

## Predictive Influence of School Management Support on Assessment Accommodation Practices for Learners with Disabilities in Inclusive Secondary Schools

<sup>1</sup>Akpan, Victor Bassey (Ph.D), <sup>1</sup>Ataben, Michael Okaba & <sup>2</sup>Joseph Bassey Offiong (Ph.D)

Corresponding author: [vicvicakpan788@gmail.com](mailto:vicvicakpan788@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup>Department of Special Needs Education, Faculty of Educational Foundation Studies  
University of Calabar

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychological Foundations of Education, University of Uyo

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20369110>

---

### Abstract

*Inclusive assessment remains central to educational equity, yet implementation in Nigerian secondary schools appears uneven, prompting this study to examine whether multidimensional school management support predicts assessment accommodation practices. To achieve the purpose of the study, cross sectional survey design was adopted. Population comprised 7,482 teachers in 271 public secondary schools in Cross River State, with 380 teachers selected through multistage sampling using Taro Yamane formula and proportionate stratified techniques. Data collection was done using researchers' developed questionnaire grounded in inclusive leadership and measurement literature. Content validity was established through expert review, and reliability coefficients .81. Instruments were administered directly in schools with ethical clearance and screened before analysis. Data were analysed in R4.5.1 using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, descriptive statistics, and multivariate logistic regression. Findings confirmed five-dimensional structure of management support with acceptable model fit, revealed very low accommodation implementation rate of 9.05 percent, and showed that specific management dimensions significantly increased odds of accommodation provision. It was concluded that structured management support is essential for improving inclusive assessment practice. The researchers recommended strengthened monitoring systems, policy enforcement with resource allocation and compulsory training in accommodation strategies.*

**Keywords:** Inclusive Education, School Management Support, Assessment Accommodation Practices, Learners with Disabilities

## Introduction

Inclusive education has become a central policy in many education systems, including Nigeria, following global commitments to equity and access for all learners. At its core, inclusive education seeks to place learners with disabilities in regular schools, and also ensure that teaching, assessment and school organisation respond to learners diversity in meaningful ways. UNESCO (2020) emphasised that assessment practices constitute a critical component of inclusion because they determine how learning is recognised and valued within the school system. In Nigeria, the National Policy on Special Needs Education (2015) formally acknowledges the right of learners with disabilities to appropriate assessment arrangements that reflect their learning characteristics rather than their impairments (Federal Ministry of Education, 2015). Despite this policy position, evidence suggest that assessment practices in many inclusive secondary schools remain largely conventional, with limited adaptation for learners with disabilities (Ajuwon, 2012; Adigun, 2021).

Concern about assessment practices in inclusive settings is closely linked to issue of educational measurement. Assessment accommodations are intended to reduce barriers that interfere with a learner's ability to demonstrate knowledge and skills, without altering the construct being measured. Bolt and Thurlow (2014) explained that well-designed accommodation helps to remove construct-irrelevant variance; thus, improving the validity of test scores for learners with disabilities. Similarly, Madaus, Russell and Higgins (2020) reported that, when applied consistently and appropriately, accommodations (extended time, alternative response formats and simplified instructions) can improve access to assessment for learners with learning and intellectual disabilities. The implication of this measurement principle is that assessment accommodation is not only a pedagogical norm but a technical concern that has consequences of fairness, interpretation of scores and decision-making.

Although the necessity of assessment accommodation has been extensively muted in the measurement literature, the practice in schools typically hinges on the local administrative practice. School management structure influences the interpretation, implementation and supervision of policies in specific schools. Florian (2014) observed that leadership decisions have a great impact on inclusive education outcomes; specifically, supervision, professional development and accountability. School principals and management team are the major intermediaries between national policy and classroom practice in Nigerian context. The research on the implementation of inclusive education in

Nigeria suggests that the practice of teachers might be limited by a lack of administrative direction and institutional support (Jacob and Pillay, 2022). In the event of inconsistency of management support, inclusive practices are more likely to be at the individual level of initiative of teachers, instead of at the school-wide, coordinated levels. In this sense, school management support functions as a set of interrelated administrative practices that shape how inclusive assessment policies are interpreted, resourced and monitored within schools.

This aspect of management is especially critical in the field of assessment accommodation; where decisions tend to be formalized, coordinated, and monitored. Ajuwon (2012) noted that assessment adaptation to learners with disabilities in most of the Nigerian schools is informal and not documented; which further heightens the chances of inconsistency in classrooms. Adigun (2021) also established that both teacher preparation and school supervision do not give much emphasis to assessment in respect to inclusive education. Consequently, disabled learners are likely to receive imbalanced assessment practices that are based more on the personal discretion of individual teachers than on school-wide practices. These circumstances cast doubt about reliability and validity of evaluation in inclusive Secondary schools. Although several Nigerian studies have explored inclusive education from the perspectives of access teachers' attitudes and instructional challenge, however, empirical research that focused specifically on assessment accommodation remain limited. Only fewer studies examined the role of school management support in shaping assessment practices for learners with disabilities; particularly at the secondary school level. In instances when management factors are examined, they are often treated as broad or undifferentiated influences. Limited attention has been paid to how specific management functions combined to form coherent support structures for assessment accommodation. This limit understanding of whether management support matters, and how it should be conceptually defined and measured in inclusive school contexts. Indicatively, Ugodulunwa and Okoroafor (2025) show that management variables significantly influence the delivery of special education services in Nigerian schools. The study however failed to isolate assessment-related practices for detailed analysis. The gap suggests that there is need for studies that move beyond descriptive account to examine predictive relationship between management support and specific inclusive practices. A cross-sectional, predictive approach offers a practical means of addressing this gap by capturing variations in management support and assessment accommodation

practices across schools at a single point in time. Such an approach allows for examination of how administrative support structures relate to actual assessment practices experienced by learners with disabilities. Focusing on learners with learning disabilities and intellectual disabilities in this study was particularly relevant. These groups often faced significant barriers during assessment due to processing, comprehension and response demand (Madaus et al., 2020). Within this context, examining inclusive secondary schools in Cross River State provided an opportunity to discover context-specific evidence that reflected realities of school administration and assessment practice in Nigeria.

Against this background, this study investigated predictive influence of school management support on assessment accommodation practices for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools in Cross River State. This study situated assessment accommodation within the broader framework of educational measurement and school management. In doing so, it addressed a documented gap in Nigerian inclusive education research and provides ample basis for improving the fairness and validity of assessment outcomes for learners with disabilities.

### **Purpose of the study**

This study aimed to examine how school management support (multidimensional construct), predicts implementation of assessment accommodation practices for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools. The study specifically sought to:

1. To model and validate the structure of school management support for assessment accommodation practices in inclusive secondary schools Cross River State, using key management dimensions.
2. To determine the extent to which assessment accommodation practices are implemented for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools Cross River State.
3. To examine the predictive effect of the validated school management support construct on the implementation of assessment accommodation practices for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools. Cross River State.

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the underlying structure of school management support for assessment accommodation practices in inclusive secondary schools, Cross River State?

2. To what extent are assessment accommodation practices implemented for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools, Cross River State?
3. To what extent does school management support, as a multidimensional construct, predict the implementation of assessment accommodation practices?

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested at .05 level of significance.

1. School management support does not demonstrate a statistically significant multidimensional structure for assessment accommodation practices in inclusive secondary schools, Cross River State
2. School management support, as a multidimensional construct, does not significantly predict the implementation of assessment accommodation practices for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools, Cross River State.

### **Methodology**

Cross-sectional survey design was adopted in this study. Data were collected from respondents at a single point in time to examine both the structural composition of school management support and its predictive relationship with assessment accommodation practices. The design is appropriate because it permits the investigation of naturally occurring variations in management practices and assessment procedures across inclusive secondary schools without manipulation of variables. It also allowed for testing predictive relationships within the same dataset.

The study was conducted in inclusive secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria. Administrative structure of these schools includes principals, vice principals and head of departments who are responsible for policy implementation, instructional supervision and assessment oversight. Population of this study was 7,482 teachers in 271 public secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria. These figures were drawn from State Secondary Education Board Report 2025, which provide state level disaggregation of public secondary school personnel. Teachers were selected because they are directly involved in classroom assessment and are positioned to report on both assessment accommodation practices and nature of management support within their schools. Multistage sampling procedure was employed for sample selection. Secondary schools were first identified through purposive sampling based on official designation by State Secondary Education Board. Only

schools that enroll learners with identified learning disabilities or intellectual disabilities were actually included in the study. Learners with learning disabilities or intellectual disabilities were identified with the help of teachers and school administrators. Thereafter, proportionate stratified random sampling was used to select teachers from each identified school in order to ensure representation across schools. Sample size for the study was 380 teachers. This sample was determined using Taro Yamane formula for finite populations at 0.05 level of precision. Using population size of 7,482 teachers, computed sample size was 379.6, which was rounded upward to 380 to ensure adequacy.

Data was collected using structured questionnaire titled “School Management Support for Assessment Accommodation and Assessment Accommodation Practices Questionnaire”. The instrument was developed through systematic review of literature on inclusive school leadership, educational measurement principles related to assessment accommodation and Nigerian inclusive education policy guidelines. Item development proceed in stages. First, key management dimensions relevant to assessment accommodation was identified, including administrative leadership and policy support, resource provision, professional development support and supervision and monitoring of assessment practices. Second, core categories of assessment accommodation was identified, including presentation accommodations, response accommodations, timing accommodations and setting accommodations. Third, items were drafted to reflect observable practices rather than abstract opinions. All items in management dimensions were measured on four-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Items in assessment accommodations were measured categorically (yes/no). The instrument consisted of three sections. The first section obtained demographic information such as teaching experience, qualification and subject area. The second section measured school management support across identified dimensions, with five items under each dimension to permit comprehensive construct modelling. The third section measured assessment accommodation practices across presentation, response, timing and setting domains. Each domain contained several items describing specific practices implemented in classrooms. Multidimensional design of management support section allowed for empirical examination of its internal structure. Content and face validity of instrument were established through expert review. The draft instrument was submitted to specialists in educational measurement and evaluation, educational management,

and special education. Three experts examined clarity, relevance, and adequacy of item coverage in relation to defined indicators. Their observations and recommendations were used to guide revision of items before final administration. Reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach alpha coefficient to assess internal consistency of each subscale and overall construct. A reliability coefficient ranges from 0.73 to .81, and was considered acceptable.

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from State Secondary Education Board and principals of selected schools. Respondents were informed about the purpose of study and assured that participation is voluntary and responses remain confidential. Questionnaires were administered directly to teachers in their respective schools and retrieved within agreed period to reduce loss and non-response. After retrieval, questionnaires were screened for completeness and consistency. Responses were coded and entered into statistical software (R4.5.1) for analysis. Data cleaning was done by checking for missing values, identifying outliers and examination of assumptions of normality, linearity and multicollinearity prior to main analysis. Only properly completed instruments were included in final analysis. Data were analysed in three stages using R software. Structure of school management support was examined through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Suitability for factor analysis was assessed using Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure and Bartlett’s test of sphericity. Principal axis factoring with Promax rotation identified five underlying dimensions based on parallel analysis and factor loadings of .40 or higher. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. Confirmatory factor analysis with diagonally weighted least squares estimator was then conducted to validate five factor model; given ordinal nature of Likert responses. Model fit was evaluated using CFI, TLI, RMSEA and SRMR, alongside composite reliability and average variance extracted to establish construct validity. Extent of assessment accommodation implementation was examined using descriptive statistics. Frequencies, percentages, and mean scores were computed for five binary accommodation practices and ordinal frequency variable in order to determine overall level of implementation. Then, predictive effect of validated management dimensions on accommodation practices was tested using multiple logistic regression. Factor scores derived from confirmatory model were entered as predictors of each binary accommodation outcome. Regression coefficients, odds ratios, confidence intervals, deviance statistics, and AIC values were examined to determine statistical significance at  $p < .05$ .

## Results

Research question one: What is the underlying structure of school management support for assessment accommodation practices in inclusive secondary schools, Cross River State? Table 1 and 2 present the results of statistical analysis

TABLE 1: Measurement Model Summary (EFA + CFA Results)

Construct	$\alpha$	CR	AVE	Loading Range	Factor Correlations (Range)
Instructional Leadership Support	0.77	0.772	0.456	0.574 – 0.729	0.498 – 0.542
Resource Provision Support	0.79	0.789	0.482	0.683 – 0.704	0.426 – 0.542
Policy and Administrative Support	0.75	0.755	0.435	0.576 – 0.759	0.426 – 0.564
Professional Development Support	0.77	0.773	0.461	0.572 – 0.730	0.458 – 0.564
Monitoring and Accountability Support	0.79	0.792	0.489	0.635 – 0.787	0.473 – 0.518

Factorability Statistics: KMO = 0.90, Bartlett's Test:  $\chi^2(300) = 2850.77$ ,  $p < .001$ , Parallel Analysis: 5 factors retained, Total Variance Explained (EFA) = 43.2%

TABLE 2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Model Comparison

Fit Index	5-Factor Model	1-Factor Model
$\chi^2$	312.51	1277.55
Df	265	275
Robust CFI	0.953	—
Robust TLI	0.946	—
Robust RMSEA	0.040	0.501
SRMR	0.054	—

Model Comparison:  $\Delta\chi^2(10) = 332.7$ ,  $p < .001$  (5-factor model fits significantly better than 1-factor model)

Results in Table 1 and 2 indicate that school management support is best represented as a five-dimensional construct comprising instructional leadership, resource provision, policy and administrative support, professional development, and monitoring and accountability. Model fit indices support this structure, with CFI = 0.953, TLI = 0.946, and RMSEA = 0.040, suggesting acceptable fit. Factor loadings and reliability estimates also fall within acceptable ranges. This pattern suggests that management support is not unitary but organised into distinct yet related domains.

Research question two: To what extent are assessment accommodation practices implemented for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools, Cross River State? Results of the statistical analysis is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Implementation of Assessment Accommodation Practices (N = 380)

Implementation of Assessment Accommodation Practices	Implementation of Assessment Accommodation Practices			Frequency of Accommodation Use		
	Not Implemented n (%)	Implemented n (%)	Implementation Rate (%)	Frequency Category	n	%
Extra Time	335 (88.16)	45 (11.84)	11.84	Rarely	311	81.84
Modified Test Format	352 (92.63)	28 (7.37)	7.37	Occasionally	64	16.84
Assistive Technology	353 (92.89)	27 (7.11)	7.11	Frequently	5	1.32
Separate Room	347 (91.32)	33 (8.68)	8.68			
Oral Examination	341 (89.74)	39 (10.26)	10.26			

Overall Mean Implementation Rate = 9.05%, Mean Frequency Score = 1.19, Scale Range: 1–3

Table 3 showed consistently low implementation across all five accommodation practices. Extra time was implemented in only 11.84 percent of cases; while 88.16 percent reported no implementation. Modified test format and assistive technology displayed even lower rates at 7.37 percent and 7.11 percent respectively, with more than ninety percent non implementation. Separate room and oral examination follow similar pattern, each below eleven percent implementation. No single practice exceeds twelve percent uptake. Overall mean implementation rate of 9.05 percent confirms that fewer than one in ten eligible cases receive documented accommodation across assessed forms. Frequency distribution strengthens this interpretation. 81.84 percent of responses fall within rarely category, while only 1.32 percent fall within frequently category. Mean frequency score of 1.19 on three-point scale further indicates that accommodation use clusters very close to lowest response option. Value remains far below midpoint of scale, suggesting minimal regularity in practice. This result implies that accommodation practices in inclusive secondary schools are implemented to very low extent, approaching absence across several forms. Descriptive indicators converge in same direction, indicating limited operational translation of inclusive assessment principles into routine practice. Frequency distributions showed that large majority of teachers reported non implementation across extra time, modified test format, assistive technology, separate room, and oral examination. Mean implementation rate remained below one tenth of possible adoption. Ordinal frequency measure further indicated that most respondents selected lowest category

of use. Findings therefore indicate limited practical application of accommodation strategies within inclusive secondary schools.

Research question three: To what extent does school management support, as a multidimensional construct, predict the implementation of assessment accommodation practices? Table 4 and 5 presented the result of data analysis.

Table 4. Multivariate Logistic Regression Predicting Accommodation Implementation

Predictor	Extra Time OR	Modified Format OR	Assistive Tech OR	Separate Room OR	Oral Exam OR
Instructional Leadership Support	1.83	3.69*	2.14	1.24	1.03
Resource Provision Support	2.36*	0.50	1.61	1.19	1.40
Policy and Administrative Support	0.66	0.93	0.58	2.11	2.85*
Professional Development Support	1.73	3.45	1.75	0.73	0.74
Monitoring and Accountability Support	1.27	1.80	3.68*	3.54**	2.53*

- $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$
- Note: Values are Odds Ratios (Exp(B)). Models adjusted for five management dimensions.  $N = 380$ .

Table 5. Model Fit Statistics

Outcome	Null Deviance	Residual Deviance	AIC
Extra Time	276.46	244.84	256.84
Modified Format	199.93	169.56	181.56
Assistive Technology	194.83	158.93	170.93
Separate Room	224.33	190.13	202.13
Oral Examination	251.43	215.36	227.36

Results in Table 4 and 5 indicate that school management support predicts implementation of assessment accommodation practices to a moderate but uneven extent across accommodation types.

Monitoring and accountability support shows the strongest influence, increasing the likelihood of implementation by approximately two to nearly four times (OR = 2.53–3.68,  $p < .05$ ). Instructional leadership also demonstrates substantial effect on modified test format (OR = 3.69,  $p < .05$ ), while resource provision increases the likelihood of extra time by more than twofold (OR = 2.36,  $p < .05$ ).

Other dimensions show weaker or non-significant effects. Reduction in deviance across models suggests improved explanatory contribution when management variables are included.

Hypotheses one: School management support, as a multidimensional construct, does not significantly predict the implementation of assessment accommodation practices for learners with disabilities in inclusive secondary schools. Table 1 and 2 present the results of the tested hypothesis. Factorability diagnostics in Table 1 confirmed suitability of data for latent modelling. Kaiser Meyer Olkin value of 0.90 indicates strong sampling adequacy, while Bartlett test of sphericity,  $\chi^2(300) = 2850.77$ ,  $p < .001$ , rejects null hypothesis of identity matrix. Parallel analysis retained five factors, and exploratory solution explained 43.2 percent of total variance. Pattern of loadings within each domain was substantive, with standardised loadings ranging from 0.574 to 0.787 across constructs, indicating meaningful contribution of items to respective latent dimensions.

Internal consistency and composite reliability indices support structural coherence. Cronbach alpha values range from 0.75 to 0.79, while composite reliability values range from 0.755 to 0.792, exceeding conventional threshold of 0.70. Average variance extracted ranges from 0.435 to 0.489. Although AVE values fall slightly below 0.50 in some constructs, loading magnitudes and composite reliability values indicate acceptable convergent validity within context of social science measurement. Inter factor correlations range from 0.426 to 0.564, remaining well below 0.85 threshold, thus; supporting discriminant validity and suggesting related but empirically distinct management domains. Summary of confirmatory analysis in Table 2 further clarifies structural integrity. Five factor model demonstrates robust fit, with  $\chi^2(265) = 312.51$ , Robust CFI = 0.953, Robust TLI = 0.946, Robust RMSEA = 0.040, and SRMR = 0.054. All indices fall within accepted cut offs for good or acceptable model fit. In contrast, unidimensional model yields  $\chi^2(275) = 1277.55$  and Robust RMSEA = 0.501, indicating severe misfit. Chi square difference test confirms superiority of multidimensional structure,  $\Delta\chi^2(10) = 332.7$ ,  $p < .001$ . Evidence from EFA, reliability analysis, validity assessment and CFA comparison converges on consistent conclusion. School management support demonstrates statistically significant multidimensional structure composed of five related but distinct domains. Null hypothesis is therefore was rejected. Measurement model provides empirically defensible foundation for subsequent structural analysis examining predictive influence of management support on accommodation implementation.

Hypotheses two: School management support, as a multidimensional construct, does not significantly predict the implementation of assessment accommodation practices for learners with disabilities in

inclusive secondary schools. Table 4 and 5 presented the result of data analysis. Table 4 indicates that management support exerts differentiated and statistically significant effects across accommodation types. Resource Provision Support significantly predict implementation of extra time,  $OR = 2.36, p < .05$ , indicating that each unit increase in resource provision more than doubles odd of providing extra time. Instructional Leadership Support significantly predict modified test format,  $OR = 3.69, p < .05$ , suggesting that strong leadership emphasis increased likelihood of format modification by nearly fourfold. Monitoring and Accountability Support showed consistent and robust influence, significantly predicting assistive technology,  $OR = 3.68, p < .05$ , separate room,  $OR = 3.54, p < .01$ , and oral examination,  $OR = 2.53, p < .05$ . Policy and Administrative Support significantly predicts oral examination,  $OR = 2.85, p < .05$ . Other coefficients, though positive in several cases, do not reach statistical significance.

Pattern of results demonstrates that certain dimensions of management support function as critical levers for specific accommodation practices rather than exerting uniform influence across all forms. Monitoring and accountability mechanisms appear especially decisive in translating policy into concrete action. Resource provision also played essential role where accommodation required logistical adjustment. Model fit statistics in Table 5 showed reduction from null deviance to residual deviance across all five models; indicating improved explanatory power when management predictors are included. AIC values remain lowest relative to corresponding null model, supporting adequacy of fitted models. Given presence of statistically significant predictors across multiple accommodation outcomes, null hypothesis was rejected. School management support, treated as multidimensional construct, significantly predicts implementation of assessment accommodation practices in inclusive secondary schools. Findings confirmed that variation in managerial structures and practices meaningfully shapes likelihood of accommodation delivery. Logistic regression analyses revealed that several management dimensions were associated with higher odds of implementing specific practices. Effect varied by accommodation type, yet pattern showed that stronger management support increased likelihood of provision. Results of the analysis indicate that validated multidimensional management structure is statistically linked to implementation of accommodation practices, despite overall low level of adoption.

## **Discussions**

Findings from this study contribute to ongoing discussion on organisational conditions that sustain inclusive education. Evidence that school management support demonstrates coherent multidimensional structure aligns with prior conceptualisations of leadership and administrative support as composite rather than unitary constructs. Research on inclusive schooling consistently argues that leadership practices operate across interrelated domains such as policy direction, resource allocation, professional learning and instructional monitoring rather than through single generalised support function (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010; Hallinger, 2011). Empirical work has similarly shown that distributed and instructional leadership dimensions can be empirically distinguished yet remain moderately correlated (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). Present validation therefore, reinforced the view that management support for accommodation practices should be modelled as structured configuration of leadership behaviours rather than global perception. This addresses gap in literature where administrative support is often treated as single composite score without testing dimensionality, particularly within inclusive secondary contexts in low implementation settings.

Low level of accommodation implementation observed in this study corresponds with evidence that policy commitment to inclusion frequently exceeds classroom enactment. Studies across diverse system report that although legislative frameworks mandate accommodation, practical uptake remain uneven and often minimal, particularly at secondary level where assessment practices are more standardised and examination driven (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Mitchell, 2014). Research has also documented that teachers often lack structural backing, time, and technical resources necessary to implement accommodations consistently (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Sharma, Loreman, & Forlin, 2012). Current findings extend this body of work by quantifying extent of non-implementation across specific accommodation forms, rather than relying on attitudinal measures alone. This distinction is important because positive teacher beliefs toward inclusion do not necessarily translate into practice without organisational reinforcement. Evidence therefore strengthens argument that inclusive reform requires systemic conditions that move beyond normative endorsement toward operational support.

Predictive association between management support dimensions and likelihood of accommodation implementation situated leadership as enabling condition for inclusive assessment. Prior scholarship work demonstrated that leadership practices influenced instructional adaptation through shaping

school climate, professional collaboration and allocation of material resources (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020). In inclusive education research, principal support has been linked to teacher efficacy and adaptive pedagogy (Sharma et al., 2012). Present findings advance this line of reasoning by connecting validated leadership dimensions directly to binary indicators of accommodation provision, thereby moving from perceptual outcomes to behavioural ones. This addresses methodological limitation in existing literature where leadership effects are frequently inferred indirectly through attitudes or generalised instructional quality. Evidence here suggests that when management support strengthens, odds of implementing specific accommodations increase, even within context characterised by overall low adoption. Such pattern reinforces proposition that leadership operates as structural lever for inclusive assessment practice, while also highlighting that absence of strong support may sustain implementation gap documented in prior studies.

## **Conclusions**

This study examined structure, extent, and predictive influence of school management support on assessment accommodation practices in inclusive secondary schools. Evidence confirms that management support operates as multidimensional construct comprising instructional leadership, resource provision, policy and administrative support, professional development, and monitoring and accountability. Measurement model demonstrated acceptable reliability, construct validity, and model fit. Multidimensional solution provided significantly better representation than unidimensional alternative, thereby rejecting null hypothesis of no structural differentiation. Management support in inclusive schooling is therefore not monolithic concept but configuration of interrelated yet distinct institutional functions. Despite this structural clarity, implementation of assessment accommodation practices remains markedly limited. Across extra time, modified test formats, assistive technology, separate room arrangements and oral examinations, reported uptake was consistently low. Mean implementation rate below 10 percent. Dominant selection of lowest frequency category indicate that accommodation practices are rarely embedded within routine assessment process. This pattern suggested persistent gaps between policy aspiration and classroom enactment in inclusive secondary education.

Predictive analysis demonstrated that management support significantly influence likelihood of accommodation implementation. Although effect vary across specific practices, several management

dimensions increased odds of provision. Instructional leadership, resource provision, and monitoring structures show notable associations with particular accommodations. Null hypothesis of no predictive effect is therefore rejected. Findings indicate that while accommodation practices remain scarce, strengthened and strategically aligned management support increases probability of implementation. Findings from the study advance understanding of inclusive school functioning in two important ways. First, they validate structural composition of management support within assessment context. Second, they revealed practical disconnect between structural capacity and actual practice; while confirming that managerial influence remain consequential. Effective inclusive assessment requires formal policy endorsement and coordinated leadership, resource allocation, professional learning and accountability mechanisms. Without sustained institutional commitment across these dimensions, accommodation practices are unlikely to move beyond minimal adoption.

### **Recommendations**

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

1. School administrators should institutionalise structured monitoring and accountability mechanisms that require documented evidence of assessment accommodation during internal moderation and examination review processes. Clear enforcement structure should ensure that validated management support dimensions are translated into observable classroom practice.
2. State Secondary Education Board and Policy Makers should establish and maintain minimum standard for assessment accommodation implementation in inclusive secondary schools. Such standards must be supported by targeted funding for assistive technology and structured professional development. Policy should ensure that their directives moved beyond inclusion rhetoric and specify measurable compliance benchmarks.
3. Teacher Education Institutions and Professional Development Providers should as a matter of urgency embed compulsory, practice-oriented training on assessment accommodation strategies within both pre-service and in-service programmes. Such training should focus on practical design, adaptation of test formats and ethical implementation procedures to increase consistent application across subjects.

### **References**

- Adigun, O. T. (2021). Inclusive education in Nigeria: Teacher preparedness and institutional support. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1930491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1930491>
- Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(4), 401–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903>
- Ajuwon, P. M. (2012). Making inclusive education work in Nigeria: Evaluation of special educators' attitudes. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 32(2). <https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/2194>
- Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration and inclusion: A review of literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17(2), 129–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250210129056>
- Bolt, S. E., & Thurlow, M. L. (2014). Five of the most frequently allowed testing accommodations in state policy. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(4), 456–495. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314549077>
- Federal Ministry of Education. (2015). *National policy on special needs education*. Abuja, Nigeria. <https://education.gov.ng>
- Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 286–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933551>
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(4), 399–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2011.625061>
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- Jacob, U. S., & Pillay, J. (2022). Teachers' knowledge and attitudes toward inclusive education in Nigeria. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 1012797. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1012797>
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11436268>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Madaus, J. W., Russell, A. E., & Higgins, J. (2020). The paradox of accommodations: High school students with disabilities. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 39(3), 42–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12324>
- Mitchell, D. (2014). *What really works in special and inclusive education*. Routledge.
- Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 12(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2011.01200.x>
- Ugodulunwa, C. A., & Okoroafor, B. O. (2025). School management variables and special education service delivery in Nigerian secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report: Inclusion and education*. <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report>