deficient. Involving them in MSF would inspire them to make inputs for improvement and take part in whatever programmes the school design as a result of MSF.

Empirical Studies

This section presents review of available and related empirical studies on multi-source feedback and school improvement.

Studies on MSF in Educational Organizations

Studies have been carried out on MSF in educational organizations. Smith (2000) investigated the Use of 360-Degree Feedback Compared to Traditional Evaluative Feedback for the Professional Growth of Teachers in K–12 Education in New York. The purpose of the study was to understand teachers' perceptions of the quality of feedback they received from the traditional administrative evaluative feedback to feedback they received from a multi-source feedback process. Four research questions guided the study and a descriptive survey design was used. A sample of 27 teachers from grades K–12 that was purposively selected, participated in the study. Three questionnaires namely: Teacher-to-Teacher feedback questionnaires containing 13 items, Parent-to-Teacher feedback questionnaires containing 25 items, and Student-to-Teacher feedback questionnaires containing 20 items, were used to collect data. Data was analysed using the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test. Findings indicated that the participants found the multi-source feedback process to be significantly more helpful than the traditional method in a number of areas, including: the development of professional growth goals, identifying professional development needs and providing feedback focused on student achievement.

The reviewed study is related to the present study because both studies are on the use of 360 degree feedback as against traditional evaluative feedback for school improvement and both were carried out in educational organization. Both adopted a descriptive survey design. They differ in the method of data analysis wilcoxon matched – Pairs Signed Rank Test and Anova for the present study. The present study uses principals at the secondary school level in Nigeria and the reviewed used Teachers in K-12 grades in New York and this warrant the present study.

Drew (2009) explored the perceived relevance and usefulness to participants of a particular 360 degree leadership survey process to assist an understanding of how ratees receive and respond to 360 degree feedback. The study included a sample of eight new and emergent leaders at one university in Australia who had completed a 360 degree feedback survey. Through semi-structured interviews, they were asked to report on their learning as a result of undertaking the 360 exercise. A constant comparison method of data analysis was used to analyse the participants' responses. The research study found that all the groups accepted MSF as relevant for University development, accountability and autonomy. It was also found that participants from the group undertaking the 360 degree feedback, in equal proportion, reported receiving (i) no surprising feedback but

reinforcement and affirmation, and (ii) new insights, with developmental strategies identified to effect change as a result of feedback. The paper argues, from findings of the literature and the study, the importance of a measure of institutional support for the feedback process including sound facilitation. The results of the semi-structured conversations held with the small sample attested to the importance of self-efficacy (belief of capacity to learn and develop) on the part of ratees to act on feedback gained, and of the organisation's role in assisting self-efficacy in 360 programs. The findings support an incremental theory approach in that participants saw the feedback exercise as an opportunity to improve their capabilities and pursue learning goals over time by acting on development items suggested by the feedback. It is posited that support received by participants in undertaking the feedback activity as part of a program of development contributed to the positive response. The studies conclude by providing some guidelines for conducting effective 360 feedback discussions.

The study is related to this present study since it tries to find out how ratees receive and respond to 360 degree feedback. The fact that the reviewed study was in Texas and the present in Nigeria, that the reviewed used leaders at the university level as against principals at the secondary school

level, and the present study used questionnaire to elicit information as against interview created a gap for the present study.

Maier (2009) investigated the use of the 360-degree feedback process as an option to the single source traditional evaluative feedback for the professional growth of teachers. The study sought to understand teachers' perceptions of the quality of feedback they received from the traditional evaluative feedback to feedback they received from a multi-source feedback process. The study adopted a descriptive survey design based on two hypotheses. Twenty seven K-12 teachers from a large suburban school district in the Hudson Valley of New York State were randomly selected to participate in the project. A questionnaire survey was used to compare teachers' experiences with the traditional single-source feedback performance evaluation to the feedback they received from the 360-degree feedback process. Data were analysed using Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test. Findings indicated that the participants in this project found that MSF significantly helped them to improve their performances more than traditional evaluative feedback.

The study is related to this present study because both of them centred on the 360 degree feedback for professional growth. The reviewed was in New York and the present in Nigeria and for the fact that feedback was from the

teachers alone as against the feedback from the vice principals, teachers and even the principals themselves led to this present study.

Nornansell (2011) assessed the convergent validity of the Situational Assessment of Leadership – Student Assessment (SALSA©) and multi-source ratings in Division I intercollegiate athletic teams. Two research questions and five hypotheses guided the study. The study was a descriptive survey involving a judgemental sample of sixty-eight student-athlete team leaders. The SALSA© instrument, which assesses eight dimensions of leadership, was used to collect data. Data were analysed using multiple regression analysis by assessing the relationship between SALSA© scores and multi-source ratings (i.e., self, teammate, and coach), of the same eight leadership dimensions. Results indicated a significant positive relationship between overall SALSA© scores and overall self and coach performance ratings. Overall SALSA© scores also were significantly correlated with Overall Leadership Effectiveness peer-ratings. The dimension of Problem Solving/Innovation was significantly correlated with self-, peer-, and coach-ratings. Influencing others and Communication SALSA© scores were significantly correlated with the self-rating for their respective dimension. Self-ratings were significantly higher than any other source of rating. The study further validates the effectiveness of the SALSA© to identify and

predict leadership behavior with traditional single-source evaluative feedback.

The study related to this present study since both are looking at using MSF to assess leadership effectiveness. The study assessed athletic teams leader using instrument title (SALSA). But the present study assesses the principal leadership effectiveness with instrument (AMFPSO). These differences made the present study relevant and necessary.

The purpose of a study by Goldring et al (2014) was to explore how principals orient and react to multisource feedback on their effectiveness as instructional leaders, and how they interpret gaps between their self-assessments of their leadership effectiveness and their teachers' ratings of their leadership effectiveness. The research design was a survey based on one research question. Sample involved 14 principals in an urban school district in the southeast United States. Data was collected using interviews at two points in time. The data was analysed using qualitative analysis to examine principals' orientations and reactions to their feedback. The finding was that principals often experience cognitive dissonance when feedback from different data sources (e.g., their self-ratings to those of their teachers) contrasts. This can result in a motivation to reduce dissonance

either by providing explanations and excuses, or making actual changes that result in improvement.

The study is related to this present study because it explored how principals react to MSF on their instructional effectiveness and how they interpret the gap between their teachers rating and their self assessment of their leadership effectiveness. Though the study was done in urban school district, Southeast United State and the present in Nigeria with public secondary school both in rural and urban areas. The present uses questionnaire to elicit information from the respondent but the reviewed used interview. The findings showed that the principals often experience cognitive dissonance from their own rating and those of their teacher and the motivation to reduce the dissonance by making actual changes result to improvement which is fundamental to this present study.

Studies Related to Principals and School Improvement

Several studies have linked principals' school culture, supervisory roles, administrative effectiveness, leadership styles and quality assurance to school improvement. In one of such studies, Bouchamma, Basque & Marcotte (2010) developed a questionnaire on the perceptions and self-efficacy beliefs of school principals with regard to principals' managerial competencies and their associated factors. A judgmental sample of 49

school principals and vice-principals were chosen. Four research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. A questionnaire titled “School Management Competencies: Perceptions and Self-Efficacy of School Principals” was developed. Data were analysed using mean, standard deviation and t-test. Respondents gave greater weight to the management of education services, followed by human resources, educational environment, and finally, administration. A significant difference was observed between administrative management and the teaching level and school size. The principals whose professional development activities consisted of conventions and seminars also felt a greater sense of personal efficacy on this factor compared to the principals whose professional development was done through mentoring.

In a related study, Ekundayo (2010) examined the relationship between principal’s leadership behaviour and effectiveness of secondary schools in Nigeria. The descriptive research design of the survey type was adopted. The population consisted of all the teachers and principals in the public secondary schools in South West Nigeria. The sample was however made up of 1200 teachers and 60 principals from 60 secondary schools across 3 states in the region. Stratified random sampling techniques were used to select the states, schools and the teachers used for the study. Two sets of

instruments were used to collect the data for the study. The data were analysed using frequency counts, percentage scores and Pearson product moment correlation. The hypothesis formulated was tested at 0.05 level of significance. The study revealed that the behaviour of principals in the area covered was satisfactorily encouraging. The study also showed that the schools were effective in the affective and the psychomotor domains but not all that effective in the cognitive domain. The study further showed significant relationship between principals' leadership behaviour and secondary school effectiveness. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the principals of schools should not relent in sustaining the tempo of their leadership behaviour. It was also recommended that all the stakeholders in the secondary school education as well as the government should try to uphold the level of performance of students in the affective and the psychomotor domains while efforts should be geared towards improving upon the students' performance in the cognitive domain.

The former study is related to the present study in terms of research design, sampling technique and instrument for data collection. The former study used teacher and principal as the population while the present used principal, vice principal and teachers and because the present was carried

out in Southeast Nigeria and the former South west Nigeria made this present study necessary.

Alimi, Alabi and Ehinola (2011) investigated teachers' perception of principals' leadership effectiveness in the important salient aspects of school management: Pedagogical skill, Administrative skill and community relation skills effectiveness. Three hundred and sixty (360) teachers were selected from 10 public and 10 private secondary schools in Ondo State on the basis of proportionate stratification to reflect the varying degrees of their proprietorship, academic qualifications and local government areas. The instrument for data collection was a 30-item questionnaire tagged, Teachers' Perception of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness Questionnaire (TPPLEQ). Three hypotheses were formulated and tested for using t-test statistical tool. The results showed that there is a significant difference in the teachers' perception of principals' leadership effectiveness in public and private secondary schools, with the principals of public secondary schools having low level of leadership effectiveness in pedagogical and community relation skills effectiveness, but high administrative skill effectiveness while the reverse is the case in private secondary schools. The study finally recommended that since the principals of public secondary schools are perceived to be less effective than principals of private secondary schools in

school leadership, appointment as principal should not be based on seniority alone but also on capability as a change agent to influence others through collaborative problem solving strategies with students, staff and community.

The reviewed study is related to the present study because both studies are on perception of principals leadership effectiveness. Though the former study used only teachers to assess the leadership effectiveness of their principals in both private and public secondary school as against the vice principals, teachers and even the principals who assesses the principals' leadership effectiveness thereby creating a gap for the present study.

Hardman (2011) investigated teachers' perceptions of their school leaders' influence on student achievement in their schools. The descriptive research design was used. The study population was a purposeful sample of 143 teachers in 16 schools in one school district. Leadership behaviors, as perceived by the teachers, were measured using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire. Student achievement was measured with the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test results for each school using three years of results. Independent t-test, multiple regressions, and an open-ended question were used to analyze the research questions. The study found that teachers in improving and non-improving schools had minimal differences

in how they perceived their principals' leadership styles. All three leadership styles were statistically significant predictors of student achievement. School status was not significant in predicting student achievement indicating no difference in student achievement between improving and non-improving schools. Transactional leadership had a negative relationship while transformational and passive-avoidant leadership style had a positive relationship with student achievement.

The present study is similar to the former study in terms of research design and instrument for data collection. Both studies differ in population, method of data analysis. The present study was carried out in Anambra State of Nigeria while the reviewed was in Florida. Result from the study in a foreign country cannot be generalized or used as a working document in Nigeria thus the need for the present study.

Akomolafe (2012) investigated principals' leadership capacities as perceived by teachers in secondary schools in Ekiti state, Nigeria. The study examined Principals' Leadership Capacities as perceived by teachers in secondary schools in Ekiti State. A total of 250 teachers were sampled from Public secondary schools in Ekiti State, using multi-stage, and simple random sampling techniques. Data were collected using self-constructed questionnaire. Three research questions were raised and answered.

Research questions were subjected to descriptive analysis using mean rating and standard deviation. The study identified ten dimensions of principals' leadership capacities as: school vision, capacity building, collaboration, motivation, curriculum leadership, school discipline, delegation, executive behaviour, managing time and resourcefulness. The finding also showed that the teachers had positive perception of their principals' leadership capacities. It further revealed that strong leadership capacities were identified in collaboration, motivation, delegation and executive behaviour. It was recommended that the principals should develop their leadership capacities generally on school vision, capacity building, collaboration, motivation, curriculum leadership, school discipline, delegation, executive behaviour, managing time, and resourcefulness. Furthermore, the school principals required more strengths of leadership capacities in: school vision, capacity building, curriculum leadership, school discipline, managing time, and resourcefulness due to moderate strength identified in these leadership variables and dimensions.

The former study is related to the present study in terms of design, instrument for data collection and method for data analysis. The studies are both carried out in Nigeria but different states and geographical zones. The

difference in the two studies in terms of population and sample size made the present study necessary.

As the review of empirical studies has shown, MSF has been effectively used in different settings and organizations as a potent tool for enhancing development of leaders so that these leaders would facilitate the improvement of their organizations. The studies also show that principals' leadership is directly linked to school improvement. Principals directly or indirectly influence many aspects of the school, which means that principals' performance could be assessed for improvement in many ways. One of such ways is MSF. Unfortunately, current research provides little guidance on the acceptance of MSF for use by the principals, thus pointing to the need for an empirical information on acceptance of MSF, which is an innovative and impactful performance evaluation approach.

Summary of Literature Review

The review of related literature commenced with the concept of multi-source feedback (MSF). Multi-source feedback is seen as a process in which data on the performance of an individual are collected systematically from subordinates, self, peers, supervisors, and customers and are used for improving performance. MSF is an innovation in the school improvement landscape. For this innovation to thrive, it is important that it is acceptable to those it is meant to serve. Some concepts in determining the acceptability

of MSF namely relevance, goals, rater sources, domains, periods and feedback utilization were reviewed. Further, the concept of school improvement was described as a growth process which principals as school leaders engage in to improve and place their schools at a competitive advantage in response to constant changes in their environment.

Multi-source feedback (MSF) theory and systemic change theory were reviewed. These theories indicate that as a system comprising multiple groups of people, schools thrive when the people in it demonstrate positive organizational behaviours. Being an innovation, MSF if accepted will provide relevant information from multiple sources to enhance principals' manifestation of positive organizational behavior to lead to school improvement.

Relevant theoretical studies that provided insights on principals' managerial responsibilities for school improvement and partners in school improvement were discussed. Following these, was a review of the goals, benefits and disadvantages of multi-source feedback. Also discussed were some measures of MSF and school improvement.

To further put the study in its proper perspective, a review of empirical studies was conducted. This section shows that the field of MSF, principals' practices and development for school improvement have attracted quite a number of studies. However, no study on MSF appears to have been carried out in the education sector in Nigeria. Also, studies related to school

improvement mostly focused on perceptions of school leadership. No study available to this researcher has investigated the acceptability of MSF on principals as a means of school improvement in Anambra State. This presents a gap in knowledge and filling this apparent gap, thus, becomes the motivation of the present study on acceptability of MSF on principals for secondary schools improvement in Anambra State.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter presents the research design, population, sample and sampling technique, research instrument, validation of the instrument, reliability of the instrument, administration of the instrument, and method of data analysis.

Research Design

A descriptive survey design was adopted for this study. Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) describe a survey research as one that seeks to collect and analyze data from sample of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables. According to Nworgu (2015), descriptive survey design is one which aims at collecting data on, and describing in a systematic manner, the characteristics, features or facts about a given population. The present study fits into the descriptive survey because the researcher utilized data collected from a sample of a population of principals, vice-principals and teachers, through a questionnaire, and on the basis of the information, determined the acceptability of obtaining MSF on principals for secondary school improvement in Anambra State.

Area of the Study

The study was conducted in Anambra State in Nigeria. Anambra State is one of the five states in the South-East Nigeria. It shares boundaries with Imo, Abia, Delta, Enugu and Kogi states in Nigeria. The people of Anambra State are mainly traders, public servants, farmers, entrepreneurs and artisans. There are a total of two hundred and fifty-six (256) public secondary schools in the six education zones in the State as at March 2016. These schools are centrally managed by the Anambra State Post Primary Schools services Commission (ASPPSSC) with headquarters in Awka, the State capital.

This area was chosen for the study because of the consistent reports of inefficiency in the secondary school management, which is attributable to principals' poor management of schools in the area. If the situation must change, all principals need to improve their schools. Perhaps, if MSF is accepted to be used on principals in the area, the feedback might be used to identify the actual area where improvement is needed and then refocus on school improvement efforts.

Population of the Study

The population for this study comprised 6,538 principals, vice-principals and teachers from public secondary schools in Anambra State. Data from Anambra State Post Primary Schools Service Commission (PPSSC) as at March 2016 indicated that there are 256 principals, 312 vice-principals and 5970 teachers in the 256 public secondary schools in Anambra State.

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample of the study is 1932 respondents selected through stratified random sampling technique. This sample was made up of 138 principals, 138 vice-principals and 1656 teachers. To compose the sample, the secondary schools in Anambra State were stratified according to their Local Government Areas (LGAs) in the six education zones. Then 60% of the public secondary schools in each LGA were randomly sampled. This yielded a total of 138 schools. The choice of 60% is to ensure that the sample is representative enough by including a little more than half of the public secondary schools in each LGA. The use of this percentage was informed by Nwana's position in Enyi (2012) that if the population of a study is a few hundreds, a 40% percentage sample or more will do.

All the male and female principals and vice-principals (administration) in the sampled schools were taken as the study sample. This resulted in 56

secondary schools headed by male principals and 82 secondary schools headed by female principals. Thereafter, simple random sampling was used to select one serving vice-principal from each of the sampled schools. This gave 45 male and 93 female vice-principals in the sample. Stratified random sampling was used in selecting the teachers from 138 secondary schools using the variables of gender and experience.

Proportionate random sampling was used to sample 60% teachers by gender and experience from each of the selected schools. This resulted in 526 male and 1130 female teachers. Three hundred and ninety-four (394) had 0-5 years of experience, 231 had 6-10 years of experience, 179 had 11-15 years of experience, 780 had 16 years and above experience. This then gave a total of 1656 teachers sampled. Altogether, 1932 respondents comprising 138 principals, 138 vice-principals and 1656 teachers made up the sample. The sample distribution is shown in appendix E (Page 151)

Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument for data collection was a researcher-made questionnaire titled “Acceptability of multi-source feedback on Principals for School Improvement” (AMSFPSI). The construction of the questionnaire was based on insights derived from the review of related literature and

interactions from stakeholders in education. The questionnaire was made up of two parts (part one and part two). Part one is the biographic data of the respondents namely: designation, Education Zone, gender, and years of experience.

Part two contains six sections (sections A–F) with seventy-five (75) items. Section A had 15 items on relevance; Section B had 10 items on goals; Section C had 16 items on rater sources; section D had 11 items on school domains; Section E had 11 items on periods for MSF; and Section F had 12 items on professional development programmes.

Items in sections A were on a five point scale of Very Great Extent (5 points); Great Extent (4 points); Moderate Extent (3 points), Low Extent (2 points) and Very Low extent (1 point). Sections B to F were on a 5-point scale of Completely Acceptable (5 points); Highly Acceptable (4 points); Moderately Acceptable (3 points); Highly Unacceptable (2 points) and completely unacceptable (1 Point). A sample copy of the questionnaire is enclosed as Appendix B (Page 140).

Validation of the Instrument

The instrument was validated by three experts. Two experts from Department of Educational Management and Policy while one was from

Department of Educational Foundation (Measurement and Evaluation). These experts are lecturers in the Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. These lecturers were given the dissertation title, purposes of the study, scope, research questions and hypotheses as well as draft copies of the questionnaire. They scrutinized the instrument in terms of its content, relevance, items clarity, and suitability in covering the variables of the study. The experts also scrutinized the research questions and hypotheses and made necessary suggestions such as removing irrelevant items, rephrasing ambiguous items and bringing out the exact parameters for the study. Based on their comments and suggestions, the instrument was modified and presented to the supervisor who finally approved it.

Reliability of the Instrument

In order to determine the reliability of the instrument, copies of the validated instrument was trial-tested in public secondary schools in Enugu State. Enugu State was chosen because its occupants share similar language, occupations, and desire for education with people in Anambra State. Enugu State was also part of the Old Anambra State before 1992, hence, both States have similar educational management structure.

The trial testing was done by administering the questionnaire on 10 principals, 10 vice principals and 20 teachers (total 40 respondents) from 10 public secondary schools in Enugu State. Their responses were scored and analysed using the Cronbach alpha method. For sections A to F the reliability coefficients of 0.73, 0.81, 0.83, 0.83, 0.73, and 0.78 were obtained for sections A to F with an overall coefficient of 0.93. This coefficient was considered satisfactory for the study because it falls within the high reliability indices described by Cresswell (2014) in that 0.00-0.20 is very low, 0.21- 0.40 is Low; 0.41- 0.60, Moderate, 0.61-0.80 is High while 0.81-1 is very high.

Method of Data Collection

The researcher set aside eight weeks during which the copies of the questionnaire were administered on the principals, vice-principals and teachers with the help of 13 research assistants. These research assistants who are teachers were briefed on the purpose of the study, the number and location of the respondents and how to politely administer and retrieve copies of the questionnaire on the spot.

There was a brief letter of introduction explaining the purpose of the study, which was attached to each copy of the questionnaire (See Appendix A, (page 141). Efforts were made to retrieve all the distributed copies of the instrument within the two weeks set aside by conducting a follow up visit in situations where the respondents could not complete the questionnaire on

the spot. At the end of the exercise, 59 copies (3.05%) were either lost or not properly filled and could not be used for the analysis. While 1873 copies out of the 1932 copies administered were collected, collated and used for data analysis. The return rate was approximately 96.95% of the sample which the researcher considered satisfactory for the study.

Method of Data Analysis

The data generated from the copies of the questionnaire were subjected to descriptive and inferential statistics. The data collected were analyzed based on the research questions and hypotheses. Data relating to research questions were analysed using mean and standard deviations. For the analysis, the responses were weighted thus:

Completely Acceptable	=	Very Great Extent	5 points
Highly Acceptable	=	Great Extent	4 points
Moderately	=	Moderate Extent	3 points
Highly Unacceptable	=	Low Extent	2 points
Completely Unacceptable	=	Very Low Extent	1 point.

The responses of principals, vice-principals and teachers in public secondary schools to each item were separately analysed and their row means were obtained. In interpreting the results, the lower limits of the weighted points on a 5-point scale were used to portray the acceptability of MSF as follows: Completely Acceptable and Very Great Extent = 4.50 - 5.00; Highly Acceptable and Great Extent = (4.00 - 4.49); Moderately

Acceptable and Moderate Extent (3.00 - 3.49); Highly Unacceptable and Low Extent (1.50 -2.49); Completely Unacceptable and Very Low Extent (1.00-1.49).

The data were analysed further using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the hypotheses. The ANOVA was used to compare the mean responses of principals, vice-principals and teachers. The ANOVA was used because it is the statistical test that can determine whether a difference exists between more than two means and whether a significant difference exists at a given probability level with appropriate degrees of freedom (Cresswell, 2014). According to Nworgu (2015), ANOVA as a statistical test, allows the researcher to compare variability of scores between and within groups to determine the probability that the difference between the means is a real difference rather than a chance difference. The null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 significance level. The decision rule was made that the null hypotheses were accepted as not significant if the calculated F was less than the critical F. If however, the calculated F is greater than the critical F, the null hypothesis was rejected and considered to be significant. Where a significant F-ratio was obtained, a scheffe post hoc test was used to determine the direction of the difference.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents the analysis of data collected and the results. The analysis of research questions and hypotheses are presented one after the other using tables. A summary of the major findings of the study is also presented.

Research Question 1:

To what extent do secondary school principals (P), vice-principals (VP) and teachers (T) in Anambra State accept MSF for principals as relevant to school improvement?

Research Question 1:

To what extent do secondary school principals (P), vice-principals (VP) and teachers (T) in Anambra State accept MSF for principals as relevant to school improvement?

Table 1: Mean Scores of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Extent of Acceptance of MSF for Principals as Relevant to School Improvement

ITEMS: MSF will be relevant to helping principals to:	P N=132		VP N=127		T N=1614		Row			
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	DEC	
1. Become more aware that they are highly responsible for school improvement so they will maintain high standards of leadership ethics, honesty, and integrity.	3.36	0.57	3.61	0.68	4.01	0.80	3.94	0.80	GE	
2. assess whether they are engaging in the types of behaviors that contribute to school improvement.	3.39	0.60	3.28	0.48	3.59	0.70	3.56	0.69	GE	
3. see the need to timely organize open discussions to clarify difficult, confusing and unfounded allegations that limit school improvement activities.	3.23	0.42	3.35	0.57	3.37	0.55	3.36	0.54	ME	
4. limit any false self-perceptions by understanding how others see their leadership and trying to improve.	4.18	0.78	4.00	0.84	4.08	0.79	4.08	0.80	GE	
5. creating and sustaining a commonly accepted vision and mission for school's improvement goals and	2.54	0.50	3.08	0.70	3.28	0.57	3.22	0.61	ME	

	programs based on feedback from many stakeholders.									
6.	prioritize how to collaborate more with staff in responding to community interests and needs for school improvement.	1.71	0.64	1.68	0.67	1.69	0.70	1.69	0.69	LE
7.	create a holistic description of school practices by obtaining multiple data to identify goals, assess school effectiveness, and improve schools.	3.43	0.62	3.50	0.56	3.36	0.48	3.38	0.50	ME
8.	become more self-aware and mindful of practices that others condemn as creating negative image for the school.	3.40	0.55	3.35	0.54	3.36	0.48	3.37	0.49	ME
9.	provide the principal a tremendous opportunity to build trust and respect by allowing staff members to provide input on how they are led.	3.30	0.52	3.39	0.55	3.34	0.48	3.34	0.48	ME
10.	develop clearer rationale for every managerial actions and seek for better ways of leading changes in the school to avoid negative feedback reports from staff.	4.17	0.79	3.97	0.83	4.07	0.79	4.07	0.79	GE
11.	develop greater happiness and motivation to manage schools based on feedback reports so that staff and students will be happy too.	2.13	0.34	2.09	0.29	2.12	0.33	2.11	0.33	LE
12.	use other people's judgment to solve problems in the best interest of the school by finding common solutions or effective compromise.	1.71	0.64	1.68	0.67	1.64	0.63	1.67	0.63	LE
13.	gain different insights about the skills and behaviors desired in the school organization to accomplish the schools' mission, vision, and goals and live the values.	3.42	0.59	3.50	0.56	3.35	0.48	3.37	0.50	ME
14.	be more careful in setting structures and routines that support the school improvement goals and vision.	3.27	0.62	3.30	0.51	3.36	0.49	3.35	0.50	ME
15.	promote team development and collaborative school improvement culture which is characterized by mutual support and collective staff responsibility.	3.33	0.60	3.45	0.65	3.35	0.49	3.35	0.51	ME
Grand Mean & Standard Deviation		3.10	0.59	3.15	0.61	3.20	0.58	3.19	0.59	ME

Key: \bar{X} Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; N= No of respondents; P=Principals; VP=Vice principals; T=teachers; HT= Head Teachers. HE= High Extent; ME=Moderate Extent; VE= Low Extent

Analysis on table 1 shows that there was mostly a moderate extent of acceptability of the relevance of MSF to school improvement by the

respondents. A total of 12 out of the fifteen items got great and moderate extent ratings. Four of the items (items 1, 2, 4 and 10) scored above 3.50 with standard deviations within 0.68 and 0.82 to depict great extents of their acceptance by the majority of the respondents. Eight items namely items 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 15 got row means ranging from 3.35 to 4.08 which fall within the moderate extent range. The standard deviations of the eight items were within 0.48 and 0.61 indicating that the ranges of the mean scores clustered closely to the average mean scores. Hence, there was a moderate extent of acceptance of the eight items by principals, vice-principals and teachers. The remaining three items (6, 11 and 12) got row average mean ratings of 1.69, 2.11 and 1.67 respectively with standard deviations that were within 0.69 and 0.33 thereby indicating a low extent of their acceptance.

The grand row mean for the entire items is 3.19 with a standard deviation of 0.69 which is moderate extent. This means that collectively, the principals, vice-principals and teachers accepted that MSF is relevant for principals' school improvement in 12 out of the 15 areas investigated.

Research Question 2:

What goals do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF on principals should serve for school improvement?

Table 2: Mean Scores of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Acceptance of the Goals of MSF on Principals for School Improvement

ITEMS		P N=132		VP N=127		T N=1614		Row		
The goals of MSF will be for:		\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	DEC
1.	Awards and commendations for principals with high MSF scores.	4.11	0.80	3.91	0.82	4.06	0.79	4.03	0.79	HA
2.	Suspending or dismissing poorly performing principals to serve as a deterrent for others	2.24	0.57	2.18	0.39	2.13	0.36	2.18	0.38	HU
3.	Evaluating principals' competences as a basis for their in-service training.	3.88	0.33	3.87	0.33	3.91	0.28	3.89	0.29	HA
4.	Promotions, merit pay and allowances for principals that perform excellently in school improvement areas.	2.03	1.00	1.39	0.80	1.16	0.55	1.53	0.65	HU
5.	Ranking and comparing principals' school improvement efforts among schools to know which principals to transfer to which schools.	1.37	0.48	1.35	0.48	1.40	0.49	1.37	0.49	CU
6.	Developing strong and respectful relationships of principals with staff, students, parents and host communities in identifying the needed areas for school improvement.	4.80	0.40	4.72	0.45	4.67	0.47	4.73	0.47	CA
7.	Routine monitoring and securing principals' accountability for school improvement.	4.08	0.83	3.85	0.85	4.05	0.80	3.99	0.80	HA
8.	Reducing hassles of principals' workplace politics and misuse of authority.	2.33	0.78	2.27	0.61	2.13	0.36	2.24	0.43	HU
9.	Promoting accurate judgments of principals' effectiveness in inspiring desired behavioral change that leads to school improvement.	3.39	0.57	3.54	0.64	3.36	0.50	3.43	0.52	MA
10.	Creating a culture of trust, collaboration and collective responsibility among principals and staff for improving student learning.	3.39	0.53	3.32	0.47	3.37	0.49	3.36	0.49	MA
Grand Mean & Standard Deviation		3.16	0.63	3.04	0.58	3.02	0.51	3.08	0.53	MA

Key: \bar{X} Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; N= No of respondents; P=Principals; VP=Vice principals; T=teachers; HT= Head Teachers. CU=Completely Acceptable; HA= Highly Acceptable; MA=Moderately Acceptable; HU= Highly Unacceptable; CU= Completely Unacceptable.

The analysis presented on Table 2 item 21 was accepted by the principals, vice-principals and teachers as a goal of MSF with a row mean score of 4.68 and a standard deviation of 0.47. By obtaining row means of 4.06, 3.91 and 4.04, items 16, 18 and 22 were highly accepted by the respondents while items 24 and 25 were moderately accepted with row mean scores of 3.37 and 3.36 respectively. On the other hand, item 20 was completely unacceptable to the respondents by a row mean of 1.37 while items 17, 19 and 23 were highly unacceptable by the respondents.

Generally, the grand row mean for the principals, vice-principals and teachers was 3.08 which exceeds the cut-off point of 3.00. The grand standard deviation is 0.53 which shows that the individual mean scores were close to the average mean score. Therefore, the respondents accepted that MSF should serve only six goals stated in items 16, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 25 out of the ten stated MSF goals for school improvement.

Research Question 3:

Which rater sources are acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers for providing credible MSF on principals for school improvement?

Table 3: Mean Ratings of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Acceptance of Rater Sources for Credible MSF on Principals for School Improvement

ITEMS Rater group included in multi-source feedback are:		P N=132		VP N=127		T N=1614		Row		
		\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	DEC
1.	Senior staff of PPSSC from grade level 13.	2.98	1.15	2.21	1.01	2.36	0.70	2.40	0.78	HU
2.	Directors of Ministry of Education	4.17	0.79	3.95	0.82	4.07	0.79	4.07	0.79	HA
3.	Vice-principals	3.70	0.46	3.85	0.98	3.87	0.99	3.86	0.98	HA
4.	Teachers (Principal cadre only)	3.70	0.73	4.82	0.82	4.66	0.65	4.44	0.67	HA
5.	All teachers irrespective of cadre	1.08	0.28	1.29	0.46	1.09	0.42	1.10	0.41	CU
6.	Senior non-tutorial staff	1.06	0.24	1.02	0.12	1.01	0.08	1.01	0.11	CU
7.	Bursars	3.20	0.40	3.30	0.46	3.35	0.49	3.33	0.48	MA
8.	Clerical staff	1.14	0.44	1.13	0.44	1.02	0.18	1.04	0.24	CU
9.	PTA executives	2.15	0.55	2.02	0.20	2.01	0.08	2.02	0.18	HU
10.	Community Leaders	2.57	0.62	2.49	0.62	2.27	0.77	2.31	0.76	HU
11.	School Prefects	3.26	0.52	3.15	0.55	3.34	0.52	3.32	0.52	MA
12.	All students	1.04	0.19	1.09	0.28	1.00	0.04	1.01	0.10	CU
13.	Alumni of the school	4.00	0.97	3.58	1.03	3.98	0.75	3.96	0.80	HA
14.	Secondary school principals	4.87	0.34	4.75	0.44	4.72	0.45	4.73	0.44	CA
15.	Non-governmental and Religious organizations that provide services to the school	1.83	0.74	1.83	0.85	1.67	0.69	1.69	0.71	HU
16.	Assistant Inspectors of Education in the Local Government Areas of the school	2.40	0.74	2.35	0.71	2.35	0.73	2.37	0.73	HU
Grand Mean & Standard Deviation		2.70	0.57	2.68	0.61	2.67	0.52	2.68	0.48	MA

On Table 3, the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers to item 39 were within the complete acceptance margins of 4.87 and 4.75 with a row average of 4.73. This shows that secondary school principals were completely accepted by a vast majority of the respondents as among the

credible rater sources for MSF. This was followed by four items (27, 28, 29 and 38) obtained row means within 3.89 and 4.44 to show that the respondents highly accepted the four groups listed in the items as rater sources that would provide credible MSF on principals for school improvement. Items 32 and 36 were rated as moderately acceptable with mean scores of 3.33 and 3.22 respectively. On the whole, seven items received complete, high and moderate acceptance. The row standard deviations of these seven accepted items were within 0.44 and 0.98 and 0.79 which shows homogeneity of the responses.

On the other hand, a total of nine items were either highly or completely unacceptable to the respondents. Five of the items (26, 34, 35, 40 and 36) got item row means within 1.69 and 2.40 to show that the rater sources listed in the items were highly unacceptable to the respondents. Four of the items (30, 31, 33 and 37) had row means that were within the ranges of 1.01 and 1.10 thereby the respondents indicated complete unacceptance of 4 rater sources listed in items. Also there was homogeneity in the respondents' mean ratings of the unacceptable items as indicated by their standard deviations which were within 0.10 and 0.79.

Generally, the row grand mean for principals, vice-principals and teachers is 2.68 which shows moderate acceptance. The grand standard deviation of 0.48 shows that variation in the respondents' rating for each item is slim, indicating homogeneity of responses. Therefore, only 7 out of 16 stated

rater sources namely Directors of Ministry of Education, vice-principals, teachers (Principal cadre only), bursars, school prefects, alumni and the principals themselves are acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers to provide credible MSF on principals for school improvement.

Research Question 4:

Which school improvement domains do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF on principals should cover?

Table 4: Mean Scores of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Acceptance of School Improvement Domains for MSF

ITEMS School domains that multi-source feedback will address are:	P N=132		VP N=127		T N=1614		Row		
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	DEC
1. Planning and progress of schools vision, goals and objectives	4.83	0.38	4.50	0.70	4.61	0.52	4.62	0.53	CA
2. Curriculum and teaching-learning processes for students' achievement	4.60	0.87	4.64	0.80	4.52	0.75	4.59	0.81	CA
3. Safe and healthy school culture	4.52	1.00	4.54	1.21	4.51	0.87	4.53	0.92	CA
4. School leadership and management especially efficiency in carrying out assignments for the PPSSC or Ministry of education	2.12	0.35	2.01	0.46	2.13	0.39	2.12	0.40	HU
5. Staff development processes and progress	4.57	0.81	4.75	0.79	4.97	0.71	4.77	0.75	CA
6. Professional qualities and instructional leadership development	4.12	0.72	4.69	0.79	4.86	0.81	4.56	0.84	CA
7. Community participation in school	3.45	0.92	3.46	1.01	4.54	0.61	3.82	0.67	HA
8. Utilization of the services and expertise of non-tutorial staff	2.08	0.83	2.90	0.84	2.07	0.11	2.36	0.80	HU
9. Promptness and punctuality to school meetings and functions	2.23	0.49	2.21	0.51	2.13	0.39	2.14	0.41	HU
10. Management of school finances and financial matters	1.73	0.59	2.63	0.68	3.07	0.76	2.47	0.68	HU
11. School plants and facilities management including ICT	4.43	0.73	4.49	0.67	4.80	0.64	4.57	0.64	CA
Grand Mean & Standard Deviation	3.52	0.70	3.71	0.77	3.84	0.60	3.69	0.68	HA

The analysis on Table 4 reveals that six out of the eleven items namely items 42, 43, 44, 46, 47 and 52 got mean ratings within 4.53 and 4.62. The standard deviation of these six items clustered within 0.53 and 0.92 to show closeness of the means. This indicates the six domains stated in the items are completely acceptable to the respondents. Item 48 scored 3.82 with a standard deviation of 0.67 to be highly acceptable to the respondents.

The remaining four items namely items 45, 49, 50 and 51 scored within 2.12 to 2.47 to be highly unacceptable to the respondents. Their standard deviations were within 0.40 and 0.80 to show that the means did not deviate so much from the average mean.

Generally, the domains have a grand row of 3.69 and standard deviation of 0.68 which is above the cut-off point of 3.00. Therefore, the school domains stated in 7 out of the eleven items were the acceptable school improvement domains that MSF should address.

Research Question 5:

What periods do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept that MSF will be obtained on the principals?

Table 5: Mean Scores of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Acceptance of Periods for obtaining MSF on Principals.

ITEMS		P		VP		T		Row		
Periods for obtaining multi-source feedback on the principals will be:		N=132		N=127		N=1614				
		\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	DEC
1.	At the beginning of every academic session	1.17	0.49	1.58	0.90	1.54	0.91	1.52	0.89	HU
2.	At the end of every term	2.20	0.40	2.25	0.82	2.41	0.81	2.29	0.81	HU
3.	During the period of teachers' promotion interview	1.27	0.54	1.29	0.46	1.36	0.56	1.34	0.56	CU
4.	During the period of State Annual Performance Evaluation of teachers	1.89	0.38	1.91	0.29	1.90	0.33	1.90	0.33	HU
5.	When there is a report against a principal	4.70	0.46	4.61	0.49	4.65	0.48	4.65	0.48	CA
6.	Prior to every external examination such as WAEC, JAMB, NECO etc	1.32	0.47	1.27	0.44	1.36	0.48	1.35	0.48	CU
7.	Prior to every seminar to be organized for principals	4.86	0.46	4.94	0.94	4.71	0.82	4.84	0.84	CA
8.	Once every year	1.61	0.92	1.88	1.00	1.57	0.90	1.59	0.91	HU
9.	Every six months	2.25	0.76	2.10	0.72	1.94	0.38	1.97	0.45	HU
10.	Once every three years	4.07	1.34	4.40	1.11	4.44	1.19	4.55	1.20	CA
11.	Anytime the school, PPSSC or Ministry of Education wishes	2.11	1.43	1.79	0.86	1.67	0.67	1.71	0.77	HU
Grand Mean & Standard Deviation		2.50	0.70	2.55	0.73	2.50	0.68	2.52	0.70	MA

Analysis on Table 5 shows that only three items namely items 57, 59 and 62 got mean ratings above 4.50 to indicate that the majority of the respondents completely accept that MSF would be obtained on principals at those three periods. Items 53, 54, 56, 60, 61 and 63 between 1.52 and 2.29 to indicate that the stated six periods were highly unacceptable to majority of the

respondents. By scoring 1.34 and 1.35, items 55 and 58 were completely unacceptable to the majority of the respondents.

Generally, the grand row mean of the entire items in the cluster was 2.52 which is less than the cut-off point of 3.00. The grand standard deviation row is 0.70 indicating that the individual means scores were close to the average mean score. This shows that majority of the items were not accepted as periods for obtaining MSF from the principals for school improvement. Therefore, the periods that MSF would be obtained on principals are when there is a report against a principal, prior to every seminar to be organized for principals and every three years, as completely acceptable to the majority of the principals, vice-principals and teachers in this study.

Research Question 6:

Which development programmes do principals, vice-principals and teachers accept should be mounted for principals' school improvement as a result of MSF?

Table 6: Mean Scores of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Acceptance of Development Programmes to be mounted for Principals School Improvement as a Result of MSF

ITEMS		P N=132		VP N=127		T N=1614		Row		
Programmes to be mounted for school staff as a result of multi-source feedback		\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	DEC
1.	Personalized executive coaching by special consultants for principals on creating and following a development plan for building on their strengths and reducing their weaknesses.	4.68	0.46	4.73	0.44	4.62	0.49	4.63	0.48	CA
2.	Face-to-face seminar/conference /workshop on identified improvement areas	4.49	0.82	4.46	0.88	4.53	0.62	4.53	0.65	CA
3.	Individualized learning and book studies on areas of most pressing changes	2.01	0.77	2.22	0.78	2.03	0.72	2.04	0.73	HU
4.	Group weekend retreats for principals following MSF identified most pressing areas of school improvement	4.86	0.34	4.94	0.22	4.93	0.41	4.92	0.40	CA
5.	Mentoring of principals with low MSF scores by those with high MSF scores	2.43	0.73	2.46	0.67	2.32	0.51	2.34	0.54	HU
6.	Networking in small study groups	2.20	0.40	2.18	0.38	2.12	0.34	2.13	0.35	HU
7.	Interpretation and presentation of anonymous feedback to principals by professionals who are experienced in delivering MSF feedback for proper understanding by principals.	4.71	0.48	4.54	0.57	4.57	0.57	4.58	0.57	CA
8.	Focused group discussions among principals to establish a development plan identifying what, when, and how to address and strengthen performance based on MSF.	4.68	0.46	4.61	0.48	4.61	0.48	4.65	0.47	CA
9.	Specialist one month leadership training in selected Universities	4.35	0.48	4.59	0.49	4.54	0.50	4.53	0.50	CA

	for principals with low MSF scores									
10.	Accredited online/self-paced leadership programmes	4.81	0.38	4.78	0.41	4.75	0.42	4.76	0.42	CA
11.	Conference audio or video tapes on MSF identified areas using audio cassettes, CD-ROMs, MP3s, or podcasts.	4.07	0.82	3.85	0.84	4.06	0.79	4.04	0.79	HA
12.	Exchange training with other schools	2.30	0.70	2.25	0.63	2.12	0.35	2.14	0.41	HU
Grand Mean & Standard Deviation		3.80	0.57	3.80	0.57	3.77	0.52	3.77	0.53	HA

Table 6 shows that with row mean scores within 4.53 and 4.92, a majority of the respondents in this study completely accepted items 64, 65, 67, 70, 71, 72 and 73 as the development programmes to be organised for principals as a result of MSF. Also with a row mean score of 4.04, the majority of the respondents indicated high acceptance of the development programmes stated in item 74. The standard deviations of the completely and highly accepted development programmes ranged from 0.40 to 0.79 which shows closeness of the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the acceptance of the items.

As shown by row mean ratings within 2.04 and 2.34 as well as standard deviations within 0.35 and 0.73, the majority of the respondents indicated that they highly unaccepted the development programmes as stated in items 66, 68, 69 and 75.

On the whole, the development programmes were highly accepted with cluster row grand mean of 3.77 and standard deviation of 0.53 which is an

indication of convergence of the means. Therefore, majority of the principals, vice-principals and teachers in this study accepted only 7 out of the 12 stated items as development programmes to be mounted for principals' school improvement as a result of MSF. They did not accept the remaining five items.

Research Question 7:

What is the extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers based on gender?

Table 7: Mean Ratings of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Extent of Overall Acceptance of MSF by Gender

Groups	N	Mean	S.D	Decision
Male principals	54	3.82	0.26	Great extent
Female principals	78	3.80	0.22	Great extent
Male vice principals	45	3.88	0.26	Great extent
Female vice principals	82	3.84	0.25	Great extent
Male teachers	522	4.05	0.18	Great extent
Female teachers	1092	3.91	0.24	Great extent
Grand mean & standard deviation	1873	3.94	0.24	Great extent

On Table 7, the mean rating for each of the groups was from 3.80 to 4.05 with a grand mean of 3.94. This shows a great extent of overall acceptance of MSF by both male and female respondents. The standard deviations for the gender groups were within 0.18 and 0.26 with a grand standard deviation of 0.24. This analysis indicates that generally, there was a great

extent of overall acceptance of MSF for school improvement by male and female principals, vice-principals and teachers.

Research Question 8:

What is the extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers based on their years of experience?

Table 8: Mean Ratings of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' Overall Acceptance of MSF by Experience

MSFACCEPTANCE BY EXPERIENCE	N	Mean	S.D	Decision
0-5yrs TEACHERS	458	3.91	0.26	Great extent
6-10yrs TEACHERS	272	4.02	0.20	Great extent
11-15yrs TEACHERS	421	3.97	0.20	Great extent
16yrs and above TEACHERS	463	3.95	0.24	Great extent
16YRS and above PRINCIPALS	132	3.82	0.23	Great extent
16YRS and above VPS	127	3.83	0.25	Great extent
Grand mean & standard deviation	1873	3.94	0.24	Great extent

Data displayed on Table 8 show that the mean ratings from the respondents with various years of experience ranged from 3.82 to 4.02 with a grand mean of 3.94 thereby showing a great extent of overall acceptance of MSF by principals, vice-principals and teachers with various years of experience. Also the standard deviations by years of experience clustered within 0.20 to 0.26 with a grand mean of 0.24 to show closeness of the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers with various years of experience on the great extent of overall acceptance of MSF.

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the extent they accept MSF on principals for school improvement in Anambra State.

Table 9: ANOVA Summary of the Mean Ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the relevance of MSF on principals for secondary school improvement.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	2.28	2	1.14	16.27	3.00	0.05
Within Groups	130.75	1870	0.70			
Total	133.03	1872				

Data on Table 9 show that the F-cal is 16.27. With 2 and 1870 degrees of freedom at .05 significance level, the F-crit is 3.00. This shows that the F-cal exceeds the F-crit and the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the relevance of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement. Since the ANOVA test is significant, it shows that all the means are not equal. Hence, a scheffe Post Hoc test was carried out to identify where these statistically significant differences existed. This is presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Scheffe Post Hoc for Differences among the Mean Ratings of vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the relevance of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement.

(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	P-value.
Principals	Vice-principals	-.06	.14
	Teachers	-.13*	.00
Vice-principals	Principals	.07	.14
	Teachers	-.06*	.04
Teachers	Principals	.15*	.00
	Vice-principals	.06*	.04

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Analysis on Table 10 shows that only the mean differences between principals and teachers on the one hand and then between vice-principals and teachers was significant. The others were not. In other words, principals and vice-principals were more similar in their acceptance of the relevance of MSF on principals for school improvement than teachers. Hence, there was a significant difference between the mean acceptance of MSF by teachers and other respondents (principals and vice-principals) as indicated by the asterisks (**).

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the goals of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement in Anambra State.

Table 11: ANOVA Summary of the Mean Ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the goals of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	.300	2	.15	1.67	3.00	0.05
Within Groups	168.696	1870	.09			
Total	168.996	1872				

Data presented on Table 11 indicate that the F-cal is 1.67. With 2 and 1870 degrees of freedom at .05 significance level, the F-crit is 3.00. This shows that the F-cal is less than the F-crit and the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the goals of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement.

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference in the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers regarding the MSF rater sources to provide credible feedback on principals for school improvement.

Table 12: ANOVA Summary of the Mean Ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the Rater Sources for MSF on principals.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	1.033	2	.52	5.29	3.00	0.05
Within Groups	182.695	1870	.10			
Total	183.728	1872				

On table 12, the F-cal of 5.29 is greater than the F-Crit of 3.00 with 2 and 1870 degrees of freedom at .05 significance level. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is a significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the rater sources for credible MSF on principals. Since the null is rejected in ANOVA, additional analyses using Scheffe is required to determine what is driving the difference in means. This is presented on Table 13.

Table 13: Scheffe Post Hoc for Differences among the Mean Ratings of vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the Rater Sources for relevance of MSF

(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	P-value
Principals	Vice-principals	.05	.37
	Teachers	-.03	.47
Vice-principals	Principals	-.06	.37
	Teachers	-.09*	.01
Teachers	Principals	.04	.47
	Vice-principals	.90*	.01

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As presented on table 13, the mean difference between principals and vice-principals is not significant while that of vice-principals and teachers is significant. Also, the mean difference between principals and teachers is not significant. Hence, the significant difference in the acceptance of rater sources for credible MSF ratings on principals is between mean ratings of vice-principals and teachers.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no significant difference in the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the school domains that MSF on principals should address.

Table 14: ANOVA Summary of the Mean Ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the School Domains for MSF.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	16.68	2	8.34	52.45	3.00	0.05
Within Groups	297.32	1870	.16			
Total	314.00	1872				

As shown on Table 14, the one-way ANOVA at 0.05 significance level (DF, 2 and 1870) revealed an F-cal of 52.45. The F-cal is higher than the F-Crit thus resulting in the non-acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is a significant difference among the principals, vice-principals and teachers groups on the school domains that MSF should cover.

Further, Scheffe's Post Hoc was used to identify the source of the significant F. The result is presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Scheffe Post Hoc for Differences among the Mean Ratings of vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the School Domains for MSF

(I) DESINATION	(J) DESINATION	Mean Difference (I-J)	P-value
Principals	Vice-principals	.08	.30
	Teachers	-.23*	.00
Vice-principals	Principals	-.08	.30
	Teachers	-.31*	.00
Teachers	Principals	.23*	.00
	Vice-principals	.31*	.00

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Data on Table 15 indicate that there is a significant difference in favour of teachers in this study. The mean differences between principals and vice-principals are not significant. However, the mean difference between principals, vice-principals and teachers is significant. This shows that principals and vice-principals are a homogenous subset with similar acceptance ratings from teachers. Hence, the level of acceptance of the school domains for MSF is more significantly different for teachers than it is for principals and vice-principals.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no significant difference in the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the periods that MSF should be administered on the principals for school improvement.

Table 16: ANOVA Summary of the Mean Ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the Periods for MSF.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	21.763	2	10.88	33.75	3.00	0.05
Within Groups	602.978	1870	.322			
Total	624.741	1872				

On Table 16, the F-cal of 33.75 is greater than the F-Crit of 3.00 with 2 and 1870 degrees of freedom at .05 significance level. In this case, the means are significantly different and the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the periods for MSF on principals. A Scheffe test was performed to show how the means differ. The result is displayed on Table 17.

Table 17: Scheffe Post Hoc for Differences among the Mean Ratings of vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the Periods for MSF

(I) DESINATION	(J) DESINATION	Mean Difference (I-J)	P-value
Principals	Vice-principals	-.25*	.00
	Teachers	-.40*	.00
Vice-principals	Principals	.25*	.00
	Teachers	-.16*	.01
Teachers	Principals	.40*	.00
	Vice-principals	.16*	.01

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The results on table 17 show that there was a statistically significant difference among the groups. The three group means of principals, vice-principals and teachers differ significantly from one another.

Hypothesis 6:

There is no significant difference in the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the development programmes to be organized for principals for school improvement as a result of MSF.

Table 18: ANOVA Summary of the Mean Ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers on the development programmes for MSF.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	.05	2	.02	6.46	3.00	0.05
Within Groups	95.21	1870	.05			
Total	95.25	1872				

Data on Table 18 show that the F-cal is 6.46 which is higher than the F-Crit of 3.00 with 2 and 1870 degrees of freedom at .05 significance level. This indicates that the group means are not significantly different and the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the development programmes for MSF on principals.

Hypothesis 7:

Gender does not significantly influence the mean MSF acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers.

Table 19: ANOVA Summary of the Influence of Gender on the Mean Ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of MSF.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	1.107	5	0.221	2.08	2.21	0.05
Within Groups	197.946	1867	0.106			
Total	105.412	1872				

On Table 19, the F-cal is 2.08 while the F-Crit is 2.21 with 2 and 1867 degrees of freedom ($P > 0.05$). This shows that all the group means are similar so there is no significant gender difference in the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' overall acceptance of MSF.

Hypothesis 8: Years of experience do not significantly influence the mean MSF acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers.

Table 20: ANOVA Summary for Differences among the Mean Ratings of Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers' overall acceptance of MSF on Principals for School Improvement by Years of Experience.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Cal	F-Crit	P-Value
Among Groups	.951	8	0.12	1.14	1.85	0.05
Within Groups	197.462	1864	0.01			
Total	105.412	1872				

The analysis presented on Table 20 shows that the F-calculated is 1.14. With 8 and 1864 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significance, the critical F value is 1.85. Since the calculated F is less than the critical F, the test is not significant and the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, years of experience do not significantly influence the mean MSF acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers.

Summary of Findings

From the analysis presented in this chapter, the major findings that emerged from the study are:

1. There was a moderate extent of acceptability of the relevance of MSF by the principals, vice-principals and teachers in this study. However, there is a significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the relevance of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement in Anambra State.
2. Most of the principals, vice-principals and teachers accepted that MSF should serve only six out of the ten stated MSF goals for school improvement. Moreover, there is no significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the six goals of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement.

3. Only six out of sixteen stated rater sources are acceptable to majority principals, vice-principals and teachers to provide credible MSF on principals for school improvement. Also there is a significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the rater sources for credible MSF on principals.
4. Seven out of the eleven stated school domains were accepted by the majority of principals, vice-principals and teachers as the school domains that MSF should address. While six of the domains were acceptable to the respondents, only one (community participation) was highly acceptable to them. However, there is a significant difference among the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the school domains that MSF on principals should address.
5. Out of the eleven periods for MSF investigated in this study, the principals, vice-principals and teachers accepted only three. There is a significant difference among the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the periods that MSF should be administered on the principals for school improvement.
6. Seven out of 12 stated development programmes are completely and highly acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers to be mounted for principals' school improvement as a result of MSF. There is

no significant difference among the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the development programmes to be organized for principals for school improvement as a result of MSF.

7. Male and female principals', vice principals', and teachers' overall acceptance of MSF is great. Hence, gender did not significantly influence the mean MSF acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers.
8. Principals, vice principals and teachers with various years of experiences (0 to 5, 6 to 10, 11 to 15 and 16 years and above) accept MSF to a great extent. Also years of experience did not significantly influence the mean MSF acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the discussion of the findings, conclusion and the implications of the findings are presented. Some recommendations of the study, limitations and suggestions for further research were also highlighted.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of the study are discussed according to the specific purposes of the study under the following sub headings:-

The Extent to Which Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers Accept MSF on Principals as Being Relevant For School Improvement

The findings of this study indicated mostly a moderate extent of acceptance of MSF by secondary school principals, vice-principals and teachers as being relevant for school improvement in Anambra State. In the opinions of the respondents in this study, there were mainly great and moderate acceptance of the relevance of MSF for principals' school improvement in twelve out of the fifteen areas investigated. Four of these areas that include that MSF is relevant in;

- a. helping principals to become more aware that they are highly responsible for school improvement, so they will maintain high standards of leadership ethics, honesty, and integrity;
- b. assess whether they are engaging in the types of behaviors that contribute to school improvement;
- c. limit any false self-perceptions by understanding how others see their leadership and trying to improve rather than react to others' perceptions and seek for various better ways of leading changes in the school to avoid negative feedback reports from staff.

The overwhelming complete response to these four areas provides strong evidence that the principals, vice-principals and teachers that participated in this study are optimistic that the introduction of MSF would reinforce principals' efforts in enhancing schools improvement. This finding is supported by Ermongkonchai (2008) that there is a great extent of acceptance of Multi Source Feedback as a relevant tool for enhancing leaders' self-awareness, high standards of leadership ethics and honesty and initiation of better school changes among Asian school managers. Moore (2009) also found that many school leaders, staff and district superintendents in the United Kingdom had a great extent of acceptance of the relevance of MSF for reducing school leaders' negative self-

perceptions, giving them a multi-lens view of their performance based on which they were able to assess their leadership behaviours and improve areas of weaknesses to avoid future negative feedback from staff. Eight received moderate extent of acceptance. By their moderate acceptance of MSF relevance, the respondents in this study confirmed the findings of a study by Goldring, Mavrogordato and Haynes, (2014) that MSF is considered relevant to documenting the quality of principals' leadership performance; helping principals improve their performance as well as holding them accountable for their work. The present work is been supported by Earley, Higham, Allen, Howson, Nelson, Rawar, Lynch, Moton, Mehta and Sims (2012) who found that MSF is moderately acceptable as being relevant for providing principals with different insights into the skills and behaviors desired in the school organization to accomplish the schools' mission, vision, and goals.

There are also some items where vice-principals gave higher mean ratings than the teachers and vice-versa. Therefore, the significant difference does not mean that the three groups of respondents did not generally accept MSF, rather it means that the magnitude of acceptance is not the same across groups. Most of the principals, vice-principals and teachers accepted

the same items on the relevance of MSF with significantly different ratings.

These differences were significant or due to chance.

The Goals the Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers Accept that MSF on Principals Should Serve for School Improvement.

Another finding of this study is that most of the principals, vice-principals and teachers accepted that MSF should serve only six out of the ten stated MSF goals for school improvement. The accepted goals include: awards and commendations for principals with high MSF scores; evaluating principals' competences as a basis for in-service training on school improvement; as well as developing strong and respectful relationships of principals with staff, parents and host communities in identifying the needed areas for school improvement. Others are routine monitoring and securing accountability in school improvement from the principals, promoting accurate judgments of principals' effectiveness in inspiring desired changes for school improvement in addition to creating a culture of trust, collaboration and collective responsibility among principals and staff for improving student learning.

This is a fundamental tenet of the MSF construct. This present finding aligns with the results of a study by Murton (2016) that MSF mostly serves the goals of development tool. This is also corroborated by Peterson (2000)

who found that MSF mostly serves developmental goals rather than suspension, pay and promotion goals.

Moreover, there is no significant difference among the mean ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' acceptance of the six goals of MSF on principals to secondary school improvement. The results indicated that a vast majority of respondents mostly had significantly high acceptance of only six out of the goals investigated in this study, which centre mostly on providing appropriate and effective professional growth for principals towards school improvement.

The results align with that of Bracken and Rose (2011) who indicated that managers acceptance of the goals which MSF should serve were not significantly different from that of other staff in business organizations. The recommendations from Atwater's (2007) 3 year study also indicate that the goal of MSF must be embedded in the personnel practices of the organization and to implement the multi-source feedback as a developmental growth process not as an evaluative process.

The Rater Sources that are Acceptable to Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers for Providing Credible MSF on Principals

Regarding the rating source, it was found out in this study that not all rater sources are accepted by principals, vice-principals and teachers as being

capable of providing credible MSF for principals. Interestingly, only seven out of sixteen stated rater sources are acceptable to the majority of principals, vice-principals and teachers to provide credible MSF on principals for school improvement. The seven rater sources are Directors in Ministry of Education, vice-principals, teachers (Principal cadre only), Bursars, School Prefects, Alumni and principals themselves. This finding indicates that respondents accepted only a few but rejected most of the rater sources. By so doing, they accepted that MSF should be from various sources and should include the principals who are being rated.

Most of the accepted groups especially vice-principals, teachers, bursars and school prefects are those almost in a daily contact with the principals in schools. Although the two other groups namely Directors in the Ministry of Education and alumni of the schools do not interact with principals daily, they are expected to be frequently involved in what goes on the schools and are in a position to provide principals with reliable feedback for school improvement.

This finding is similar to that of Maher (2009), who reported that in schools, District Superintendents (Directors), assistant principals, high ranking teachers, financial managers (bursars) and student leaders (prefects) are acceptable rater sources for principals' MSF. Findings also support

those of Dipali and Maulik (2014) who reported that accepted raters in MSF for school leaders include employees, peers, subordinates, supervisors, students, alumni and others within the evaluatee's circle of involvement.

The acceptance of school prefects in this study is a deviation from some studies carried out in USA by Fullan (2007) and Farley-Ripple, et al (2014), who respectively found a trend of non-acceptance of student leaders as reliable sources for MSF. Fullan specifically concluded that “When adults think of students whether they are leaders or not, they think of them as potential beneficiaries of change... they rarely think of students as participants in a process of school change and organizational life. p.28). But the present study suggests that in Anambra State of Nigeria, student leaders are becoming accepted as participants in school improvement efforts. This is probably because people are being more enlightened or increase in awareness.

The School Improvement Domains which the Principals, Vice-Principals, and Teachers Accept that MSF on Principals Should Cover.

The domains accepted were seven in number out of the eleven stated school domains. Interestingly, the respondents indicated a complete acceptance of six of the domains namely planning and progress of schools vision, goals and objectives, curriculum and teaching-learning processes for students’

achievement and safe and healthy school culture, staff development processes and progress, professional qualities and instructional leadership development as well as school plants and facilities management including ICT. The acceptable school domains identified in this study are supported by Ehren, Perryman and Schakleton (2015). They found that schools used the data for school improvement through planning of professional development, setting goals, ICT use, school safety, motivating teachers and students, visually stating school priorities and goals and communicating with parents.

A related study by Scott, Coates and Anderson (2008) in tertiary institutions in Australia found that similar improvement domains of planning, curriculum and teaching, school culture, and professional leadership capabilities were most acceptable to respondents. These two findings indicate that whether in Anambra State or elsewhere, be it a University or secondary school. The accepted school domains are pervasive areas where MSF should cover for school improvement.

Only the domain of community participation was highly acceptable to them. Four domains such as School leadership and management, especially efficiency in carrying out assignments for the PPSSC or Ministry of education, Utilization of the services and expertise of non-tutorial staff,

promptness and punctuality to school meetings and functions and management of school finances and financial matters are highly unacceptable by the respondents.

However, some other previous researches indicated that both administrators, their assistants and teachers did not significantly differ in the MSF domains where improvements are needed, including the management of school finances and financial matters (e.g., Barton, 2012; Hopkins, 2014; Toch & Rothman, 2016). The results of this study did not substantiate that line of thinking. In this present study, although the majority of principals, vice-principals and teachers indicated a generally high acceptance of the domains, yet they did not display equal levels of acceptance of each of the domains. The observed differences suggest that they all accepted the school domains but teachers want a greater coverage of these domains than principals and vice-principals. This is important in the light of a finding by Atwater, Roush, and Fischthal (2015) which suggested that a deliberate focus on selected domains of an organization can be useful for the effectiveness of MSF for improving managers meaningful professional development activities that help to enhance their instructional ability, skills, and knowledge for organizational improvement. It is therefore important that when developing MSF tools, it is necessary to

ensure that the domain sets are specific job related areas. These would enable the accepted rater sources to provide feedback on the same criteria.

The Periods that Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers Accept that MSF be obtained on the Principals

A majority of the respondents in this study completely accepted that the periods that MSF should be obtained on principals are only when there is a report against a principal, prior to every seminar to be organized for principals and once every three years. The overall response of the three periods was high. This finding supports Shelton (2015) and Shepherd (2016) who found that MSF is an acceptable tool to use whenever investigating reports against school principals. As with other previous research (Clifford & Ross, 2016; Jacques, et al, 2016), principals, assistant principals and teachers indicated that MSF is acceptable and should be the most commonly used method of principal's evaluation. This finding also agreed with the studies of Zohd (2015), Ellett and Teddlie (2013) and Al-Barmi (2015) as they all signified that the MSF should precede principals' professional development programmes.

However, the respondents accepted that MSF should be done once every three years. The finding is contrary to many other previous studies (Crossley, 2015; Goldring et al, 2015; Moore, 2009) who reported in their

respective studies that MSF is highly accepted as a yearly process. They noted that once every 12 months should be sufficient, so as to give employees sufficient opportunity to implement their Development Plans before the next MSF appraisal becomes due. The results of the hypotheses yielded similar results to Noakes (2009) study which indicated that there was a significant difference among administrators and teachers on the acceptable periods for MSF. There is a significant difference among the mean acceptance ratings of principals, vice-principals and teachers' on the periods that MSF should be administered on the principals for school improvement.

The Development Programmes Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers Accept that should be mounted for Principals as a Result of Feedback from MSF.

The findings of this study further show some development programmes that are acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers to be mounted for principals' school improvement as a result of MSF. These includes: face-to-face seminar/conference/workshop on identified improvement areas; personalized executive coaching by special consultants for principals on creating and following a development plan for building on their strengths and reducing their weaknesses as well as interpretation and presentation of feedback to principals by professionals; who are experienced in delivering

MSF feedback for proper understanding by principals. Other accepted development programmes are accredited online/self-paced leadership programmes, focused group discussions among principals to establish a development plan; identifying what, when, and how to address and strengthen performance based on MSF; selective specialist leadership training for six months at a particular center for principals with low MSF scores and conference audio or video tapes on MSF identified areas, using audio cassettes, CD-ROMs, MP3s, or podcasts.

These development programmes found in this study are in line with studies by Jacques, Clifford and Hornung (2016), Mendels (2016), and Manna (2015), which found that it is a generally accepted practice for seminars, conferences, workshops, focused group discussions and retreats to be provided for principals following MSF.

The findings from this study further showed no significant differences among the responses on principals, vice-principals and teachers on the seven development accepted programmes. This indicates a high level of unanimity in the responses irrespective of whether the responses were from principals, vice-principals or teachers. Numerous scholars have also pointed to the lack of significant difference between principals and their staff on the accepted development programmes to be offered to MSF recipients (Lori,

McClelland, & Stewart, 2010; Normore, 2007). This shows that training and creating a development plan for principals' improvement, following MSF, is necessary, given the dynamic and challenging context that currently surrounds principals' work (Battle, 2010; Hoffman & Johnson, 2005; Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Wagner et al., 2006). This is significant because it is through various forms of training that all principals must have the capacity needed to meet all student academic and emotional needs, content knowledge to support the curriculum requirements and a sense of their own efficacy and professional needs. Our educational leaders need these same skills and must also be able to translate visions and goals into actions, support learning and teaching within their schools and respond to the affective needs of students, staff, parents and community. Although MSF cannot produce all needed improvements; however, it is often one of the first steps that must be implemented in order to support substantive improvements in schools.

The Extent of Overall Acceptance of MSF by Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers Based on Gender.

Another finding of this study is that there was a great extent of acceptance of MSF by male and female principals, vice-principals and teachers that participated in this study. In other words, both male and female respondents in this study indicated a high acceptance of MSF on principals for school

improvement. Irrespective of gender, many of them indicated a high extent of acceptance that MSF is relevant; should focus on specific goals, involve multiple raters, and cover selected school domains. They also showed high acceptance of the periods and development programmes to be mounted for the principals as a result of MSF. This finding agreed with the studies conducted by (Hatamleh, 2016), (Al-Araifi and Al-Omari, 2001) and (Al-Barmi, 2005), as all of these studies pointed out that there was a high extent of acceptance of MSF by male and female participants in secondary schools in Illinois, Turkey and Oman respectively. In essence, being a male or female principal, vice-principal or teacher did not affect the acceptance MSF items.

The comparisons for overall acceptance by gender concur with many studies. In Chile, Montecinos, Madrid, Fernández and Ahumada (2014) found that MSF is highly accepted as relevant to male and female principals' school improvement. Therefore, the results of this study clearly support the trend of point to great extent acceptance of MSF by male and female respondents.

The Extent of Overall Acceptance of MSF by Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers Based on Years of Experience.

Finally, according to the findings of the study, there were no statistical significant differences resulting from experience between means of responses of the principals, vice-principals and teachers in the sample. It has been demonstrated that the overall acceptance ratings were similar for all the respondents irrespective of experience. This could be explained by the fact that both more and less experienced anticipate that principals could benefit from the espoused strengths of the MSF appraisal process as an objective approach to school improvement. It is also an outcome to be hoped for from the equality-centred and positive action. This could be explained by the fact that the accepted relevance of MSF, its goals, multiple raters, school domains, periods and development programmes outweigh the effects of any potential effect due to the years of experience of the respondents. This indicates that experience in the educational domain (be it short or long) has no significant effect on the acceptability of MSF. The result of this finding is supported with the result of the studies conducted by (Al-Ghamedi, 1996), (Al-Araifi and Al-Omari, 2001) and (Al-Barmi, 2005). These studies pointed out lack of statistical significant differences resulting from the variable experience. However, it disagreed with the

studies conducted by (AlJaradat, 1995) and (Al-Mamari, 2004), which found differences resulting from the variable experience.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study presented, analyzed and discussed, it was obvious that there was a great extent of acceptance of Multi Source Feedback (MSF) on principals for the improvement of secondary schools in Anambra State. The relevance of MSF to principals' school improvement in several areas, the goals of MSF, the rater sources and periods for obtaining MSF from the principals were all moderately accepted by the respondents. However, many school domains and development programmes are highly accepted for inclusion in MSF. The acceptability levels of the principals, vice-principals and teachers differed significantly in terms of relevance, rater sources, school domains, and periods for MSF but their acceptance levels of goals and development programmes for MSF did not differ significantly. Gender significantly affected the overall acceptance of MSF but years of experience did not affect it. In conclusion, MSF is accepted as a potentially relevant intervention that can positively impact on principals and schools improvement in Anambra State, if acceptable rater sources, goals, periods, school domains and development programmes are included.

Implications of the Findings

The findings of the study have several implications to educational management and policy, and quality assurance in Anambra State secondary schools. The results of this research suggest that introducing MSF as part of the principals' performance improvement system is acceptable and advisable at this time, since principals could benefit from using MSF as a tool for professional development and to gain an aggregate view of leadership across the school staff. The findings however imply a caution that overzealous use of MSF without careful attention to relevance, goals, rater sources, domains, periods and development programmes, might be completely acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers in the schools. Therefore, mandating MSF in schools, even for development purposes should be handled moderately.

Findings also have some implications for improving principals' capacity in secondary education management in Anambra State. At a broad management and policy level, since the principals, vice-principals and teachers accepted MSF as being relevant to principals' school improvement, the implementation of MSF would be a welcome development in the schools. If this were to be the case, then there is need for policy decisions and commitments to the institutionalization of MSF in

schools. Although each principal is in a sense unique, and operates in his own contextual school environment, these important issues accepted by respondents in this study would certainly present some relevance to their school improvement efforts.

Also, the findings have implications for the goals which MSF would serve in the schools. A clear statement of goals is an essential starting point. It should not be used for promotion and appraisal but rather it has to be used as a development tool for continuous learning and improvement for principals. Whatever goals it should serve, should be communicated to the participants. Failure to communicate the goals to relevant stakeholders could make the purposes of MSF unclear even amongst the principals themselves. It could also result in negative reactions to MSF. Also unless participants are well informed about the goals of MSF as a development tool, rater biases might emanate and the goals of the MSF might not be achieved. Without such clear statements, it will be impossible to determine whether the MSF is designed properly, working as intended, or even needed at all.. If principals can be convinced that the feedback process will be useful and valuable for their professional development, they would be more motivated to improve following receipt of feedback, even if that feedback is negative.

However, not everybody that has a stake in secondary schools should be included as a credible rater source. As a starting point, those category of raters accepted in this study would be involved. The acceptance of some rater sources and rejection of others in this study is important as it shows that the respondents understood that MSF requires participants to self-assess themselves by completing the questionnaire themselves as a means of comparing self and others' perceptions of professional performance. If these sources were to be included for principals, their feedback would be acceptable and can drive the shared capacity of principals, vice-principals, staff, prefects, bursars and alumni to improve schools.

Moreover, it is more advisable to allow MSF to cover the specific domains identified in this study and perhaps after some time extending the use of MSF to other domains should the need arise. Focus on selected school domains is likely to make MSF outcomes to target areas of priority improvement in the schools. However, the domains should be always carefully balanced to include as many domains as possible so that the outcomes would improve and strengthen principals' school improvement efforts across other domains. Moreover, specificity of school domains is important because views diverge on the utility of MSF in all areas of schools improvement. It does not have to be termly or yearly affair but

might generally be administered every three years except in cases where there are special reports against a principal or when it is to be used as a needs assessment for in-service training. When MSF is used in these periods, it will better serve as a basis for course designing and selection of materials, methods, and evaluation techniques.

However, MSF results could help the principal to identify, strengthen and improve on his weaknesses. The bottom line is that making 360 feedback available for developmental use in the secondary education sector is an acceptable idea and is essentially how the tool is being used in many countries today.

The findings further imply that MSF should be administered for but should be followed up with several development programmes for principals. If this is not done, incompetent principals and irrelevant leadership activities might continue to mar the management of secondary education in Anambra State. It also implies the need to organize only in-service workshops and seminars that are directly related to the strengths and weaknesses of principals identified through MSF.

In addition, results obtained from the MSF would be expected to be a useful component in developing a richer understanding of a school's principal's improvement, irrespective of the constructs of gender and years of

experience of the respondents. There would serve to broaden the conceptual and practical understanding of the acceptance of MSF. There is the implication that the MSF variables accepted by male and female respondents would provide useful information the quest to provide high quality principals' services to organizations.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The Anambra State Government should consider establishing the use of MSF for secondary school male and female principals with various years of experience as it is accepted to be relevant to principals' school improvement.
2. In instituting MSF in the secondary schools, government and other stakeholders should consider using goal of MSF for staff development and not for principals' appraisal for salary increase, promotion or compensation. Therefore, the State Education Commission and school principals could implement MSF but it is important to minimize negative outcome by using multi-source feedback as developmental purpose.

3. Focus on some goals such as awards and commendations for principals with high MSF scores, routine monitoring and accountability, collective responsibility among principals and staff for improving student learning, as well as building sound principal stakeholder relationship and trust for school improvement are advisable.
4. Directors of Ministry of Education, Vice-principals, teachers (Principal cadre only), Bursars, School Prefects and Alumni should be involved as accepted sources to credible MSF to principals. However, anonymity of the rater sources should be ensured at all times and should be allowed to assess the principals' multisource feedback system objectively by carefully designed methods. Also general students' participation in MSF should not be considered in secondary schools in Anambra State.
5. MSF should be started off with a deliberate focus on selected school domains, especially planning and progress of schools vision, goals and objectives, curriculum and teaching-learning processes for students' achievement and safe and healthy school culture. It should also cover staff development processes and progress, professional qualities and instructional leadership development, community participation as well as school plants and facilities management including ICT.

6. MSF should be designed to be administered on the principals on specific periods, especially when there is a report against a principal, prior to every seminar to be organized for principals and every three years as these periods were completely acceptable to the majority of the principals, vice-principals and teachers in this study.
7. Following MSF, and its accepted goal of principals' development, it is advisable that Government and her educational agencies and the principals themselves mount several development programmes including face-to-face seminar/conference/workshop, executive coaching by special consultants, and group weekend retreats for principals.
8. If MSF is to be used for school improvement, then follow-up is critical. Government and her agencies should engage the services of MSF professionals who are experienced in delivering MSF feedback, and coaching employees to interpret the feedback to the principals. This would ensure proper understanding of the feedback results and the imperatives for improvements.
9. Staff of State Education Commission, principals, vice-principals, teachers and non-tutorial staff should be trained on the use and benefits of MSF so that, it may be effectively implemented in schools in Anambra State in line with international trends.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of the findings is that some of the respondents were reluctant to complete the copies of the questionnaire because they felt that they were being monitored. This resulted to non retrieval of some of the copies. However, the percentage of the returned copies was considered high enough for information needed in the study.

Suggestions for Further Studies

In addition to the replication of the study in other states in Nigeria, the following areas are suggested for further research:

1. A comparative study of the acceptance of Multi-Source Feedback (MSF) in public, private and special schools in Anambra state.
2. Development and validation of Multi-Source Feedback (MSF) instrument for assessing Principals' School improvement efforts in secondary Schools in Anambra State.

REFERENCES

- Adelman, H. S. & Taylor, L. (2007). Systemic change and school improvement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 17, 55-77.
- Agu, N. (2009). *Basic statistics for education and the behavioural sciences*. Awka: Valoux Prints.
- Akomolafe, C. (2012). Principals' leadership capacities as perceived by teachers in secondary schools in Ekiti state, Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, 8 (22), 28-38
- Alfadly, A. (2012). How Kuwaiti managers can accept the multisource feedback for development purpose in the Organization? *Business Management Dynamics*, 3 (2), 1-10.
- Alimi, O. S., Alabi, F. O & Ehinola, G. O. (2011). Teachers' perception of principals' leadership effectiveness in public and private secondary schools in Ondo state. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11 (12), 23-27.
- American Association of School Administrators. (2010). Leadership to improve student achievement; *Journal of Scholarship Practice*, 7(1), 11-13.
- Arikewuyo, M. (2009). Professional training of secondary school principals in Nigeria: A neglected area in the educational system. *Horida Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 2(2) 73 - 84.
- Asumeng, M. (2013). The effect of employee feedback-seeking on job performance: An Empirical study. *International Journal of Management*, 30(1), 373-388.
- Atwater, L. E. & Waldman, D. A. (2012). Understanding and optimising multisource feedback. *Human Resource Management*. 41(2), 193-208

- Atwater, L. E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F. J., & Fleenor, J. W. (2012). Self-other rating agreement: Does it really matter. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 576-597.
- Atwater, L.E., Waldman, D.A. & Brett, J.F. (2012). Understanding and optimizing multisource feedback. *Human Resource Management*, 41, 193–208.
- Augier, M., & March, J. G. (2007). The pursuit of relevance in management education. *California Management Review*, 49(3), 129–146.
- Australian Capital Territory (ACT). (2009). *School improvement framework: Better schools... better futures. Raising quality and achieving excellence in ACT public schools*. Retrieved from: www.det.act.gov.au.
- Babalola, J. B. (2013). *Education for sustainable development in Africa*. Ibadan: His Lineage Publishing House.
- Bailey, C., & Austin, M. (2011). 360 degree feedback and developmental outcomes: The role of feedback characteristics, self-efficacy and importance of feedback dimensions to focal manager's current role. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14(1), 51-66.
- Berger, J. (2011). *A change theory: Key concepts for understanding the work of Robert Kegan*. Retrieved from http://www.shiftingthinking.org/?page_id=449
- Botha, I. S. & Triegaardt, P. (2014). Distributed leadership towards' school improvement: case study in South African Schools. *Kamla-Raj International Journal of Educational Science*, 7(2), 309-317
- Bouchamma, Y., Basque, M, & Marcotte, C. (2014). School management competencies: Perceptions and self-efficacy beliefs of school principals. *Creative Education*, 5, 580-589. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.58069>.

- Bracken, D. W., & Rose, D. S. (2011). When does 360-degree feedback create behavior change? And how would we know it when it does? *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26(2), 183-192. doi:10.1007/s10869-011-9218-5
- Bracken, D., Timmreck, C., & Church, A. (2011). *The handbook of multisource feedback: The comprehensive resource for designing and implementing MSF processes*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Brutus, S. (2006). Multi-source assessment programs in organizations: An insider's perspective. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13, 187-201.
- Brutus, S., Derayeh, M., Fletcher, C., Bailey, C., Velazquez, P., Shi, K., Simon, C. & Labath, V. (2014) Internationalization of multi-source feedback systems: a six-country exploratory analysis of 360-degree feedback. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17 (11), 1888–1906
- Burke, R. J. & Major, D. A. (2014). *Gender in organizations: Are men allies or adversaries to women's career advancement?* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Catano, N & Stronge, J (2012). What do we expect of school principals? Congruence, between principal evaluation and performance standards. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7 (10), 379–399
- Center for the School of the Future. (2012). *Indicators of school quality*. Retrieved from <http://www.csf.usu.edu/IsqFaq.php>
- Chang, L. (2014). Self-other agreement in 360-degree leadership ratings: a cross-cultural measurement equivalence study. *Doctoral Dissertations. Paper 305*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/dissertations/305>.
- Childers, G. L. (2013). *Principals' perceptions of successful leadership*. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 1205. <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1205>

- Childs, P. E. (2006, May). Relevance, relevance, relevance. *Physical Sciences Magazine*, 14.
- Condon, C., & Clifford, M. (2012). *Measuring principal performance: How rigorous are publicly available principal performance assessment instruments?* Retrieved from <http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/QSLBrief2.pdf>
- Conger, J. & Toegel, G. (2003). Action learning and multi-rater feedback as leadership development interventions: Popular but poorly deployed. *Journal of Change Management*, 3 (4), 332-348.
- Conway, J. M., & Huffcut, A. I. (2013). Psychometric properties of multisource performance ratings: A meta-analysis of subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings. *Human Performance*, 10, 331-360.
- Corderman, D. S. (2014). *Perceptual agreement between multi-rater feedback sources in the federal bureau of investigation*. Unpublished dissertation, Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Corporate Leadership Council. (2011). *Considerations for implementing 360-degree reviews: secondary research findings*. Washington, DC: Corporate Executive Board.
- Creswell (2014). *Research Design Qualitative, Qualitative and mixed methods Approach* (4th ed, p304) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Dalessio, A. T. (2008). Using multi-source feedback for employee development and personnel decisions. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State-of-the-art in practice* (pp. 278-330). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Leithwood, K., Hopkins, D., Gu, G., Brown, E. & E. Ahtaridou. (2011). *Successful school leadership: Linking with learning*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

- Debebe. G., & Reinert, K.A. (2014). Leading with our whole selves: A multiple identity approach to leadership development. In M. Miville & A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Handbook on race-ethnicity and gender in psychology* (pp 271-293). New York, NY: Springer.
- DeNisi A. S., & Sonesh S. (2010). The appraisal and management of performance at work. In Zedeck S. (Ed.). *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Selecting and developing members for the organization*, 2: 255–279. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- DeNisi, A.S. & Kluger, A.N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 129–139.
- Dipali, J. & Maulik, G. (2014). Multi-source feedback system: A descriptive study. *International Journal for Scientific Research & Development*, 2 (6), (online): doi: 23210613659.
- Doherty, E. (2013). How to develop, implement, and assess multi-source feedback (MSF). for Trainees. *MedEdPORTAL*, 2(1),1-13. Retrieved from: www.mededportal.org/publication/9476
- Donnon, T., Al- Ansari, A., Samah, A. I. & Claudio, V. (2013). The reliability, validity, and feasibility of multisource feedback physician assessment: A systematic review. *Academic Medicine*, 89 (3), 1-6
- Donnon, T., Ansari, A., T., Al Khalifa, K., Darwish, A. & Violato, C. 4 (2014). The construct and criterion validity of the multisource feedback process to assess physician performance: A meta-analysis. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S57236>
- Doss, G. A. (2014). A generational perspective of teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership practices. *Dissertations, Theses and Capstone Projects*. Paper 622.
- Drew, G. M. (2009) A “360” degree view for individual leadership development. *Journal of Management Development*. Retrieved from QUT Digital Repository. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>

- Drew, T. L. (2009) Perceived usefulness of 360 degree feedback for leadership development. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 6(1),35-44
- Duze, C. (2012). Comparative analysis of principals' management strategies in public and private secondary schools in Anambra State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 1 (1), 239-256
- Earley, P, Higham, R, Allen, R, Allen, T, Howson, J, Nelson, R, Rawar, S, Lynch, S, Morton, L, Mehta, P & Sims, D. (2012). *Review of the school leadership landscape*. Nottingham; National College for School Leadership.
- Eberlein, M., Ludwig, S., & Nafziger, J. (2010). The effects of feedback on self-assessment. *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 63 (2), 177-199. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8586.2009.00345
- Edwards, G., Elliott, C., Iszatt-White, M. & Schedlitzki, D. (2013) Critical and alternative approaches to leadership learning and development. *Management Learning*, 44 (1), 3-10.
- Edward, M. & Ewen, A. (1996). 360⁰ feedback: The powerful new model for employee assessment and performance improvement. AMACOM, New York.
- Egbe, M. & Baker, P. (2012). Development of a multisource feedback instrument for clinical supervisors in postgraduate medical training. *Clinical Medicine*, 12 (3), 239–43
- Egboka, P. N., Ezeugbor, C. O & Enueme, C. P. (2013). Managerial skills and enhancement strategies of secondary school principals. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(26), 168-174
- Ehren, M., Perryman, J. & Shackleton, N. (2015). Setting expectations for good education: how Dutch school inspections drive improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice* 26, (2), 296-327. DOI:10.1080/09243453.2014.936472

- Ekundayo, H. T. (2010). Principal's leadership behaviour as a determinant of effectiveness of secondary schools in Nigeria. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(1), 2-10
- Elliott, S. N., & Clifford, M. (2014). *Principal assessment: Leadership behaviors known to influence schools and the learning of all students* (Document No. LS-5). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website: <http://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/literature-syntheses/further>,
- Enyi, C. (2012). *Administrative competencies required by secondary school principals in South East of Nigeria*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Ermongkonchai, P (2008) An evaluation of multisource feedback (MSF) for managerial development in large-size manufacturing companies in Thailand *Contemporary Management Research* 4,(3) 189-218
- Federal Ministry of Education (2009). *Roadmap for the education sector*. Abuja: Federal Ministry of Education
- Federal Ministry of Education (2010). *Education sector analysis: Proposals for reforms at the secondary sector*. Abuja: Federal Ministry of Education
- Federal Ministry of Education (2013). *Outcome of the 3rd summit on improving education: Agenda, actions and priorities*. Abuja: Author
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National policy on education*. Abuja: Government Printers.
- Ferguson, J., Wakeling, J. Bowie, P. (2014). Factors influencing the effectiveness of multisource feedback in improving the professional practice of medical doctors: a systematic review. *BMC Medical Education*, 14 (6),76-82. doi:10.1186/1472-6920-14-76
- Ferris, D. L., Spence, J. R., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2012). Interpersonal injustice and workplace deviance: *The role of esteem threat*. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1788-1811

- Fletcher, C & Baldry, C. (2000). A study of individual differences and self-awareness in the context of multi-source feedback. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 303-319.
- Fletcher, C., & Bailey, C. (2003). Assessing self-awareness in multisource feedback: Theoretical issues and methods. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(5), 395-404.
- Ford, J. M. (2013). *Organizational politics and multisource feedback*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- Foster, C. A., & Law, M. R. (2006). How many perspectives provide a compass? Differentiating 360-degree and multi-source feedback. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14 (3), 288-292.
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H.H., (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- French, P. V. (2014). The roles of school advisory councils in school improvement: a case study in policy interpretation. *UNF Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 165. <http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/165>
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, Teachers College Press.
- Gajek, A. K. (2009). *A comparison of overrater, underrater and in agreement on MSF performance*. Unpublished Master's Theses. Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Paper 3736.
- Geake, A., Oliver, K., & Farrell, C. (2009). *The application of 360 degree feedback survey*. Thames Ditton: SHL.
- Georgescu, B. & Stănculescu, A. (2012). The use of multi-source feedback as a human resource management tool. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 2(1), 36-14

- Goldring, E. B., Mavrogordato, M. & Haynes, K. T. (2014). Multisource principal evaluation data: principals' orientations and reactions to teacher feedback regarding their leadership effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 4 (online). Doi:0013161X14556152
- Grissom, J. A., & Loeb, S. (2011). Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(5), 1091–1123.
- Guangrong, F. S. (2014). Impact of multi-source feedback on leadership competency development: A longitudinal field study. *International Education Studies*, 11(7), 238-251
- Guilleux, F. (2010). A developmental perspective on the influence of coaching and multi-source feedback (360-degree surveys) on *leadership education of aspiring principals*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh
- Gülşen, C. (2014). The readiness levels of secondary school administrators to the innovation management. *International Journal on New Trends in Education & Their Implications*, 5 (2), 77-89
- Guskey, T. R (2009). Planning professional learning. *Professional Learning: Reimagined*, 10-16
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(2), 95–110.
- Hardman, B. K. (2011). Teacher's perception of their principal's leadership style and the effects on student achievement in improving and non-improving schools *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/3726>.

- Harrelson, R. (2014). *The process of implementation and its impact on the school improvement turnaround model: Lessons learned during the first Year*. (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>
- Helsing, D., Howell, A., Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2008). Putting the "development" in professional development: Understanding and overturning educational leaders' immunities to change. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(3), 234-251.
- Hjørland, B. (2010). The foundation of the concept of relevance. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(2), 217-237.
- Hooijberg, R., & Lane, N. (2009). Using multisource feedback coaching effectively in executive education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(4), 28-39
- Hopkins, D. (2001). *School improvement for real*. London: Routledge Falmer
- Huddleston, L. (2012). Evaluating treatment acceptability, treatment integrity, and cultural modifications of a bullying prevention intervention. *Dissertation*, Georgia State University, http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cps_diss/86
- Ikediegwu NN (2008). *Basic theories and concepts in educational administration*. Enugu: Okfic printers.
- Inko-Tariah, D. C. (2013). Attitude of lecturers towards student's evaluation of their teaching effectiveness in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4 (15), 21-26
- Jarvis, C. Gulati, A., Mcririck, V., & Simpson, P. (2013). Leadership matters: Tensions in evaluating leadership development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 15, 27- 45. doi:10.1177/1523 42231 2467138
- Khan, A. N. & Khan, I. A. (2014). Academic role of a principal and continuous professional development. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3 (2), 925-942

- Kio, S. I. (2015). Feedback theory through the lens of social networking. *Issues in Educational Research*, 25(2), 135-152
- Ko, J., Hallinger, P., & Walker, A. (2015). Exploring whole school versus subject department improvement in Hong Kong secondary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 26, (2), 215-239. DOI:10.1080/09243453.2014.882848
- Labaree, D. F. (2008). The dysfunctional pursuit of relevance in education research. *Educational Researcher*, 37(7), 421–423. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X08325557
- Lakshminarayana, I., Wall, D. Bindall, T. & Goodyear, H. (2015). A multisource feedback tool to assess ward round leadership skills of senior paediatric trainees: Development of tool. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 91 (1075), 268-273. doi:10.1136/ postgradmedj-2015-133308
- Levin, B. (2012). *System-wide improvement in education. Education Policy Series*, London: International Academy of Education.
- Lochmiller, C. R. (2016). *Examining Administrators' Instructional Feedback to High School Math and Science Teachers* *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52 (1), 75-109
- London, M. Mcfarland, L.A. (2010). Assessment feedback in JL farr and N.T. Tippins (Eds). *Handbook of Employee Selection* New York: Tylor & Francis.
- Loosbrock, J. M. (2014). Senior Leaders' Response to Multi-Source Feedback: An Interpretive Multi-Case Study. *Education Doctoral Dissertations in Organization Development*. Paper 34. <http://ir.stthomas.edu/capsedorg devdocdiss/34>
- Lunenburg, F. (2011). *Systems thinking and the learning organization: The path to school improvement*. *Schooling*, 2 (1), 1-6
- Luthans, F & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 321-349

- Maheer, J. (2009). The use of 360-degree feedback compared to traditional evaluative feedback for the professional growth of teachers. *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. Paper 1700.
- Malisuwana, P., Jaitip, N. & Siridej, S. (2015). Self-reflection with Critical Friends and Multisource Feedback via Online Social Media for Students' Oral Presentation and Self-esteem. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174 (12) 1021–1025
- Marzano, R.J. Waters & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School leadership that works: from research to result. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA.
- Mbonu, O. A. (2015). A framework for effective complexity management in secondary schools' administration in Anambra State, Nigeria. *The International Journal of Educational Organization and Leadership*, 22(2), 15-23.
- McCauley, C. D., & Moxley, R. S. (2013). Developmental 360: How feedback can make managers more effective. *Career Development International*, 1(3), 15-19. doi:10.1108/13620439610118555
- Modebelu, M. & Onyali, L. C. (2014). Qualitative record management skills for effective service delivery in Nigerian education system. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2 (12) 1250-1256.
- Nakpodia, E.D. (2011). A critique of the methods of evaluating the competency of lecturers in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *African Journal of Education and Technology*, 1(1), 53-59
- Nigeria: A neglected area in the educational system. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 2(2), 73-84
- Normansell, D. (2011). *Situational assessment on leadership - student assessment (SALSA®): An evaluation of the convergent validity with multi-source feedback in division in intercollegiate athletics*. Masters Theses & Specialist Projects. Paper 1050. <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1050>

- Nwaka, N. G. (2010). Secondary school administration in Anambra state today: challenges and the way forward. *African Research Review*, 4(2) 384-397
- Nwangwa, K & Omotere, T. (2015). The new roles of school managers in managing educational changes in Nigerian schools. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(25), 160-169
- Nworgu, B.G. (2015). Educational research: Basic issues and methodology. Owerri: Wisdom Publication Limited.
- Nowack, K.M. (2009). Leveraging multi-raters feedback to facilitate successful change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61(4) 280.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2012), *Equity and quality in education: Supporting disadvantaged students and schools*. Fairfax: OECD. Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264130852-en>
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2014). *Pisa 2012: What makes schools successful? Resources, policies and practices*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Ofoegbu, F, Clark, A & Osagie, R (2013). Leadership theories and practice: Charting the part for improved Nigerian schools. *Journal of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM)*, 41(2), 67 – 76
- Ofoegbu, N. & Obiweluzor, N. (2015). New and unexpected demographic challenges to educational leadership in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 5(1), 39-44
- Ofojebe, W. N. (2010). Relevance and benefits of management by objectives to secondary school management in Anambra State: Teachers views. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 2(7), 99-104. Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/IJEAPS>

- Ogunkoya, O. A. (2012). 360 degree feedback and employees' commitment: A study of the Nigerian beverage industry. *Prime Journal of Business Administration and Management* 2(2), 466-473
- Oleforo, N. & Anugwu, M. (2014). Massification of students' intake and effectiveness of administration in public secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 2 (6), 19-29.
- Olowoselu, A. & Bello, A. (2015). Challenges to secondary school principals' leadership in northern region of Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 3(3)1-5.
- Orr, M. T. (2011). *Innovative leadership preparation and effective leadership practices: Making a difference in school improvement*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Pansiri, N. O., & Bulawa, P. (2013). Parents' participation in public primary schools in Botswana: Perceptions and experiences of head teachers. *International Education Studies*, 6(5),68-77.
- Patel, J. P., Sharma, A., West, D., Bates, I. P., Davies, J. G. and Abdel-Tawab, R. (2011). An evaluation of using multi-source feedback (MSF) among junior hospital pharmacists. *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice*, 19: 276–280. doi: 10.1111/j.2042-7174.2010.0092.x
- Pinto, D. A. (2014). *Effective principal leadership behavior: The student perspective*. *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. Paper 11. <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1205>
- Pont, B. (2014). School leadership: From practice to policy. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 2(1), 4-28. doi:10.4471/ijelm.2014.07
- Potter & David (2002). School improvement for schools facing challenging circumstances: A review of research and practice. *School Leadership & Management*, 22 (3), 243—256.
- Raghunadhan T, & A H Sequeira (2013). Strategic 360 degree performance appraisal model as a synergy for strategic education planning in premier HTIs in India. *American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 17-22

- Rahabav, P. (2016). *The Effectiveness of Academic Supervision for Teachers*. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7 (9), 47-55
- Richard, H. (2014). Local authorities and the school system: The new authority-wide partnerships. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 42: 355-371, doi:10.1177/17411 43 21 4521591
- Rombout, Y. L. & Bosman, M. (2014). *Multi source feedback among physicians, Is it effective? A rapid evidence assessment*. Fourth Annual International Conference on Engaged Management Scholarship, Tulsa, Oklahoma. September 11 14. Available at SSRN : <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2553352> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2553352>.
- Sargeant, J. (2015). Reflecting upon multisource feedback as ‘assessment for learning. *Perspectives on Medical Education* 4 (2), 55-56,
- School Improvement Opinion Survey. (2006). *School keys: Unlocking excellence through the Georgia school standards*. Retrieved from <http://archives.doe.k12.ga.us/DMGetDocument.aspx/GAPSS%20FINAL%20Rev%20PRINT%20READY%2086.pdf?p=6CC6799F8C1371F629970641DAA1DDE3ED496B145857D4450887CCABED6ACE36&Type=D>
- Scott, E. & Norris, J. (2014). Managerial rhetoric, accountability, and school leadership in contemporary Australia. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 13(2), 169-187.
- Scott, F., Coates, P. & Anderson, M. (2008) Capabilities for 360 interventions and related feedback. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27 (1), 91–101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513541311289846>
- Seifert, C. F., Yukl, G., & McDonald, R. A. (2003). Effects of multisource feedback and a feedback facilitator on the influence behavior of managers toward subordinates *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 561–569

- Seifert, D. & Hartnell-Young, E. (2015). *An effective school improvement framework: using the national school improvement tool*. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/tll_misc/21
- Silva, J. P., White, G., Yoshida, R. (2011). The direct effects of principal–student discussions on eighth grade students’ gains in reading achievement: An experimental study. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5), 772–793.
- Skalde, A. & Pont, B. (2013). A literature review on the implementation of school improvement programmes: Common success factors and the role of context. Unpublished paper.
- Smith, L., G. (2000). *The development and implementation of 360 Degree Feedback® for administrators of a K-12 public schooldistrict*. Retrospective Theses and Dissertations. Paper 13931.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., & Reilly, R. R. (2005). Does Performance Improve Following Multisource Feedback? A Theoretical Model, Meta-analysis, and Review of Empirical Findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(1), 33-66. doi:10.1111/j.1744
- Smither, J. W., London, M., & Richmond, K. R. (2005). The relationship between leaders' personality and their reactions to and use of multisource feedback: A longitudinal study. *Group and Organization Management*, 30, 181-210.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Vasilopoulos, N. L., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., & Salvemini, N. (2011). An examination of the effects of an upward feedback program over time. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 1-34.
- Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., & Buda, R. (1988). The effect of prior performance information on ratings of present performance: Contrast versus assimilation revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 487-96.
- Spillane, J.P. (2013). *The practice of leading and managing teaching in educational organisations*. In OECD (2013), *Leadership for XXIst Century Learning*, OECD Publishing.

- Su, Y. (2013). *Improving instructional leadership behaviors of school principals by means of implementing time management training sessions*. PhD (Doctor of Philosophy). Thesis, University of Iowa, 2013. Retrieved from <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/4916>.
- Taole, M. J. (2013). *Exploring principals' role in providing instructional leadership in rural high schools in South Africa*. *Studies in Tribes Tribals*, 11(1), 75-82
- Taylor, S. (2006). *Student self-assessment and multisource feedback assessment exploring benefits, limitations, and remedies*. *Journal of Management Education*, 38 (3) 359-383. doi:10.1177/ 105 25 62 91 3488111
- Toegel, G. & Conger, J.A. (2003). 360-degree assessment: Time for reinvention. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2, 297-311.
- UNESCO (2014). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2013/4*. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002256/225660e.pdf>
- Uzoehina, G. O. (2013). *How do they lead? An assessment of principals' leadership practices based on Kouzes and Posner's leadership model*. Online Journal for Emerging Scholarly Research Conference on Global Leadership, Learning, and Research 2, 108-124
- Valiant, D. (2015). *School leadership, trends in policies and practices, and improvement in the quality of education*. Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015, Education for All 2000-2015: achievements and challenges". Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- Wagner, T., Kegan, R., & Howell, A. (2011). *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming our schools*. Education Week, 25(18), 30-30.
- Wahlstrom, K., Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Executive summary of research findings*. Retrieved from: www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning-Executive-Summary.pdf

- 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
- Wallace Foundation (2011). *The school principal as leader*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center>.
- Wallace Foundation. (2014). *Education leadership: An Agenda for School Improvement*. Wallace Foundation's National Conference (Washington, DC, October 14-16). Retrieved from www.wallacefoundation.org.
- Waters, T., & Grubb, S. (2004). *The leadership we need: Using research to strengthen the use of standards for administrator preparation and licensure programs*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Watt, J. (2008). *Student leadership and school improvement*. Retrieved from: www.ncsl.org.uk.
- Wilkey, G. G. (2013). Research into the characteristics of effective high school principals: a case study of leadership practices used in the high school setting. *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1478. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/1478>
- Williams, H.S., & Alawiye, O. (2014). Performance assessment of residency principal interns on Washington standard 5 knowledge and skills. *National Forum of Educational Administration & Supervision Journal*, 32(4),1-13
- Yukl, G. A. (2012). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed., p. 528). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zenger, J., & Folkman, J. (2014). *Your employees want the negative feedback you hate to give [Web log post]*. Retrieved from HBR Blog Network website: <http://blogs.hbr.org/2014/01>
- Zmuda, A., Kuklis, R., & Kline, E. (2004). *Transforming schools: Creating a culture of continuous improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Acceptability of Multi-Source Feedback for School Improvement (AMSFSI) Questionnaire

Letter to the Respondents

Department of Edu. Management & Policy,
Faculty of Education,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
12th October, 2014.

Dear Respondent,

The researcher is a post-graduate student of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. She is carrying out a study under the above named department. The purpose of the study is to determine the relevance and acceptance of multi-source feedback for school improvement of principals in public secondary schools in Anambra State. Your co-operation is therefore solicited in filling the attached questionnaire, in order to make this work successful. Please your frank and objective responses to the questions are required and will be treated as confidential.

In the questionnaire attached herewith, a set of statements are listed on the left side of the pages and on the right side; boxes are provided for your response.

You are please requested to rate the listed statement and by ticking (✓) in any of the boxes that best represents the level of your agreement with the states item(s). Do not write your name and be assured that any information you give will be treated in strictest confidence and will be used purely for research work.

Thanks you for your anticipated co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

Izuka, Ifunanya,
(Researcher)

APPENDIX B

ACCEPTABILITY OF MULTI-SOURCE FEEDBACK FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (AMSFIS) QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear respondent,

Multi-source feedback is a process by which the managerial performances of a school principal might be evaluated by his or her peers, subordinates (vice-principals, teachers, students, parents, non-teaching staff etc), supervisors from Ministry of Education and Post Primary Schools service Commission, students and community (PTA, community members). This innovation is increasingly being applied in USA, UK, Canada, Australia, China, South Africa, New Zealand, Hongkong, Kuwait and many other countries in the world. In Nigeria, it is being used in the manufacturing sector and top private schools to improve principals' performances and consequently improve schools. Assuming that the Anambra State government wants to adopt this strategy for school principals, this instrument seeks your views on whether you will accept that MSF be introduced on principals for school improvement in Anambra State.

Part A:

Please, supply the following background information by putting a tick (✓) in the box next to your response.

1. Gender of respondent

Male ☐

Female ☐

2. Years of Job experience

Less than 5 years ☐ 6 to 10 years ☐

11 to 15 years ☐ 16 years and above ☐

3. Job Designation:

Principal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice-Principal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART B:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instruction: Below is a list of statements depicting the multi-source feedback framework. You have five options to each statement to indicate your response. You are expected to tick (✓) in the column that best describes your response.

Note: The response options for Section A are: Very Great Extent = VGE, Great Extent = GE, Moderate Extent = ME, Very Low Extent = VLE, Low Extent = LE

	Question: To what extent do you think that MSF would be relevant to principals in:	VGE	GE	ME	LE	VLE
1.	Becoming aware that they are highly responsible for school improvement so they will maintain high standards of leadership ethics, honesty, and integrity.					
2.	assessing whether they are engaging in the types of behaviors that contribute to school improvement					
3.	seeing the need to timely organize open discussions to clarify difficult, confusing and unfounded allegations that limit school improvement activities					
4.	limiting any false self-perceptions by understanding how others see their leadership and trying to improve					
5.	creating and sustaining a commonly accepted vision and mission for school's improvement goals and programs based on feedback from many stakeholders					
6.	prioritizing how to collaborate more with staff in responding to community interests and needs for school improvement					
7.	creating a holistic description of school practices by obtaining multiple data to identify goals, assess school effectiveness, and improve schools					
8.	Becoming more self-aware and mindful of practices that others condemn as creating negative image for the school.					
9.	providing the principal a tremendous opportunity to build trust and respect by allowing staff members to provide input on how they are led					
10.	developing clearer rationale for every managerial actions and seek for better ways of leading changes in the school to avoid negative feedback reports from staff					

11.	Developing greater happiness and motivation to manage schools based on feedback reports so that staff, students and students will be happy too.					
12.	using other people's judgment to solve problems in the best interest of the school by finding common solutions or effective compromise					
13.	Gaining different insights about the skills and behaviors desired in the school organization to accomplish the schools' mission, vision, and goals and live the values.					
14.	becoming more careful in setting structures and routines that support the school improvement goals and vision					
15.	promoting team development and collaborative school improvement culture which is characterized by mutual support and collective staff responsibility					

Note: Items in Sections B to E are to be responded to on a five point rating scale of:

(a) Completely acceptable: CA, (b) Highly acceptable: VA, (c) Moderately acceptable: MA, (d) Highly unacceptable: HU, (e) Completely unacceptable: CU

SECTION B: Goals for MSF

	The goals of MSF will be for:	CA	HA	MA	HU	CU
1.	Awards and commendations for principals with high MSF scores					
2.	Suspending or dismissing poorly performing principals to serve as a deterrent for others					
3.	Evaluating principals' competences as a basis for their in-service training					
4.	Promotions, merit pay and allowances for principals that perform excellently in school improvement areas					
5.	Ranking and comparing principals' school improvement efforts among schools to know which principals to transfer to which schools.					
6.	Developing strong and respectful relationships of principals with staff, students, parents and host communities in identifying the needed areas for school improvement					
7.	Routine monitoring and securing principals' accountability for school improvement					
8.	Reducing hassles of principals' workplace politics and misuse of authority					
9.	Promoting accurate judgments of principals'					

	effectiveness in inspiring desired behavioral change that leads to school improvement					
10.	Creating a culture of trust, collaboration and collective responsibility among principals and staff for improving student learning.					

SECTION C:

	Rater groups to be included in multi-source feedback are:	CA	HA	MA	HU	CU
1.	Senior staff of PPSSC from grade level 13					
2.	Directors of Ministry of Education					
3.	Vice-principals					
4.	Teachers (Principal cadre only)					
5.	All teachers irrespective of cadre					
6.	Senior non-tutorial staff					
7.	Bursars					
8.	Clerical staff					
9.	PTA executives					
10.	Community Leaders					
11.	School Prefects only					
12.	All students					
13.	Alumni of the school					
14.	Non-governmental organizations that work with the school					
15.	Religious organizations that provide moral instruction and services to the school					
16.	Assistant Inspectors of Education in the Local Government Areas of the school					

SECTION D: School domains that MSF will address

	Which school domains do you accept that MSF should address?	CA	HA	MA	HU	CU
1.	Planning and progress of schools vision, goals and objectives					
2.	Curriculum and teaching-learning processes for students' achievement					
3.	Safe and healthy school culture					
4.	School leadership and management especially efficiency in carrying out assignments for the PPSSC or Ministry of education					
5.	Staff development processes and progress					
6.	Professional qualities and instructional leadership					

	development					
7.	Community participation in school					
8.	Utilization of the services and expertise of non-tutorial staff					
9.	Promptness and punctuality to school meetings and functions					
10.	Management of school finances and financial matters					
11.	School plants and facilities management including ICT					

SECTION E: Periods for obtaining MSF on the principals

	What periods do you accept that MSF will be obtained on the principals?	CA	HA	MA	HU	CU
1.	At the beginning of every academic session					
2.	At the end of every term					
3.	During the period of teachers' promotion interview					
4.	During the period of State annual performance evaluation of teachers					
5.	Only when there is a report against a principal					
6.	Prior to every external examination such as WAEC, JAMB, NECO etc					
7.	Prior to every seminar to be organized for principals					
8.	Once every year					
9.	Every six months					
10.	Every three years					
11.	Anytime the school, PPSSC or Ministry of Education wish					

SECTION F: Programmes to be mounted for school Staff as a Result of MSF

	What development programmes will be mounted for school improvement as a result of feedback from MSF?	CA	HA	MA	HU	CU
1.	Personalized executive coaching by special consultants for principals on creating and following a development plan that for building on their strengths and reducing their weaknesses.					
2.	Face-to-face seminar/conference /workshop on identified improvement areas					
3.	Individualized learning and book studies on areas of most pressing changes					
4.	Group weekend retreats for principals following MSF identified most pressing areas of school improvement					
5.	Mentoring of principals with low MSF scores by those					

	with high MSF scores					
6.	Networking in small study groups					
7.	Interpretation and presentation of anonymous feedback to principals by professionals who are experienced in delivering MSF feedback for proper understanding by principals.					
8.	Focused group discussions among principals to establish a development plan identifying what, when, and how to address and strengthen performance based on MSF.					
9.	Specialist one month leadership training in selected Universities for principals with low MSF scores					
10.	Accredited online/self-paced leadership programmes					
11.	Conference audio or video tapes on MSF identified areas using audio cassettes, CD-ROMs, MP3s, or podcasts.					
12.	Exchange training with other schools					

Appendix C

Reliability Analysis Using Cronbach's Alpha

Scale: Section A- Relevance of MSF

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.734	15

Scale: Section B Goals of MSF

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.812	9

Scale: Section C- Rater Groups in MSF

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.834	16

Scale: Section D- School Domains that will Address MSF**Case Processing Summary**

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.832	11

Scale: Section E – Periods of Obtaining MSF on the Principals**Case Processing Summary**

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.731	11

Scale: Section F- Programmes to be mounted for School Staff as a Result of MSF**Case Processing Summary**

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.784	12

Summary of Reliability Analysis

S/N	Scale	Number of Items	Coefficient
1	Relevance of MSF	15	.734
2	Goals of MSF	9	.812
3	Rater Groups in MSF	16	.834
4	School Domains that will Address MSF	11	.832
5	Periods of Obtaining MSF on the Principals	11	.731
6	Programmes to be Mounted for School Staff as a Result of MSF	12	.784

Appendix D

Population Distribution of Administrators and Teachers in Public Secondary Schools in Anambra State.

Education Zones	Total no of Public School Principals	Total No of Public School Vice-Principals	Total No of Public School teachers
Aguata	47	54	846
Awka	60	72	1775
Nnewi	52	60	856
Ogidi	41	48	1475
Ontisha	30	48	769
Otuocha	26	30	249
Total	256	312	5970

Appendix E

60% Sample Distribution of Principals, Vice-principals and Teachers in Public Secondary Schools in Anambra State.

Sampled Education Zones and LGAs	Public Secondary School Principals			Public Secondary School Vice-Principals			Teachers in Public Secondary Schools		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Aguata Zone									
Aguata	22			22			173		
Orumba North	13			13			89		
Awka Zone									
Dunukofia	8			8			107		
Awka North	8			8			76		
Njikoka	11			11			167		
Nnewi Zone									
Nnewi South	8			8			81		
Ekwusigo	8			8			80		
Ogidi Zone									
Idemili South	13			13			138		
Oyi	11			11			75		
Onitsha Zone									
Onitsha South	6			6			306		
Ogbaru	11			11			180		
Otuocha Zone									
Anambra East	10			10			110		
Anyamelum	9			9			74		
Total	138			138			1656		

Sources: PRS Department of the PPSSC Awka and Principal's offices at public secondary schools in Anambra State (March 2016)