

**ACCEPTABILITY OF MULTI-SOURCE FEEDBACK ON PRINCIPALS
FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN
ANAMBRA STATE.**

OHAMOBI, IFUNANYA NKECHI (PhD)

Faculty Of Education

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University,

Igbariam Campus

E-Mail: kechiohamobi@gmail.com, ekpeledalu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the level of acceptance of multi-source feedback (MSF) on principals for improved management of public secondary schools in Anambra state. The study was guided by three research questions and three null hypotheses. It adopted the descriptive survey research design. The study was carried out in Anambra state. The population comprised 256 principals, 312 vice principals and 5,970 teachers in the 256 public secondary schools in Anambra state. A sample of 138 principals, 137 vice principals and 1656 teachers were selected through stratified random sampling technique. The instrument for data collection was a researcher designed questionnaire titled "Acceptability of MFS on Principals for School Improvement (AMSFPSI). The instrument was validated by three experts in the Faculty of Education. The reliability of the instrument was determined using cronbach alpha method with overall coefficients of 0.93. The researcher was assisted by five research assistants in collecting data. Mean and standard deviation scores were used to answer the research questions while the ANOVA and Scheffe post HOC were used in testing the null hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance. The finding shows among others that there was a moderate extent of acceptance of Multi-source feedback (MSF) on principals for improved management of secondary schools in Anambra state. Most of the principals, vice principals and teachers adopted that MSF should serve only six out of the ten stated MSF goals for school improvement. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended among other things that the Anambra state government should consider establishing the use of MSF on principals as it is accepted as being relevant to principals for improved management of secondary schools. In instituting MSF in the secondary schools, government and other stakeholders should consider using the goal of MSF for staff development and not principals appraisal for salary increase, promotion or compensation.

Keywords: Acceptability, Multi-Source Feedback, Management, and Principals

INTRODUCTION

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. Huggins, Klar, 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.

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. In this paper MSF is described as a technique whereby a principals leadership for school improvement is evaluated by external supervisors and his or her subordinate such as staff of the Ministry of Education, Post Primary School Service Commission, vice principals, teachers, non-tutorial staff, parents, student, alumni and even the principals themselves. The feedbacks from such evaluation are made available to the principals to guide them in improving their performances and ultimately improving the schools.

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 and rater sources. 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 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 & Obiweluozor, 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.

Statement of the Problem

It thus appear that incumbent principals of public secondary schools in Anambra state 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.

An important way of obtaining such feedback is to utilize Multi Source Feedback (MSF). MSF is one of 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 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 for improved management of 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. Determine the rater sources that are acceptable to principals, vice-principals and teachers for providing credible MSF on principals.

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 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 would also guide principals, vice-principals and teachers in deciding on the people to be use to obtaining multi-sources of information for 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. The information on acceptability of MSF could inspire Anambra State Post Primary School Service Commission (ASPPSC) to consider initiating MSF in the secondary schools. Findings would also guide them in making policies and implementation guidelines on the goals and rater sources, programmes to be mounted for principals as a result of MSF.

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.

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 Schools 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?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 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.

METHOD

This section of the study 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) described 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.

Area of the Study

The study was conducted in Anambra State of Nigeria. Anambra State is one of the five states in the South-East geo-political zone in Nigeria that shares boundaries with Imo, Abia, Delta, Enugu and Kogi states in Nigeria.

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 1,656 teachers. To compose the sample, the secondary schools in Anambra State were sorted according to their Local Government Areas (LGAs) in the six education zones.

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 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 three sections (sections A-C) with forty-one (41) items. Section A had 15 items on relevance; Section B had 10 items on goals; Section C had 16 items on rater sources.

Items in sections A were on a five point Likert 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 C 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).

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). The experts examined 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. The suggestions of the experts were incorporated in the final copy of the instrument before use.

Reliability of the Instrument

In order to determine the reliability of the instrument, 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 analyzed using the Cronbach alpha method. For sections A to C the reliability coefficients of 0.73, 0.81, and 0.83

were obtained with an overall coefficient of 77.8. This coefficient was considered satisfactory for the study.

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 thirteen 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.

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 analyzed using mean and standard deviations.

The data were analyzed further using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the hypotheses.

RESULTS

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 high 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	GE

4.	See the need to timely organize open discussions to clarify difficult, confusing and unfounded allegations that limit school improvement activities.	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 programs based on feedback from many stakeholders	2.54	0.050	3.08	0.70	3.28	0.57	3.22	0.61	ME
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 judgement 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 behaviours 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 in 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: 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
	16. 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
17. 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
18. 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
19. 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
20. 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
21. 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
22. 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
23. 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
24. Promoting accurate judgments of principals' effectiveness in inspiring desired behavioural change that leads to school improvement.	3.39	0.57	3.54	0.64	3.36	0.50	3.43	0.52	MA
25. 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	0.56	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 in 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.

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: MSF will be relevant to helping principals to:	P N = 132		VP N = 127		T N = 1614		ROW		DEC
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	
	26. Senior staff of PPSSC from grade level 13.	2.98	1.15	2.21	1.01	2.36	0.70	2.40	
27. Directors of Ministry of Education	4.17	0.79	3.95	0.82	4.07	0.79	4.07	0.79	HA
28. Vice Principals	3.70	0.46	3.85	0.98	3.87	0.99	3.86	0.98	HA
29. Teachers (Principals Cadre only)	3.70	0.73	4.82	0.82	4.66	0.65	4.44	0.67	HA
30. All teachers irrespective of cadre	1.08	0.28	1.29	0.46	1.09	0.42	1.10	0.41	CU
31. Senior non-tutorial staff	1.06	0.24	1.02	0.12	1.01	0.08	1.01	0.11	CU
32. Bursars	3.20	0.40	3.30	0.46	3.35	0.49	3.33	0.48	MA
33. Clerical staff	1.14	0.44	1.13	0.44	1.02	0.18	1.04	0.24	CU
34. PTA executives	2.15	0.55	2.02	0.20	2.01	0.08	2.02	0.18	HU
35. Community Leaders	2.57	0.62	2.49	0.62	2.27	0.77	2.31	0.76	HU
36. School prefects	3.26	0.52	3.15	0.55	3.34	0.52	3.32	0.52	MA
37. All Students	1.04	0.19	1.09	0.28	1.00	0.04	1.01	0.10	CU
38. Alumni of the school	4.00	0.97	3.58	1.03	3.98	0.75	3.96	0.80	HA
39. Secondary School Principals	4.87	0.34	4.75	0.44	4.72	0.45	4.73	0.44	CA
40. 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
41. 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

In 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.

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 4: 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 in Table 4 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 5.

Table 5: 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 in Table 5 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 6: 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 in Table 6 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 7: 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				

In table 7, 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 in Table 8.

Table 8: 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 in 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 rating of vice-principals and teachers.

Summary of Findings

From the analysis presented, 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.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study are discussed according to the research question and hypotheses that guided the study.

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 include that MSF is relevant to;

- 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 principal 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.

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.

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.

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), who 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. But the present study suggests that in Anambra State of Nigeria, student leaders are becoming accepted as participants in school improvement efforts. Probably because people are being more enlightened or increase in awareness.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study presented, analyzed and discussed, it was obvious that there was a moderate 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 and 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, and rater sources.

REFERENCES

- Berk, R.A. (2013). Using the 360⁰ multisource feedback model to evaluate teaching and professionalism. *Medical teacher*, 31(12) 1073-1080. DOI: 10.3109/0142 159080 2572775.
- 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.unconn.edu/dissertations/305>.
- Corporate Leadership Council (2011). *Considerations for implementing 360 degree reviews: secondary research findings*. Washington, DC: Corporate Executive Board.
- 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.
- Ehren, M., Perryman, J. & Shackleton, N. (2015). Setting expectation for good education: how Dutch school inspection drive improvement. *School effectiveness and school improvement: an International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice* 26(2), 296-327. DOI: 10.180/09243453. 2014.936472.
- Elliott, S.N, & Clifford, M. (2014). *Principal assessment: Leadership behaviours 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://cedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/literature-syntheses/further>.
- Ermongkonchai, P. (2008). An evaluation of multisource feedback (MSF) for managerial development in large –size manufacturing company in Thailand *Contemporary Management Research* 4(3) 189-218.
- Fraenkel, J.R, Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H.H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Fullan, N. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, teachers college press.
- Maher, J. (2009). *The use of 360⁰ feedback compared to traditional evaluative feedback for the professional growth of teachers*. Seton Hall University Dissertation and Theses (ETDs). Paper 1700.
- 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.
- 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.
- Nwangwu, K. & Ometere, T. (2015). The 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.
- Sergeant, J. (2015). Reflecting upon multisource feedback as ‘assessment for learning. *Perspective on medical education* 4(2), 55-56.

- Taole, M.J. (2013). Exploring principals' role in providing instructional leadership in rural high schools in South Africa. *Studies in Tribes Tribal's*, 11(1), 75-82.
- OECD (2014). *Pisa 2012: What makes schools successful? Resources, policies and practices*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- 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).
- Valiant, D. (2015). School leadership, trends in policies and practices, and improvement in the quality of education. Paper commission for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015, *Education for all 2000-2015: Achievement and challenges*. Paris: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.