

EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT: Theories and Tasks

Edited by

**J. B. Babalola
A. O. Ayeni**



Macmillan
Nigeria

© J.B. Babalola, 2008

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: mechanical, electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written consent of the copyright owner.

First published 2009

Published by

Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited

4, Industrial Avenue

Ilupeju Industrial Estate

P.O. Box 264, Yaba, Lagos

New Oluyole Industrial Estate

P.O. Box 1463, Ibadan

Companies and representatives throughout the world

ISBN 978-978-018-722-4

Printed by: Foludex Press Limited, Ibadan.

Contents

Preface	ix
Notes on Contributors	x

PART I: PLANNING AND POLICY

Chapter 1

Strategic Planning at the School Level

<i>Akinsolu, A.O. and Ojedele, P. K.</i>	1-11
--	------

Chapter 2

Introduction to Educational Planning

<i>Ayeni, A. O.</i>	12-31
---------------------------	-------

Chapter 3

Problems and Issues in Higher Education in Nigeria

<i>Ojedele, P. K. and Fadokun, J. B.</i>	32-49
--	-------

Chapter 4

Efficiency of Education

<i>Ajayi, I. A.</i>	50-63
---------------------------	-------

Chapter 5

Educational Systems Analysis

<i>Ayodele, J. B.</i>	64-89
-----------------------------	-------

Chapter 6

Basic Concepts in Educational Planning and Administration

<i>Okunamiri, P. O. , Ibiom, N. and Okunamiri, M. C.</i>	90-109
--	--------

Chapter 7

Strategic Planning: Development, Implementation and the Role of University Administrators

<i>Babalola, J. B.</i>	110-129
------------------------------	---------

Chapter 18

Instructional Evaluation and Accountability

Onuka, A. O. U.

Preamble

This paper is necessitated by the need to introduce student educators to the rudiments of instructional evaluation and accountability in the context of the Nigerian education system in the twenty-first century. It is also meant to equip them for the challenges posed by educational evaluation and accountability in order to assist them to position themselves in such a way to always be able to evaluate the level of attainment of instructional objectives of any instructional strategy as well as to determine how accountable or responsible such a strategy is for the attainment of stated behavioural or learning objectives. The paper highlights the relationships among the three key words in the title of the paper: **Instruction, Evaluation and Accountability** and how they operate separately and together for the achievement of the stated objectives. The interdependence of evaluation and accountability in bringing about improved instruction and the subsequent realization of learning outcomes is stressed.

Introduction

The topic before us, though very important to teaching and learning, is often given little or no attention at all when the issue of instruction is being discussed. Thus, the necessity to begin the discussion of the subject by giving it the full attention that it deserves so as to elevate the status of education in twenty-first century Nigeria. The topic contains three key

words, namely: *instruction, evaluation and accountability*. The order in which these key words occur shows that the first action or activity leads to the next. It therefore, means that the best way to treat the topic is to follow the order of their occurrence, explaining them one after the other and then linking them together to give us a meaningful whole that gives us an insight to what the topic is all about and how useful it is in achieving educational objectives. The best approach is thus defining each component.

Instruction

Instruction or teaching is, in terms of economics, a service profession in the business of education which ultimately produces the final product of the system, namely: the graduate. The profession of instructing is a noble one and the bedrock of the growth and development of any society. Ajumogobia (Yoloye, 1999) posits that although teaching or the act of instructing is the poorest profession, it is the noblest of the professions.

Teaching or instruction is the process of facilitating students' learning through the use of appropriate management and instructional techniques by the teacher, to manage the interrelationships among students' interests, the content for learning, and the methods and materials that the teacher intends to use in teaching and learning. In other words, for instruction to take place effectively, the teacher must through the appropriate management, harness interrelationships among students' interests, the content of the curriculum to be learnt, and the instructional methods and materials to be employed in the learning exercise. Therefore, it is the process of facilitating interaction of students with the appropriate materials and strategies in order to engender the desired learning.

Instruction would normally involve instructing some person(s) on knowledge, attitudes and skills aimed at making the person(s) acquire the relevant information being passed to him, or to do what he is being instructed to do compatibly with the instruction. Instruction involves an instructor giving instruction to the instructed, usually termed a learner/pupil or student or trainee or educand. The means by which a teacher passes information determines whether she is teaching or instructing or training or indoctrinating. The act of teaching or instructing involves basically three stages:

- ❖ The planning phase
- ❖ The implementation
- ❖ The evaluation.

All good teachers are usually good planners. All instruction or teaching, must of a necessity, begin with good planning. The first stage of the planning phase is goal setting for the instruction followed by the selection of appropriate instructional strategies that match the set instructional goals, the content of instruction to be carried out, and the students involved.

The instructional plan is implemented when the instructor and the students engage in purposeful activities to realize the expected behaviour change. Finally, the process of instruction is subjected to an evaluation, whose result tells whether the instruction has been successful in achieving its purpose, how and why? And if it did not achieve its purpose, why it did not? This reveals the level of accountability of the instructional exercise that took place. At the stage of instructional evaluation, the teacher gathers information through tests, quizzes, and students' participation in the lessons in order to find out if his instruction has accomplished its objectives. This is done by probing if the instruction and the adopted instructional strategies have attained the stated learning objectives effectively. It thus provides feedback that could be used to revise and improve the entire instructional process for better attainment of stated objectives and goals. We can find out how effective an instruction has been whether teacher-centred or student/pupil- centred or a balance of the two over a period of time by examining it.

Some Concepts in Instruction Paradigm, model and theory

A paradigm is a general statement of presumed relationships among variables. It thus assists research by limiting the investigator's attention and commitment to the particular variables stated in the paradigm. It also directs the investigator to any temporal, spatial or internal relationship specified by the paradigm. Therefore, a paradigm is a master plan for research even though it does not provide explanatory concepts. Nonetheless, a paradigm focuses research efforts by providing a **context** for investigation.

A model in its simplest form is an aid to integrating data. It is an isomorphic representation of certain aspects of a larger and more complicated form of a reality. In the absence of knowledge about the real world, a hypothetical model of what this world might be like could be constructed. Therefore, testing the workability of a model in relation to what it is supposed to represent could be carried out to see whether it actually represents that reality (Ugodulunwa and Ugwuanyi, 2003). It is

noteworthy that there is a difference between **model for** and **model of something**.

Model for is an attempt made to generalize from an area about which a good deal is known to an area about which little is known. **Model for** serves as a basis on which a **model of** is built. A model based on clearly defined body of knowledge about a mechanical system could provide several models for teaching-learning experiences. For instance, mathematical models are non-representational models which posit basically mathematical relationship for a non-mathematical structure such as when a statement of mathematical structural possibilities is applied as a model for human decision-making behaviour. While paradigms are essentially outlines of research plans, models suggest hypotheses by conceptualizing the unknown in terms of a more familiar context.

A theory is constructed by relating known facts or principles to another. By providing these relationships, theory has a three-fold utility:-

- (i) It replaces how and why previously disparate observations are related or integrated.
- (ii) It permits interferences about operation of phenomena that cannot be directly investigated.
- (iii) It permits predictions of phenomena in advance of their occurrence.

A theory of instruction would normally set forth rules concerning the optimal way of achieving knowledge and skill or acquiring an attitude. It is, therefore, prescriptive.

In its elementary form instruction aims at two principal objectives namely:

- (i) that the child should learn a rule and; (ii) that the child is positioned to apply the rule learnt over a wide horizon of apparently disparate circumstances, that is, to realize maximum transfer.

Instruction also has the objective of ensuring that the pupil has mastery of a selected aspect of his world. Such learning is accomplished usually under a teacher's guidance.

Instruction may be viewed as a multimedia process between two anchoring points: the learner and the body of knowledge with the teacher as the facilitator. A theory of instruction should, therefore, aim at establishing arrangement for optimizing teaching/learning encountered with the environment for the purpose of accomplishing these three objectives.

There are generally four aspects of a theory of instruction:

- (i) It specifies optimal experience/interaction which predisposes the learners to learn.
- (ii) It structured knowledge that is optimal for comprehension.
- (iii) It specifies optimal experiences of presentation of materials to be learned.
- (iv) It specifies the nature and pacing of rewards and punishments in the process of learning and teaching.

Instruction and Teaching

Instruction is broader than teaching. The intervention of another human being (a teacher) is not always necessary for learning. Instruction therefore implies an intervention between the tutee (learner) on the one hand and the tutor and/ or materials on the other hand. The teacher can either be a human being or an object such as a computer or even the environment which could be textbook, observations of phenomena as in practicals, among others. In a classroom situation, instruction is synonymous with teaching. However, teaching is a subset of instruction given the definition above. Thus teaching and learning are not the same even though the former results in the latter. Teaching is the deliberate manipulation of learning processes by some outside agencies (i.e., factors exogenous to the learner) for the purpose of enhancing learning. From this definition, we may conclude that teaching and instruction are manifestly and symbolically related though, in reality both concepts are not the same.

Scope of Instruction

Instruction is wide and ensued from a developed curriculum. In fact it is the entire process of executing a curriculum in a particular aspect of education. Instruction covers the development of instructional objectives, determination of the appropriate instructional materials/strategies and the use of appropriate modes of instruction/i instructional methods viz: lecture method, discussion, peer-tutoring, instructional procedure; systematic process of executing instruction, as well as the instruction and the instructed. This can be inferred from the earlier definition of instruction.

Instructional Methods

Instructional methods involve verbal exposition by the teacher. The

teacher presents information through an explanation of principles and procedures or through questioning. These methods of instruction include lecture, discussion, recitation and tutorial. The lecture (didactic) is a teaching strategy through which the teacher makes a verbal presentation of ideas to the students/pupils. The taught receives these ideas meaningfully or by rote. It is the best in teaching students new concepts and principles particularly in the cognitive domain of learning.

Another instructional strategy is the discussion method whereby the teacher and the taught share ideas, compare and contrast views on a given problem, question or situation.

It assumes that the students have some idea or background information on the topic of discussion. It can be led either by the teacher or the student with the teacher guiding. It may be used to promote inquiry and develop problem-solving skills. Yet another method is the recitation. This is a method that involves a question and answer session whereby the teacher asks a set of questions while the students are expected to answer them. The questions could be based on given assignments or project or previous lecture and other activities which the students are expected to have mastered. Its purpose is to find out whether they have mastered what they were expected to have read from the textbooks, lecture notes or other materials assigned them earlier on, it is used to teach concepts and principles as well as for explaining and elaborating ideas.

The tutorial is another method of instruction whereby instruction is individualized. It allows students to be placed on one to one relationship with the teacher, peer or, adult. Placing students on a one to one relationship is an effective teaching technique and has many uses in instruction. It is also known as 'coaching'. Students can use the tutorial method of instruction to master difficult concepts and understand information in students' own way where the tutor is not a teacher. There are quite a number of other methods but any one can be subject to evaluation and thus accountability.

Evaluation

Evaluation is a three step action taken to arrive at the value or worth of a thing or an attribute. It is a three-step/phase exercise because it begins with measurement progressing through assessment and ending with evaluation which subsumes the first two steps in a three stage – process. Often, educationists confuse the three terms and either viewing them as

terms expressing the same thing or as three different things. Neither of the two views is exactly correct as the three terms depict different stages of the same process except that the last term; Evaluation is used to describe the whole process. Some even use the terms; Tests and Measurement to describe the process, whereas tests as method is measurement or at best a measuring instrument. Measurement takes place when you measure a particular educational or psychological or some other useful attribute with a view to assigning a value to that attribute. Assessment takes off from where measurement stops and tries to assess the outcome of the measurement exercise while evaluation is the final stage, that results in interpreting the results arising from the assessment (which is akin to analysis of measurement efforts), in order to provide summary data in alternate forms on which the ultimate decision – maker bases his choice.

In other words, evaluation provides the basis for judgement on the worth or value of a programme such as instruction. Beeby (1975) sees evaluation as ***the systematic collection and interpretation of evidence leading, as part of the process, to a judgment of a value with a view to action.*** But to Yoloye (1978): Evaluation can only be meaningfully defined if it is put in perspective or in the context of the use to which it would be put. Implying there is no one universal definition. His operational definition, however, tallies with that of Alkin (1970) thus: ***Evaluation is the process of ascertaining the decisions to be made, selecting the related information in order to report summary data useful to decision makers in selecting among alternatives.*** This definition emphasizes the fact that evaluation should be decision based. Sourmelis (1977) opined as follows:

The reason for evaluating something or someone is to estimate its worth or value, importance, relevance, performance... with a view to pricing, rating, correcting, improving or changing it. Cronbach (1983) confirms that evaluation: ***The collection and use of information to make decision about a program worth or otherwise.*** These definitions has thus far underscored the fact that the best way to the definition of evaluation is to situate within a context or operationalise it.

For Bajah (1980) attempts to define evaluation lately reflected concern for both information on outcomes of programmes and judgement regarding the desirability or value of the programmes. He (Bajah) stresses that practitioners in the field of evaluation gave definitions from different

perspectives, paying attention to the points of interest to them. For instance, agreeing Umoru-Onuka (1996) cites authorities as Greenberg (Umoru-Onuka 1996) and Suchman (Umoru-Onuka, 1996) as emphasising its information seeking aspect, while Alkin (1970) stresses the use to which the information from evaluation is made. Grondlund (1976) thinks that 'evaluation is a continuous process'. He posits that the features of evaluation as on going process are:

- ❖ Improving learning, instrument and achievement.
- ❖ Reporting to parents or sponsors about trainees' or the institution's performance.
- ❖ Employing the results (outcomes) for planning purposes.
- ❖ It is also used to improve programme by feeding back information to the system for the purpose of effecting positive revision of the programme. This on-going aspect of evaluation is referred to as formative evaluation.

Grondlund (1974) also opines that the other aspect of evaluation called summative evaluation, is used to take decision on a particular course of action especially when the programme has matured.

Others scholars in the field like Bajah (1980), Hayman and Rodney (1975) and Roy-Macauley (1988) agreed that, evaluation equally serves as feedback mechanism, thus enabling one to find out whether or not a programme's goals are being accomplished. Umoru-Onuka (1996) concludes that feedback aspect of evaluation enables the evaluator to discover the strengths, weakness, opportunity, and threats of a programme (SWOT). Orukotan (1993) says evaluation subsumes measurement and assessment and goes beyond and extends to worth determination, while Ojelabi (1981) agrees with Orukotan's view and states that measurement, assessment and evaluation are three stages of a process, stressing further that evaluation cannot take place without the other two stages having been carried out. To him, measurement is quantitative in nature which leads to assessment which is the scoring of what has been measured and evaluation is the qualitative conclusion drawn from these previous exercises. Evaluation serves variety of purposes. It can be used in several ways provided we situate and approach it within the context or purpose we intend to serve at a particular point in time.

Measurement, Assessment and Evaluation Explained

Alternatively, measurement in the context of education and psychology

could be seen as the systematic process of determining the characteristics or behaviour of an individual and reporting same quantitatively. Joshua (2005) defines measurement as 'the assignment of numerals to objects or events according to rules'. He posits that measurement is the process of obtaining a numeral description of the degree to which an individual possesses a particular characteristic (or attribute, construct, variable). Joshua sees assessment as the global process of synthesizing information about individuals so as to describe, understand and then assist people better or it could also be viewed as the description of a candidate's worth in terms of behaviour, yet no judgment is passed. Yet Umoru-Onuka (2001) opines that measurement is assigning values to attributes, characteristics or behaviour of person or a thing while assessment is analyzing these values via scoring what has been measured. Umoru-Onuka also posits that evaluation is giving interpretation to what has been measured and assessed in order to provide summary data in alternative forms on which a decision maker bases his choice and course of action with a regard to a particular programme. Joshua sees evaluation thus;

Evaluation is the broadest of the three terms and also most comprehensive as well as inclusive and concludes that it is the systematic process of collecting, analyzing and interpreting information to determine the extent to which pupils achieve educational objectives.

In other words, it is the systematic process of passing value judgment of worth of a thing or an object or a programme. It also qualitatively and quantitatively describes the worth of something based on the measurement and assessment that has already taken place. So without measurement and assessment there cannot be any evaluation. Yet measurement and assessment without evaluation is inconclusive and might not be very useful. It is thus safe to say measurement and assessment provide basis for evaluation or are tools of evaluation.

Tools of Educational Evaluation

There are various tools for evaluating educational projects/programme. These includes tests of various kinds; intelligence, aptitude, achievement, competence/ability, written or oral, multiple-choice or written for cognitive measures; questionnaires, rating scales, attitude scales, sociometry, inventory, and observation techniques among others for measuring both affective and psychomotor and some other educational variables such as facilities.

Achievement Test measures the amount of cognitive learning that the student has achieved. It measures the present level of the learner's achievement of certain cognitive or any other form of learning objectives.

Aptitude Testing measure the student's aptitude (his potentials for future task(s)), while Intelligent testing tests the level of the intelligence of the individual (i.e his intelligence quotient).

Ability (Competence) – this tests the level of competence possessed by the individual concerning a particular task. It assists in determining the level of dexterity she/he possesses i.e. the amount of efficiency and effectiveness she/he possesses in relation to a particular task or group of tasks. Apart from tests which determine the cognitive domain of learning, there are instruments that can be used in measuring the non – cognitive domains of learning. These include; the questionnaires, inventory, rating scales, sociometry techniques, observation techniques among others.

It portends that the domain of learning one is evaluated, determines the type of instrument to employ. For instance, it is out of place to use achievement or any form of test to measure an affective domain of learning or to use a questionnaire instead of observation instrument to measure a psychomotor domain element of learning. The result, if any, would be a fake result because the tool used is a wrong one. In other words what we get is garbage in and garbage out.

However, whatever domain one is measuring, it is essential to ensure that the instrument of measurement is not appropriate but possesses the following properties:

- (i) Validity
- (ii) Reliability
- (iii) Usability
- (iv) Objectivity
- (v) Interpretability

In other words, the instrument must be valid i.e. measuring exactly what it is meant to measure. The content of the instrument must conform to the content of the attribute you set out to measure or else it becomes an exercise in futility. In most cases the instrument must possess construct validity, i.e. to which its result can be interpreted in terms of the psychological constructs associated with the attributes being measured. It may also have to be related to certain criterion that has been afore set.

According to Alonge (2004), type of instrument in terms of whether it is criterion or norm – referenced is based on interpretation. Criterion–

referenced instrument is interpreted in terms of how well specific learning tasks have been mastered while norm-referenced instrument is one that is interpreted in terms of the group for which it is meant. Either in reference to age or some other feature of the group.

The instrument must be reliable, meaning it must be consistent in measuring what the instrument purports to measure. Its results are usable and also interpretable so as to put them to useful purpose. The result of the use of the instrument must produce objectivity, otherwise the whole essence of developing, validating and sometimes standardizing the instrument as well as the use would be tantamount to a waste of one's precious time.

The chief and in fact the main purpose of determining accountability is feedback and the resultant project/programme improvement.

Type of evaluation/accountability to be carried out determines the kind of evaluation instrument(s) to be employed. Thus, accountability in the area of cognitive learning will mainly employ tests, but when you want to determine accountability in classroom interaction, you have to engage the use of observation technique. Determining attitude to interest in learning involves the use of questionnaires, attitude measurement instrument, inventory and sometimes checklists. In other words the determination of accountability in the affective domain of learning does not involve the use of tests. Whereas finding the extent of accountability in the psychomotor domain, the main instrument is observation technique. Since instructional evaluation and accountability involves all the three domains of learning, determining accountability of instruction would involve the use of eclectic instrumentation. This implies the use of multiple instruments because of the holistic nature of instructional evaluation and accountability.

Evaluation is often based on the purpose of the programme i.e. you carry out evaluation of a programme by evaluating the objectives of the programme, if these objectives are being realized, are not being realized and also what went wrong as well as how it went wrong.

Accountability

The views of many scholars including Gronlund (1976), Umoru-Onuka (2001 and 2003), Jonathan-Ibeagha (1986), Cooley and Lohnes (1976) and Babarinde (1992) concerning the term educational accountability as implying that *those are given responsibility are held answerable for educational*

outcomes (learning and development) of the students or are aware of the duty to give stewardship account to those who (all other stakeholders in the industry) gave the responsibility in terms of productivity and the quality of the products thereof. The concept of accountability in education stresses the need for practitioners in education and stakeholders to accept and acknowledge the right of the public and other interested stakeholders such as parents, education authorities, and communities to know what goes on in the education sector of the economy not only how judiciously the money allocated to the sector is spent, but much more so about how much learning is taking place and how efficient and effective it is.

In this regard, Cooley and Lohnes (1976) gave the underlisted as three important components of educational accountability:

- ❖ Assessment of the performance and progress of the student in school.
- ❖ Diagnosis of differences among schools with respect to the student's performance.
- ❖ Corrective action to improve the student's learning.

It is as a result of the concept of accountability in education that expected students' performance objectives are set from the outset. This in turn gives rise to measurement of student's performance objectives and the description of discrepancies between attainment and set objectives.

According to Ogunwuyi (1995) there are clearly two schools of thought concerning types of educational accountability viz:

1. The Smith's (1971) school that outlined three types as underlisted:
 - i Programme accountability;
 - ii Process accountability and;
 - iii Fiscal accountability and.
2. The Alkin's school of 1970 namely:
 - (i) Goal/objective accountability;
 - (ii) Programme accountability and;
 - (iii) Outcome accountability.

However, it is possible to derive four types of accountability from the two schools of thought on its types as follows:

- (i) Fiscal accountability which deals mainly with how the funds allocated to a programme are judiciously utilized for the purpose they were meant; here it is actually the programme managers/operators who bear or take the responsibility for spending the money meant for a

particular responsibility and judiciously so that in that regard, all other things being the programme purpose could be achieved without hindrance.

- (ii) Programme accountability – deals with how a programme operation/ implementation is effectively and efficiently provided for by programme administrators and formulators, in order to achieve its purpose; in the education sense,
 - ❖ Are the processes put right and able to produce the right and the expected results? Is the enabling environment in place? Were the students provided with the right types of learning equipment? These are among the questions that accountability at this stage find answers to?
- (iii) Outcome accountability centres on the product accountability i.e. the quality of the product that comes out of the programme. Are the best instructional strategies employed in the process of teaching and learning so that the best learning outcome could be attained. Were the teachers living up to their professional calling?
- (iv) Goal/objective accountability is derived from a non-goal free evaluation. In other words, goal accountability presupposes that the evaluation leading to its determination is based on the set goals or objectives of the programme at its outset. It thus deals with how efficiently the set goals or objectives are achieved. Therefore, any goal accountability programme must first determine what the goals or objectives of say a curriculum or project or instructional programme are, before setting about evaluating the curriculum or programme to verify its goal accountability.

The crux of the concept of educational accountability is that it take responsibility or is held responsible for its action or inaction or the success or failure of a school programme whether it is the process of the programme or output of the programme.

Indeed, according to Gronlund (1976) measurement and evaluation are the tools of accountability. However, measurement is a sub-set of evaluation.

The essence of accountability programme to improve students' learning and development. Therefore, all stakeholders in the education industry must be involved in accountability through meaningful contribution and in honesty in their respective roles to ensure effective provision of functional education to the upcoming generation.

In determining instructional evaluation and accountability, cognizance should be taken of all factors influencing learning, be concerned with all instructional objectives which should be stated in measurable terms and the evaluation process must be comprehensive employing as many instruments as would potentially assist in getting accurate results.

The twin mechanism of evaluation and accountability, for providing feedback for instruction and the resultant learning, should be an in-built mechanism in the education system for ensuring success in instruction, allowing the teachers the freedom of experimenting with new instructional methods. The evaluation segment should take account of all possible unexpected (negative) effects of the instruction (Gronlund, 1974). The evaluation and accountability mechanism should identify the likely technical problems in educational measurement and provide means of controlling for them in the program and ensure provision for an enduring reporting system for communicating feedback resulting from the mechanism to the appropriate stake holders so as to engender relevant actions for instruction.

Conclusion

Instruction can be functional and useful if and only if it is accountable in terms of effecting or improve learning. Obviously however, it can only be known to be effective or accountable if it has been evaluated and found to have been responsible for improving or effecting learning. Otherwise the need to find out what went wrong leads to another level of evaluation. Thus in conclusion it is no gain-saying the fact that instruction propels effective learning, which is known only if it is found to be accountable in effecting learning. It is also veritable that evaluation is the potent tool for determining the degree of accountability of an instructional programme. Therefore, instructional evaluation and accountability is an important and indispensable component of educational evaluation and accountability; a twin tool for providing feedback for improved instructional and educational outcomes. By implication therefore, evaluation and accountability mechanism should be built into every instructional strategy to enhance its effective as correction mechanism becomes in-built into the strategy for self-correction and improvement. Teachers, parents, school managers and all other stake holders should not only be interested in but must be practically involved in instructional evaluation and accountability to ensure its success and the success of the beneficiary of instruction in schools.

References

- Alkin, M. C. (1970). 'Evaluation Theory Development' in Weiss, C. H. (ed.) *Evaluation Action Programmes: Reading in Social Action and Evaluation*. Boston: Allyn Bacon. 107.
- Alonge, M. F. (2004). *Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology* 2nd Edition. Ado-Ekiti: Adebayo Printing Nigeria Ltd.
- Babarinde, E. O. (1992). "National Universities Commission and the Development of University Education in Nigeria 1974 – 90: An Evaluative study. A Ph. D. Proposal" at Dept of Management, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Bajah, S. T. (1980). *Intricate Programme Evaluation Climate in Rapidly Developing Third Country*. Nairobi: SEPA.
- Beeby, C. E. (1975). "The Meaning of Evaluation". Paper Delivered at Evaluation Dept. of Education. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Cooley, W. A. and Lohnes, P. R. (1976). *Evaluation Research in Education*. New York: Irvington Publishers Inc.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1983). *Designing Evaluation of Educational and Social programs*. San Fransisco: Jessy Base Publisher.
- Gronlund, N. E. (1974). *Determining Accountability for Classroom Instruction*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Gronlund, N. E. (1976). *Measurement and Evaluation Teaching* 3rd edition. London: Macmillan.
- Jonathan-Ibeagha, E.L. (1986). "Instructional Strategies of University Trained Physics Teachers as Correlates of Learning Outcomes in Secondary Schools" An unpublished Ph.D. thesis at the Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Joshua, M. T. (2005). *Fundamentals of Tests and Measurement in Education*. Calabar: University of Calabar
- Ogunwuyi, A. O. (1995). Accountability in Nigerian Schools: A Quest for Quality Education in *the Moulder - Journal of School of Education*, St. Andrew's College of Education, Oyo 1(1) 25 – 30.
- Ojelabi, A. (1981). *A Guide to School Management*. Ibadan: Valuta Educational Publishers.
- Onasanya, K. (2005). *Evaluation of Student*. Revised Edition. Lagos: Bestway Printing Nigeria Ltd.
- Orukotan, A. F. (1993). *Basic Issues in Curriculum Development*. Ibadan: Olu-Akin Publishers.

- Roy – Macauley, C. A. (1988). "Evaluation of the Serria-Leonian Social Studies/Population Education Programme". An Unpublished Thesis at the Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Sourmelis, C. G. (1977). *Project Evaluation: Methodologies and Techniques*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Ugodulunwa, C. A. and Uguanyi, C. L. (2003). *Understanding Educational Evaluation*. Revised 2nd edition. Jos: FAB Education Books.
- Umoru – Onuka, A. O. (1996) "An Impact Valuation of the Training Programme of Agricultural and Rural Training Institute", Ilorin. An Unpublished Ph. D. thesis at the Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Umoru – Onuka, A. O. (2001). Accountability in Education: the Programme Evaluation Approach in Yomi Awosika et al (eds.) *Topical Issues in Education – papers in honour of Professor C. O. Udoh*. Ibadan: Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. 193-203.
- Umoru – Onuka, A. O. (2003). Accountability in Education: Programme for Improving Student Performance in Babalola, J. B. and S.O. Adedeji eds. *Contemporary Issues In Educational Management A book of Honour*. Ibadan: Dept. of Educational Management, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. 125-136.
- Yoloye, E. A. (1978). *Evaluation for Innovation*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Publishing House.
- Yoloye, E. A. (1999). Comparative Education through Educational Evaluation in Obemeata, J. O.; Ayodele, S. O and Araromi, M. A. (eds.) *Evaluation in Africa in Honour of E. A. Yoloye*. University of Ibadan, Institute of Education (by Stirling-Horden Publishers (Nig.) Ltd.)