



RESEARCH ARTICLE

ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLE PERFORMANCE OF HEAD TEACHERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF NOMADIC SCHOOLS IN YOBE STATE OF NIGERIA

¹AHMED MOHAMMED DEDE, ²NURA ABDULSALAM, GARBA MOHAMMED DEDE

¹Department of Curriculum and Instructions Umar Suleiman College of Education Gashua, Yobe State, Nigeria E-
²Department of General Studies College of Administrative, Management and Technological Studies Potiskum Yobe
State, Nigeria. ³Department of Education College of Administrative Management and Technological Studies,
Potiskum Yobe State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This study was on Assessment of the Role Performance of Head Teachers on the Management of Nomadic Schools in Yobe State of Nigeria. The study has two (2) objectives, in line with these objectives, two research questions, two null hypotheses were formulated respectively. Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. A total of two hundred and sixty (260) respondents were sampled from the total population of seven hundred and two (702), through the use of research advisor (2006). A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. The data collected were presented in tables and analyzed using weighted means to give the responses of respondents to the research questions. The two null hypotheses were tested using One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 alpha level of significance. Major findings of the study were that: It was established by the findings of this study that the head teachers of nomadic schools made efforts in area of maintenance and utilization of infrastructural facilities but couldn't do anything in terms of provision of the infrastructure in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State. This was obtained from the responses of the respondents to the structured questions given to them. There was a unanimous acceptance of the all the item statement on research question one that most Head Teachers do very well in the management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools; among which are: there is proper placement of available infrastructural facilities by the Nomadic School Heads.; The study concluded that: Most of the head teachers of nomadic schools in Yobe State largely performed their roles as expected particularly in the areas of; maintenance and utilization of infrastructural facilities.

Keywords: Role performance, head teachers, Normadic school, management

Corresponding Author

Ahmed Mohammed Dede

E-mail: mohammeddedeahmed@gmail.com

Received: 29/12/2024; **Revised** 2/2/2025; **Accepted:** 20/01/2025; **Published:** 15/03/2025



1.0. INTRODUCTION

The Nomadic population in Nigeria seemed to be marginalized and disadvantaged educationally. This is because of their wandering lifestyle; migrating from place to place in order to meet up with the quest for socio-economic needs. This constant movement denies their children access to formal education. Even though, government has demonstrated a commitment through policies and programmes of addressing the glaring challenges of education in national development and in achieving the goals of education. This has constantly been manifested in the different policies and programmes of governments at all levels in this country, targeting different groups including Nomadic Education.

The National Policy on Education states that education is compulsory and a right of every Nigerian irrespective of gender, social status, religion, colour, ethnic background and nay peculiar individual challenges (FGN, 2014). This is to allow the children of nomadic people to access education without compromising their way of life. Thus, Nomadic Education Programme is designed to provide basic and functional literacy skills to the children of the migrant sets in Nigerian society. To this end, successive governments in developing countries particularly in Africa have made concerted efforts to establish, provide and ensure concrete and more purposeful direction aimed at enhancing greater and philosophy of equal educational opportunity to all, irrespective of gender, class or creed.

In spite of these efforts made by various African Governments and their constant reaffirmation of their commitments, to provide equal opportunities in education to their citizens; many countries are systematically failing to address extreme and persistent educational disadvantage that leave large section of the society marginalized, abandoned or segregated (UNESCO in Batagarawa & Tsagem, 2017). In view of that, Maria, Bawa & Ytunde (2016) stated that, the government established primary schools for the nomads in all the 36 states and Abuja FCT. These schools are equipped with trained teachers with curriculum specially developed for the nomadic children.



Though, this was a good intervention. Yet it did not actually work out because the nomads always move with their cattle from one place to another in search for greener pastures.

Batagarawa & Tsagem, (2017) reported Kosko & Klochko (2010) that, Nomadic Education Programme is basically, a Primary and Adult Education Programmes in conforming to the past UPE and present UBE programmes which were designed to wipe out illiteracy, the but also designed to improve the productivity of the Nomads, promote social justice and equity and sensitize them to their basic human constitutional rights as bonafide Nigerians.

The basic reasons for the establishment of schools for children in all countries of the world are to provide educational opportunities to the children and integrate them into their societies, it is also to prepare them to be functional citizen who will be able to contribute their quota to the development of their societies and families and help them live a normal life. Greater commitment to the universalization of access to basic education has heightened interest in provision of quality basic education to nomadic and other educationally disadvantaged groups in Nigeria. These segments of the population (the nomads) have serious limitations of equitable access to basic education through the conventional education system as a result of certain occupational and socio-cultural peculiarities (Maria, 2016).

Management of Nomadic Schools like conventional schools encounters number of problems such as management of infrastructure, management of instructional facilities, management of staff development, management of discipline, management of fund, management of school-community relations, management of decision making process among others. These problems posed a numbers of challenges to the schools' heads performing efficiency in the management of nomadic schools. It is against this background that, the researcher carried out this research work to investigate how these problems are being managed by the heads of nomadic schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.



2.1. Objectives of the Study

The study is set to:

- i. Assess the performance of Head Teachers in management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria;
- ii. Examine the performance of Head Teachers in management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria;

2.2. Research Questions

- i. What efforts do the Head Teachers make on the management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools Yobe State, Nigeria?
- ii. What are the efforts of Head Teachers on the management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria?

2.3. Research Hypotheses

- i. There is no significant difference in the opinions of Head Teachers, Teachers, Pupils and Community Members on the roles performance of Head Teacher on management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.
- ii. There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents on the roles performance of Head Teachers on management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.

3.0. METHODOLOGY

Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. A total of two hundred and sixty (260) respondents were sampled from the total population of seven hundred and two (702), through the use of research advisor (2006). A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. The data collected were presented in tables and analyzed using weighted means to give the responses of respondents to the research questions. The seven null hypotheses were tested using One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 alpha level of significance.



4.0. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Presentation of Results

Research Question One: What efforts do the Head Teachers make on the management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools Yobe State, Nigeria?

This Research Question relates to Item 1-10 on performance of Head Teachers in management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.

Table 1 revealed the view of respondents on performance of Head Teachers in management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria. Item 1 shows the responses of respondents on whether Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools in Yobe State ensure adequate provision of infrastructural facilities. From the responses of the respondents, the item statement was rejected by all the respondents with the mean score of 2.7, 2.2, 2.0, 2.0 and 2.4 respectively. The implication is that head teachers lack the capacity for provision of infrastructural facilities. Item 2 shows the responses of respondents on whether there is proper placement of available infrastructural facilities by the nomadic school heads.

The mean scores of the respondents show that the item was accepted by the respondents with the mean scores of 3.4, 3.1, 4.8, 4.1, and 4.5 for head teachers, teachers, LGEA Official, SUBEB Official and PTA/ SBMC. Item 3 was on whether available infrastructural facilities in Nomadic schools are adequately allocated by the Schools' Heads. The responses of the respondents shows that the item statement was accepted with mean score of 3.5, 3.7, 3.3, 3.8 and 3.5.



Table 1: Analysis of Performance of Head Teachers in Management of Infrastructural Facilities

S/N	Item statement	Respondents	SA	A	UD	D	SD	N	Mean
1	Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools in Yobe State ensure adequate provision of infrastructural facilities	Head teacher	-	3	2	9	-	14	2.7
		Teacher	2	-	-	12	6	20	2.2
		LGEA Official	-	2	1	5	2	10	2.0
		SUBEB Official	-	1	-	4	-	5	2.0
		PTA/ SBMC	5	11	-	159	40	211	2.4
2	There is proper placement of available infrastructural facilities by the nomadic school heads	Head teacher	1	8	-	2	2	14	3.4
		Teacher	6	-	6	-	8	20	3.1
		LGEA Official	3	3	-	4	-	10	4.8
		SUBEB Official	3	-	-	1	1	5	4.1
		PTA/ SBMC	106	77	-	29	3	211	4.5
3	Available infrastructural facilities in Nomadic schools are adequately allocated by the Schools' Heads.	Head teacher	2	4	-	4	-	14	3.5
		Teacher	5	5	1	4	5	20	3.7
		LGEA Official	3	5	-	2	-	10	3.3
		SUBEB Official	1	3	-	2	-	5	3.8
		PTA/ SBMC	54	56	5	55	45	211	3.5
4	Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate utilization of available infrastructural facilities.	Head teacher	4	4	-	6	-	14	3.3
		Teacher	11	2	-	6	1	20	3.6
		LGEA Official	2	5	-	5	-	10	3.1
		SUBEB Official	2	3	-	-	-	5	3.5
		PTA/ SBMC	95	40	-	58	32	211	3.9
5	Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools adequately maintain available infrastructural facilities in their respective schools.	Head teacher	-	-	1	12	1	14	3.1
		Teacher	-	5	-	13	2	20	3.3
		LGEA Official	1	-	-	8	1	10	3.3
		SUBEB Official	1	-	-	3	1	5	3.7
		PTA/ SBMC	104	25	-	9	72	211	3.0
6	Available infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools are adequately evaluated by the Head Teachers.	Head teacher	2	6	1	-	5	14	4.0
		Teacher	5	10	-	2	3	20	3.9
		LGEA Official	6	1	-	3	-	10	3.3
		SUBEB Official	1	2	-	2	-	5	3.4
		PTA/ SBMC	34	11	-	70	1	211	3.6
7	Head teachers ensure that licking roof are fixed as soon as discovered	Head teacher	2	1	1	9	1	14	2.3
		Teacher	4	-	2	10	2	20	2.6
		LGEA Official	3	-	-	7	-	10	1.8
		SUBEB Official	1	-	-	4	-	5	3.9
		PTA/ SBMC	7	10	-	192	2	211	2.2
8	Nomadic schools are repainted yearly to keep it attractive	Head teacher	2	1	-	9	2	14	2.4
		Teacher	-	4	-	14	3	20	2.5
		LGEA Official	-	1	1	6	2	10	2.4
		SUBEB Official	-	1	-	4	-	5	3.3
		PTA/ SBMC	8	3	-	172	44	211	1.9
9	Broken windows and doors are regularly repaired by the head teachers	Head teacher	-	3	1	10	1	14	2.2
		Teacher	2	-	2	10	6	20	2.9
		LGEA Official	2	1	-	5	3	10	2.1
		SUBEB Official	-	1	-	2	2	5	2.5
		PTA/ SBMC	53	53	-	60	49	211	2.6
10	Staff rooms are well equip with teachers chairs and tables	Head teacher	-	1	-	12	1	14	2.7
		Teacher	-	5	-	12	3	20	2.9
		LGEA Official	3	-	-	5	2	10	2.5
		SUBEB Official	3	-	1	1	-	5	3.4
		PTA/ SBMC	106	44	-	54	11	211	3.0

Source: Authors' Analysis (2025).



Item 4 was on whether Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate utilization of available infrastructural facilities. The mean scores of 3.3, 3.6, 3.1, 3.5 and 3.9 were obtained from the responses of the respondents, implying that the respondents accepted the item statement. Item 5 is on whether head teachers of Nomadic Schools adequately maintain available infrastructural facilities in their respective schools. The item was also accepted by the respondents with the mean scores of 3.1, 3.3, 3.3, 3.7 and 3.0 for head teachers, teachers, LGEA Official, SUBEB Official and PTA/ SBMC. Similarly, item 6 was accepted by the respondents with the mean scores of 4.0, 3.9, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6 respectively.

Item 7 was to find out whether Head teachers ensure that leaking roof are fixed as soon as discovered. The mean score showed that the item was rejected by the respondents; with the decision mean of 2.3, 2.6, 1.8, 3.9 and 2.2 by the respective respondents. Item 8 was on whether Nomadic schools are repainted yearly to keep it attractive. The item statement was rejected by the respondents with the mean scores of 2.4, 2.5, 2.4, 3.3 and 1.9 respectively. From item 9, the decision mean of the respondents were found to be 2.2, 2.9, 2.1, 2.5 and 2.6, meaning the item was rejected by the respondents. Item 10 was on whether Staff rooms are well equipped with teachers' chairs and tables. The item was further rejected by the respondents with the mean score of 2.7, 2.9, 2.5, 3.4 and 3.0 respectively. From the analysis of table 4.2 it was revealed that the head teachers of nomadic schools made efforts in area of maintenance and utilization of infrastructural facilities but couldn't do anything in terms of provision of the infrastructure in nomadic schools in Yobe State.

Research Question Two: What are the efforts of Head Teachers on the management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria?

The Mean Score of evaluation of respondents' perception of performance of head teachers in management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State is summarized Table 2 using a ten item index.



Tab le 2: Analysis of Performance of Head Teachers in Management of Instructional Facilities

S/N	Item statement	Respondents	SA	A	UD	D	SD	N	Mean
11	Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate provision of instructional facilities in their respective Schools	Head teacher	1	8	-	2	2	14	3.5
		Teacher	6	-	6	-	8	20	3.1
		LGEA Official	3	3	-	4	-	10	3.3
		SUBEB Official	3	-	-	1	1	5	3.5
		PTA/ SBMC	106	77	-	29	3	211	3.3
12	Available instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools are adequately distributed and allocated by the Schools' Heads.	Head teacher	2	-	-	4	4	14	2.0
		Teacher	1	2	1	10	5	20	2.1
		LGEA Official	3	-	-	7	-	10	2.1
		SUBEB Official	1	3	-	2	-	5	3.4
		PTA/ SBMC	54	56	5	55	45	211	3.6
13	Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate utilization of available instructional facilities..	Head teacher	4	4	-	6	-	14	3.0
		Teacher	11	2	-	6	1	20	3.1
		LGEA Official	2	5	-	5	-	10	3.6
		SUBEB Official	2	3	-	-	-	5	3.7
		PTA/ SBMC	95	40	-	58	32	211	3.3
14	Teachers in Nomadic Schools are motivated by the School Heads to make improvisation of instructional materials where necessary.	Head teacher	5	5	1	3	-	14	3.0
		Teacher	5	7	-	5	3	20	3.5
		LGEA Official	7	-	-	3	-	10	3.9
		SUBEB Official	2	2	-	-	1	5	4.1
		PTA/ SBMC	104	10	-	100	1	211	3.8
15	Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools provide adequate maintenance of available instructional materials..	Head teacher	6	1	1	-	6	14	3.6
		Teacher	10	4	-	4	2	20	3.0
		LGEA Official	4	4	-	2	-	10	4.3
		SUBEB Official	1	4	-	-	-	5	4.0
		PTA/ SBMC	107	10	-	92	2	211	3.5
16	Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate evaluation of available instructional facilities	Head teacher	3	4	-	5	2	14	4.0
		Teacher	7	4	-	7	3	20	3.2
		LGEA Official	5-	2	1	-	2	10	3.3
		SUBEB Official	3	1	-	2	-	5	4.4
		PTA/ SBMC	108	30	-	52	36	211	3.5
17	Head teachers ensure that black boards in all the classes are in good condition all the time	Head teacher	5	3	2	4	-	14	3.0
		Teacher	2	8	-	4	3	20	4.1
		LGEA Official	4	4	1	1	-	10	3.0
		SUBEB Official	3	-	-	2	-	5	3.6
		PTA/ SBMC	105	11	-	59	40	211	3.8
18	Head teachers ensure that there are adequate specimen for practical illustration during teaching	Head teacher	1	8	-	2	2	14	3.0
		Teacher	6	5	1	-	8	20	4.6
		LGEA Official	3	3	-	4	-	10	3.8
		SUBEB Official	2	1	-	1	1	5	3.2
		PTA/ SBMC	100	77	-	29	9	211	4.3
19	Head teachers ensure that card papers are used by all teachers as teaching aid	Head teacher	6	1	-	6	1	14	3.0
		Teacher	8	7	-	4	1	20	3.0
		LGEA Official	3	2	-	3	2	10	3.3
		SUBEB Official	3	1	-	1	-	5	3.0
		PTA/ SBMC	106	44	-	54	11	211	4.2
20	Teachers in nomadic schools use available charts during teaching	Head teacher	8	2	1	3	1	14	3.2
		Teacher	10	5	-	3	2	20	3.0
		LGEA Official	3	4	-	2	1	10	3.4
		SUBEB Official	2	2	-	-	1	5	3.3
		PTA/ SBMC	54	75	-	59	22	211	3.3

Source: Authors' Analysis (2025).

Table 2 revealed the views of respondents on performance of Head Teachers in management of



instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria. Item 1 shows the responses of respondents on whether Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate provision of instructional facilities in their respective Schools. From the responses of the respondents, the item statement was accepted by all the respondents with the mean score of 3.5, 3.1, 3.5 and 3.3 respectively. Item 12 shows the responses of respondents on whether Available instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools are adequately distributed and allocated by the Schools' Heads. The mean scores of the respondents show that the item was rejected by the respondents with the mean scores of 2.0, 2.1, 2.1 2.4, and 3.6 for head teachers, teachers, LGEA Official, SUBEB Official and PTA/ SBMC. Item13 was on whether Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate utilization of available instructional facilities. The responses of the respondents show that the item statement was accepted by the respondents. Item 14 was on whether Teachers in Nomadic Schools are motivated by the School Heads to make improvisation of instructional materials where necessary. The mean scores of 3.0, 3.5, 3.9, 4.1 and 3.8 were obtained from the responses of the respondents, implying that the respondents accepted the item statement. Item 15 is on whether Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools provide adequate maintenance of available instructional materials. The item was also accepted by the respondents with the mean scores of 3.6, 3.0, 4.3, 4.0 and 3.5.

Similarly, item 16 was accepted by the respondents with the mean scores of 4.0, 3.2, 3.3, 4.4 and 3.5 for head teachers, teachers, LGEA Official, SUBEB Official and PTA/ SBMC. Item 17 was to find out whether Head teachers ensure that black boards in all the classes are in good condition all the time. The mean score showed that the item was accepted by all the respondents; with the decision mean of 3.0, 4.1, 3.0, 3.6 and 2.8 by respective respondents. Item 18 was on whether Head teachers ensure that there are adequate specimens for practical illustration during teaching. The item statement was accepted by the respondents with the mean scores of 3.0, 4.6, 3.8, 3.2 and 2.3 respectively. From item 19, the decision mean of the respondents were found to be 3.0, 3.0, 3.3, 3.0 and 4.9, meaning the item was accepted by the respondents. Item 20 was on



whether Teachers in nomadic schools use available charts during teaching. The item was accepted by the respondents with the mean score of 3.2, 3.0, 3.4, 3.3 and 3.3 respectively. It was therefore established that most head teachers of nomadic schools were very active in management of instructional facilities in most nomadic schools in Yobe State.

Hypotheses Testing

This section is concerned with all results and outcome of the null hypotheses raised and tested in line with the objectives of this study. Data obtained as responses from the respondents (Head teacher, Teacher, LG EA Official, SUBEB Official PTA/ SBMC) from the questionnaire administered were tested. The hypotheses were tested using One-Way Analysis of variance (ANOVA). This was determined at 0.05 level of significant and statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. In all, eight hypotheses were tested and acceptability or rejection of the Null Hypothesis was determined by comparing the p-value against the significant set by the study (0.05). Hypothesis is therefore rejected if the p-value is less than the level of significance set by the study.

Hypothesis I (HO₁): There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents on the roles performance of Head Teacher on management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.

The responses to the postulated null hypothesis one was collected and analyzed, the summary of data analyzed is presented in table 3: Summary of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the roles performance of Head Teacher on management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.

Table 3: ANOVA Model of Variances in Head Teacher Management of Infrastructure

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.983	3	0.661	0.310	0.246
Within Groups	683.873	257	1.613		
Total	685.856	260			

Source: Authors' Analysis (2025).



From table above, the F-value is 0.410 and the P-value is 0.246 at 0.05 levels of significance. Since the P-value is greater than the level of significance set for the study, the hypothesis is therefore retained. Thus, there is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents on the roles performance of Head Teacher on management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.

Hypothesis II (HO₂): There is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents on the roles performance of Head Teachers on management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.

The responses to the postulated null hypothesis one was collected and analyzed, the summary of data analyzed is presented in table below:

Table : Summary of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the roles performance of Head Teachers on management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8.808	3	2.936	2.038	0.063
Within Groups	522.136	257	1.442		
Total	530.944	260			

From table above, the F-value is 2.038 and the P-value is 0.063 at 0.05 levels of significance. Since the P-value is greater than the level of significance set for the study, the hypothesis is therefore retained. Thus, there is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents on the roles performance of Head Teachers on management of instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State, Nigeria.



4.2. Discussion

It was established by the findings of this study that the head teachers of nomadic schools made efforts in area of maintenance and utilization of infrastructural facilities but couldn't do anything in terms of provision of the infrastructure in Nomadic Schools in Yobe State. This was obtained from the responses of the respondents to the structured questions given to them. There was a unanimous acceptance of the all the item statement on research question one that most Head Teachers do very well in the management of infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools; among which are: there is proper placement of available infrastructural facilities by the Nomadic School Heads. Available infrastructural facilities in Nomadic Schools are adequately allocated by the Schools' Heads. Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate utilization of available infrastructural facilities Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools adequately maintain available infrastructural facilities in their respective schools.

It was established by the findings of this study that Most Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools are very active in the management of instructional facilities in most nomadic schools in Yobe State. This was obtained from the responses of the respondents to the structured questions given to them. There was a unanimous acceptance of the all the item statement on research question two that most Head Teachers relatively managed the available instructional facilities in Nomadic Schools; among which are: Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate utilization of available instructional facilities , teachers in Nomadic Schools are motivated by the School Heads to make improvisation of instructional materials where necessary, Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools provide adequate maintenance of available instructional materials, Nomadic Schools' Heads ensure adequate evaluation of available instructional facilities and Head Teachers ensure that chalk boards in all the classes are in good condition all the time.

5.0. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS



5.1. Summary

This study was conducted on the assessment of the role performance of head teachers on the management of nomadic schools in Yobe state of Nigeria. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, two specific objectives were raised, in line with these objectives, two research questions, two null hypotheses and were formulated. . Descriptive statistic research design was adopted for the study, a total of two hundred and sixty (260) respondents were sampled from the total population of seven hundred and two (702). A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. The data collected were presented in table and were analyzed using weighted mean to answer the research questions. The two hypotheses were tested using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the null hypotheses at 0.05 alpha levels of significance.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher gleans to conclude that:

1. Most of the Head Teachers of Nomadic Schools in Yobe State largely performed their roles in the areas of maintenance and utilization of infrastructural facilities.
2. Most Nomadic School Heads in Yobe State were effectively performed their roles in the management of instructional facilities, in the areas of provision, maintenance and utilization of instructional facilities in their respective schools.

Competing Interest

The authors have declared that no competing interest exist in this paper.



REFERENCES

- Adede, K. O. (2019). Impact of School Infrastructure on Provision of Quality Education in Public Secondary Schools of Nyakach District, Kenya. Retrieved from www.erepository.uonbi.ac.ke December, 2019.
- Aji, U. U. (2016). Assessment of the Management of Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme in Gashua and Nguru Education Zones of Yobe State, Nigeria. A Dissertation Submitted to School of Postgraduate Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Article, L. (2019). Essay on Discipline: Definition, Concept, Components and Principles. Retrieved from www.yourarticlelibrary.com
- Arum, R. (2015). Judging School Discipline: The Crisis of Moral Authority. Retrieved from: <https://en.m.wikipedia.org> August, 2022.
- Asiabaka, I. P. (2008). The Need for Effective Facility Management in School in Nigeria. *New York Science Journal*, ISSN 1554-0200. Retrieved from: <http://www.sciencepub.org> October, 3rd 2019.
- Asogwa, P. I. (2010). Management of Instructional Materials for Effective Teaching and Learning in Secondary Schools in Obollo Afor Education Zone of Enugu State, Nigeria. A Dissertation submitted to the Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Batagawa, M. N. & Tsagem, S. Y. (2017). Revitalizing Nomadic Education for Sustainable Development in Nigeria Through Counselling Strategies. *International Journal of Tropical Educational Issues*. Vol. 1 (No.2) 355-366. <http://oer.udusok.edu.ng:8080>
- Caramela, S. (2018). Max Weber Bureaucracy Theory: Concept, Principles and Forms. Retrieved from: <https://www.toppr.com> October, 2019.
- Carroll, S R. (nd). How to Successfully Deal with Your Dissertation. Retrieved from: www.dissertation-statistics.com September, 2019.
- Craven, J. (2019). The Importance of Infrastructure. Retrieved from www.thoughtco.com January, 2019.
- Daft, R. L. (2019). What is Decision Making? www.managementstudyguide.com June, 2020



- Fousiya, O. P. (2017). Head Masters' Duties & Responsibilities. Retrieved from www.slideshare.net July, 2021
- Goldsmith, O. (nd). Head Teacher- Job Description. Retrieved from: <https://www.brent.gov.uk> June, 2021.
- Greatschools S. (2016). Roles of the Parent Teachers Association (PTA). Retrieved from <https://www.greatschools.org> November, 2019.
- Green, C. (2013). Head of School: Role & Responsibilities. Retrieved from <https://www.tcd.ie> January, 2020. In Financial Management: The Current Status. A Case Study of Four
- Gutsche, B. (2019). Manage Staff Development. Retrieved from www.webjunction.org October, 2019
- Herrity, J. (2019). What is Management? Definitions, Functions and Styles. www.indeed.com
- Idris, O. S. (2018). Role of Principal in School Financial Management: The Current Status. A Case Study of Four Public Secondary Schools in Zoba Debub, Eritrea. Eritrea Institute of Technology. College of Education Asmara, Eritrea. Journal of Education & Practice. Vol. 9, No. 33. Retrieved from <https://iiste.org/JEP/article/view> July, 2021.
- Ion, E. & Criveanu, M. (2016). Organizational Performance-A Concept that Self-Seekers to Find Itself. Annals of the "Constantin Brancusi" University of Targu Jiu. Economic Series, Issue 4. <https://ideas.respec.org>
- Isaac, J. F. (2016). Staff Development in Schools, the Implications for Teacher Education/In-Service Education. Retrieved from <https://www.tandonline.com> September, 2019.
- Isah, F. (2012). Assessment of Decision Making Process in Secondary Schools in Kaduna State. A Thesis Submitted to Postgraduate School, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria, in Partial Fulfilment of the Award of Master's Degree in Educational Administration and Planning from Department of Educational Foundations and Curriculum.
- Kaduna State, (2010). Kaduna State School Based Management Committee Policy. P. 3
- Kapur, R. (2019). Infrastructural Development in Schools. Retrieved from: www.researchgate.net October, 2019.
- Karinje, N. (2019). School Finance Management: Hoe to Manage It Effectively. Retrieved From: <https://fedena.com/blog> January, 2020.