

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLES OF HEADTEACHERS IN HIGH
AND LOW ACHIEVING PUBLIC BASIC SCHOOLS OF THE BOSOMTWE
ATWIMA KWANWOMA DISTRICT OF THE ASHANTI REGION OF
GHANA

MARY-MAGDALENE WOMPAKEAH

2010

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLES OF HEADTEACHERS IN HIGH
AND LOW ACHIEVING PUBLIC BASIC SCHOOLS OF THE BOSOMTWE
ATWIMA KWANWOMA DISTRICT OF THE ASHANTI REGION OF
GHANA

BY

MARY-MAGDALENE WOMPAKEAH

Dissertation submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration of the faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Master of Education Degree in Educational Administration

JULY 2010

DECLARATION

Candidate Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this University or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature: Date.....

Name: Mary-Magdalene Wompakeah

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the supervision and preparation of the dissertation were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of dissertation laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Supervisor's Signature..... Date.....

Name: Dr. Albert L. Dare

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to find out the leadership styles headteachers exhibit in public basic schools in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwanwoma District of the Ashanti Region. The study was specifically interested in finding out the factors accounting for high performance in particular schools in the district and those responsible for low performance in other schools of the same district.

Questionnaires were used as the instrument for the study. Out of a sample population of sixty, fifty responded. The data was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). There were divided opinions by teachers concerning the leadership styles their heads used. One-third of teachers from both high and low achieving schools described their heads as democratic leaders. One-third of teachers from high achieving schools also described their heads as situational leaders. Teachers from low achieving did not associate their heads with situational leadership. Twenty-one percent and 41% from both high and low achieving schools respectively perceived their heads as autocratic leaders.

Both heads and teachers admitted the great significance of positive personal qualities such as good health, neatness, sound mental ability, commitment, fairness, firmness and courage in the management process. They also regarded academic qualification in education management as a necessary ingredient in school administration. The study recommends that teachers and headteachers be assisted more by educational authorities to acquire more knowledge and skills in the universities to school administration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My profound gratitude goes to my supervisor, Dr. Dare, for his immeasurable guidance and support to the successful completion of this dissertation. Indeed, he has been so helpful, painstakingly reading through the manuscript and offering several valuable suggestions. His effort will forever be remembered.

I also want to express my special thanks to my siblings and family members (the Wompakeahs) for the invaluable encouragement and assistance they offered me during the two-year course.

To all lecturers of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, University of Cape Coast, and my course mates who shared their knowledge and experience with me, I say accept my appreciation and may we live to influence the lives of one another positively.

DEDICATION

To my parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Peter Wompakeah of blessed memory,
for enduring the hardship in giving me education.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	
CHAPTER	
ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	6
Research Questions	7
Significance of the Study	7
Delimitations	8
Limitations	8
Organization of the Dissertation	9
TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
The concept Educational Management	10
Educational Management and Educational administration Compared	15
Styles of Leadership	16
Democratic Leadership	17
Autocratic Leadership	18

	page
Delegative/Free Reign	18
Resource Management in Educational institutions	20
Functions of the Headteacher	23
Factors Influencing Students Performance	29
Summary	30
THREE: METHODOLOGY	31
Research Design	31
Population	32
Sample and Sampling Procedure	32
Research Instrument	33
Pilot- Testing of Instrument	34
Data Collection Procedure	34
Data Analysis Procedure	35
FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	37
Views of Teachers	37
Research Question 1	38
Research Question 2	42
Research Question 3	47
Research Question 4	56
Views of Headteachers:	59
Research Question 1	59
Research Question 2	67
Research Question 3	67
Research Question 4	67

	page
Suggestions to fellow Headteachers and Stakeholders	72
FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS	
RECOMMENDATION	74
Summary	74
Summary of Findings	75
Conclusions	78
Recommendations	79
Suggestions for Further Research	80
REFERENCE	81
APPENDICES	85
A: Questionnaire on leadership styles/practices of headteachers (views of teachers/subordinates)	85
B: Questionnaire leadership styles/practices of headteachers (views of headteachers)	92
C: Letter of introduction	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	page
1. Leadership styles of Headteachers	38
2. Preferred leadership styles of Headteachers	41
3. Possession of University Degree	42
4. Additional training in Educational Administration	43
5. Teaching for more than ten Years	44
6. Neatness in Appearance	46
7. Having good physical Health	47
8. Fitness, firmness and courage in facing issues and Problems	49
9. Allowing subordinates to Participate in Decision Making	50
10. Showing interest in the Personal welfare of Subordinates	52
11. Promoting good Relations among Personnel	53
12. Carefully analyzing, accepting and applying suggestion made by staff and Students	55
13. Discussing the use and Strength of school Finance	57
14. Maintenance and Repair of school Equipment and Infrastructure	57
15. Views of headteachers on Leadership Styles	60
16. Respondents ratings of headteachers Leadership Practices	64
17. Respondents ratings of headteachers personal Qualities	68

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

The history of mankind has forged a strong link between education and national development. Education is the primary means of bringing about social and economic development of a country.

McWilliams and Kwamena-Poh (1975) stated that the main purpose of education, whether formal or informal, has been to produce a person who will be a useful member of society. Harbibson and Meyers (1964) have also shown that the higher the level of educational development of a country, the greater the range of economic development. It therefore means that the higher the level of education of the workforce, the greater their productivity. So it can be deduced that education and national and well as personal development are inextricably linked. Education has been seen as imparting knowledge from one generation to another in order to promote social stability and coherence. Education is also a means of passing on values cherished in society and a way of initiating the individual into society.

Education imbues man with the necessary tools such as knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to solve the problems that affect the survival of the individual in society. Education is thus viewed as an instrument for promoting and controlling change, for transmitting national values and economic skills.

Moreover, it is a medium for promoting unity into rapidly changing national society, typified by pluralism in relation to beliefs and roles and the individual's attachment to one or many of these. Furthermore, education is concerned with the united concern of a people for the right upbringing of its children and improvement of its national life (Cambridge Conference on African Education, 1952).

The school is the main institution charged with the responsibility of giving to the young ones formal education. Children are the greatest resources of every nation. The success and quality of life of every nation will be determined by today's children and their ability to solve the problems that face them as individuals and that of the society as a whole (Lockheed & Verspoor, 1991). It is the duty of the school to unearth these potentials and abilities in children so as to realize that investment in children's education for better contribution to nation development in future. The success or attainment of these laudable objectives rests on the school administration of which the headmaster is the leader. The clarion call for effective management in our schools sounds louder today than ever before. This is an indication that all is not well in our schools. This may be attributed to the fact that people are becoming more and more interested in what goes on in our schools.

The existence of parent teacher associations, the formation of school management committees, and the institution of the district education oversight committees buttress the point that there is increased interest in the affairs of our

schools. The heightened interest is comparable to the awareness of most people in the community that education holds the key to the development of their communities and the nation as a whole. No nation can have a future without a well-trained manpower resource.

It is for this reason that the headteacher of the school is tasked with the responsibility of ensuring that the country's educational aims are realized so that this manpower resource can be produced. The motto of Conference of Heads of assisted Secondary Schools emphasizes the importance of school heads in the words "The future in our Hands". The question however, is: How do heads actually hand this future?" The performance of pupils in the school system seems unsatisfactory and parents are worried about the huge investments they are making in their children's education and as such they raise this issue in most parent teacher association meetings. The factors for this unsatisfactory performance are many and varied.

One factor is, however, striking and is the complaint of many parents about poor management of schools. This they always state in their meetings with school authorities. One may not be too wrong to think that ineffective management in our schools, especially at the basic level, is the cause of poor performance in the school. The organizational structure in the school has the headteacher at helm of affairs, the teachers, and then the pupils. The hierarchical structure depicts the headteacher as the leader and it is his or her administrative behaviour that ensures the success or otherwise of the school.

Like definitions of management, conceptions of management effectiveness differ from person to person, highlighting the idea that criteria use to evaluate management effectiveness reflect a researcher's explicit or implicit perception of what management effectiveness is. In the educational context, it is assumed that in an institution where staff turnover is low, where results of pupils in examinations are good, where there is a cordial relationship between the headteachers and staff, where staff works with zeal and competence, then there is presumed to be effective educational management (Yukl, 1994).

Effective management requires the ability to get others to work enthusiastically and competently towards acceptable objectives. As both a science and an art, it involves inter-relating with people. The science of management develops valid concepts, principles and processes to guide the day- to-day practice of headteachers or administrators to bring about more predictable end results. Though these principles and processes do not guarantee definite or ready-made solutions to organization problems, they provide a logical and analytical approach to planning decision-making and problem solving. Administrators, headteachers for that matter, who follow these principles, or processes, find greater assurance when it comes to problem solving.

The art of management, on the other hand, emphasizes on management skills, such as how heads work with others and how they apply their knowledge and experience to achieve desired results. Bothwell (1983) indicates two qualities that set true of administrators apart. These are that;

1. They have a dream they are determined to carry out.
2. They are people of action.

Burns (1978) express the belief that head's principal task is one of instilling purpose. He contends that effective management unlike naked power wielding is thus inseparable from those being managed (staff). To him, heads continue to influence others mainly by means of competence, motivation and communication, towards goal setting acceptance and achievement. An understanding of effective management is therefore of vital importance to educational administration (Morphet, Roe & Theodore 1959). This is because the head does not only manage human resources but the material resources as well. There is the need to have competent and effective heads that can harness all resources necessary for good academic performance.

The competence and effectiveness management may be acquired through experience. However, this might not be the best. This is because the practice when long-service in the teaching profession and a pass in interviews and recommendations from superiors were enough to grant headship in our school has outlived its usefulness in his era when educational administration exist as an academic discipline. The current practices of appointing headteachers call for studies into effective management practices of headteachers in our educational institutions, especially at the basic level.

Statement of the Problem

It is a fact that effective leadership practices/behaviours in all human institutions lead to high morale and adequate performance. The desire of most parents to enroll their children in some particular basic schools prompts a question relating leadership, management and administration at basic schools.

Even though some public basic schools are adequately equipped with some of the necessary educational resources, they do not perform as well as or as satisfactorily as other equally resourced (or less resourced) schools. Are heads of basic schools doing the right things to enable the schools realize their educational goals?

This study was done to find out why schools “tick” while others “sleep”. In particular, the study was designed to study how head of schools manage the schools-the leadership styles and principles they adopt in their administrative process.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions:

1. What are the leadership styles used by heads in their administration? Which one(s) yield(s) good results?
2. How are the personal qualities of headteachers influencing school management?

3. How does the academic qualification of the heads and their administrative behaviour aid them to be effective?
4. How are available resources of the school used?

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to find out what leadership styles were exhibited by heads in basic schools. It was also to find out whether the personal qualities and academic achievements of heads can influence their performance.

Significance of Study

The findings of this study may be useful in discerning the administrative behaviour, the qualities and characteristics of the head who qualifies to be an effective headteacher of a school. It thus seeks to give a greater exposure of management styles that are likely to influence positively in the running of schools. The results of the study may serve as a guide to curriculum developers in designing appropriate curriculum for educational institutions especially in teacher training colleges so as to give the necessary skills and knowledge of leadership to every teacher to help them apply the necessary skills when the mantle falls on them.

The results of the study may also serve as a guide to educational authorities in the selection and appointment of personnel to head educational institutions (basic schools) so that the right caliber of people will be entrusted with this responsibility to accomplish the goals of education.

As an educative material, the findings of the study may be a source of reference to researchers who may have the desire to make further investigation into the topic. The findings are also an addition to already existing knowledge in educational management which will guide students in the study of the course.

Delimitations

The study was confined to basic schools in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwanwoma District of the Ashanti Region. Only selected headteachers and staff at the basic level were used in the study. The study was also delimited to leadership styles/ management practices in public basic schools.

Limitation

The findings of the study cannot be generalized since the delimitations are in themselves limitations to the study. Since the sample was purposively selected the incidence of bias cannot be completely controlled. Considering the problem being focused in the study, it would have been appropriate to carry out this research to cover many schools in the area of study but due to its vast nature all the schools in the catchment area could not be used. Hence, a number of headteachers and teachers were purposively selected. It is therefore probable that the exclusion of certain teachers might have led to the loss of some information that might enrich the study. Some respondents also avoided some items of the questionnaire. Some of the questionnaires could not also be retrieved. These could have also provided beneficial and richer information to the study.

Even though, respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their views, the possibility that their responses to the questionnaire were done with perceptions and fear of victimization by superiors cannot be ruled out. This might therefore also influence the quality and appropriateness of the responses. However, these reasons were not of a serious degree to affect the validity of the study.

Organization of the Dissertation

The rest of the report of this study is organized in four other chapters. Chapter Two presents the review of related literature. Chapter Three describes the research design, population and sample, data collection procedure, the instrument used as well as the statistical tool used in the analysis of the data. The results of the study and discussion of the results constitute Chapter Four. This is followed by a summary, conclusions and recommendations in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literature related to the subject of study. It focuses on the review of related literature in which some authors highlighted the constituents of effective leadership. The chapter reviews the topic under the following broad headings:

1. The concept “Educational Management”.
2. Styles of leadership
3. Resources management in educational institutions.
4. Factors influencing students’ performance.
5. Functions of the headteacher.

The Concept “Educational Management”

Human relationship in organized dealing does not spontaneously result in harmonious or productive outcomes. People do not always just work eagerly in happy ways. There is bound to be friction and strains. These are difference to productive results. There is the need for some co-operation of sorts, or no productive outcomes would result. However, for the co-operation of sorts to beget

the desired results there is the need for effective management in all organized human dealings (Gyang, 2001).

The central purpose of management and administration in any institution is that of co-operating the efforts of people towards the achievement of its goals (Mullins, 1996). Effectiveness in educational management like any other organization should concern with doing things right and relates to output of the job and what the administrator actually achieves. However, how the administrator achieves the result and the effects on other people is very important. Mullins therefore sees managerial effectiveness as a combination of personal attributes and dimensions of the managers to meet the demands of the situation and fulfill the requirements of the organization. In education, these goals have to do with teaching and learning. Management and administration in education organization has its central purpose as enhancement of teaching and learning. Therefore, all activities of the school administrator whether working for public, board of an education or professional staff should ultimately be contributed to this end (Campbell, 1977). This means that the scope of educational management is wide. Educational management therefore is the harmonious interplay and coordination of all the inputs in education. It cuts across what goes into education by way of policies, funding curriculum, and resources to the quality of the product of the schools (Gyang, 2001).

Educational management also deals in broader terms the management of both human and material resources to the ultimate achievement of the educational goals, be they local or national (Sallis, 1996). In contribution to this view, (Pasiey,

1981), defined educational management as, the process of relating resources to the objectives required in organizations which explicitly exist to provide education. The educational administrator with the educational philosophy therefore attaches considerable significance to a universal standard of performance of basic skills subjects. The recruitment of staff, motivation of staff, acquisition of the needed educational materials and execution of effectively planned learning outcomes determine to a large extent how effective management is (Bush, 1986). Bush further says that effective management results in how all these constituents are directed to the ultimate aim of education. He concludes that educational administration is not an issue of what is needed in education but how it is harnessed and directed towards educational goals. In a similar vein, Sallis (1996) explains that for effective educational management, there is the need for good leadership. As Gyang (2001) points out, a leader is one who looks for individually as well as group departure from criterion, of mastery, which has been set. Also, according to Pierce and Newstrom (2000), a leader is an individual who is capable of taking ambiguous situations, interpreting the situation, presenting them clearly for the follower to understand and suggest ideas in order to move forward. He takes charge and guides the performance of an organization.

Sallis (1977), identified weakness to institute both corrective and preventive measures, to search and eliminate institutional obstacles to student learning and productivity as challenges to effective educational management. Since education is all about learning and effective learning is all about effective educational management, educational management is the key to education in

general. This means that if educational management is not taken care of effectively, management will not make substantial contribution to quality in education. This is why Houston (1999) cautions that management effectiveness can only occur when there is effective leadership. To him management effectiveness requirements of today are not the same as in the traditional preparation programmes. For effective management of today, Houston asserts that today's leaders need to move away from their focus of the B'S (Budget, Buses, Books, Bounds and Building) to C'S (Communication, Collaboration and Community building). This means that the quality of programmes in education is a function of effective educational management. In support of this view, Bush (1986) asserts that school management is essential since it affects the future opportunities of its products.

The overall responsibility of management can be seen as the attainment of the given objectives of the organization. Objectives are therefore the desired end result the organization (School) is striving to achieve. Clarification of education objectives and policy is a prerequisite if the process of educational management is to be effective. It should however be noted that management is not homogeneous. It takes place in different ways at different levels of the organization (Mullins, 1996).

Though the subject of educational management may sound new, it is as old as the human race in the 20th century, educational management meant more than just the outcomes of policies or aims of education. It entailed the systematic study of educational administration. This therefore brings to the fore suggestions by

Fayol as cited in Amuzu-Kpeglo (2005) that the administrative process includes the element of planning, organization, commanding, coordinating and controlling all activities relevant to the learning process. He also complements these by outlining a set of management principles which will help in the process of administration. He enumerated these as; Division of labour; Authority and responsibility; Discipline; Unity of command; Unity of direction; Subordination of individual interest; Remuneration of personnel; Centralization ; Scalar chain; Order; Equity; Stability of tenure of personnel; Initiatives; and Team work (Esprit de corps).

However, Fayol emphasized that these principles must be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances. He also recognized that there were no limits to the principles of management but advocated the above. These views according to Amuzu-Kpeglo (2005) have gained a lot of favour from theorists such as Gulick and Urwick.

Management of an organization such as the school should concern itself with all the activities of the organization and must be undertaken at all levels. Management is not a separate discrete function. It cannot be departmentalized or centralized. In support of this view Mullins (1996) describes management as a process common to all other function carried out within the organization. It is essentially an integrating activity, According to him the overall responsibility of management can be seen as the attainment of the given objectives of the organization. Objectives are the end-result the organization (school) should strive

to achieve. Clarification of educational objectives and policies is therefore a prerequisite if the process of management is to be effective (Everard, 1986).

Education Management and Educational Administration Compared.

The concept educational management is inter-changeably used with educational administration. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defined administration as management. But are these terms really the same? Even though the two terms are related, many schools of thought have tried to distinguish between them.

Amuzu-Kpeglo (2005), citing Treworth and Newport defined management as a process of planning, organizing, actuating and controlling organization operations in order to achieve co-ordination of human and material resource necessary in the effective and efficient attainment of objectives. In the same vein Gibson et al (1976) perceive it as a set of activities which can be classified as concerned with planning, organizing or controlling.

Administration on the other hand has been viewed by Duodu (2001) as the activity that maintains an organization and concerns itself with the direction of the activities of people working within the organization in their reciprocal relations aiming at the achievement of organization goals. Miewald (1978) on his part describes administration as the means by which formal goals are achieved through cooperative effort. In a more formal and comprehensive sense Educational administration is a specialized set of organizational functions whose primary purpose are to insure the efficient and effective delivery of relevant educational

services as well as implementation of legislative policies through planning, decision making, and leadership behavior that keeps the organization focused on predetermined objectives, provides for optimum allocation and most prudent care of resources to insure their most productive uses, stimulates and coordinates professional and other personnel to produce a coherent social system and desirable organizational climate, and facilitates determination of essential changes to satisfy future and emerging needs of students and society (Knezevich, 1984 p.9).

The fact that educational management and educational administration are related cannot be over emphasized since they are both concerned with organization and how they mobilize resources effectively and efficiently to achieve institutional goals. However management is often used to represent top hierarchy which is concerned with formulation of policies while administration deals with the implementation of these policies as part of management (Atta et al, 2000). Management is therefore an umbrella body under administration operation. In other words administration is a subset of management.

Styles of Leadership

Leadership styles are major determiners in successful management of every human institution. In our day to day activities/encounters, we find ourselves exhibiting or experiencing leadership in one way or the other. We can easily find leadership in the world of business, sports, religion and politics and even at home. Different types of leaders exist and you will come in contact with one type or the other over a period of time. The understanding of different leadership styles and

what they can do will help one become a better and more effective leader Williger (2008).

The renowned psychologist Kurt Lewin, cited in Wikipedia (1/4/2008), identified the basic styles of leadership in operation. Though three main styles of leadership have been established, types which are more specific came to light since that time. The understanding of leaders and managers is therefore crucial when it comes to management of institutions. Leaders are always in positions of management but not all managers are leaders. Good leaders tend to use a style or combination of styles that seems effective with situations as they occur.

Democratic Leadership

Democratic leadership is a leadership style that is participatory and it is the most effective form of leadership. Employees and team members will feel in control of their work and when they are involved in decision making process which leads to a greater sense of satisfaction and a better feeling of being appreciated. The leader however has the final say in everything. This style has the following characteristics:

- (i) Leader acts as a guide, accepting suggestions and decisions unanimously taken by the team.
- (ii) The team is part of the entire process.
- (iii) Can lead to problems because the final decision is held back by wide range of opinions.
- (iv) Team members become more committed because they are involved in decision making process.

- (v) It tends to benefit everyone who is involved and helps improve their skills.

Autocratic Leadership

This is a dictatorial type of leadership where a single person takes the entire decisions of the organization. Expectations are always clear. This type of leadership can cause the most discontent in any organization. It is rarely demonstrated but can be used for the completion of routine or unskilled tasks. It is characterized by the following:

- (i) Tasks, procedure and time of completing routines are under the direction and responsibility of the leader.
- (ii) Produces quick decisions and saves time.
- (iii) This approach does not encourage initiative. You do what you are told. This means obedience of instructions is mandatory.
- (iv) Can be appropriate when a group or members has no knowledge of the practice or the procedure.
- (v) It usually works when there is hardly any need for input or when input would hardly affect the decision or outcome.

Delegative/Free Reign

A leader cannot bear the burdens of the organization alone. A leader must learn to organize his priorities and delegate tasks decisions to others while taking the final responsibility.

- (i) This is appropriate when the team or members of the team know a lot more about the subject in question. Highly motivated and well trained people work best with this style.
- (ii) Minimal in direction.
- (iii) Allow decision making by team members.

Starling (2002), citing Reddin (1987) using various combinations of two kinds of behaviour-task and relationship summed the leadership styles as;

1. Supporting, or human relations, style-This manager has less than average task orientation and more than average relationship orientation.
2. Coaching, or participative, style-This manager has more than average task orientation and more than average relationship orientation.
3. Delegating, or laissez-faire (“hands off”), style-This manager has less than average task orientation and less than average relationship orientation.
4. Directing, or autocratic, style-This manager has more than average task orientation and less than average relationship orientation.

Starling however emphasized that, the effectiveness of managers depends on whether the style they use is appropriate for their situation. More specifically, to know what is the appropriate style, managers must look to the culture or climate of their organizations; to the nature of the work performed; to the styles, expectations, and maturity of their superiors, subordinates, and coworkers. All these factors help determine which style is effective and which styles are less so (p.328).

Resource Management in Educational Institutions

Man is the most helpless of animals, but this very biological weakness is the basis of his strength, the prime cause of his specifically human qualities (Fromm (1948). Learning is however, not just a psychological process that happens in splendid isolation from the world in which the learner lives, but it is intimately related to the world and affected by it (Woodruff, 1968). The human being can therefore be considered as a learning creature par excellence. However, whatever forms this learning takes there is the need for some “Tools” (Karl & Foltz, 1965).

This brings to the fore the importance of learning or education resources. In education, resources range from human resource through material resource to financial resource. In educational management, in the school system, the management of these resources is a major component of effective educational management. According to Everard (1987), for any organization to remain effective and indeed survive, there is the need to harness and manage effectively the needed resources. This brings into focus the responsibility of the administrator. This is because the educational administrator is called upon to give an account of his stewardship from time to time to justify his continuous occupation of that position.

The headteacher and his staff and the students form human resource, the teaching and learning material – the resource and the money from the taxpayer which is used to pay the teachers, provide infrastructure and fund education programmes constitute the financial resources. The effective management of all

these is what makes an effective school system. According to Everard (1987), such a situation becomes an issue of cost and effectiveness involved in pursuing a quality-oriented educational environment.

Education resources therefore form the bases of effective school systems. This view has been supported by Birdsall (1989) and a World Bank Report (1986) about the serious equity and efficiency problems and the way these problems affect schooling in most developing countries. Lockheed and Verspoor (1991), in their view contend that since education is so crucial to socio-economic development, it deserve high priority in the acquisition and distribution of the needed resources. The teacher needs to get good training, which should receive periodic updating. It is just not any kind of resource that will do the trick. According to Adentwi (2002), the quality of a nation's education system cannot be better than the caliber of teachers employed in its classrooms. This is often seen as the responsibility of central government; however, there is the need for the sector ministry and even heads to be involved. This notwithstanding, teacher recruitment and retention is also another area that can affect educational management. Castetter (1991) has noted that the recruitment of teachers is no longer a seasonal affair but a year-round affair for many institutions. As in the case of other purposeful organizations, educational institutions are required to make fresh recruitment regularly because of the need to hire teachers to:

- (a) Take up vacancies resulting from large school intake and expansion;
- (b) Replace teachers leaving the school as a result of Retirement, Resignations, Dismissals, deaths and other kinds of employee separations;

- (c) Replace teachers who seek greener pastures in better remunerated jobs and other countries; and
- (d) Fill in vacancies resulting from chain of transfers, promotions and study leave.

Rebore (1982) has observed that in the United States, the recruitment function is often neglected in school districts because of a large number of unsolicited applications from college graduates who continually contact districts in search of teaching appointments. In Ghana, however, the districts education offices and heads often employ teachers without subjecting them to selections, interviews, tests and the like because prospective teachers graduating from the college are treated, more or less as members of the Ghana Education Service. This usually compromises quality for quantity (Adentwi, 2002). It is one thing recruiting these teachers and another retaining them. This is basically as a result of the remuneration of the teachers and more as an issue of society's perception of the profession. As Antwi (1992) has pointed out, teaching as a career appears to have very low power to attract high caliber personnel globally relative to other jobs requiring similar qualifications. The micro factors are yet other disincentives that pose as a problem to teacher retention. Since there is no job satisfaction; it becomes difficult to retain teachers who have other alternative jobs. This situation is peculiar to several countries. Lockheed and Verspoor (1991) revealed that, in countries such as Haiti and Korea teaching is viewed as a transitory occupation. They stated that the attrition rate in such countries ranges from 5 to 10 percent.

Another area of concern is teaching and learning resources. Lockheed and Verspoor (1991) posit that to improve learning, resources must be distributed wisely and managed effectively. According to Aggarwal (1996), quality teaching, also known as effective teaching is the chief instrument of quality education. However, this cannot happen in the absence of needed teaching and learning resources. This was one of the key reasons for the establishment of the science resources centers to promote the effective studying of science. The effective management of all these resources and the effective management of time are key to effective quality education (Landers & Myers, 1977).

Functions of the Headteacher

In order to be effective in educational management, management in education practices must be of good quality. Common causes to failure are numerous but the leading cause is insufficient staff development especially the head of the institution who is usually promoted to the position by virtue of long service. The head of the school who happens to be the leader of the school should be one who takes the position on competence and not by virtue of long service. Halpin (1996) reveals in a research conducted, that there are two sets of behaviours associated with effective leadership. The first set “initiating structure”, refers to leaders’ behaviour in delineating the relationship between the leader and the members of the work group and in endeavouring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedures. The second set Halpin terms “consideration”, involves the expression of friendship, mutual trust, respect and certain warmth between the leader and the

group. Halpin's concept of leadership stresses that the head who wishes to be leader must engage in both types of behavior in order to meet the achievement goals of the school, while maintaining positive and satisfying relationships with others.

The behaviour approach involves the "style" the head uses in dealing with subordinates. Many different labels have been generated to describe essentially two types of leadership: task oriented and person oriented. It is worth noting that while considerate behavior by heads did generally lead to increased satisfaction, the converse is not necessarily the case. Equivocal and sometimes negative result (Stogdill, 1974) indicated that this normative approach was not the answer in all situations.

Researches such as a study done by Blake and Mouton cited by Hackman & Richard (1993) argued that an effective head must be high on structuring and high on consideration. The finding did not however clearly conform to the normative prescription (e.g. by Larson, Hunt & Osborn, 1975). Citing Hill Hughes, Hackman & Richard (1993) reveal that there is evidence suggesting that leaders change their behaviours in response to situational conditions and to subordinates behaviour. In the case of the school head, they are not perceived by subordinates as having one particular style nor do they treat all subordinates the same way.

Early studies indicated that neither personal characteristics nor leadership styles could predict leadership effectiveness across situations. The school head may find it difficult to develop among his staff the feeling of cohesiveness and collaborative effort that facilitates productivity (Pascal and Robbins 1989).

Snowden and Gorton (1993), citing Johnson and Johnson, argue that the key developing interactive and cohesiveness in a group is the development and maintenance of a high level of trust among the members of the group. This can be entrenched the more if the school head realizes that not all leadership functions are to be performed by him.

The head's leadership behaviour should also reveal that he is much aware of the axiom that a vision without a strategy is an illusion and as such the school's culture should be strongly emphasized. Robbins and Alry (1995), citing Schein, contend that effective leadership must be both administrative and cultural in scope. Beare et al (1994) contend that the school head should realize that aims inspire hard work and focus effort; objectives translate the aims into achievable activities. Together they provide education for all school activity.

In the view of McConnell, as captured in Pascal and Robbins (1998), the headteacher must be a mixture of a manager and a leader. He or she must have his/her systems, there in lies the management role. However, the leadership role is very important, one has to be aware of the issues (the key issues). These are the quality teaching and learning that goes on within schools. There is very urgent need for the teacher for that matter the head to have a clear understanding of the issues relevant to quality in education and clear knowledge of how to implement effective systems. Leadership of the head, even though very important should not supersede the management team as a whole. A co-operation between the head and his management team (teachers) is a prerequisite to effective management.

A headteacher has to make the best of every member of staff and the appropriate way of achieving that is to take them on board with you. She or he may possibly lose many battles before winning the war. It is necessary for the headteacher to get interested in knowing his staff members and their problems in the work. At certain times the headteacher needs to give up hope to be given back. The headteacher must try to win his management team round by first giving them what they need before demanding what his school needs (Pascal & Robbins, 1998). For a headteacher to get his staff to work along side with him, he must listen and respect the views of the team. It must be noted that every member of the team is of equal value. The team members do not work for the head but working with him. This gives a true meaning of a team. Even though the head should be responsible for decision taken about the school, the team members should have a major say.

Effective management should as much as possible learn to create conditions which call for others to be empowered to express, develop and act on their reservoir of untapped abilities at work. The headteacher must acquire the skills of being a “green-fingered leader”-having the ability to grow people. He or she should be like a master gardener who knows the soil and the plant that will grow on it. Effective managers ought to be conversant with the conditions that can be created to enable people learn to develop and grow and make the best out of themselves and their abilities (Bailey, 1995).

If headteachers really want to perform their administrative functions to the maximum they must possess certain qualities. There is however not one way of achieving organizational goals. Some qualities perhaps might have been exhibited by some role models and yielded good results and for that matter headteachers try to emulate them. Because every individual has his or her conceptions and perceptions about leadership, qualities needed for managing institutions may be varied and numerous. Burgoyne (1976) in a study of management of organizations outlined the following qualities as having yielded positive results when adopted by some managers:

- i) Command of basic facts: the headteacher is expected to be knowledgeable in his field of work. He should be able to remember issues and be in the position to explain basic facts to his staff.
- ii) Relevant professional understanding: the headteacher can demonstrate this by having a feel for management and capable of commanding respect from both teachers and pupils. He should also have a deep concern and care about education of children.
- iii) Continuing sensitivity to events: He should have a good foresight of the future. He must be a smart personality, who can easily identify weaknesses in the work process to caution members of staff who are not pulling. He should ensure clear aims are set and activities carried to achieve the aims. All activities must be monitored by him.

- iv) Analytical problem solving, decision-making skills: A good administrator knows how best to organize personnel and manage his own time. He should be the type who delegates authority up or down at the right time. As much as possible he should be good at detailed thinking asking questions, decisive in control and having a sense of balance. He must be a good devils advocate.
- v) Social skills and abilities: This demand the ability to deal with work with individuals in a fair and firm manner. It calls for openness, ability to listen to people and accepting their ideas where necessary, ability to handle conflicts diplomatically and exhibiting interpersonal skills(Burgoyne, 1976, p98)

In addition to these, Burgoyne suggested exhibition of these qualities to help transform institutions positively: These are emotional resilience, inclination to respond purposefully to events, creativity, mental ability, and balance learning habits. It should however be noted that there is no one clear-cut quality which is said to be effective in achieving organizational goals. The headteacher should try as much as possible to build most of these qualities and integrate them in his administration.

Factors influencing Students Performance

Students would not benefit from a system of education unless there is some form of evaluation aimed at determining students' performance. This is one of the purposes of schooling. Examination and testing provide one objective measurement of student attainment. Qualities like social, emotional and physical

development other than academic performance must also be developed in students and assessed (Hoy & Hannum, 1997). In a study conducted by Hoy and Hannum (1997), a health metaphor was used to conceptualize and measure important aspects of school climate and examine relationship between school health and students achievement in reading, writing and mathematics in a sample of middle schools. It was found that organizational health was significantly related to student achievement when socio-economic status of the school was controlled.

In other studies by Brookover, Bready, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979), and Bossent (1988), on organization climate and student performance, it was evident that student performance was linked to school climate. School health is positively associated with both school effectiveness and students achievement, which are both end products of effective school management (Hoy, et al 1991). The single test organization health predictor of student achievement is academic emphasis. A school with an orderly and serious learning environment, with teachers who set high but achievable goals, and with students who work hard and respect others who do well academically, have higher levels of students achievement. Learning is a key factor in determining students' performance. It has to do with how prepared the students is to learn and the conditions under which he learns. According to Lockheed and Verspoor (1991), learning is greatly determined by four factors of school input and process which are; Curriculum, instructional materials, learning time, quality teaching and children's teachability.

Summary

Chapter Two provided information on five main issues. These are the concept of management; styles of leadership; resource management in institutions; factors influencing student performance; and functions of the headteacher. The information from these key areas guided the research questions. Information from these major issues enriched the data collected for this study and provided opportunities to fill in gaps in knowledge about how headteachers are performing in terms of their leadership styles and practices in the administration of schools in the study area.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the methods used in collecting data and respondents for the study. It specifically devotes itself to the following areas: Research design; Accessible population; sampling techniques; Instrument; Data collection procedure and Data analysis procedure.

Research Design

The research is a descriptive survey in which views on the leadership styles of heads of public basic schools were sampled. Fraenkel and Wallen 2000 described the descriptive survey as a research that attempts to describe existing situations. Macmillan (1996) also contributes to this by describing a descriptive research as a type in which the researcher describes existing phenomena without changing some condition to affect participant's responses. It presents issues the way they are, what prevails and what has been.

In relation to this study, there is a general perception that the leadership style of a school administrator can influence the performance of the school either negatively or positively. This is in agreement with descriptive research which describes existing phenomena without changing some conditions to affect participant's responses.

Population

The target population for the study was all professional teachers and headteachers in the public basic schools in the Bosomtwe Awima Kwanwoma District in the Ashanti Region whose performance was said to be either high or low. There were ten such schools in the District-seven high performing schools and three low performing schools.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

A sample of 60 respondents comprising 10 headteachers and 50 teachers was selected from 10 schools whose performance was described as high or low in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwawoma District. This was based on the information given by the District Director on performance of the schools. Views were sampled from seven schools that were said to be performing satisfactorily and three other schools whose performance was below expectation. These categories were arrived at based on the performance of the schools in the Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE) for 2008 where seven schools scored 100% and some other three scored below 35%. Five teachers from each of the categories of schools were randomly selected. All the headteachers from the two categories of schools-high achieving schools and low achieving schools were purposively sampled.

Research Instrument

Two sets of questionnaires made up of closed and open- ended items were distributed to respondents. The questionnaires contained 20 items. This was made up of 15 closed ended questions and 5 open- ended questions each for the two sets. The questionnaires were scrutinized by the supervisor of this research to ensure its face validity. To improve content validity of the instrument, the researcher ensured that the questionnaires were within the scope of the research questions. Clear deliberations and explanations were also given on the purpose of the study to help achieve reliability of the findings. A breakdown of the number of respondents was as follows: 28 out of the 35 questionnaires administered to teachers from selected high achieving schools were retrieved. Twelve questionnaires out of 15 administered to selected low achieving schools were also retrieved. All the 10 copies of the questionnaire distributed to headteachers of both high and low achieving schools which were made up of seven headteachers and three headteachers respectively were retrieved. However, seven out of the 35 copies of questionnaire administered to teachers in high achieving schools were not retrieved. Three out of the fifteen questionnaires administered to low achieving schools were not also retrieved.

Pilot- testing of Instrument

A pilot test of the instrument was carried out in Bosomtwe Atwima Kwawoma District of the Ashanti Region in an attempt to detect any faults in the survey instrument for the actual study. The study was done between Januarys and

February 2009. Krobo-Odumasi Methodist cluster of basic schools, though in another district of the Ashanti Region, yet it had a lot of commonalities with basic schools in Bosomtwe-Atwima-Kwawoma District. The questionnaires were therefore distributed to 10 selected teachers and 4 headteachers of these schools on trial bases, who answered and returned them to me within two days. To ensure validity their responses were pre-tested to show that the variables under the items were not of ambiguity. The responses generally satisfied the purpose of the study. The Cronbach coefficient alpha for the instrument was .81, showing that it was internally consistent. A few abnormalities including asking teachers and headteachers whether they discussed how the school imprest should be used did not seem appropriate. These abnormalities were detected and the question was reframed to rather capture the “Capitation Grant”.

Data collection Procedure

An introductory letter was presented to the District Director of Bosomtwe Atwima Kwawoma District Education Office to seek permission to carry out the research in his jurisdiction. The circuit supervisor for Twedie was detailed to assist me with the information I needed about the schools. The categories of the schools based on performance were received from his outfit. These consisted of seven schools which scored 100% and another three schools which scored below 35% based on the analysis of the 2008 Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE) results. I distributed the questionnaires personally to the respondents at their schools during break periods. The questionnaires were accompanied with the research topic. I presented a copy of an introductory letter from my department to

each of the head teachers in order to gain their acceptance and readiness to provide the necessary information. The respondents were given a period of one week to answer the questionnaires and I followed up in the second week to retrieve the questionnaires.

Data Analysis Procedure

The responses to the items were analyzed and summarized in tabular form and discussed in relation to the research questions. Questionnaires were serially numbered for easy identification of each item and were finally scored and tabulated. Items on the five/four- point likert- type scale respectively were scored by assigning one to each of the levels “of very great importance” of great importance” of some importance” “of little importance”, unimportant” and “very often”; “often”, “not often”, “not at all” whenever the level was chosen by a respondent. Then the total score for each level was computed on them. The open-ended items were categorized given mutually exclusive codes after the questionnaire had been retrieved. The main tools of analysis were descriptive statistics. The data collected were statistically analyzed using Statistical Product for Services Solutions (SPSS) software. Data were summarized in tables according to the requirement of the research questions.

The data were analysed in two separate dimensions. Views of teachers from both high and low achieving schools were presented on one hand and that of head teachers of the same categories on the other hand. The data were analyzed under the following research questions:

- i. Leadership styles headteachers adapt in their administration
- ii. Influence of personal qualities and academic qualifications of headteachers in school management.
- iii Management of school resources

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the study and discusses them. The results and interpretation are derived from the analysis of the questionnaire and observation data. The purpose of this research was to find out what management styles were exhibited by heads in basic schools in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwawoma District. To achieve this, a questionnaire was designed, piloted and finally administered based on the objective of finding out the managerial styles/practices heads exhibited in public basic schools in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwawoma District. There was 80% response to this study. Data were gathered on the following:

- i. Leadership styles headteachers adapt in their administration
- ii. Influence of personal qualities and academic qualifications of headteachers in school management
- iii. Management of school resources

Views of Teachers

Research Question One: What are the leadership styles used by heads in their administration? Which one(s) yield(s) good results?

Questionnaire relating to leadership styles intended to give teachers the chance to express themselves openly with their views concerning the leadership

styles and the behaviours their headteachers adopt in the administration of the schools and their own suggestions. Their views were compiled and analyzed under common/similar responses concerning leadership styles of their headteachers. The following indicators came out: Democratic, autocratic, laissez faire and situational leadership styles.

Tables 1 and 2, respectively, presents a summary of views from teachers relating to leadership styles of their heads and respondents preferred styles.

Table 1

Leadership styles of Headteachers

	Responses High achieving schools	%	Low achieving	Percentage
Democratic	10	35.7	4	33.3
Situational	12	42.8	2	16.6
Autocratic	6	21.4	5	41.6
Laissez faire	0	0	1	8.3

In line with the leadership styles headteachers adopt, teachers had this to a total of 28 and 12 from high achieving schools and low achieving schools respectively answered this question. There was therefore an 80% response to this question from both categories. Ten (35.7%) teachers from high achieving schools described their headteacher as democratic leaders. This they indicated by saying that, their headteachers involved them in decision making concerning the school most of the time. They also said their headteachers listened to their views on matters concerning the school before implementing the most preferred ones which

are unanimously accepted. In addition they indicated that their heads held regular staff meetings to discuss issues concerning the school with them.

Again the teachers admitted that their headteachers delegated some duties to teachers to perform to help in the smooth running of the schools. This confirms the suggestion by Pascal and Robbins (1998) that, as a headteacher you have to make the best of every member of staff and the appropriate way of achieving that is to take them on board with you. To do this the headteacher has to listen and respect the views of his staff because they make up the team with him. Four teachers representing 33.3% from low achieving schools also supported their colleagues from the other category by sharing similar and in most cases the same views with them. Six teachers representing 21.4% from high achieving schools indicated that their headteachers were autocratic headers. To this group of teachers their headteachers imposed decisions on them. They said their headteachers did not allow their voices to be heard. It was also revealed that their heads get angry when they countered their decisions. They added that anytime they countered decisions of their heads they were served with queries. They also complained that their heads were not opened to teachers and for that matter there was not free flow of information. Five teachers from low achieving schools representing 41.6 also described their heads as autocratic leaders by using labels such as; secretive, bossy, imposing, victimizing and dictating to describe them. They further stated that working under such head teachers was characterized with fear, anger and boredom since tension gets high at the least provocation.

Twelve teachers (42.8%) from high achieving schools described their headteachers as situational leaders. To them their heads do not stick to one style of leadership in the administration process. They revealed that a situation in time determines the approach and style their headteachers use. They explained that though some leadership styles like autocracy and laissez faire are sometimes condemned, there are situations or behaviors which may call for their use. They say headteachers adapt situational style of leadership because sometimes staff members take advantage of particular styles they identify the heads with, and disorganize the management process. Six teachers from low achieving schools of a percentage of 50 argued in line with their counterparts from high achieving schools by also describing the head teachers as situational leaders with similar reasons. These views of the teachers go to confirm what Hackman et al (1983) said that, leaders change their behaviours in response to situational conditions and to subordinates behaviours. Hill (1973) also backed this by stating that school heads are not perceived by subordinates as having “one” style nor do they treat all subordinates the same way.

None of the teachers from high achieving schools described their headteachers as practising laissez faire. However, one teacher from low achieving schools 8.3% stated that his head teacher practices liassez faire. He said his head teacher was neither strict nor loose. He gives them duties to perform but with no or little supervision. He does not gave them strict instructions and did not impose any of his decisions on them. He did him as having an attitude of “everybody for himself, God for us all”.

Table 2

Preferred Leadership Styles of Headteachers

Responses	High achieving Schools	%	Low achieving School	%
Democratic	13	46.4	6	50
Autocracy	2	7.1	3	25
Situational	12	42.8	2	16.6
Laissez faire	1	3.5	1	8.3

Concerning the leadership styles subordinates would have preferred, 13 teachers (46.4%) indicated they preferred democratic leadership while 6 (50%) respondents from low achieving schools supported this view. Two (7.1%) and 3 (25%) from both categories respectively confessed they are comfortable with autocracy. Twelve teachers representing 42.8% declared they wanted their heads to be situational leaders. Two of their counterparts from low achieving schools (16.6%) also backed this view. One teacher each from both categories of schools (3.5%) and (8.3%) respectively confessed they would have liked their heads to be laissez faire leaders.

Research Question Two: How are the personal qualities of headteachers influencing school management?

The rationale of this research question seeks to find out how the personal attributes of headteachers can affect the smooth running of a school. Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 presents a summary and discussion of views by teachers on this issue.

Table 3
Teaching for more than Ten Years

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Of very great importance	11	41	8	67
Of great importance	8	30	2	7
Of some importance	6	22	0	0
Of little importance	2	7	2	17
Unimportant	0	0	0	0

With regard to teaching for over ten years before headship, 11 teachers out of a total number of 26 teachers from high achieving schools making up a percentage of 41 accepted that it was of very great importance. Eight teachers out of a total of 12 from low achieving schools representing 67% also shared the view that staying in the service for more than ten years before headship was of very great importance. Eight and two teachers from both categories representing 30% and 17% respectively stated that it was of great importance for one to teach for a period of more than ten years before gaining headship. Again 6 teachers from high achieving schools representing 22% held the view that teaching for more than ten years was of some importance. None from low achieving schools supported this view. Two teachers each from both categories representing 7% and 17% respectively expressed that teaching for more than ten years was of little importance in choosing a head for a school. However, no teacher from both sides considered it as unimportant. All the teachers recognized the need to gain experience by the number of years served before one is given the mantle of

headship. To teachers in low achieving schools this need was strongly appreciated. They backed this by the saying “experience is the best teacher. It must be noted however that experience does not necessarily come out of long service. Even though it contributes to some extent, it is not totally a determining factor.

Table 4
Neatness in Appearance

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Of very great importance	18	64	8	67
Of great importance	8	30	2	17
Of some importance	2	7	2	17
Of little importance	0	0	0	0
Unimportant	0	0	0	0

As illustrated in the table 6, out of a total of 28 and 12 teachers from high and low achieving schools respectively, 18 (64.%) and 8(67%) teachers from the two categories of schools respectively stated that neatness of a head was of very great importance in school management. Again 8 teachers representing 30% from high achieving schools and 2(17%) from low achieving schools stated that the neatness of a school head was of great importance in school management while 2 teachers each from the two categories of schools representing 7% and 17% respectively indicated that neatness in appearance was of some importance. None of the teachers from both categories stated that it was of little importance and unimportant.

From the responses, the teachers generally considered neatness as a major factor in school management. On the whole 94.2% of respondents from high achieving schools ranked the importance of this issue high by stating “of very great importance and “of great importance”. Eighty- four percent (84%) of respondents from low achieving schools supported their counterparts from the other category. Seven percent (7%) of respondents from high achieving schools rated the importance of this issue minimal by stating “of some importance. Seventeen (17%) from low achieving schools backed their counterparts by sharing the same view.

Table 5

Having good Physical Health

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Of very great importance	20	71.4	9	75
Of great importance	4	14.3	2	16.7
Of some importance	4	14.3	1	8.3
Of little importance	0	0	0	0
Unimportant	0	0	0	0

On the issue of good physical health, 28 respondents out of 35 from high achieving schools representing 80% answered that question. Twelve respondents from low achieving schools out of 15 respondents representing 80% also answered that question. Twenty respondents from high achieving schools representing 71.4% said the issue was of very great importance. Nine respondents

from low achieving schools representing 75% also said good physical health was of very great importance in school management. Again 4 respondents from high achieving schools representing 14.3% and 2(16.7%) from low achieving schools stated that good physical health was of great importance. Four respondents from high achieving schools representing 14.3% and 1(8.3%) from the other category were of the view that good physical health was of some importance. None of the respondents from both high and low achieving schools saw good physical health as of little importance or unimportant.

From the analysis above it can therefore be deduced that both categories admitted the need for good physical health in school management. Compilation of their views gives an interpretation of 100% acceptance from both categories even though their views vary in degree/ levels of acceptance. The fact that none of the respondents from both categories indicated of little importance or unimportant confirmed that good physical health is a major factor to consider when giving management responsibilities to individuals.

Table 6

Fitness, Firmness and Courage in Facing Issues and Problems

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Of very great importance	26	92.9	9	75.0
Of great importance	2	7.1	2	16.7
Of some importance	0	0	1	8.3
Of little importance	0	0	0	0
Unimportant	0	0	0	0

Out of a total set of 35 questionnaires distributed to high achieving schools 28 respondents representing 80% answered the question relating to fitness, firmness and courage in tackling issues and problems. Also out of 15 respondents, 12(80%) from low achieving schools answered the question.

In the case of the high achieving schools, 26 respondents representing 92.9% stated that the issue of fitness, firmness and courage in facing management problems was of very great importance while 9 respondents from low achieving schools representing 75.0 % supported the idea that the issue in question was of very great importance. Two respondents each from the two categories of schools, representing 7.1% and 16.7% respectively described the issue as of great importance. None of the respondents from high achieving schools rated the issue as of some importance, of little importance and unimportant". However one person from low achieving schools representing 8.3% said the issue was of some importance. None of the respondents from low achieving schools said it was of little importance or of no importance.

Further analysis of this issue revealed the following; 100% of the respondents from high achieving schools gave a high rating of its importance while 91.7% from low achieving schools also gave a high rating of the issue. None of the respondents from both sides saw it as completely unimportant.

Research Question Three: How does the academic qualification of heads and their administrative behaviour aid them to be effective?

This research question sought to find out how the educational achievements and the attitudes of heads towards their subordinates impact on or influence school administration. Table 7 to 12 presents a summary discussion of views in relation to this.

Table 7
Possession of a University Degree

Responses	High achieving Schools	%	Low achieving school	%
Very great importance	14	50	5	41.6
Of very great importance	10	35.7	4	33.3
Of some importance	2	7	3	25.0
Of little importance	2	7	0	0
Unimportant	0	0	0	0

Out of a total number of 35 teachers from high achieving schools and 15 from low achieving schools, a total number of 28 from high achieving schools and 12 from low achieving schools answered this question. Fourteen teachers from high achieving schools representing fifty percent (50%) stated that the possession of university degree in education was of very great importance in school management. Five (41.6%) teachers from low achieving schools share the same view that it was of very great importance. Ten teachers representing 36% also from high achieving schools testified that university degree in education is of

great importance while four teachers from low achieving schools representing 33.3% supported that view. Again two teachers from high achieving schools representing 7% were of the view that university degree in education was only of some importance and 3 (25%) teachers from low achieving schools also shared the same opinion with their colleagues in the other category. Two teachers from high- achieving schools representing 6% and no teacher from low achieving schools stated that university degree was of little importance. None of the respondents from both categories considered it as completely unimportant. From the responses collated from teachers of the two categories of schools, it can be concluded that a university degree especially in education to some extent has a positive influence on school management. Even though few others from the respondents had reservations they did not completely rule out the values of it.

Table 8

Additional training in Educational Administration

Responses	High achieving school		Low achieving school	
	No. of respondents	%	No. of respondents	%
Of very great importance	13	46.4	2	16.6
Of some importance	10	35.7	4	33.3
Of little importance	3	10.7	4	33.3
Of very little importance	2	7	2	16.6
Unimportant	0	0	0	0

On the need for additional training in educational administration, 13 out of a total of 28 teachers from high achieving schools representing 46.4% of the respondents indicated that it was of very great importance. Two (16.6%) teachers from low achieving schools out of 12 said it was of very great importance. Whereas 10 teachers representing 35.7% from high achieving schools said it was of great importance, four teachers representing 33.3% of respondents from low achieving schools said it was of great importance. Three and four teachers from both categories representing 10.7% and 33.3% respectively were of the view that it was of some importance. Two teachers each from the two categories representing 7% and 16.6% respectively held the view that it was of little importance. None of the respondents considered it as unimportance.

From the responses above it can be concluded that the need for additional training in educational administration was appreciated by both categories of teachers in the public schools system. Even though the responses showing the degree of importance vary in rating, the fact that most teachers regarded it necessary cannot be over emphasize

Table 9

Allowing Subordinates to Participate in Decision Making

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Very often	12	42.8	5	41.7
Often	14	50.0	4	3
Not often	2	7.1	3	25.0
Not at all	0	0	0	0

Out of 35 respondents from high achieving schools, 28 teachers answered this question. This gives a percentage of 80. Twelve out of 15 respondents from low achieving schools also representing 80% answered this question. Twelve respondents representing 42.8% from high achieving schools indicated that head teachers involved subordinates in decision making very often while 5 respondents representing 41.7 from low achieving schools also shared the same view. Fourteen respondents representing 50% from high achieving schools stated that head teachers involved subordinates often in decision making concerning the school. Four teachers representing 33.3% from low achieving schools also indicated that head teachers allowed their subordinates to participate in decision making often. However, two respondents representing 7.1% from high achieving schools revealed that subordinate were not often allowed in decision making concerning the school. Three teachers representing 25% from low achieving schools also supported the fact that subordinates are not often allowed in decision making. A detailed analysis of this issue revealed that 92.8% of respondents from high achieving schools rated the issue high by stating “very often and often”. On the part of low achieving schools 75% also ranked it high by indicating same.

Two (7.1%) and 3(25.0%) from high and low achieving schools respectively however rated the issue low by stating “not often”. None of the respondents indicated that the issue was not in practice. These responses further revealed that teachers in high achieving schools were involved in decision making more than those in low achieving schools. It can also be concluded from the analysis that head teachers from both categories did not exhibit this attitude to the fullest

expectation. Thus a 100% acceptance cannot be given to this. Even though the situation was not bad, a little effort needs to be put in by head teachers in this line.

Table 10

Showing Interest in the Personal Welfare of Subordinates

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Very often	9	32.1	4	33.3
Often	13	46.4	5	41.7
Not often	6	21.5	3	25.0
Not at all	0	0	0	0

As to whether headteachers show interest in the personal welfare of subordinates, 9 teachers out of a total of 28 from high achieving schools representing 32.1% indicated headteachers practice this very often. Four respondents from low achieving schools representing 33.3% also stated that this was seen very often. Thirteen respondents representing 46.4% from high achieving schools said this practice was often. Five respondents from low achieving schools representing 41.7% confirmed that this practice was often. Six respondents from high achieving schools representing 21.4 stated that this practice was not often. Three respondents from low achieving schools representing 25% also stated that the practice was not often.

On the whole 78.5% of respondents from high achieving schools confirmed the regularity of the practice by stating “very often” and “often” while 75% of respondents from low achieving schools also confirmed the regularity by indicating “very often” and “often”. However, 21.5% of respondents from high achieving schools demonstrated the feeling of irregularity in this practice while 25% from low achieving schools also indicated the practice is not regular.

The fact that the practice existed in both categories cannot be ruled out. However there appeared to be room for improvement since management has to work in a team. Though the head teachers have not deviated much from the suggestion by Pascal and Robbins (1998) that the head teacher must try to win his management team round by first giving them what they need before demanding what his school needs, it is still necessary that the head teachers get more interested in knowing their staff members and their problems in the work.

Table 11

Promoting Good Relations among Personnel

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Very often	10	37.0	5	41.7
Often	6	22.2	4	33.3
Not often	8	29.6	2	16.7
Not at all	3	11	1	8.3

Out of a total of 35 copies of questionnaire given to high achieving schools, 27 respondents representing 77% gave answers to the question concerning the promotion of good relations among personnel. Twelve out of a total of 15 from low achieving schools representing 80% also answered the question.

Ten respondents from high achieving schools representing 37% indicated their headteachers worked to promote good relations among personnel very often. Five respondents from low achieving schools representing 41.7% also said their headteachers did this very often. Six respondents from high achieving schools representing 22.2% stated that this was practiced often by headteachers. Four respondents from low achieving schools representing 33.3% confirmed that the practice was often. Eight respondents from high achieving schools representing 29.6% were of the view that the practice was not often. Two respondents from low achieving schools representing 16.7% also supported their colleagues in the other category that the practice was not often. Three and one respondents from both categories representing 11.1% and 8.3% respectively indicated headteachers were not demonstrating that practice at all.

These analyses showed that there were some lapses with regard this issue. Compilation of the analyses revealed the following; 59.2% accepted the existence of this practice by stating “very often” and “often”. This percentage is just a little above average. Seventy-five percent from low achieving schools also acknowledged the existence of such a practice. This is a little improvement over the practice in high achieving schools. A percentage of 29 and 16.7 from both

categories stated the practice was irregular while 11.1% and 8.3% also from both categories respectively indicated the practice was not in existence at all.

Table 12

Carefully Analyzing Accepting and Applying suggestions Made by staff and Students

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Very often	8	28.5	3	25
Often	11	39.2	3	25
Not often	9	32.1	4	33.3
Not at all	0	0	2	16.6

With regard to the issue of careful analyzing and application of suggestions put forward by staff and students, 28 and 12 respondents from high and low achieving schools respectively answered this question. This gives an 80% response. Eight respondents (28.5%) from high achieving schools stated that headteachers practised this very often. Three (25%) respondents from low achieving schools also said headteachers practised this very often. Eleven (39.2%) respondents from high achieving schools also stated that the issue is practised often. Three (25%) respondents from low achieving schools also supported that the practice was often. Nine (32.1%) respondents from high achieving schools revealed that this practice was not often given attention by headteachers. Four (33.3%) respondents from low achieving schools backed the view that that practice was not often. Two (16.6%) respondents from low achieving schools stated that the practice is not demonstrated at all.

This means that a total of 19(67.8%) respondents from high achieving schools admitted that heads demonstrate this practice. Six (50%) respondents from the other category also share this view. From these analyses, it can be concluded that the practice existed in both categories of schools. There is however a slide disparity in its level of intensity. While the practice can be graded quite satisfactory in high achieving schools, it is demonstrated averagely in low achieving schools.

Research Question Four: How are available resources of the school used?

The rationale for this research question was to assess the utilization of existing school resources and the involvement of staff in decisions relating to this. Table 13 and 14 presents views concerning this issue.

Management of School Resources

Table 13

Discussing the Strength and use of School Finance

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Very often	3	10.7	2	16.6
Often	8	28.5	5	41.6
Not so often	15	53.5	4	33.3
Not at all	2	7.1	1	8.3

Concerning management of school finance, 28 and 12 respondents from high and low achieving schools respectively gave their responses. Three teachers representing 10.7% stated that their heads discussed the financial stands of their schools with them very often. Two teachers from low achieving schools

confirmed the practice was indeed very often in their schools. Eight (28.5%) teachers from high achieving schools said their heads discussed matters relating to school finance often with them. This was supported by 5 (41.6%) teachers from low achieving schools. However, 15 teachers from high achieving schools representing a percentage of 53.5 claimed that this practice was not so often. Four teachers from low achieving schools representing 33.3% also aligned themselves to the view that the practice was not so often. Two and one teachers from both high and low achieving schools representing 7.1 and 8.3% respectively indicated that the practice was not in existence in their schools at all.

From these analyses, it can be said that some headteachers are not giving much attention to management of school finance as it deserves. Seventeen teachers representing 60.6% from high achieving schools indicated “not often” and “not at all”. Five teachers from low achieving schools representing 41.6% also stated same as their colleagues from the other category. These showed there were some lapses in the practice in the school system.

Table 14
Maintenance and Repair of School Equipment and Infrastructure

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Very often	9	32.1	1	8.3
Often	10	35.7	3	25
Not so often	6	21.4	7	58.3
Not at all	3	10.7	1	8.3

With regards maintenance of school equipment, 6 teachers out of a total of 28 from high achieving schools of a percentage of 32.1 stated that headteachers maintained school equipment and infrastructure very of said his headteacher practiced this very often. Ten teachers again from high achieving schools of a percentage of 35.7 indicated that this practice was often demonstrated by their heads. Three (25%) teachers also from the other category agreed to this opinion. Six teachers representing 21.4% from high achieving schools expressed that maintenance was not often carried out by their heads. Seven teachers (58.3%) from low achieving schools said it was not often done by their heads. Three from high achieving schools and one from low achieving schools representing 10.7 and 8.3 respectively said the practice was not demonstrated at all. On this issue teachers from high achieving schools rated their heads satisfactorily. Sixty-seven percent of teachers rated the performance of their heads on this issue high by indicating “very often” and “often”. About 32 percent of teachers from high achieving schools rated the performance of their heads low by stating “not often” and “not at all”.

However, teachers from low achieving schools rated the performance of their heads on this issue low. About 35 percent indicated “very often” and “often” while about 66 percent indicated “not often” and “not at all”.

Views of Headteachers

Research Question One: What are the leadership styles used by heads in their administration? Which one(s) yield(s) good results?

This aspect of the analyses sought views from headteachers on the leadership styles and practices they adopt in the management of their schools. Table 15 and 16 summarises and discusses this issue,

Table 15

Respondents' views on Leadership Styles.

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
Democratic	3	42.8	2	66.7
Situational	3	42.8	0	0
Autocratic	0	0	0	0
Laissez faire	1	14.2	1	3

In response to how headteachers use leadership/management styles in their administration, the following views came out: Three headteachers representing a percentage of 42.8 from high achieving schools said that they used the democratic style in managing their schools. They explained that democracy in school administration creates a cordial environment for the smooth running of their schools. According to them they do this by involving staff in decision making so that every teacher get the opportunity to share his/her views and

opinions on matters concerning the school. This practice they say, leads to faster solutions to problems which could have taken the head several days if left to decide alone. They demonstrated the significance of democratic leadership using terms like “unity is strength” and “two heads are better than one”.

They also explained that, due to the large numbers in the public school system of late, there is the need to delegate power to subordinates to get involve in some administrative duties. This, they claim they do by giving staff and pupils schedules such as in the areas of sports, disciplinary matters, sanitation, welfare and culture. These headteachers are of the view that knowledge is not vested in one person, and that human who fortunately form part of the team. To this group of headteachers, they feel comfortable involving their staffs in school management because it reduces suspicion and brings sanity in the administration process.

Two headteachers from low achieving schools representing 66.7% supported their colleagues from the other side. They indicated that, all staff members should be given a portion of responsibility in school administration. They believed that this will bring about trust and open mindedness in school management. To them, using democratic leadership in school management creates a peaceful “family” for members to share their problems especially those affecting work.

Three, (42.8%) of headteachers from high achieving schools differed from their colleagues. They confirmed that they were situational leaders, thus they did not stick to a particular style of leadership. This group of headteachers believed that, the human being cannot be predicted. Human behaviours/life styles can change at anytime. It is therefore not safe to have a particular way of dealing with staff. The behaviours they exhibit at a given time should determine how they should be handled. The headteachers disclosed that they use the democratic style when staff members can easily take a unanimous decision without unnecessary delays and stubborn behaviours. In situations where staff is not coping with decision which seemed to be the only alternative option at a particular time, then they use the autocratic style. In this situation they confirmed that they devised an antidote called “do and inform”. They explained that most staff members seek their selfish interest. They refuse to co-operate when decisions are not in their favour. The headteachers cited instances where truant and recalcitrant teachers resist decisions on the need to amend the time table especially when pupils are preparing for external examinations (BECE). They stated these behaviours call for autocratic measures. Their belief is that when matters are handled democratically all the time, staff will abuse the concept (democracy). Beings are created with individual talents and skills. There is therefore the need to tap these gifts of nature from the individuals

However, the heads also realized the need to sometimes leave staff to be on their own. They indicated that they sometimes allow their staff a briefing space to take their own decisions and act on them. According to the heads, they sometimes relaxed their principles in areas of supervision and monitoring to give staff the chance to use their mental abilities and maturity.

These views demonstrate that, the description of headteachers by some of their subordinates as situational leaders is right. No headteacher from low achieving schools approved the use of situational leadership. This contradicts the views of some of their teachers who described them as situational leaders.

One headteacher each from the two categories representing about 14% and 33% respectively indicated that they are Laissez faire leaders. They explained that teachers can differentiate between good and bad because they are matured enough. To them there is no need putting pressure on teachers because, “you can only force a horse to the riverside but you cannot force it to drink water”.

Table 16

Views of Headteachers on their Leadership Practices

This table shows views of respondents on the ratings of headteachers leadership practices. Views were sought from headteachers of high achieving schools and low achieving schools respectively. A total number of seven headteachers from high achieving schools and three from low achieving schools were served and they all answered this question. Three headteachers from high achieving schools representing about forty-two percent (42%) indicated that the issue of supervision and monitoring of staff was very important.

No headteacher from low achieving schools saw this issue as very important. Again three out of the seven headteachers representing about forty – two percent (42%) stated that the issue was “important”. Two headteachers from low achieving schools representing 66.7% also stated the issue was important. One headteacher representing over fourteen percent (14%) of seven headteachers from high achieving schools were of the view that supervision and monitoring of staff is not so important. No teacher from low achieving schools saw it as “not so important”. However zero (0) and one (1) headteacher from high and low achieving schools respectively suggested that this issue was unimportant. These analyses further indicated that 85 percent of headteachers from high achieving schools considered the issue of monitoring and supervision of staff as valuable. They demonstrated this by ticking “very important” and “important”. About 66% of teachers from low achieving schools also recognized the value of monitoring and supervision by supporting their colleagues with same views.

The extent to which headteachers considered engaging qualified personnel to do work revealed the following: Two headteachers representing about 28% out of a total of seven headteachers from high achieving schools said it was very important to consider this issue. One headteacher from low achieving schools representing over 33% supported that it was very important. Three and two headteachers from both high and low achieving schools representing over forty-two and sixty-six percent respectively held the view that it was important. Two headteachers from high achieving schools stated that it was not so important. No headteacher from low achieving schools indicated “not so important”. No headteacher from the two categories described this issue as unimportant.

This shows that about 71% of teachers from high achieving schools regarded the issue of engaging qualified personnel as beneficial. This, they demonstrated by indicating “very important” and “important”. On the other hand, 100% of teachers from low achieving schools considered this issue of having a greater value to school performance. On the issue of organizing regular staff meetings, three head teachers out of seven from high achieving schools representing over 42% indicated that it was very important. One out of three of their colleagues in low achieving schools representing thirty-three percent (33%) supported the view that regular staff meetings were very important.

Four headteachers (4) out of the seven headteachers from high achieving schools saw the issue of having regular staff meetings as important. This gives a percentage of about 57. One out of three headteachers from low achieving schools representing 33.3 % backed his colleagues by also stating that it was important. One headteacher out of a total of three from low achieving schools

representing 33.3% percent described it as unimportant. These results revealed that 100% of heads from high achieving schools rated this issue very important while about 66% of heads from the other category of schools also rated it high.

In assessing the level of importance headteachers attached to their physical presence in some school activities, two headteachers from high achieving schools representing about 28% admitted that it was very important. No headteacher from low achieving schools ranked the issue as very important. Four headteachers and two headteachers from high and low achieving schools representing about 57% & 66% respectively ranked the issue as important. Again one headteacher from both categories of schools representing about fourteen and thirty-three percent respectively stated that this was not so important. No headteacher from the two categories of schools saw it as completely unimportant.

Research Question Two and Three

1. How are the personal qualities of headteachers influencing school management?
2. How does the academic qualifications of heads and their administrative behaviour aid them to be effective?

The rationale for these research questions was to ascertain the contribution of a heads educational achievement, his attitudes towards subordinates and his personality to school management. Table 17 sampled and discusses views pertaining to this.

Table 17

Personal Qualities/Acadamic Qualifications of Headteachers

With regard to the value or contribution of a university degree towards effective management, one headteacher from high achieving schools representing about 14% confessed it was of very great importance. No headteacher confirmed this from the low achieving schools. Two and one headteachers from high and low achieving schools respectively representing about twenty-eight and thirty-three percent held the view that this issue was of great important. Three headteachers representing over 42% from high achieving schools attested that the issue was of some importance. One headteacher from low achieving schools confirmed this. One headteacher each from both categories of schools representing about 14% & 33 % respectively ranked the issue as of little importance.

As to whether teaching for more than ten years influence effective management, respondents indicated these: One headteacher representing about 14% from high achieving schools was of the view that it was of very great importance. Two of his colleague headteachers representing about 66% from low achieving schools supported this by also stating of very great importance. Two headteachers from high achieving schools representing about 28% indicated it was of great importance, while one of their counterparts from low achieving schools representing about 33% backed this view. Three heateachers of a percentage of about 42% from high achieving schools said this issue was of some importance. No headteacher from the other category stated this. One headteacher

from high achieving schools representing about 14% said the issue was of little importance. No headteacher from low achieving schools stated this.

Regarding the importance respondents placed on the need for further training in educational administration, one headteacher from high achieving schools representing about 14% indicated that it was of very great importance. No headteacher from low achieving schools responded to this. Four headteachers from high achieving schools representing a greater percentage of about 57 stated it was of great importance. Two from low achieving schools representing about 66% also stated it was of great importance. Two headteachers from high achieving schools giving a percentage of about 28 said the issue was of some importance, while one headteacher representing about thirty-three percent also said it was of some importance. No headteacher from both categories stated “of little importance and unimportant”.

In relation to good health, four headteachers from high achieving schools representing about fifty-seven percent stated that it was of very great importance in school management. Two headteachers from low achieving schools representing over 66% also stated this issue was of very great importance. Three headteachers from high achieving schools representing about 42% indicated that it was of great importance. One headteacher representing about 33% from low achieving schools also confirmed that it was of great importance. None of the headteachers from both categories rated the issue as “of some importance”, “of little importance” and “unimportant”.

Research Question Four: How are available resources of the school used?

This research question intended to find out how available resources in the schools are managed by heads and how staff members are involved. The summary and discussion of views concerning this are presented in table 18.

Table 18
Discussing the Strength, and Use of School Finance with Staff

Responses	High achieving schools		Low achieving school	
	No of respondents	%	No of respondents	%
a. Very important	1	14.2	1	33.3
b. important	2	28.5	2	66.7
c. not so important	2	28.5	0	0
d. unimportant	2	28.5	0	0

One headteacher out of seven from high achieving schools representing 14.2% stated that the issue was very important. One headteacher out of three from low achieving schools representing about 33% also supported that it was very important. Two headteachers, from high achieving schools, out of seven giving a percentage of 28 saw the discussion of finance with staff as important. Two headteachers representing over 66% from low achieving schools also backed this view. Again two headteachers from high achieving schools representing over twenty-eight percent (28%) described the issue as not so important. None of their colleagues from low achieving schools described it as “not so important”. Two headteachers from high achieving schools indicated it was unimportant. No headteacher from low achieving schools stated unimportant.

Further analysis revealed about 42% acceptance of this practice by heads from high achieving schools. This means the assessment by their teachers was fair when about 61% indicated “not often” and “not at all”. All heads from low achieving schools claimed they are practicing this. The views of the heads from low achieving schools are however contradictory to the way their subordinates described them. This was because only about 58% of the teachers confirmed the practice.

Other Findings

Suggestions to fellow Headteachers and Stakeholders

The headteachers had these suggestions for other headteachers and stakeholders in education to promote effective management of schools:

All the seven headteachers from high achieving schools were of the view that; headteachers and stakeholders should have the interest of the children at heart and work towards achieving the goal for which children are in school. They suggested co-operate responsibility of all stakeholders to ensure effective management of schools. They stressed that all should perform the roles required of them to achieve the goal of education. They suggested that parents should visit the schools to find out the problems and progress of their wards. As a matter of urgency, parents should provide their wards with their basic needs to prepare them well for learning.

Teachers should also be dedicated to their work. Heads should play efficient and effective supervisory and monitoring role where necessary to ensure teaching and learning is on track. The heads also suggested that educational authorities should provide the necessary tools and facilities to create an enabling environment for learning. They stressed on the need for infrastructure, right personnel, instructional materials and good monitoring system. It is their desire that, supervision, be it internal or external takes a clinical dimension in order to assist teachers to bring out their best. In total agreement to their counterparts, the three headteachers from low achieving schools also suggested that, all heads should be open approachable and yet firm in management of their schools. It is their wish that all stakeholders visit the schools and participate in matters pertaining to the schools when the need arises.

They strongly appealed that qualified teachers be posted especially to poorly performing schools. They stated that a number of pupil teachers were in such schools, which in their view did not augur well for good performance.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter provides a summary of the research process and findings and offers recommendations to enhance effective management of schools at the basic education level. Basically this study was to find out those factors that influence managerial effectiveness in public basic schools of the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwanwoma District of the Ashanti Region. The study specifically wanted to find out among other things why some schools are said to be performing satisfactorily while others are lagging behind.

Generally, the study sought answers to four main questions:

1. What are the leadership styles used by heads in their administration? Which one(s) yield good results?
2. How are the personal qualities of headteachers influencing school management?
3. How does the academic qualifications of heads and their administrative behavior aid them to be effective?
4. How are available resources of the school used?

To obtain answers to these questions, data were provided by teachers and headteachers of selected public basic schools of the district. Seven schools which were said to be performing well according to BECE results provided information on one hand, and three other basic schools whose performance were below average according to the same standard on another hand. Two sets of questionnaires were designed each for teachers and headteachers and used to collect the required data for the study. The researcher administered the questionnaire personally and guided respondents on how to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire was retrieved after two weeks.

The instrument of the research was pilot tested to ensure validity and reliability. The responses however satisfied the research study. The same respondents were served with the questionnaire again to ensure reliability. Respondents provided the same information. Few abnormalities were detected and eliminated during the actual study.

Summary of Findings

Teachers' Views

1. Concerning the leadership styles headteachers used in their administration, one-third of the teachers from high achieving schools on one hand and the same percentage of teachers from low achieving schools stated that their heads were democratic leaders. They also said their heads involved them in decision making, organized regular staff meetings, delegated power to subordinates when and where necessary and accepted their views if only they were unanimously agreed on. On the contrary, about one-fifth of

teachers from high achieving schools described the leadership styles of their heads as autocratic while two-fifths of their counterparts from low achieving schools shared the same opinion. To this group, their heads were not opened to staff. They intimidated and victimized staff who countered their views, and all decisions were taken by heads alone.

This claim was denied by heads of high achieving schools except for one who admitted he practiced autocracy.

2. All teachers from both high and low achieving schools who participated in the study indicated that good physical health is a necessary ingredient in school management.
3. Eighty-six percent of teachers from high achieving schools attested that the possession of a University degree is highly necessary. Seventy-five percent of teachers from low achieving schools also shared this view.
4. Eighty-two percent of teachers from high achieving schools considered the need for further training in educational administration highly necessary while 50% from low achieving schools also maintained this fact.
5. Regarding the management of school finance, 39% of teachers from high achieving schools confessed that headteachers involved them in decisions relating to school finance. On the other hand, 58% from low achieving school also admitted this.

6. Sixty-nine percent of teachers from high achieving schools stated that their heads had a maintenance culture. Thirty-three percent of teachers from low achieving schools also said the same.

Views of Headteachers

7. About two-fifths of headteachers from high achieving schools who responded to the study revealed that they were situational leaders. On the other hand, all the heads from low achieving schools who participated in the study objected the use of situational leadership. These heads from high achieving schools believed that human beings cannot be predicted and as such they needed to handle their subordinates according to the behaviours they portray at particular times. Their subordinates also shared the same view.
8. Headteachers from both categories who were respondents to the study could not help but agree totally with their subordinates that good physical health was very necessary in the day to day running of the schools.
9. Headteachers from high and low achieving schools respectively appreciated the need for them to obtain a university degree. Their rating of the issue however was average as compared to their subordinates.
10. The headteachers from both high and low achieving schools rather appreciated the need for further training in Educational administration than just a university degree.
11. While 43% of headteachers from high achieving schools expressed the need to involve teachers in decisions relating to school finance, all the

heads from low achieving schools who participated in the study totally supported this practice but unfortunately they were perceived by their subordinates as not exhibiting a maintenance culture.

12. On suggestions to fellow heads and stakeholders, all the heads were entreating all hands to be on deck, each performing his or her role to realize the goal of education. Heads from low achieving schools especially called for recruitment of qualified teachers in low achieving schools.

Conclusions

1. There were divided opinions regarding the leadership styles heads used however, democratic and situational leadership were predominant in high achieving schools.
2. Most heads of low achieving schools were perceived as democratic leaders.
3. There was a minority of respondents from both categories of schools who believed their heads were autocratic leaders.
4. Both heads and teachers from the two categories of schools recognized the need for positive personal qualities in school administration and these were exhibited.
5. Most heads and teachers from both schools placed value on academic qualification in school management.
6. Management of school resources did not appear to be receiving the necessary attention by heads in both schools.

Recommendations

1. Based on the reasons heads are giving for the leadership styles and principles they used in running the schools, and how they handled school resources, the Ghana Education Service (GES) should organize regular workshops for headteachers especially in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwanwoma District of the Ashanti Region on good management practices to keep them on track. Newly appointed heads especially should be given orientation and regular in-service training so that they will not veer off. Administrators of high achieving schools should be used as resource persons in this direction.

2. High performing schools should be given substantial awards to serve as a motivational factor to do much better and be a source of inspiration to other schools.

3. Every school should be made to set targets and teachers should be motivated by school administrators through acknowledgement of good work by praises, giving token amounts and awards such as certificates to deserving teachers during open days and recommending them for available opportunities. Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) and School Management Committees (SMCs) should assist in providing funds for this purpose. Educational authorities should ensure their representatives follow up to check whether the schools are meeting the targets they set.

4. Even though government has made an effort to solve the accommodation problems of headteachers in remote areas by providing them with quarters,

there are still a lot of schools in this category which have not received this assistance. The government of Ghana should try to cover those areas which have not benefited especially in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwanwoma District. It should also extend this kind of assistance to include the building of teachers' quarters in remote areas to compliment the few existing school resources.

5. To improve the academic status of teachers and headteachers, and to inculcate in them good leadership and administration practices, teachers should be given the chance to upgrade their knowledge in the academic field. The government should increase the grant given to graduate-students to at least cover their fees and course work. The Ghana Education Service should encourage teachers to take up courses on distance and Sandwich bases especially in educational management and related courses at the teachers Universities-University of Cape Coast and University of Education, Winneba. Though the Ministry of Education and the Ghana Education Service approves the distance and sandwich courses of study, there is still resistance on the ground. The district directors of education should relay to the various heads of institutions in their jurisdictions to permit teachers who want to take up these courses to do so within the specified time.

Suggestions for further Research

1. The leadership styles of headmasters in high and low achieving second cycle institutions.
2. A comparative study of management practices of public second cycle institutions and private second cycle institutions.

REFERENCES

- Adentwi, K.I. (2002). *Principles, practices and issues in teacher education*.
Kumasi: Skies Printing Works.
- Aggarwal, J.C (1996). *Principles, methods and techniques* (2nd ed). New Delhi:
Vikas Publishing House Ltd.
- Amuzu-Kpeglo, A. (2005). *Approaches to administrative theory in education*.
Cape Coast: Andimuz Associates Limited.
- Antwi, M.K. (1992). *Education, society and development in Ghana*. Accra:
Unimax publications.
- Atta, E.T., Agyenim-Boateng, E.O., & Baafi-Frimpong, S (2000). Educational
management and Administration. Unpublished pamphlet, University ofCape
Coast.
- Bailey, R. (1995). *How to empower people at work: A guide to becoming a green
fingered Manager*. Didcot: Management Books 2000 Ltd.
- Beare, H., Simpkins, W,S, Thomas, A.R. & Thomas, E.B. (1994). *Creating
excellent schools: Some new management techniques*. London: Routledge.
- Birdsall, N. (1989). *Pragmatism, Robin Hood, and other themes: Good
government and social well-being in developing countries*. Draft report
written for Rockefeller foundation, New York.

- Bothwell, L. (1983). *The art of leadership: Skill-building techniques that produce results*. Englewood cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Bosomtwe-Atwima-Kwanwoma District. Public schools BECE results analysis. Kumasi.
- Brookover, W.B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J. & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School social system and student achievement*. New York: Praeger.
- Burgoyne, J.G. (1976). *Taxonomy of managerial qualities as learning goals for management education and initial testing*. Lancaster: Routledge.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. (1986). *Theories of educational management*. PCP Education Service. Cambridge Conference on African Education (1952).
- Campbell, R., Bridges, F. E. M. & Nystrand, R.O. (1977). *Introduction to educational administration* (5th ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Castetter, W. (1991). *The personnel function in educational administration*. New York: Macmillan Publishing co.
- Duodu, F. (2001). *School administrator*. Accra: Artedu Publication.
- Everard, K.B. (1986). *Developing management in schools* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Freankel, J.R. & Wallen (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed). New York: Mcgraw-Hill Inc.

- Fromm, E. (1948). *Man for himself*. New York: Farrar & Rhineharth.
- Gibson, J. L, Ivancevich, J. M. & Donnelly J H. (1976). *Organisation: Behavior, structure, and processes*. (rev. ed). Dallas, TX: Business Publications.
- Gorton, R.A & Snowden, P.E. (1993). *School leadership and administration*. Madison: Wm. c. Brown communications Inc.
- Gyang, R.A. (2001). *Improving management effectiveness in nursing and midwifery training institutions in Greater Accra Region of Ghana through supervisory visits*. Unpublished M,PhilThesis. University of Cape Coast.
- Hackman, D, & Richard, J. R (1983). *Perspectives on behaviour in organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Halpin, A. W., (Ed) (1958). *Administrative theory of education*. London: Macmillan.
- Harbison, F. & Meyers, C. A. (1964). *Education, manpower, and economic growth*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Houston, P. (1999). *Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) policy brief: Effective leaders for todays schools-Synthesis of policy forum on Educational leadership*. Washington DC. U.S Department of Education.
- Hoy, W.K. & Hannum, J. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33, 290-311.

- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. (4th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Karl, U.S. & Foltz, M.S. (1965). *Cybernetic principles of learning and educational design*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Ltd, Inc.
- Knezevich, S.J (1984). *Administration of public education* (4th ed): A sourcebook for the leadership and management of educational institutions. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki A. (2000). *Organizational behaviour* (5th ed). New York McGraw-Hill/ Irwin
- Landers, T.J & Myers, J. (1977). *Essentials of school management*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.
- Lockheed, M.E. & Verspoor, A.M. (1991). *Improving primary education in developing countries*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Macmillan J.H (1996). *Educational fundamentals for the consumer* (2nd ed). New York: Harper Collins.
- McWilliam, H.O.A. & Kwamena-Poh, M.A. (1975). *Development of education in Ghana*. Hong Kong: Commonwealth Printing Press.
- Mieldwald, R.D. (1978). *Public administration: A critical perspective*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Morphet, E.L. Roe L.J & Theodore L. R. (1959). *Educational administration*. N.J Prince-Hill Inc.

- Mullins, L. J. (1996). *Management and organizational behaviour* (4th ed). London: Pitman Publishing.
- Myers, J. G. (1977). *Essentials of School management*. Philadelphia: W. B Sanders Company.
- Paisey, A. (1981). *Organization management in schools*. Harlow: Longman.
- Pascal, C. & Ribbins, P. (1989). *Understanding primary headteachers*. London: Cassell.
- Pierce, J.L. & Newstrom, J.W. (2000). *Leaders and the leadership process: Readings, self- assessments, and applications* (2nd ed). Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Rebore, R.W. (1982). *Personnel administration in education: A management approach*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Reynolds, D. & Cuttance, P. (1996). *School effectiveness: Research, policy and practice* London: Cassell.
- Robbins, P. & Alvy H. B. (1995). *The principal's companion: Strategies and hints to make the job easier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin press, Inc.
- Sallis, J. (1977). *School managers and governors: Taylor and after*. London: Ward lock educational.
- Sallis, E.J. (1996). *Total quality management in education*. London: Kogan Page.

Starling, G. (2002). *Managing the public sector* (6th ed). Belmont CA:
Wadsworth/Thomson Learning

Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Williger, D. (2008). *Leadership*. Retrieved from
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leadership> on 1/04/2008.

Woodruff, D.S. (1968). *Scientific perspectives and social issues*. (2nd ed).
California: Brooks.

World Bank Policy Study, (1988). *Education in SubSaharan Africa*. Washington
DC:World Bank.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organization* (3rd ed). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
Prentice-Hill, Inc.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON MANAGEMENT STYLES/PRACTICES OF HEADTEACHERS (TEACHERS/SUBORDINATES)

This research is being conducted to find out the management styles/practices headteachers use in the administration of public basic schools in the Bosomtwe Atwima Kwanwoma District of the Ashanti Region of Ghana.

Your contribution on this burning issue will therefore be considered valuable and highly appreciated. But rest assured that the confidentiality of your opinion is secured. Thank you.

SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA

Kindly indicate your response to the following by ticking []

Sex: Male [] Female []

Position: Headteacher [] Class teacher [] Subject teacher []

No. of years in service (experience) : less than 5years [] 5-9years []

10-14years []

15-19years [] 20-24years [] 25-29years [] 30-34years [] 40-44years []

50yeas or more []

SECTION B

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR/STYLES OF HEADTEACHERS

Tick [] any of the letters to show your opinion about the leadership behavior/styles your headteacher use in his administration. Use the options below to answer.

- a. Very often
- b. Often
- c. Not often
- d. Not at all

1 All owing subordinates to participate in decisions

- a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e. []

2. Showing interest in the personal welfare of subordinates

- a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e. []

3. Carefully analyzing, accepting and applying suggestions

- Made by staff and students a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e. []

4. Promoting good relations among the personnel of the School

- a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e. []

5. Engaging qualified staff and supervising the work of subordinates

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

6. Organizing staff meetings a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

SECTION C

PERSONAL QUALITIES AND ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

Tick [\surd] any of the letters below to show your opinion on the influence of personal qualities and academic qualifications of Headteachers in the administration/management of schools.

a- of very great importance

b- of great importance

c- of some importance

d- of little importance

e- unimportant

7. Possession of a university degree

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

8. Additional training in educational administration

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

9. Teaching for more than ten years

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

10. Neatness in appearance

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

11. Being physically and mentally sound

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

12. Fairness, firmness and courage in facing issues

and problems

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

SECTION D

MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOL RESOURCES

How does your head go about the following? Use the following to answer by ticking []

a. very often

b. often

c. not often

d. not at all

13. Discusses with teachers how school capitation should be used

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

14. Ensure maintenance and repair of school equipment and

Infrastructure a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

15. Provides and takes care of instructional materials

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

SECTION E

OPEN QUESTIONS

16. How can you describe the leadership style of your headteacher? Explain your point.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

17. How best do you think teachers can help in the management of school resources?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

18. How does your head involve teachers in the administration of the school?

.....
.....
.....
.....

19 How best do you think a head should use leadership styles/behaviours in the administration of the school? Should he stick to particular ones or vary? Explain your point.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire on management styles/practices of Headteachers

(Views of headteachers)

Tick [] the appropriate response from the options provided

SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA

Sex: Male [] Female: []

Position: Headteacher [] Assistant headteacher []

No. of years in service (experience): Less than 5years []

5-9years [] 10-14years [] 15-19years [] 20-24years []

25-29years [] 30-34years [] 35-39years [] 40-44years []

45 49years [] 50years or more []

Management Styles

1 How can you describe your style of administration?

a. democratic and open []

b. autocratic and closed []

c. situational []

d. laissez faire []

2 How many styles of leadership do you think is/are appropriate?
to be demonstrated in the management process?

- a. One style through out []
- b. Two or more styles []
- c. One style at a time []
- d. The situation determines []

3. Which style of leadership in your opinion is more appropriate
for school management?

- a. democratic and open []
- b. autocratic and closed []
- c. laissez faire []
- d. one which best suits a particular situation at a time []

4. To what extent do you consider the following in the management of your
school? Use these to answer.

- a. very important
- b. important
- c. not so important
- d. unimport

5. Allowing subordinates to participate in decision making

concerning the school a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

6. Organizing staff meetings regularly

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

7. Accepting, carefully analyzing and applying suggestions made by staff and

Students. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

8. Promoting good relations among the personnel of the school

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

9. Showing interest in the personal welfare of staff and students.

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

10. Promoting good school-community relationships

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

11. Supervising and monitoring members of staff to carry out their work

diligently. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

12. Engaging qualified personnel to do work.

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

Management of School Resources

13. Discussing the strengths and use of school finance with staff.

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

14. Being present and participating in some school activities.

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

15. Which of the following do you think the headteacher has a great responsibility to? Tick those you feel are closely related to the head.

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

- a) Discussing with staff school capitation and how it should be administered
- b) Maintenance and repair of school equipment
- c) Provision and care of instructional materials
- d) Rewarding and punishing student and staff

Personal Qualities and Academic Qualifications

16. Tick the options below to show the extent to which in your personal opinion, the academic qualifications and personal qualities stated help to make the headteacher effective.

- a. of very great importance
- b. of great importance
- c. of some importance
- d. of little importance
- e. unimportant

a. Having a university degree. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. []

b. Having taught for more than ten years a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

c. Having received further training in educational administration

a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

- d. Having good physical health. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []
- e. Having sound mental health. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []
- f. Neatness in appearance. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []
- g. Can be trusted in dealing with his/her subordinates.
- h. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []
- i. 8. Courageous in facing problems. a. [] b. [] c. [] d. [] e []

Open Questions

17. In what particular areas do you involve your subordinates in the administration of your school?

.....

.....

.....

.....

18. Explain how best you can use the management/leadership styles with reference to the situation in your school.

.....

.....

.....

.....

19. What is your opinion about delegating responsibilities to staff and students? Explain how you can delegate responsibilities to staff and students respectively.

.....

.....
.....
.....

20 What suggestions can you give to fellow Headteachers and stakeholders in education to promote effective management of basis schools?

.....
.....
.....
.....



APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

Tel. No. : 042-33824
Fax No. : 042-30588
E-mail : ucciepa@yahoo.co.uk

University Post Office
Cape Coast
Ghana

Our Ref: EP/144.8/V.2/74

October 21, 2008

.....
.....
.....
.....

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

The bearer of this letter, **Mary-Magdalene Wompakeah** is a graduate student of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration of the University of Cape Coast. She requires some information from your outfit for the purpose of writing a Dissertation as a requirement of M.Ed degree programme.

We should be grateful if you would kindly allow her to collect the information from your outfit. Kindly give the necessary assistance that she requires to collect the information.

While anticipating your co-operation, we thank you for any help that you may be able to give.

Mr. Y.M. Anhwere
Asst. Registrar

Table 16**Respondents' Ratings of Headteachers Management Practices**

Practice	High Achieving Schools				Low Achieving Schools											
	VI	%	IM	%	NSI	%	UI	%	VI	%	IM	%	NSI	%	UI	%
Supervising and monitoring members of staff to carry out their work diligently	3	42.8	3	42.8	1	14.2	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3
Engaging qualified personnel to do work	2	28.5	3	42.8	2	28.5	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
Organising staff meeting regularly	3	42.8	4	57.1	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0
Being present and participating in some school activities	2	28.5	4	57.1	1	14.2	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0

VI - very important

IM - important

NSI - not so important

UI - unimportant

Table 17

Academic Qualification and Personal Qualities of Headteachers

Respondents' ratings on Headteachers personal qualities and academic Qualifications

Practice	High Achieving Schools										Low Achieving Schools									
	VGI	%	GI	%	SI	%	L	%	U	%	VG	%	G	%	S	%	L	%	U	%
Having a University degree	1	14.2	2	28.5	3	42.8	1	14.2	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0
Having taught for more than ten years	9	14.2	2	28.5	3	42.8	1	14.2	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Having received further training In educational administration	1	14.2	4	57.1	2	28.5	1	14.2	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
Having good physical health	4	57.1	3	42.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0

VGI – of very great importance
 GI – of great importance
 SI – of some importance
 LI – of little importance
 UI - unimportant

