

**SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND PRODUCTIVITY IN PUBLIC SENIOR  
SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BAYELSA STATE**

**ELIJAH WORDAH (Ph.D)**

**National Teachers' Institute, Kaduna,  
Ahoada Study Centre, Rivers State, Nigeria.  
Phone: 08039326463**

**Email: [wordahelijah@gmail.com](mailto:wordahelijah@gmail.com)**

**&**

**AMAKA ANGELA EKWESIANYA (Ph.D)**

**Department of Educational Foundation,  
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria.  
Phone: 08037278332**

**Email: [kepolamma@gmail.com](mailto:kepolamma@gmail.com)**

**Abstract**

*The study is titled school organization and productivity in Public Senior Secondary School in Bayelsa State. Two research questions and two null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. Descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. The population of the study was six hundred and ninety eight thousand, eight hundred and fifty (698,850) which consist of the principals and teachers, while probability sampling technique was adopted to determine the sample size which was four hundred (400). Self-constructed rating scale titled School Organization and Productivity Rating Scale (SOPRS). The instrument was face-validated by two experts from Educational Management and Educational Measurement and Evaluation in Ignatius Ajuru University, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Rivers State. The reliability of the instrument was tested using Cronbach Alpha to determine the internal consistency of the items. The reliability coefficient was 0.85, which was high enough to conclude that the instrument was reliable. Simple percentage was used to answer the research questions and the hypotheses were tested using chi-square statistical tool. The finding of the study indicates among others; that there is no significant relationship between the role of principals' and productivity in Public Secondary School in Bayelsa State. Based on the findings, the researchers recommend among others; principals' participation in administrative conferences and workshops to update their leadership capacity for effectiveness and efficiency.*

**Keywords:** School Organization, Productivity, and Secondary School.

**Introduction**

School is paramount for any nation that sees development as a watch world. School operates within the context of multitudinous environment. School is an organized group of persons pursuing defined studies at different levels and receiving instruction from one or more teachers usually with the addition of other employers and officers such as principles or headmasters, various supervisors or instructional processes, staff of

maintenances and other workers usually housed either in a single building or a group of buildings and edifices. This implies that the school is a formally organized social institution mainly established for the education of person or group of persons. It is organically made up of several actors with definite role and capacities such as teachers, student/pupils, headmasters, parents/guardians and the communities all geared towards the achievement of the objectives for which it is established.

The concept of organization such as school finds relevance in the setting of people, activities and goals. For certain obvious reasons people come together in the school system to achieve a common goal. The goal for coming together may be to accomplish task. It may also be for the purpose of sharing common belief, belonging in the same difficult situations. For whatever reasons, an organization is formed to achieve commonly agreed goals. Organization is an entity enlivened by activities deliberately engineered and geared towards a given target (Okorie, 2019).

Cook & Hansaker cited in (Agi & Edward 2015) defined organization as a group of people working in a network of relationships and system towards a common objective of providing value to the people served. Moorhead & Griffins in Agi & Edward (2015) sees organization as a group of people working together to achieve common goals. Nwachukwu in Oku, et al (2018) sees organization as a group of people bound together to provide unit of action for the achievement of predetermined objectives. The school, as a formal organization, has the head teacher, the tutorial and non-tutorial staff and even the students coming together with the view to achieve the set educational goals and objectives.

School is described as a formal organization because it has rationally planned activities and goals expected to be achieved through a set of people who work together under the control of authority and leadership. As a formal organization, the school is an institution created for the purpose of providing education for the community in which it is located. The school like all formal organizations, is characterized by the following according to Agabi in Nnabuo, et al as cited in Agi & Edward (2015); goals, structural pattern, the existence of task, people and relationship, hierarchy of authority, division of labour rules and regulations.

School organizations have a tremendous influence on the live of staff and students because they spent part of their active lives as members of school organization. That is why some schools have been of the view that school organization should be structure in a way that it will positively affect human live accordingly. This is in line with the assertion that an organization is a purposeful social unit whose components include functions, personnel and physical factors. It is a device or tool for the management of economic, political and social functions. In management study, organization can be referred to the structure of relationships among individual (Ukeje, et al in Okeke, 2017).

Organization is an equilibrium systems of coordinated efforts in which participants make contributions in turn for inducements. On the nutshell, organizations are primarily seen as a systems for getting work done for applying techniques to the problems

of altering materials-people, symbols or things. As a system, organizations are composed of a set of interdependent parts which have needs for survival, behave and take action. It is dynamic and ongoing system. They are not static. The elements of an organization include; communication, willingness to serve and common purpose (Okeke, 2017).

Okeke & Uwazurike (2016) avers that the school as a complex organization established within the community for certain social functions. Many different persons (students, teachers, and non-professionals) who perform different functions are included in the interactions. School as a social organization because the participants are inter-dependent and their actions socially promulgated and enforced to actualize it of objectives.

Schools as formal organizations gave some type of organizational structure that help the implement short and long range plans for the accomplishment of educational objective. Schools at all levels are organizations that are established with the specific aims of equipping their clientele with knowledge, skills and attitudes that will help them live quality lives and also contribute meaningfully to the development of their immediate and global society (Oku, et al, 2018).

Okeke & Uwazurike (2017), states that school organization is made up of four variables. These include the leader (Supervisor) who influence and determines output, the subordinates (teachers/supervisees) or followers on whom influence is exerted with positive or negative impact, then the situation or environment which the leader and subordinates are interacting, and the products (students) which emerge from the organization. If the leader performs his functions extensively, it will make a positive impact on the employees, who will produce effective teaching/learning experience whose end product would be bright students who will be s useful to themselves and the society. All of these variables play significant roles in achieving school's objectives. The roles of the principal is unique because it focuses on the production of people who must be worthy in both character (normative) and learning (cognitive) and ability to utilize learned behaviour (psychomotor). But this study is focused on two school organization variables, such as principal (supervisor) and the teacher (subordinate).

Hornby in Anyaogu, (2016), enunciated that school is a place where children go to be educated; where children learn. School is a formal institution where members of the community are exposed to the values, skill and culture that make them useful to themselves and the society. To actualize the schools purse the staff (i.e head teacher and learners) and the environment plays significant role. Every school is cognizance of its product (i.e the students). Productivity is the eye of every organization Mali in Ogbonnaya, et al (2013), defines productivity as the measure of how well resources are brought together in organizations and utilized for accomplishing a set of result. It is reaching the highest level of performance with the least expenditure of resources. Nwachukwu in Ogbonnaya, et al (2013), sees productively as total output and total input. The (funds, physical facilities and equipment, personnel and motivation) to produce goods and services is what is called productivity. The effective and efficient use of resources, human and material maximizes output or productively.

Okeke & Uwazurike (2016), opines that goals achievement is gratification of system goals. Objectives are defined realistically and resources mobilized to achieve the desired objectives. Typical indicators to goal attainment for educational organization are academic achievement, resources acquisition and quality of students and services.

The leader (supervisor), the subordinates (teacher/supervisees), the situation or environment and the products (students) are important part of school organization in the actualization of school goals. The principals and teachers play significant roles in actualizing school goals. The principal helps to achieve the goals of the educational system through other staff such as teachers. Principal is the executive head of the school since he makes decisions and implements and also coordinates activities for work to proceed smoothly, quickly and efficiently (Anukam, et al, 2018). Teacher is the individual who is able to make the learner want to learn and helps same to learn more. Teachers are the pivot of teaching and learning, the core objectives of education as well as the centre of education (Onye & Ajuzie, 2018). All hands are always on deck to achieve school goals. It is on this premise that this study relied to ascertain the relationship between school organization and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of this study is to examine school organization and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State. Specifically, the study sought to:

- a) ascertain the relationship between principals' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.
- b) identify the relationship between teachers and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were posed to guide the study.

1. What are relationship between principals' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State?
2. What are relationship between teachers' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State?

### **Hypotheses**

Based on the research questions, the following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study.

H0<sub>i</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the principal and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.

H0<sub>ii</sub>: There is no significant relationship between teachers and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.

### **Methodology**

The study adopted descriptive survey design aimed at examining the relationship between school organization and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State. The population of the study is six hundred and ninety eight thousand, eight

hundred and fifty (698,850), while the sample size of the study is four hundred (400). Probability sampling technique was employed to determine the number of the respondents for reliable data analysis. The instrument for data collection was ten (10) item statements self constructed rating scale. The instrument was face-validated by two experts, one from Educational Management and the other in Educational Measurement and Evaluation from Ignatius Ajuru University, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Rivers State. They were requested to critically and analytically examine the instrument in terms they were also requested to advice the researchers on the suitability of the rating scale. Their comments and suggestions were taken into consideration in the final modification of the instrument. The reliability of the instrument was tested using Cronbach Alpha to determine the internal consistency of the items. The reliability co-efficient was 0.85. The value was high enough to conclude that the instrument was reliable.

The researchers employed one research assistant who helped in distributing the rating scale. Out of the four hundred (400) rating scale distributed to the respondents, three hundred and eighty (380) were returned. Simple percentage was used to answer the research questions and the hypotheses were tested using chi-square.

### **Data Analysis and Results**

Research Question 1: What are the relationship between principals' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State?

Principal's leadership style motivates staff performance.

Table 1: Responses

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Agree               | 80                    | 21.1                  |
| Strongly Agree      | 180                   | 47.4                  |
| Disagree            | 60                    | 15.8                  |
| Strongly Disagree   | 40                    | 10.5                  |
| Undecided           | 20                    | 5.2                   |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100%</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The table shows that 80 respondents representing 21.1% of the total responses agreed that principal's leadership style motivates staff performance. While 180 respondents representing 47.4% strongly agreed. And 60 respondents amounting to 15.8% disagreed, while 40 (10.5%) of the total respondents strongly disagreed and 20 respondents representing 5.2% of the total responses were undecided.

Table 2: Principals' lack mannerism in addressing staff demands.

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Agree               | 78                    | 20.5                  |
| Strongly Agree      | 216                   | 56.8                  |
| Disagree            | 44                    | 11.6                  |
| Strongly Disagree   | 32                    | 8.4                   |
| Undecided           | 10                    | 2.6                   |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100%</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

This table indicates that 78 respondents representing 20.5% of the total responses agreed that principals' lack mannerism in addressing staff demands. But 216 respondents representing of the total responses 56.8% strongly agreed, while 44 respondents representing 11.6% of the total responses disagreed; while 32 respondents representing 8.4%, strongly disagreed. And 10 respondents representing 2.6% of the total response are undecided.

Table 3: Principals are regular in school.

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Agree               | 42                    | 11                    |
| Strongly Agree      | 284                   | 74.7                  |
| Disagree            | 20                    | 5.3                   |
| Strongly Disagree   | 20                    | 5.3                   |
| Undecided           | 14                    | 3.7                   |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100%</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

Table shows that 42 respondents representing 11% of the total responses agreed that principal's are regular in school. But 284 respondents (74.7%) strongly agreed that principal's are regular in school. 20 respondents (5.3%) disagreed, while 20 respondent (5.3%) strongly disagreed. And 14 respondents representing 3.7% of the total responses were undecided.

Table 4: Principals' supervision pattern is encouraging to the staff.

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Agree               | 44                    | 11.6                  |
| Strongly Agree      | 190                   | 50                    |
| Disagree            | 74                    | 19.5                  |
| Strongly Disagree   | 63                    | 16.3                  |
| Undecided           | 10                    | 2.6                   |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100%</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The above table indicates that 44 respondents representing 11.6% of the total responses agreed that principals' supervision pattern is encouraging to the staff. While 190

respondents representing 50% of the total responses strongly agreed. 74 respondents (19.5%) disagreed, while 63 respondents representing 16.3 of the total reposos strongly disagreed. And 10 respondents representing 2.6% of the total responses were undecided. Table 5: Principals are total disciplinarian.

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Agree               | 46                    | 12.1                  |
| Strongly Agree      | 216                   | 36.8                  |
| Disagree            | 54                    | 14.2                  |
| Strongly Disagree   | 50                    | 13.2                  |
| Undecided           | 14                    | 3.7                   |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100%</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The above table indicates that 46 respondents representing 12.1% of the total responses agreed that principals are total disciplinarian. But 216 respondents representing 56.8% of the responses strongly disagreed. 54 respondents representing 14.2% of the total responses disagreed, while 50 respondents representing 13.2% strongly disagreed. And 14 respondents representing 3.7% of the total responses were undecided.

Question 2: What are the relationship between teachers and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State?

Teachers' follows professional entices of teaching adequately.

Table 6: Responses

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Agree               | 90                    | 25                    |
| Strongly Agree      | 190                   | 50                    |
| Disagree            | 38                    | 10                    |
| Strongly Disagree   | 38                    | 10                    |
| Undecided           | 19                    | 5                     |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100%</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The table shows that 90 respondents representing 25% of the total responses agreed that teachers' follows professional entice of teacher adequately. While 190 respondent representing 52.6% of the total responses strongly agreed. But 38 respondents representing 10% of the total responses disagreed, while 38 respondents representing 10% of the total responses strongly disagreed. And 19 respondents representing 5% of the total responses could not decide.

Teachers do not obey principals' instructions.

**Table 7: Responses**

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Agree               | 95                    | 25                    |
| Strongly Agree      | 38                    | 10                    |
| Disagree            | 20                    | 5.3                   |
| Strongly Disagree   | 206                   | 54.7                  |
| Undecided           | 19                    | 5                     |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100%</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The table indicates that respondents representing 25% of the total responses agreed that teachers do not obey principal's instructions, while 38 respondents representing 10% of the total responses strongly agreed. 20 respondents representing 5.3% of the total responses disagreed, but 206 respondents representing 54.7 strongly disagreed. And 19 respondents representing 5% of the total responses were undecided. Teachers have mastery of their subjects.

**Table 8 Responses**

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentages %</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Agree               | 75                    | 25                   |
| Strongly Agree      | 190                   | 50                   |
| Disagree            | 76                    | 20                   |
| Strongly Disagree   | 14                    | 3.7                  |
| Undecided           | 5                     | 1.3                  |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100</b>           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

The table indicates that 95 respondent representing 25% of the total responses agreed that teachers have mastery of their subjects. While 190 respondents representing 52.3% of the total responses strongly agreed. 76 respondents representing 20% of the total responses disagreed, while 14 respondents representing 3.7% of the total responses strongly disagreed. And 5 respondents representing 1.3% of the total responses were undecided.

Teachers are up-to-date with their diaries and registers.

**Table 9 Responses**

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentages %</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Agree               | 304                   | 80                   |
| Strongly Agree      | 38                    | 10                   |
| Disagree            | 19                    | 5                    |
| Strongly Disagree   | 19                    | 5                    |
| Undecided           | Nil                   | Nil                  |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>380</b>            | <b>100</b>           |

Source: Field survey, 2023.

The table indicates that 304 respondents representing 80% of the total responses agreed that teachers are up-to-date with their diaries and registers. While 38 respondents representing 10% of the total responses strongly agreed. 19 respondents representing 5% of the total responses disagreed, while 19 respondents representing 5% of the total responses strongly disagreed. And there was no undecided response.

Teachers are truant to their duties.

Table 10 Responses

| <b>Alternatives</b> | <b>Frequency (No)</b> | <b>Percentages %</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Agree               | 38                    | 10                   |
| Strongly Agree      | 20                    | 5.5                  |
| Disagree            | 95                    | 25                   |
| Strongly Disagree   | 210                   | 55.2                 |
| Undecided           | 17                    | 4.5                  |
| Total               | 380                   | 100                  |

Source: Field survey, 2023.

The table above shows that 38 respondent representing 10% of the total responses agreed that teachers are truant to their duties. While 20 respondents representing 5.5% of the total responses strongly agreed. While 95 respondents representing 25% of the total responses disagreed, but 210 respondents representing 55.2% of the total responses strongly disagreed. And 17 respondents representing 4.5% of the total responses were undecided.

## **Test of Hypotheses**

### **Hypothesis 1**

H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant relationship between principals' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.

This hypothesis was tested with respect to table 5, which states that there is no significant relationship between principals' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State. The method of analysis adopted was chi-square, using a contingency table previously calculated through the use of simple percentage.

The formula for chi-square is given as;

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

Where X<sup>2</sup> = Chi-square 2

Σ = Sumation

E = Expected frequency

### Contingency Table

| Alternatives      | Frequency (No) | Percentages % |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Agree             | 46             | 12.1          |
| Strongly Agree    | 216            | 56.8          |
| Disagree          | 54             | 14.2          |
| Strongly Disagree | 50             | 13.2          |
| Undecided         | 14             | 3.7           |
| Total             | 380            | 100           |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

### hi-Square Table

| Option (O) | Exp. Freq.<br>(E) | O-E | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> | $\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$ |
|------------|-------------------|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 46         | 76                | -30 | 900                | 11.8                  |
| 216        | 76                | 140 | 19600              | 257.9                 |
| 54         | 76                | -22 | 484                | 6.4                   |
| 50         | 76                | -25 | 625                | 21.1                  |
| 14         | 76                | -62 | 3,844              | 50.6                  |
| Total      |                   |     |                    | 347.8                 |

Therefore, calculate frequency = 347.8

To compute the degree of freedom (DF) or critical value =  $DF=(R-1) (C-1)$ .

Where R = Number of Rows which is 5

C = Number of Columns which is 2

$DF = (5-1) (2-1)$

$= (4) (1)$

$= 4 \times 1 = 4$

The researchers assumed 95% level of confidence and 5% level of significance.  
The degree of freedom (DF) at 4 = 9, 488

### Division Rule

If the calculated Chi-Square value is greater than the critical value, that is degree of freedom (DF) at 4, the alternative, hypothesis is accepted, while the will hypothesis is rejected and vice versa.

From the above computation, the hypothesis is hereby accepted since the calculated value( $X^2$ ) (347.8) is greater than the critical value (9.488). So, the condition has confirmed that there is the significant relationship between principals' and productivity in public senior secondary school in Bayelsa State.

### Hypothesis 2:

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between teachers' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.

**Contingency Table**

| Alternative       | Frequency (No) | Percentage |
|-------------------|----------------|------------|
| Agree             | 95             | 25         |
| Strongly Agree    | 204            | 54.7       |
| Disagree          | 38             | 10         |
| Strongly Disagree | 19             | 5          |
| Undecided         | 20             | 5.3        |
| Total             | 380            | 100%       |

Expected Frequency (E) =  $380 = \frac{70}{5}$

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

**Chi-Square Table**

| Option O | Exp. Freq. (E) | O – E | (O – E) <sup>2</sup> | $\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$ |
|----------|----------------|-------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 95       | 76             | 19    | 361                  | 4.75                  |
| 206      | 76             | 132   | 17,424               | 229.26                |
| 138      | 76             | -38   | 1,444                | 19                    |
| 19       | 76             | -57   | 3,249                | 42.75                 |
| 20       | 76             | -56   | 3,136                | 41.29                 |
| Total    |                |       |                      | 337.02                |

Therefore, calculate frequency =337.02

To compute the degree of freedom (DF) or critical value=DF=(R-) (c-1)

Where R= Number of Row which is 5

C=Number of Columns when is 2

∴ DF = (5-1) (2-1)

= (4) (1)

= 4X1

DF = 4

The researchers assumed 95% level of confidence and 5% level of significance. At 95% level of confidence and 5% level of significance, the degree of freedom (DF) at 4 = 9.488.

### **Decision Rule**

If the calculated chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) value is greater than the critical value, that is the degree of freedom at 4, the alternative hypothesis is accepted while the null hypothesis is rejected and Vice Versa.

From the above computation, the alternative hypothesis is here by accepted since the calculated frequency value ( $\chi^2$ ) (337.02) is greater than the value of the critical value (9.488). So, the condition has confirmed that there is no significant relationship between teachers' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.

### **Discussion of findings**

Findings in table one revealed that there is significant relationship between principals' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State. In the course of determining the results, 95% level of confidence and 5% level of significance was assumed. At 95% level of confidence and 5% level of significance, the degree of freedom (DF) at 4=13.28. From the computation, alternative hypothesis was accepted because the calculated frequency value ( $\chi^2$ ) = 51.4 is greater than the critical value (13.28). This is based on the decision rule which states that if the calculated chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) value is greater than the critical value, that is, degree of freedom (DF) at 4, the alternative hypothesis is accepted while the null hypothesis is rejected and vice versa. This confirmed that there is no significant relationship between principals' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State.

The results of hypothesis two indicates that there is no significant relationship between teachers' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State. The statistical tool used was chi-square, using contingency table previously calculated through the use of simple percentage. The researchers assumed 95% level of confidence and 5% level of significance. At 95% level of confidence and 5% level of significance, the degree of freedom (DF) at 4=9.488. From the computation, the alternative hypothesis was accepted since the calculated value ( $\chi^2$ ) (337.02) is greater than the critical value (9.488). This revealed that the relationship between teachers' and productivity in Public Senior Secondary Schools in Bayelsa State is not significant based on the findings of the study, it is indicated that school organization variables such as principals and teachers does not correlate significantly with productivity in public senior secondary schools in Bayelsa State.

### **Conclusion**

The study revealed the importance of variables of school organization in the school system. The principals and teachers as variables of school organization do not have significant relationship with productivity in public senior secondary schools in Bayelsa State. But that do not imply absolutely that they don't have relationship but it is not significant. School organization variables such as principals (leaders), teachers (subordinates), environment and students play vital roles in achieving school goals.

### **Recommendations**

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

1. Principals should participate in administrative and leadership seminars, workshops, conferences etc to acquire modern leadership style that facilitates healthy relationship among staff to positively affect productivity.
2. Teachers' education and global conferences on adequate teaching technique. Teachers should pass through adequate training and retraining process and as well as engage in global conferences on teaching technique, to enable them adequately prepare for quality service delivery.

## **References**

- Agi, U.K, & Edward, A. E (2015). Educational management. Port Harcourt: Harey publications coy.
- Anukam, et al (2018). Educational management. Aba: Echech versatile.
- Anyago, R.O, (2016). Educational management in a digital world: Emerging perspectives. Owerri: Bon publications.
- Ogbonnaya, et al (2015). Fundamentals in educational administration and planning. Nsukka, Nigeria; Chuka educational publishers.
- Okeke, B.C & Uwazurike, C.N (2016). Introduction to educational administration. Owerri; Klef-Ken computers ltd.
- Okeke, F.B (2017). Management in the digital world. Port Harcourt. Ben-Sat publishers.
- Okeke, F.N, & Anyago, R.O, (2017). Organizational theories and management practice in education. Owerri: Career publishers.
- Okorie. Business organization and productivity: Port Harcourt: Fresh publishers.
- Oku, et al (2016). Issues on contemporary Nigerian education; Book of readings: Owerri: Evan Enwerem University. Department of educational foundations and administration, faculty of education.
- Oku, et al (2018). Fundamental issues in educational administration and supervision. Owerri; Joe Mankpa publishers.
- Onye, C.D., & Ajuzie (2018). Fundamentals of teaching/learning accounts and economics in a digital age. Owerri: Cape publishers int'l ltd.