STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF
HEADS OF SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS IN THE CAPE COAST

BETTY E. DJOKOTO

2012
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF HEADS OF SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS IN THE CAPE COAST

BETTY E. DJOKOTO

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

February 2012
DECLARATION

Candidate’s Declaration

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

Candidate’s Signature:………………………………  Date………………………

Name:   Betty Ewuradwoa Djokoto

Supervisor’s Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation 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:  Mr. S. Atakpa
ABSTRACT

In the Cape Coast Municipality, there are single sex senior high schools and co-educational senior high schools. The study set out to investigate how students in the single sex senior high schools perceived the administrative functions of the heads. The purpose was to examine how the heads of the schools played their administrative roles.

The research employed a descriptive survey. Purposive and random sampling techniques were used to draw a sample size of 640 from five single sex senior high schools in the Cape Coast Municipality. For the data collection, the main instrument used was a questionnaire which comprised both open-ended and closed-ended items. The return rate of the retrieval of the questionnaire distributed was 91%.

The major findings of the study indicated that the student perceived heads of single sex senior high schools of the Cape-Coast Municipality to perform their administrative duties to a great extent. Students of the girls’ schools perceived their heads are being more caring in their welfare than the heads of boys’ schools. Also the study revealed that the heads involved the students to some extent in the planning of activities of the school and in the execution of their administrative functions.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Background to Study

Single sex schools have been in existence in Ghana since the inception of formal education in the country. The first schools established in the country by the Portuguese in the castles were for boys only. After some time, the need to establish girls’ schools was also realized. Subsequently, some girls’ schools were also established at the Coast. One of these was Wesley Girls’ High School (the primary division) established in 1836.

Secondary school education started in the country in 1876 with the establishment of Mfanstipim School. It was an all boys’ school so it also marked the beginning of single-sex education in the country. In 1884, the Wesleyan Girls’ School and Training Home (Wesley Girls’ High School) also started the secondary division, thus the oldest girls’ secondary school in the country started as a single sex school. Single-sex secondary schools and for that matter, secondary schools have been in the country for more than 100 years.

In 1951, the Accelerated Development plan of Kwame Nkrumah regime saw the establishment of many co-educational secondary schools. Before 1951, there were 57 secondary schools. Two were government controlled, eleven were government assisted and 44 were unassisted (Antwi, 1992). Of the government assisted secondary schools, four were girls’ schools, namely Wesley Girls’ High
School (Methodist), Aburi Girls’ Secondary School (Presbyterian), Holy Child School (Roman Catholic) and St. Monica’s Secondary School (Anglican).

At the moment, there are 486 secondary (senior high) Schools in the country. Some are single sex schools and the others co-educational schools. In the Cape Coast Municipality where the oldest secondary schools are to be found, five of the eight senior high schools are single sex, namely, Mfantsipim School, Adisadel College, St. Augustine’s College, Holy Child School and Wesley Girls’ High School.

The aim of education is to equip the learners with the necessary knowledge, skills, attitudes and values which will enable them contribute meaningfully to the development of the society in which they live. Education helps to develop the personality of the individual so that he/she can achieve his/her highest potential as a human being. For education to achieve these goals there is the need to have machinery in place. The school as a formal organization provides this machinery. The school as an organization brings together individuals such as students, teachers, school board members and directors of education to work together for the achievement of goals.

There seems to be the general desire for many parents to send their children to single sex senior high schools. This stems from the general perception held that students in single sex schools generally perform well. This perception is deepening in recent times as single sex schools seem to be doing much better academically than the co-educational schools of late. This is evidenced by the
rating of the performance of schools on the SSSCE 2003 published in the newspapers. In the rating, eight of the top ten schools were single sex schools.

In a school system, the one responsible for the arrangement of the human and material resources and programmes in order to achieve the goals of the school is the Headmaster or the Headmistress. He or she has to perform a lot of administrative functions to ensure that the goals of the school are achieved.

Owen (1970) defines administration as working with and through people to achieve organizational goals. Maxwell (2001), describes educational administration as the systematic arrangement of human and material resources and programmes that are available for education and carefully using them within guidelines for enhancing teaching and learning. It is in the playing of this role that questions are often raised concerning the effectiveness of school Heads. According to Maxwell (2001), everything in an organization rises and falls on leadership; “when you see the leader, you see the organization and the single most important factor in determining the climate of an organization is the top executive” (p. 59).

The importance of leadership in the achievement of organizational goals cannot be over-emphasized. It is leadership which brings people and resources together to set organizational goals, decide and take appropriate actions to achieve the goals and make self-assessments as to the effectiveness of performance (Maxwell 2001). It is the human factor that binds a group together and motivates it towards goals. This implies that leadership depends on followership.
In a school organization, there is a Head, the teaching and non-teaching staff, students and other stakeholders who must all work together to achieve the goals of the school. It is necessary for the organization to be properly organized, controlled and administered in order to ensure the type of education desired (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978). In senior high schools, heads have functions such as planning and supervising curriculum, giving instruction and appraisal, recruiting staff and admitting students, managing financial resources and educational inputs and building school-community relationships.

According to Abosi & Brookman-Amissah, (1992), schools are like any other organization found in modern society and like any other organization such as a hospital, an army, a ministry, it relates with its environment. The environment is the complex of values and expectations, which are reflected in the legitimate, and to some extent, conflicting demands that come from parents, professional opinion and educational policy. These demands from the environment of the school have an influence on the operations of the school. The school is thus not an autonomous entity within the society. It is there for the society and the society is therefore quick to react if it is not meeting its expectations.

The Head of the school is therefore confronted with the challenge of ensuring that the school is able to meet the expectations of all its stakeholders to a very large extent. The visibility and cruciality of the education enterprise makes all people think they have a say in it. This is what makes the question of perception important to a school administrator. Another uniqueness of school
administration is the fact that the stakeholders with whom the administrator works are human beings who have emotions, opinions and perceptions, all of which can affect the process and thus the outcome which is seen in the competences and attitudes exhibited by the pupil. This makes the administration of a school quite unique. The very nature of the stakeholders the administrator works with, that is human beings, makes a lot of demands on the process.

Peretomode (1992) observed that the perceived power of the leader determines his ability to influence, persuade and motivate others. Owen (1970) added his voice by describing leadership behavior as being best understood in terms of two specific kinds of behaviours namely:

1. Behavior that gives structure to the work of the group, especially how the work is to be done, when and by whom.

2. Behavior as perceived by subordinates as showing consideration for the subordinates as human beings.

Perception therefore is very important in leadership. The perception the public holds of Heads of second cycle institutions and their effect on the performance of the students has undergone a lot of changes. During the colonial era, the image of the Head of a school was that of a strict disciplinarian clad in white shirt and shorts with well polished shoes. He was the “monarch of all he surveyed”. No one could dispute his authority. His orders could not be flouted; he was to be obeyed without questioning since he had all the answers to all the problems of the school.
These days the picture is different: Heads of senior high schools are no longer seen in this light. Their position is that of leader. As a leader, the Headmaster/Headmistress must influence his/her subordinates towards the achievement of the goals of the school. He must apply effectively administrative techniques to ensure that goals of the institution are achieved.

A leader must know the way, go the way and show the way. Effective leaders, according to Sergiovanni (1992), determine where they are and where they want to be. They know why they want to get there and decide the best way to get there.

The results of the first SSSCE in 1990 put the whole educational reform of 1987 in question. It evoked adverse comments and criticisms from all sectors of the community. Heads of senior high schools were not spared, they had their own share of the negative criticisms.

The upsurge of indiscipline in some senior high schools in the country has brought into a sharp focus the role of Headmasters/Headmistresses in senior high schools. Additionally, the lack of sufficient places in the senior high schools for all applicants to be admitted into schools of their choice has added to the already poor image that the public has about the Headmasters/Headmistresses. The sanctioning of eleven Heads of senior high schools in December 2001 for allegedly charging unauthorized fees made the role of Headmasters/Headmistresses in Ghanaian senior high schools a subject for national debate. During the debates that ensued, the question about the effectiveness of Heads of senior high schools was extensively discussed. Thus Heads of senior high schools
in Cape Coast bore the brunt of such attacks since most of the senior high schools are found in Cape Coast.

**Statement of the Problem**

The Heads of senior high schools in the Cape Coast municipality of late do not enjoy any good image from the public. The sanctioning of nine of them in December 2001 for allegedly charging unauthorized fees aggravated the plight of the Heads. Comments from students from single-sex senior high schools as well as mixed senior high schools about how their schools were managed are generally derogatory. From the experience of the researcher as a teacher in all three types of secondary schools, that is an all boys secondary school, an all girls secondary school and a mixed senior high school, there seem to be some differences in the comments that students in the different types of senior high schools make about their Heads. Whereas in all boys and mixed schools, students often make derogatory comments, girls in all girls schools often refer to their Headmistress as their mother, their mentor and their counselor.

Could the difference in attitude of students in the boys’ senior high schools and girls senior high schools towards their Heads be attributed to the way each group perceives the way in which the administrative practices are carried out by the Head? Are the Heads playing similar roles in their respective schools? Why are their roles perceived differently? There is therefore the need to carry out an in-depth investigation to find answers to these questions.
Purpose of Study

The study aimed at researching into the administrative practices of Headmasters/Headmistresses of single-sex senior high schools in the Cape Coast municipality as perceived by the students. Specifically, it sought to

1. Identify the administrative behavior of Heads of single-sex schools in the Cape Coast municipality.
2. Find out the perceptions of students regarding how effective the Heads are in carrying out their administrative functions.
3. Explore possible differences in the perceptions of students in girls’ schools Headed by females and students in boys’ schools Headed by males with regard to the administrative behaviours exhibited by these Heads.

Research Questions

The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. How are Heads perceived by students as parent figures?
2. What are the perceptions of boys and girls in senior high schools in Cape Coast with respect to the effectiveness of their Heads in carrying out their various administrative functions?
3. What are the expectations of students in boys’ schools of their Heads?
4. What are the expectations of students in girls’ schools of their Heads?
5. How do the expectations of students in boys’ schools compare with that of students in girls’ schools of their Heads?
Significance of the Study

The study had as its main objective to identify the effectiveness of the administrative functions practiced by Heads of single-sex senior high schools in the Cape Coast Municipality. The outcome would be of help to Heads of senior high schools, Educational Administrators, the Supervision and Inspectorate Division of the Ghana Education Service (GES) when planning strategies to enhance and improve the work of Heads of senior high schools in their various areas of operation. The study would also be useful in pre-service orientation courses for new Heads of senior high schools and in-service training for those already at post. The study would also contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of educational administration.

Delimitation of the Study

Every research has a subject matter and geographical scope. In this research the subject matter involves perceptions and management of secondary education. The researcher confined the study to students in single-sex high schools in the Cape Coast Municipality, which is known to have the greatest number of second cycle schools in the Central Region.

Limitations of the Study

A study of this nature certainly had its limitations. Limitations envisaged related to obtaining of information. The survey was done at a time when students were preparing to write examinations so getting their maximum co-operation and
attention was difficult. It is therefore likely that this may affect the responses they provided. The attitude of some students in the boys’ schools towards the researcher during the collection of data was sometimes negative. These reactions are likely to affect the final outcome of the study.

**Organization of the rest of the Study**

Chapter two is the literature review. It reviews related literature on works done by scholars in the field of study. Chapter three is the methodology. It looked at the research design used, the population, and the sample and sampling technique, the instrument used for data collection, the data collection procedure and how the data were analyzed.

Chapter four presents the analysis and discussion of the findings of the research, taking into account the research questions. Chapter five is made up of the summary, conclusion, and recommendations. The chapter ends with suggestions for further investigations.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter consists of a review of theoretical works as well as works of previous researchers on the topic under consideration. The chapter seeks to provide relevant information that throws light on the topic and keeps it in its proper conceptual framework. This chapter is organized under the following subtitles

i. The concept of leadership

ii. Leadership styles

iii. Administrative functions and practices of school Heads

iv. Personal qualities of a school Head

v. Gender and leadership

The Concept of Leadership

Every organization has specific goals to achieve. To achieve these goals, the work to be done is divided up into sub-tasks and assigned to people who occupy established positions. At the top of these positions is the manger, administrator, supervisor and in the case of the school, the principal or the Headmaster/ Headmistress.

Since leadership has to do with human behavior, it will entail many dimensions and human behavior being unpredictable will manifest itself in
various ways. The way these manifestations are perceived by different persons will determine the kind of definition that will be derived to describe it. Owen (1970), viewing leadership as a group function states that leadership is not something that “great people” or individuals with formal legal authority do to their subordinates, but rather is a process involving dynamic interaction with subordinates.

Owen, (1970) continues that members of groups tend to elect into leadership positions, individuals who are perceived to have the ability (or power) to satisfy the needs of the group who are, at the same time perceived as ready to accept the responsibility. Leadership is therefore a dynamic relationship based on mutual influence and common purpose between leaders and collaborators in which both are moved to higher levels of motivation and moral development as they effect real and intended change.

According to Tack (1984) leadership is exercised when persons with certain purposes mobilize, in completion or in conflict with others, various resources; institutional, political, psychological in order to arouse and satisfy the motives of followers. To Musaazi (1982), leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts towards goal achievement in a given situation.

The leadership process involves an unequal distribution of power among leaders or group members. Stoner and Freeman (1992) explains this further by stating that leaders can direct some of the activities of group members but the latter can similarly direct the leader’s activities in a number of ways.
Maxwell (2001) also sees leadership as influence. All of us can exercise a certain degree of influence on someone at some point in some place. He asserts that leadership is not about titles, positions or flowcharts. It is about one’s life. It is the capacity to translate vision into reality. Effective leadership knows how to lay down action steps for yourself and the organization so that the vision can be realized. Musaazi (1982) agrees with this when he said leadership can be defined as the process of influencing the activities and behavior of an individual or group in efforts towards goal achievement in a given situation. It can be defined in basic terms as the use of authority in decision-making. All these researchers agree on the fact that leadership is about influencing some people in the achievement of a goal.

Another researcher however defines leadership as a process. Cole (1997) saw leadership as a dynamic process at work in a group whereby one individual over a period of time and in particular organizational context, influences the other group members to commit themselves freely to the achievement of group tasks or goals. Middlemist and Hitt (1981) also saw leadership as the process of providing direction and influencing or groups to achieve goals.

In spite of these various definitions, there are basic concepts of leadership, which underlines all leadership definitions. Peretomode (1992) outline them as follows;

i. Leadership involves other people-followers or subordinates. There can be no leader without followers. Leadership depends on followership and that followership determining the leadership, is a function of cooperation of
mutuality with the leader rather than forcible domination and coercion by the leader

ii. Leadership involves the use of influence

iii. The leadership process involves an unequal distribution of power among leaders and group members (Fieldler & Chemers, 1975)

iv. Leadership is a process. That is an ongoing activity engaged in by certain individuals in an organization.

v. Leadership focuses on the accomplishment of goals. In other words, the outcome of the leadership process is some form of goal accomplishment.

**Leadership Styles**

**Factors influencing the choice of leadership Styles**

Over the years, researchers on leadership have been preoccupied with the question of which leadership style will produce the most effective results. No single answer to this question has been found. The style that leadership adopts depends on their beliefs, values, assumptions and the organizational culture.

According to Hoy and Miskel (1982), the way a leader relates to his subordinates and task assigned to the group defines his styles leadership. Owen (1970) thinks that it is more of the attitude of leadership towards the members of group that determines the leadership style. This is inline with Blumberg’s (1989) way of looking at what influences the choice of leadership style.

The scholars view leadership styles in terms of task orientation versus employee orientation.
i. Task Orientation or Directive Behavior reflects how much a leader is concerned with the actual task at hand and ensures that those following him complete it.

ii. Employee Orientation or Supportive Behavior reflects how much a leader is concerned for the people around him, providing support and encouragement for them. According to them style choice depends on the different level of ability, confidence and commitment of the members of the group. Some followers need directing, others coaching, others supporting and other delegating. As the manager tries to do this, a certain kind of leadership style emerges.

**Directing.** A team member who has a lot of enthusiasm for the job but not much actual ability, for example a beginner, has to be directed. You will not need to spend much time giving encouragement or coaxing them along. You will however have to tell them what to do next after they complete every task, and how to do the task set.

**Coaching.** After being in the group for a while, somebody might begin to lose confidence and therefore motivation, as they still find it difficult to do the work they want to do. At this stage you will need to coach them along. You will still need to tell them what to do at virtually every point along the way, while taking care to encourage them and praise them at every turn.

**Supporting.** Gradually the team’s technical ability will increase until they are at a stage where they can actually do everything required of them; however they may still lack the confidence to actually do it off their own backs. You should no
longer have to tell them what to do, although they may think otherwise. You should seek their opinions on the next stage, and to be seen to take notice of their ideas.

Delegating. A technically competent person’s confidence will gradually grow until they feel able to work completely on their own. The Head should now be able to delegate specific areas of work to them and feel little need to tell them either what to do or to praise them as frequently for doing it. The time that you don’t have to spend ‘leading’ these members of the group can be spent with the less experienced group members, or on the work that you need to do.

D’souza (1990) names four important sources of influence which determine the behavior patterns that leaders will follow. They are:

a) **Personality of leaders:** The value system of an individual, the amount of trust the leader has in other people considering their capabilities and his capabilities. For example, the leader’s inclination towards how one should behave in a group. Some leaders operate best in a team, whereas others enjoy issuing orders to resolve problems. Then his own feelings of security in uncertain situations: leaders who release control over the decision-making process reduce the predictability and stability of the outcome.

b) **Nature of tasks:** Here, the importance and complexity and urgency of the task to be accomplished come into play. For example, the more leaders feel the need for immediate decisions, the more difficult it is to involve
other people. Situations may arise, needing immediate decisions but some organizations operate in such a state of crisis or crush programming.

c) The nature of the environment where the leader operates: This includes structure of the organization and outside personnel. With economic, social political situations for example, labour unions can put considerable pressure on leadership, thus, making the leader adopt a particular trend of leadership style.

Brookman-Amissah (1992) describe three leadership styles derived from studies. They were concerned with the behaviour of the group under basic style of leadership namely:

**The Laissez-faire, the Democratic and the Autocratic**

Each style has its own set of good and not-so-good characteristics, and each uses leadership in a different way. Now the question that is often asked is which leadership style promises to be more effective? Is it the one that emphasizes the work to be done or the one that is more concerned about meeting the needs of the individuals that work in the organization?

There may be situations that an autocratic style is most effective and other situations that call for highly participatory methods for greatest effectiveness. The problem for the leaders is to analyze the contingencies in each situation and then behave in the most effective manner. What style to use depends on the issue to be addressed. The behaviour that works best in the specific situation is the preferred “style” or behaviour.
**Autocratic Style.** According to Musaazi (1982), the autocratic style of leadership centralizes leadership, power and authority in the management of an institution. Its purpose is to achieve high productivity in the organization. It does not involve individual workers in decision-making policies. Being task-oriented, management uses workers as machines to effect productivity. The leader places little trust in subordinates and uses fear and punishment as motivators.

The autocratic leader believes that an average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if he can. He thinks that because of this most people must be controlled, directed, threatened and punished to get them to produce. The autocrat also believes that the average person prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibilities, has relatively little ambition and wants security above all. The behaviour of the autocratic leader is reflected in the following expressions; “Don’t do as I do- do as I say”, “Be reasonable, do it my way”.

The work is strictly structured and does not promote initiative and creativity. Workers abhor close supervision exercised by leaders. Workers needs are often ignored; they easily get frustrated and have low morale for work. Conflicts arise easily between workers and leaders.

In this type of leadership style, the leader makes the decision using whatever information available or the leader secures necessary information from members of the group before making the decision. In obtaining the information the leader may not tell followers what the problem is. He imposes all policies, guidelines and decisions for the group and individual behaviour. The autocratic leader is one who dominates team members using unilateralism to achieve a
singular objective. The approach to leadership generally results in passive resistance from team members and requires continual pressure and direction from the leader in order to get things done. Generally, an authoritarian approach is not a good way to get the best performance from a team.

The commanding leader soothes fear and gives clear direction by his or her powerful stance, commanding and expecting full compliance (agreement is not needed). They need emotional self control for success and can seem cold and distant. This approach is the best in times of crises when you need unquestioned rapid action and with problem employees who do not respond to other methods. There are, however, some instances where an autocratic style of leadership may be appropriate. Some situations may call for urgent action, and in these cases, an autocratic style of leadership may be best. In addition, most people are familiar with autocratic leadership and therefore have less trouble adopting that style.

**Democratic Style.** Abosi, O.B., & Brookman-Amissah J. E. (1992) describes this style as one where there is involvement of the group in the decision-making process. The result is motivation, productivity, originality, friendliness and cooperation. The democratic leader makes decision by consulting his team, whilst still maintaining control of the group. The democratic leader allows his team to decide how the task will be tackled and who performs which task.

A good democratic leader encourages participation and delegates wisely, but never loses sight of the fact that he bears the crucial responsibility of leadership. He values his team members’ strong points in order to obtain the best
performance from his team. He motivates his team by empowering them to direct themselves, and guides them with a loose rein.

The leader shares the problem with relevant members of the group on a one to one basis, getting their ideas and suggestions individually without bringing them together as a group. The leader shares the problem with members in a group at a group meeting, and then decides. Leader acting as chairperson shares the problem with the group at a meeting and facilitates efforts of the group to reach consensus on a group decision. However, the democrat can also be seen as being so sure of himself and his relationship with his subordinates that everything is a matter for the group discussion and decision. Clearly, this type of ‘leader’ is not leading at all.

**Laissez-faire Style.** According to Brookman-Amissah (1992), under the laissez-faire style, the leader allows things and activities to take their own course without interference or direction from the leader. There is therefore complete freedom on the part of the members to do whatever they like. There is therefore indiscipline, low productivity and poor quality of work, as members have no particular sense of direction. The laissez-faire manager exercises little control over his group, leaving them to sort out their roles and tackle their work, without participating in the process himself. In general, this approach leaves the team floundering with little direction or motivation.

Again, there are situations where the laissez-faire approach can be effective. The laissez-faire technique is usually appropriate when leading a team of highly motivated and skilled people, who have produced excellent work in the
past. Once a leader has established that his team is confident, capable and motivated, it is often best to step back and let them get on with the task, since interfering can generate resentment and detract them from their effectiveness. By handing over ownership, a leader can empower his group to achieve their goals.

There are a number of different approaches or ‘styles’ to leadership and management that are based on different assumptions and theories. The style that individuals use will be based on a combination of their beliefs, values and preferences, as well as the organizational culture and norms, which will encourage some styles and discoursages others. He names the following styles of leadership:

i. Charismatic Leadership

ii. Participative Leadership

iii. Situational Leadership

iv. Transactional Leadership

v. Transformational Leadership

vi. The Quiet Leader

**Charismatic Leadership**

Charm and grace are all that is needed to create followers. Self believe is a fundamental need of leaders. People follow others that they personally admire. The Charismatic Leader gathers followers through dint of personality and charm, rather than any form of external power of authority. It is interesting to watch a Charismatic Leader ‘working the room’ as they move from person to person. They pay much attention to the person they are talking to at that moment, making
that person feel like they are, for that time, the most important person in the
world.

Charismatic leaders use a wide range of methods to manage their image, and if they are not naturally charismatic, may practice assiduously at developing their skills. They may engender trust through visible self sacrifice and taking personal risks in the name of their beliefs. They will show great confidence in their followers. They are very persuasive and make very effective use of body language as well as verbal language.

Deliberate charisma is played out in a theatrical sense, where the leader is ‘playing to the house’ to create a desired effect. They also make effective use of storytelling, including the use of symbolism and metaphors. Many politicians use a charismatic style as they need to gather a large number of followers. If you want to increase your charisma, studying videos of their speeches and the way you interact with others is a great source of learning. Religious leaders also may well use you charisma, as do cult leaders.

Charismatic leaders who are building a group, whether it is a political party a cult or a business team will often focus strongly on making the group very clear and distinct, separating it from other groups. They will then build the image of the group, in particular in the minds of the followers as being far superior to all others. The charismatic leader will typically attach him/her firmly to the identity of the group such that to join the group is to become one with the leader. In doing so, they create an unchallengeable position for themselves.
The description above is purely based on charisma and takes into account varying moral positions. Other descriptions tend to assume a more benevolent approach. Moser (1986) notes that charismatic leaders seek to instill both commitment to ideological goals and also devotion to themselves. The extent to which either of these two goals is dominant depends on the underlying motivations and needs of the leader. Charismatic leaders pay a great deal of attention to scanning and reading their environment, and are good at picking up the moods and concerns of both individuals and larger audiences. They then will hone their actions and words to suit the situation.

The Charismatic Leader and the Transformational leader can have many similarities in that the transformational leaders may well be charismatic. Their main differences are in their basic focus, whereas the Transformational Leaders has a basic focus of transforming the organization and quite possibly their followers, the Charismatic leader may not want to change anything. Despite their charm and apparent concern, the Charismatic leader may well be somewhat more concerned with themselves than anything else.

**Situational Leadership**

The best action of the leader depends on a range of situational factors. When a decision is needed, an effective leader does not just fall into a single preferred style, such as using transactional or transformational methods.

Factors that affect situational decision include motivation and capability of followers. This in turn, is affected by factors within the particular situation. The relationship between followers and the leader may be another factor that affects
leader behavior as much as it does follower behavior. The leaders’ perception of
the follower and the situation will affect what they do rather than the truth of the
situation. The leaders’ perception of themselves and other factors such as stress
and mood will also modify the leader’s behavior. Tack (1984) seeks to combine
other approaches and identifies six variables:

1. Subordinate effort: the motivation and actual effort expended.

2. Subordinate ability and role clarity: followers knowing what to do and how to
do it.

3. Organization of work: the structure of the work and utilization of resources.

4. Resources and support: the availability of tools, materials and people.

5. Cooperation and cohesiveness of the group in working together.

6. External coordination: the need to collaborate with other people.

Here the leaders work on such factors as external relationships, acquisition
of resources, managing the demands of the group and the structures and cultures
of the group.

According to D’souza (1990), the attitude of a leader towards both the
group and the task at hand will produce a special kind of style.

i. Impoverished Leadership/Management (low concern for task, low
concern for people). This style is characterized by minimal effort on the
part of the leader, just enough to get the job done and maintain the group
structure. He just reasons: ‘I will just let them get on with it, I am sure
they will do fine, they don’t really want me interfering anyway.
ii. **Country Club Management (low concern for task, high concern for people)**. The leader argues, ‘it stands to reason, if they are happy, they will work harder and the work will take care of itself.

iii. **Authority/Obedience Management (high concern for task, low concern for people)**. Probably a bit of a taskmaster. The important thing is to work. He leads from behind by driving the group in front of you. We are here to work; the work needs to be done. If they are working hard enough they won’t have time to feel unhappy, they are not here to enjoy themselves’. They tend to rely on a centralized system and the use of authority. Good relations are accidental in this type of leadership he says “produce or perish”

iv. **Team management (high concern for people, high concern for task)**. He sees the completion of the task and the well being of the group as interdependent through a common stake in the organization’s future. This leads to relationships built on trust and respect, and work accomplishment from committee employees. The policy of the leader is “live and lets live”, “we’re in this together, we need to support each other to get this job done’. It is generally accepted that group leaders who have a Team Management style are the most effective, though this is not always the case. In this type of leadership, the welfare of staff as well as production is considered and taken care of. The leader is fair and firm.
Administrative Functions and Practices of School Heads

‘When two men cooperate to roll a stone that neither could have moved alone, the rudiments of administration have appeared’. At the end of the school organization is the educational administrator who must play the major role of ensuring the efficient implementation of educational policies and programmes that will promote the achievement of the goals of the institution. To do this, he must undertake certain activities.

According to Owens (1970), it has been long accepted that the functions of administration are planning, leading, coordinating and controlling. But the persistent puzzling issue throughout this country has been, “What are the most effective ways of performing these functions?” He explains that there are conflicting ways to approach administrative practices, however, classical approaches and human resource approaches are the leading contenders among the currently competing systems of analysis through which administrative practice is interpreted. The choice that the administrator chooses to embrace rests largely on the on the assumptions about the nature of the organizations and the people in them. There are at least two important dimensions to the role of a manager: task and human interaction. The task dimension is concerned with the management’s responsibility for:

i. Defining, planning, organizing and providing the necessary resources for coordinating as well as monitoring the tasks or activities which are required to achieve the organization’s goals.
Anticipating and identifying problems or obstacles to group/organization achievement.

Making decisions about a correct course of action.

Traditionally, the term “management” refers to the set of activities, and often the groups of people involved are in four general functions including planning, organizing, leading and coordinating activities. It is to be noted that the four functions recur throughout the organization and are highly integrated.

The process by which leaders achieve their desired goals are described differently by different authors but there are some basic processes that are common to all and although they may have different approaches to these leadership activities, they all boil down to some basic steps described in the acronym “POSDCORB” which stands for Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting.

**Planning**

D’souza (1990) describes planning as looking a Head, setting goals and evolving a design for future actions. Planning, he adds, goes on continuously like a never-ending activity. It bridges the gap where people are and where leaders want them to go. It answers in advance, the ‘what’, ‘why’, ‘when’, ‘who’ and ‘how’ of future action. Planning refers to the thinking or conceptualizing stage before leaders make decisions or start actions. Effective action requires planning. Without proper planning, results depend upon luck or hoped-for events to happen.
Planning advances the work smoothly without making the group members feel they are being rushed. Planning, however, does not eliminate all risks. Good planning takes the right risks at the right time. Planning attempts to prevent crises from arising. A continuing series of crises may indicate poor planning. Proper planning also ensures the effective use of available resources towards the achievement of the most important objectives.

D’souza (1990) adds that effective planning should include the following:

1. **What must be done?** – checks with given objectives, including all necessary resources.
2. **Why must it be done?** – Is the work really needed? Can the use of the resources be justified?
3. **Where should it be done?** – Here the use of resources to space and the location come onto play.
4. **When should it be done?** – The use of time – How to coordinate it with other activities.
5. **Who should do it? What manpower? What skills are necessary to accomplish the tasks?**
6. **How should it be done?** – Methods to be followed are outlined.

Koontz and O’Donnel (1976) have a similar definition. They say: Planning is deciding in advance, what to do, how to do it, when to do it, and who to do it. They described three steps in the planning process:

i. First, the administrator must determine the present state of things (the status quo)
ii. He makes accurate diagnosis of the status quo. It is this diagnosis that will determine the kind of action to be taken. Then he decides where he wants to be, the optimum place he would want the organization to be.

iii. Finally, he would determine what it will take to move the present position of the organization to the optimum position. This will bring in the human and material resources and what it would need to get there.

Effective leaders plan for achievement by pinpointing desired results. They determine in advance, the best means of achieving their goals. This key function in the managerial leadership will perform other leadership roles (D’souza, 1998).

Marshall (1991) sees planning as having the capacity to deal with the future or having ‘foresight’. It is a vital function of leadership. Marshall intimates that it has a unique importance to the whole business of leadership. Its absence will derail an otherwise well qualified and well equipped incumbent of a leadership position. Planning requires vision and insight, it makes the administrator better than others at identifying opportunities and possibilities and knowing how to respond to forthcoming events or likely situations. To plan effectively, the administrator must possess a sense for the unknown.

Planning to Pertomode (1992) means working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods for doing them to accomplish the purpose set for the organization. Every organization must understand the fundamental nature of its mission if the planning process is to be effective. The administrative team must delve sufficiently into the question of what the mission
is all about before it can effectively plan the direction the system should take to achieve those major outcomes it intends to achieve. The nature and scope of the educational programme constitutes a major planning consideration in every school system.

Musaazi (1982) intimates that it is essential for the school Head to plan well in advance what he intends to do, how it is to be done and the sequence of events, and then prepare for the change. More importantly, the Head should be able to rally support for his programmes, plans and goals. Planning includes the following functions:

1. Defining missions and goals, (determining the nature and scope of the work to be performed).

2. Determining strategies (determining where to invest time, energy work and talent)

3. Identifying and specifying indicators of effectiveness (determining factors on which objectives may be measured).

4. Selecting and setting objectives (determining results to be achieved).

5. Action plans (determining how to achieve specific objectives).

6. Programming (establishing a sequence of actions to follow to reach set objectives).

7. Scheduling which include establishing time requirements for objectives and action steps.

8. Budgeting (determining and assigning the resources required to reach objectives).
9. Fixing accountability (that is determining who will see to the accomplishment of objectives and action steps).

10. Testing and reviewing (testing and revising a tentative plan as needed prior to commitment to action).

**Organizing**

Organizing means establishing the formal structure of authority through which work sub-divisions are arranged, defined and coordinated for a defined objective. It also means building up both human and material resources of the organization.

D’Souza (1990) sees organizing as making a checklist of all important things to accomplish, and arranging those tasks in order of priority. Each activity is then broken down and the sequential steps to be accomplished. All delegated responsibilities, authority and relationships must be clearly defined and coordinated. The administrator must also decide what to delegate and what not to delegate.

Organizing consists of assembling and arranging all required resources especially people to do the work successfully. It assists people to do the work effectively together. It also coordinates the work of many people to achieve desired results. It provides job satisfaction since the task is allotted according to their skills, knowledge and needs. All members of the team must know what activities they are responsible for, who helps them, and whom they help. They must be informed of the relationships and channels of communication, and the general structure of their work group.
In the school, as stated in Better Schools (module 2, 2001), the Head organizes by preparing up-to-date job descriptions for all employed staff. He then assigns roles, responsibilities and duties to staff and students. The recruitment of new staff and admission starts the process of organizing so the Head should arrange to have the right kind of staff he can use to achieve the goals of the school.

Allen (1998) supports this by defining organizing as a process of identifying and grouping work to be performed, defining responsibility and authority and establishing relationship for the purpose of enabling people to work most effectively together in accomplishing objectives.

Programming, like decision-making, tends to be an organizational action rather than a one-man performance. Therefore, several types of organizational personnel may be involved in the programming exercise. The superintendent may set budgetary limits for the deliberations but allow complete freedom in deciding how the money is to be spent.

According to Allen (1998), the purpose of the organizing function is to make the best use of the organization’s resources to achieve organizational goals. Organizational structure is the formal decision-making framework by which job tasks are divided, grouped and coordinated.

**Controlling**

There is a need for the school administrator to pause from time to time to examine the outcomes of school activities as against the set objectives. Controlling according to Campbell (1978) is concerned with ensuring the
effective accomplishment of objectives of the organization. This is done by establishing standards including basically devising a gauge of successful performance in achieving objective, assessing actual versus planned performance.

According to Campbell (1978), it is necessary to assess the outcomes of the decisions to see the extent of the change. They add that there are to be four purposes or concerns in appraising or evaluating performance. They may be stated as follows:

1. Are the objectives and the procedures chosen to achieve them consistent with one another?
2. Are the procedures operating as intended?
3. To what extent and how well has the organizational objectives been met?
4. To what extent and how well has the organization been maintained?

These points emphasize the fact that organizations exist to achieve some purpose. In the case of the public school, the purpose includes the teaching of literacy and critical thinking. In appraisal, the key question would have to do with how well literacy and critical thinking are being taught and learned.

Ozigi (2002) says it is important that from time to time the Head reviews the programme of activities in the school in order to make necessary improvements. In so doing, the Head sometimes has to consult the staff and agree on satisfactory criteria for the evaluation process. Koontz and O’Donnel (1976) regard the controlling process as the establishing standards against which performance can be measured, and deviations from standards and plans corrected.
Co-ordination

Koontz and O’Donnel (1976) see organizational coordination and control as going together. It is a systematic approach to figuring out if one is doing what one intended to do or not. In recent times people react strongly against the phrase “management control”. The word itself can have a negative connotation, e.g., it can sound dominating, coercive and heavy-handed. It seems that writers of management literature now prefer the use of the term “coordinating” rather than “controlling.”

Staffing

Staffing is determining the requirements for ensuring the availability of personnel to perform the work (Ozigi (2002). This includes determining personnel needs by analyzing the work for personnel by identifying and appointing people by providing opportunities for people to increase their capabilities in line with organizational needs.

Koontz and O’Donnel (1976) maintain that supervisors regularly review the needs of their employees. Consequently, they are often the first to notice the need for a new position in the organization. In this case the, the supervisor opens a new role by getting authorization from upper management, this often requires the supervisor’s communication and justification for funds to fill the new position. The supervisor reviews advertisements for job candidates, reviews resumes and conducts interviews. The supervisor recommends who should be hired from among job candidates and ensures a job offer is made to the most suitable
candidate. There is usually a great deal of paperwork, e.g. a job application, starting a personnel file, providing an employee manual, salary and tax forms, etc. finally, the supervisor must ensure the new employee has adequate facilities like desk, computer, and office supplies.

Directing

Ozigi (2002) describes directing as the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in a specific and general orders and instructions and serving as a guide to the establishment. He calls ‘directing’ ‘commanding’ and sees it as directing subordinates and making them to do their work. To him it means more than the enforcement of obedience. He believes it entails getting the best out of employees in the interest of the organization as a whole. He suggests that to facilitate command, the manager should perform such activities as acquiring knowledge of his personnel, eliminating incompetence, avoiding pre-occupation with detail, setting good example and fostering teamwork and cooperative spirit, initiative and loyalty among his staff.

Campbell (1978) contends that directing has at times been called command. While any administrator may on occasions need to command at other times direct, they feel the better term for what is involved here is stimulating. The objective of stimulating is to elicit individual efforts and contributions in implementing organizational decisions.

There are several kinds of stimulation. At one level the organization or the administrator acting for the organization can exercise considerable pressure upon an individual in that organization. Seldom, if ever, can a formal status leader
in an organization free himself or herself completely from exercising such influence. At another level, the administrator stimulates by a set of conditions which inherently motivate people to act in the situation. In this case, members of the organization are involved in identifying the information they will take as evidence of an existing problem, examining the information which is gathered, judging whether a problem exists, and deciding upon the course of action to be taken. It is their belief that the latter mode of stimulation is more effective than the former one, which rests on pressure

**Supervision**

According to Glickman, Gordon and Ross, (1998), behind every successful school is an effective supervision programme. It has been established that teachers who are adequately supervised perform better and are more purposeful than teachers who are not supervised. Supervision can influence the performance of teachers and the school as a whole.

The scope of supervision is very broad, covering all the factors that affect work in the school. It is therefore very important to have adequate supervision after the necessary human and material resources have been provided. In view of the broadness of the scope of supervision, all stakeholders in education are to exert some influence by way of supervision in the schools (Musaazi, 1982). Glickman et al (1998) contends that there are several interpretations of the term “supervision”, but typically, supervision is the activity carried out by responsible persons to oversee the productivity and progress of employees who report directly to the supervisors. For example, first- level supervisors supervise
entry-level employees. Depending on the size of the organization, middle-managers supervise first-level supervisors; chief executives supervise middle-managers.

Supervision of a group of employees often includes: Conducting basic management activities (decision making, problem solving, planning, delegation and meeting management), organizing their department and teams, noticing the need for and designing new job roles in the group and hiring new employees. It also involves training new employees, employee performance management (setting goals, observing and giving feedback, addressing performance issues, firing employees, etc.), conforming to personnel policies and other internal regulations.

In administrative supervision, the primary problem is concerned with the correct, effective and appropriate implementation of agency policies and procedures. The supervisor has been given authority by the agency to oversee the work of the supervisee. This carries the responsibility for ensuring that agency policy is implemented – which implies a controlling function – and a parallel responsibility to enable supervisees to work to the best of their ability.

In educational supervision, the primary problems are worker ignorance and/or ineptitude regarding the knowledge, attitude and skills required to do the job. The primary goal is to dispel ignorance and upgrade skill. The classic process involved with this task is to encourage reflection on, and exploration of the work. Supervisees may be helped to understand the client better; become more aware of
their own reactions and responses to the client; understand the dynamics of how they and their client are interacting.

**Decision-Making**

According to Campbell (1978), decision making can be irrational or rational. In the first instance the decision maker acts on the basis of whim or caprice whereas in the second he deliberates and acts in terms of a careful diagnosis of the situation and a thorough consideration of the means used to achieve a given end.

Rational choice has two major phases: problem analysis and decision. Problem analysis is aimed at finding the cause of a difficulty while the task of decision is to select a course of action that will eliminate the problem or reduce its negative effects. At the problem-analysis stage, the first step is to describe precisely what is wrong. This description is both a matter of what the problem is and what the problem is not. The second step in problem analysis is to locate what is producing the difficulty; the cause is often a change, a change in people, technology, or situational circumstances.

When the cause of the difficulty has been identified, the decision maker’s consideration shifts to the possible alternative courses of action. For each alternative, there are multiple consequences, some are intended and others are unintended. The unintended side effects may be either positive or negative. A major task of the decision maker during this second principal phase of rational choice is to select the course of action which yields the most favorable consequences and carries with it a minimum of negative ones.
General Duties of a School Administrator

Peretemode (1992) defines educational administration as the systematic arrangement of human and material resources and programmes that are available for education and carefully using them to achieve educational goals. It is not an end to itself but a means to an end, that of enhancing teaching and learning.

The school administrator can be called by a variety of titles; Head teacher, principal, school advisor, executive, curriculum director, policy maker, innovator, organizer, communicator, educator. These and other nomenclatures reveal a great deal about the way people see the school administrator performing his task. The administrator deserves these and other titles because of the multiplicity of functions he/she has to perform.

The administrator has to deal with teaching and non-teaching staff, pupils and members of the public. He/she is concerned with the quality of instruction as well as with the moral and spiritual tone of the school and the maintaining of discipline. He/she is an organizer, coordinator and supervisor of various activities. He must maintain good human relations with all those with whom he/she deals with. There are also the financial responsibilities. The specific duties will depend for example on the size of the institution, the tradition of the school, the general organization of the institution and the number of staff. However, the responsibilities of most administrators fall into two main categories, technical and administrative.

Technically, the administrator supervises instruction and the effective and efficient use of instructional tools and materials. This involves the use of technical
skills which refers to the proficiency or ability to use the tools, methods, processes, procedures and techniques of a specialized field which is in this case education.

In administration, the Head makes sure formal goals are achieved through cooperative human effort. According to Peretemode (1992), administration is the careful and systematic arrangements and use of resources (human and material), situations and opportunities for the achievement of the specific objectives of the organization. Administration is the part of management that is concerned with the installation and carrying out of procedures by which programmes, plans and targets are laid down and communicated and the progress of activities regulated and checked.

Musaazi (1982) contends that if the school Head is to achieve the goals of improving the curriculum programmes, he must have an understanding of the teacher and the teacher’s role, and he/she must always be prepared to work effectively with the teacher. First of all he/she must maintain discipline among the teaching staff, but this has to be done with tact, fairness and firmness. A high degree of discipline may lead to good morale among the staff.

As a leader, the school Head must decide on the school’s goals in terms for instance of expected pupil behavior outcomes based on public expectations. He/she assigns duties, plans a Head and establishes ways of getting the duties performed. He/she must know however, that by nature, every human being likes some position of authority, and this is no less true of a teacher, in that each teacher is given an opportunity to satisfy his/her leadership aspirations. This is
done by sharing duties among the staff. It is important for the school Head to have confidence in those to whom he has entrusted tasks, unless the teachers do not prove equal to the task. However, there must be mutual trust between the school Head and his staff.

First of all the Head must show genuinely that he has concern for teachers and that he respects their views. Consequently, he/she must involve them in the making of decisions that affect the school. Even when good planning comes from him/her alone, he/she must, as a good leader, share it with others and let them feel like important contributors to what is going on in the school.

An administrator can thus be described as an individual who directs the affairs of an organization in such a way as to achieve its primary goals and objectives, and who can get things done quickly and efficiently. This will involve effective planning, organizing, supervising, controlling and evaluating.

**Effective Administrative Functions of the School Head**

Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) maintains that for a Head of a school to be effective, he needs foresight, capacity for understanding change and good judgment. He/she should be able to understand his students, his staff, and his community and have a good knowledge of his profession. This, he believes, will foster teamwork and make the staff understand their objectives as well as roles in the achievement of goals of the school. He adds that working together is the most important thing in organizing a school since the talents of all are harnessed for the achievement of goals.
He also ensures information flow, promotion of professional growth and the provision of working materials as some of the tasks of a Head of a school. His/her day to day activities that go to make a school alive include the following; help others such as teachers to do their work, trying to foster good relationship among school personnel, exchanging ideas with members of staff, taking decisions after consultation with the staff, working with parents, promoting the teaching profession by discussing links with professional organizations, planning for the future, solving persistent problems, and appraising the work of the school.

Musaazi (1982) also agrees with him and states that in order to manage and administer a school efficiently; the Head must provide organizational leadership in the school. In this respect, he/she is responsible for planning, organizing, coordinating, motivating the staff and students, and managing school buildings and facilities. For the school Head to be able to carry out these tasks, there must be well developed routines, policies and procedures which are actually the best techniques for efficient management. In fact it has often been said that ideal management is found when it looks as if the schools runs by itself. The underlying idea behind such a statement is that the school’s problems have been reduced to routines and that policies are adequate and is being followed.

Students are the focal point of school administration. Therefore whatever the school Head does, he/she must take into account, the students’ education and their welfare. First of all, he/she must encourage and provide for their training so that they can discover the truth for themselves. This means that a spirit of enquiry must be created in the students. They must question, be critical, and have a
curious mind. If students, in their future lives as adults, are to be innovators, they must be taught in these early years how to think and do things independently.

Secondly, personal opinions and initiative among students must be encouraged and respected. The school Head must ensure that his/her school teaches tolerance and respect of other people’s points of view and rights. Students’ learning and experiences should be treated as problems where answers are to be discovered by the individual students themselves rather than being given out by the teacher. To achieve all these educational goals, the school Head must have the cooperation and support of every teacher in the school. These goals have to be achieved in the classroom, on the football field, in school clubs, dormitories and dining halls (Musaazi, 1982).

**Personal Qualities of a School Head**

Ozigi (2002) describes a number of personality traits needed by a school administrator:

i. **Modesty**: He/she should try to be modest and not give the impression that he/she is a ‘big’, all-important person whilst others are not.

ii. **Friendliness**: He/she should try to possess the virtue of friendliness. He/she can demonstrate this by being personally interested in the welfare and problems of his staff and pupils, listening sympathetically and with understanding to complaints and problems.

iii. **Integrity and Frankness**: These are virtues which he/she should cultivate. The Head should be frank and honest in dealing with people, and in the handling of public property. He/she must not set a double standard of moral integrity.
iv. Tack: The Head or administrator also needs to be tactful, ready to see things from other people’s point of view, and should avoid saying or doing things which will unnecessarily hurt people’s feelings.

v. Moral Courage: The Head/administrator should possess the courage to face issues squarely to stand by the truth and what is considered to be right.

vi. Fairness and impartiality: These qualities the Head/administrator should try to develop, particularly since he/she has to deal with so many people. He/she should be fair and impartial in his/her judgments, in the handling of matters, and must be ready to consider all opinions about an issue.

vii. Dedication: The administrator should give his/her whole heart, body and mind to the work. He/she must also be completely committed to it, accepting it as a challenge, displaying every sense of responsibility, and doing his very best all the time. This will demand a great sense of sacrifice of time, and of physical and mental effort on the part of the Head/Administrator.

Leadership demands a lot of intellectual qualities such as sound judgment, resourcefulness, initiative, broad-mindedness, originality, the ability to foresee and analyze problems and to be able to offer good solutions. He should try and cultivate these qualities.

According to Mussazi (1982), many people have an image of what the modern school Head should be. This image is characterized by certain important leadership qualities. The following personal qualities are generally considered as the desirable qualification of an effective school Head:
Intelligence: This characteristic involves natural intelligence, mature and sound judgment, broad-mindedness and the ability to foresee and examine problems or tasks and the ability to provide appropriate solutions to them. Intelligence also here includes the verbal ability to communicate effectively with other people.

Self – confidence: The school Head deals with staff, students, school board members, parents and members of the general public. It is therefore essential that the Head has confidence in himself/herself and in his/her ideas as he/she interacts with these stakeholders.

Sociability: For the school Head to function effectively in all the duties and responsibilities placed upon him/her, he/she must interact with many individuals and groups of people. Therefore he must have the ability to deal with human beings, that is, he/she must have interpersonal skills. He/she must be friendly, cheerful and sociable in his/her approach to people.

Consideration for others: Usually, it requires more than friendliness and sociability when one works with many individuals for long periods of time. People desire respect and consideration from their fellow human beings. Respect for human dignity requires consideration on the part of the leader.

Professionally minded: The school Head should always have a positive attitude towards the education profession and towards students, teachers, administrators and other members in the teaching profession. He/she must recognize the good in the profession and do what he/she can to further it.
Humility: The school Head, as a leader, must not give people the impression that he/she is the most important person in the school. He/she should always be humble and modest. He/she must not think he/she is better or more important than other people. It should be for other people to judge his/her abilities.

Moral integrity: The school Head must always uphold high ethical and moral standards. With courage, he/she should always stick to the truth, that is what he/she considers right. He must be honest in dealing with students, staff and general public. A respectable school Head must practice what he says. For example, if he/she wants everybody to be punctual at school, he/she must be punctual as well.

Sound health: An often-sick school Head may not be able to discharge his/her duties and responsibilities effectively. Good physical and mental health is essential requisites for maximum effectiveness. School Heads themselves need to maintain sound principles of health as much as they can.

Other requirements: Besides the above personal characteristics desired of school Head, there are other critical requirements or attributes, which an efficient and effective school administrator should possess. These attributes are as follows:

1. A school Head has a definite schedule of work and organizes his/her office staff efficiently. He/she assigns routine work to his/her clerks and distributes some of his/her functions among the staff through committees.

2. A school Head encourages student participation in matters relating to the affairs that are accessible to the students and shows interest in their welfare.
3. The school Head keeps regular office hours that are known to the students and the staff. But in cases of emergency or special need, both students and staff can see him anytime.

4. A school Head deals impartially and equitably with all individuals and groups. He/she avoids showing any favoritism to particular people.

5. A school Head helps in organizing the parent-teacher association and cooperates with parents and other citizens in solving school problems. He/she interprets to the community the work and activities of the school and reveals its weaknesses and its strengths.

6. A school Head accepts constructive criticisms gracefully and takes full responsibility for achieving the educational goals of the school.

**Gender and Leadership**

Women are often described as the vulnerable sex. Religious and cultural beliefs have emphasized it and this notion is as old as creation. Thus, the question of a woman being in a position of leadership was unacceptable worldwide. It has taken a lot of sensitization and education in the last century for the question of gender equity to be seen as a necessary tool for national development. Do men and women in leadership position exhibit different leadership styles? If so, why do they do so?

Owen (2002) citing Rosener states, men turned to use a ‘command style’- relishing personal power, thinking and making decisions in logical linger fashion, issuing orders. However, women are more personal in their style, sharing information, sensitive to the feelings of others, promoting empowerment of
followers and motivating people by appealing to their commitment to the organization’s ideas.

Rosener (1990), makes similar observations and claims that the behavior of women in leadership positions is not only different from men, but also more effective as well. The debate about whether it is individual personality or gender from which leader behavior style arises has been boiling and expanding ever since.

The literature on leadership in cooperate world as well as in the education world has recently experienced a surge of description of how women leaders behave differently from men. The reason for the difference is ascribed to gender rather than personality type.

Rosener (1990) described women cooperate leaders as using interactive leadership “encouraging the participation of others, sharing power and information with them, facilitating their inclusion in the group making them feel important, evoking in them high levels of enthusiasm and excitement for the work”(97). She reported that, in contrast, the male counterparts of these women tended to rely on “the traditional command-and control-leadership” style that has served them well in the past.

However, she stopped short of claiming that women possess some “natural” abilities to lead in participative empowering ways that men do not possess. She concluded that the extent to which gender differences exist in leadership styles, may be due to non-biological factors such as the different ways in which men and boys and women and girls are socialized in our culture.
In matters of style, women managers demonstrate their different working styles. Using the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, male managers consistently come out predominantly as Traditionalists (a mix of sensing and “judgmental”). In contrast, female managers emerge as significantly more “intuitive”, combined with either ‘thinking’ as visionaries or ‘feeling’ as catalysts. The natural strength of the visionary is being strategic, while that of the catalyst is fostering higher productivity by personally motivating people. The problem with letting males dominate organizations is that leadership style is narrowly defined.

Kakabadse (1999) arguing against the motion that men and women have different leadership styles stated that there is a myth about gender and leadership capabilities. This holds that women are better team players than men; more open and mature in the way they handle sensitive issues; and more conscious of their impact on others and hence better people manager than men. An international survey by Moser (1986) comparing top male and female managers in the private and public sector clearly showed that women are no better or worse than men in the practice of management and leadership. It all depends on the man or woman in question and the organization for which they work.

To Moser (1986) there are some basic factors that affect the performance of each gender such as the length of tenure in the job and organization, the age of the manager and their attitude. In essence, the longer the manager has been in the job and been held to account for their performance, the more positive, outward-looking and mature they are both in attitude and years; the more responsive they are to the demands of customers, the better they are as managers.
Countless studies of men and women at work have highlighted the differences they display. The question remains, what is the relevance of such differences to managerial and leadership performance? Gender is but one demographic and, according to our survey, not a significant differentiator of performance. However, context— the culture of the company, the leadership style of the boss, and the attitudes in the office— does play a powerful role. Men and women occupying comparable jobs but in different organizations are likely to react differently, not because of differences of personality, or gender, but because of contextual pressures, (Kakabadse, 1999).

Lakoff (1973) maintains that for most of recorded history, women were largely excluded from formal leadership positions. A comprehensive review of encyclopedia entries published just after the turn of the last century identified only about 850 eminent women, famous or infamous, throughout the preceding 2,000 years. In rank order, they included queens, politicians, mothers, mistresses, wives, beauties, religious figures, and “women of tragic fate”.

Since that publication, there has been a transformation in gender roles, yet the progress is incomplete. Women remain dramatically underrepresented in formal leadership positions in politics, management, and many professions.

Lakoff (1973) analyses some barriers against women seeking leadership. The first of these obstacles involves stereotypical assumptions about women’s competence and commitment, and the mismatch between qualities associated with leadership, such as decision-making and delegating tasks, and qualities
traditionally associated with women, such as consensus and intuitive understanding.

The second barrier- inadequate support networks- involves the absence of mentors and access to informal networks of advice, contacts and client development. Due to inequalities of access between men and women for support networks, women need to develop effective support peer groups and women mentors; but they would also benefit from sympathetic men mentors (if they can find them).

The final obstacle involves workplace structures that fail to accommodate family commitments. Since women bear a disproportionate share of household responsibilities, they pay a disproportionate price for this failure in the system. This price is the low status and time-consuming, unrewarded work of family commitments, which frequently prevents women advancing on the career path with men.

Prichard and Evans (1970) cited Compte, who believed that women should not work outside the home, own property, or exercise political power. He said the gentle nature of women required that they remain at home as mothers tending to their children and as wives tending to their husbands’ emotional, domestic, and sexual needs. Nukunya (1998), also asserts that in many Ghanaian societies, the traditional position is that a woman is never wholly independent. He postulates that a woman must always be under the guardianship of a man and when she marries her original guardian hands her over to her husband.
Despite the fact that there are gender biases against women, it has been cited that women posses the qualities of the superior sex. Jacklin (1989), said men are more vulnerable and susceptible to stresses, both prenatally and perinatally. Betz and Fitsgerald (1987) added that women leaders not only maintain feminine features such as warmth and openness but also exhibit “masculine” qualities such as rational, assertiveness and independence. Eagly et al (1992) also reported that female leaders were found to be more task-oriented, democratic and participative in their leadership style. Female leaders were described as collaborative, cooperative and supportive. Brady (1992) saw female leaders as highly effective in delivering professional development to teachers.

Women are found to be less competitive in conflict management situations than men, and they communicate with co-workers to satisfy needs for affection while men communicate to satisfy needs for control. According to Burke (1994), these qualities have enabled women to become effective mentors because they tend to support their protégés both professionally and psychologically. Female leadership values are also considered valuable components of a strong corporate culture.

According to Lewis and Fagenson-Eland (1998), in a gender-centered model claim that there are psychological differences between men and women that lead them to favour specific leadership styles and behaviours at work. According to the model, effective female Heads or supervisors are likely to prefer more task-oriented leader behaviours. Decker (1991) said task-oriented styles of leadership are perceived to be masculine while relationship style is usually
perceived as more feminine, and masculine traits have traditionally been favoured over feminine leader characteristics. It is concluded that although perceptions of gender difference are common, the evidence for such differences is thin. It comes largely from self-reports and laboratory studies, which indicate that women leaders display greater interpersonal skills and adopt more participatory styles while men rely more on directive task-oriented approaches.

**Women as Leaders**

The woman’s role in the society has undergone a lot of changes over the years. From their traditional role of child-bearing and housekeeping, women are now seen playing roles that used to be the preserve of men- and leadership is one of these roles. The leadership role of women as Heads of institutions is gaining recognition as they ably rub shoulders with their male counterparts.

According to Cater (1998), women who did enter the teaching profession tended not to get to the top. Despite the fact that 58.8% of schoolteachers in Britain were women, they were significantly under-represented among Heads of schools and women academics very seldom became professors. Nor did women do well in getting top jobs in management. She contended that, the claim that women do not want managerial jobs has often been put forward by employers and can be a convenient excuse for limiting women’s opportunities. She concludes that women have tended to be less ambitious than most men.

Akure (1994) argues that the absence of women in leadership positions is due to different socialization of women and men. Women are socialized to believe that paid work is done in addition to work in the home. Dapaah (1986) advances
reasons why Ghanaian women rarely get into managerial positions. She maintains that they are faced with many constraints such as having to work harder than their male counterparts in order to prove themselves. She also intimates that most Ghanaian women lack ambition; they are made to feel that they have achieved success once they attain a certain level in management.

Bezt and Fitsgerald (1987) commenting on the characterization of women leaders state that women leaders in the management maintain feminine features such as warmth and openness and also exhibit “masculine” qualities such as assertiveness and independence.

**Gender Issues in Education**

Female school Heads, in order to be accepted as able school managers, have moved from a softer and more caring role to that of a harder business manager- a change perceived to be more of a structural backlash, introducing more masculine quality to the school. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), women’s education can only be fully exercised in an all female environment due to the gendered society and the way boys and girls are treated. Gender identity begins at birth and parents act according to the projected future roles of their child on the basis of the stereotypical attributes associated with this role. The way parents and adults treat girls is different from that of boys because of the way society has portrayed the roles they will fulfill when they become adults. Whereas girls are treated as fragile, delicate little things that need to be handled with great care, boys are viewed as strong children who need rough adventurous play and are sent off, on
their own, at an early age to explore what is around them. These two different 
views and attitudes toward the genders account for the helplessness, passivity and 
dependence of most girls and the autonomy, independence and self-confidence 
that are seen in boys. This suggests that the needs of boys and girls are different 
by school-going age.

Summary

From the literature reviewed, the concept of leadership was discussed 
giving divergent and similar views by various authors. The assertions mentioned 
issues on the attitudes and behaviour of administrators.

Some factors that influence the choice of leadership styles were also 
discussed. It was observed that the choice of leadership style depends on the level 
of ability, confidence and commitment of the group. Under leadership style it was 
discussed that one particular leadership style is not used exclusively. Two or more 
are used at the same time for the effective running of an administration. The 
administrative functions and practices of school Heads were also discussed 
spelling out the duties of the school Head. The review also discussed some basic 
qualities of an administrator. Some literature was reviewed on gender and 
leadership, women as leaders and gender issues in education.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

The objective of this research was to find out the perception of students in single sex schools about the administrative practices of their Heads. This chapter presents the procedures that were adopted in conducting the study. They include the research design, the population, sample and sampling techniques, data collection instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis.

The Research Design

The research design provides the glue that holds the research project together. A design is used to structure the research to show how all the major parts of the research project- the samples or groups, measures, treatment of programmes and methods of assignment work together to address the research questions.

The descriptive research design was used for this study. Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (1990) describe descriptive research as studies directed at determining the nature of a situation as it exists at the time of the study. A descriptive research can be either a sample or census survey which involves the collection of information of the population in order for generalization to be made about the said population that was used. According to Osuala (1987), descriptive research is critical to education because educational events cannot be reduced to a controlled
laboratory environment. Gay (1992) also notes that a descriptive survey method is useful for investigating a variety of educational problems including assessment of attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions and procedures. This method also deals with questions concerning what exists with respect to variables or conditions in a situation.

Pilot and Hungler (1995) also said descriptive survey aims at primarily describing, observing and documenting aspects of a situation as it naturally occurs rather than explaining them. It also involves asking a large number of individuals the same set of questions by mail, telephone or in person. It provides a more accurate picture of events and seeks to explain people’s perception and behavior on the basis of data gathered at a point in time. It is appropriate when a research attempts to describe some aspects of a population by selecting unbiased samples who are asked to complete questionnaires, and respond to interviews and tests. They went further to say that the big advantage of the descriptive survey design is that it has the potential to provide a lot of information from quite a large number of individuals.

Despite the advantages of the descriptive survey, Sefert and Hoffnung (1991) maintained that there is the difficulty in ensuring that the questions to be answered using the descriptive survey design are clear and not misleading because survey results can vary significantly due to the exact wording of questions. It may also produce untrustworthy results because they delve into private matters and people may not be completely truthful about them. They further maintained that questionnaires require respondents who can articulate their
thoughts well and sometimes even put such thoughts into writings. Another weakness of the descriptive survey design is getting a sufficient number of questionnaires completed and returned so that meaningful analysis can be made.

In spite of these disadvantages, the descriptive survey design was considered most appropriate for revealing the way students in single-sex schools perceived the administrative practices of their Heads. It helped to determine the opinions and attitudes of the respondents on the variables under study using questionnaires. Babbie (1990) has recommended the descriptive survey for purposes of generalizing from a sample to a population so as to make inferences about some characteristics or behavior of the population.

The objective of the current study was to find out the perception of students in single-sex secondary schools about the administrative practices of their Heads. Therefore a descriptive survey is best suited for the kind of findings expected.

**Population**

The nature of this research necessitated two target populations. This is because single-sex secondary schools involve students in all boys’ schools and students in all girls’ schools in the Cape Coast Municipality. The first category comprised the boys’ secondary schools made up of 1681 from Adisadel College, 1523 from St Augustine’s College and 1761 from Mfantsipim School totaling 4,965 boys altogether. The second category involved the girls’ secondary schools and their total was 1900, with 728 from Holy Child School and 1,172 from
Wesley Girls’ High School (WGHS). Overall, there were 6,865 boys and girls constituting the study population.

**Sample and Sampling Technique**

In all 382 students were selected as the sample for the study representing approximately 10% of the population with 260 from the girls’ secondary schools and 420 from the boys’ schools. These students were randomly selected from the three forms, namely Form One, Form Two, and Form Three of the respective schools.

The final year students (Form Three students), were more in number since they were considered to be more conversant with the administrative practices of the Head being the seniors of the school with prefects among them. The boys’ schools had bigger student population than the girls’ schools.

To achieve the randomness, each girl or boy in each form in question was given a piece of paper with an identity number on it. These pieces of paper were folded and put in a box shaken and picked one by one by a teacher-assistant until the required number for the form was obtained. The reason for employing this random sampling method was to give each student an equal opportunity to be selected.
Table 1: School Representation of Students’ Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. Selected</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adisadel</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine’s</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfantsipim</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGHS</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Child</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6865</strong></td>
<td><strong>680</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Senior High Schools Selected*

**Data Collecting Instrument**

The questionnaire was the main instrument for data collection due to the number of people who necessarily had to be involved in the study. Another reason for choosing the questionnaire for the data collection is that it is relatively inexpensive to administer, it can be completely anonymous and the results are easy to compute and analyze.

Creswell (2003) cautions that to ensure validity, item biases such as ambiguity in the interpretation of questions, inappropriate assumptions, complexity and memory overload, poor grammatical format, hypothetical items and the use of unfamiliar terms and jargons should be avoided. Following such guidelines and others that ensured that the organization and the subject of items were logical, the researcher developed the questionnaire herself.
The questionnaire was structured in two sections (see Appendix A). With the exception of a few items which asked for reasons for specific answers on naming, most of the questions were closed-ended Likert scale type. This type of questionnaire has been found to be most suitable for the measurement of attitudes and perceptions. This is because it enables respondents to indicate the degree of their belief in a given statement (Best & Kahn, 1996).

Section A has items for gathering information on the background of the respondent. These include the respondent’s age, sex, Form and programme. Section B seeks to find out how well the students know their Headmaster and Headmistress aside from their administrative role. It also presents items seeking information on some specific administrative practices of the Head (like planning, organizing, directing, supervising, and evaluating). It also elicited the respondents’ expectation of the administrative behavior of their Heads. The open-ended questions were to give them the opportunity to express their personal opinions on the general comportment of the Head.

**Pilot Testing**

To collect data for the study, effort was made at ensuring the validity and reliability of both the instruments for the research and the results. Creswell (2003) explains reliability as the extent to which an experiment, test, or a measuring procedure yields the same result on repeated trials.

Validity refers to the degree to which a study accurately reflects or assesses the specific concept that the researcher is attempting to measure. While
reliability is concerned with the accuracy of the actual measuring instrument or procedure, validity is concerned with the study’s success at measuring what the researcher set out to measure (Creswell 2003).

The researcher used a group of students in Wesley Girls’ High School to pilot instrument because Wesley Girls’ High School was one of the schools used for the study. The researcher ensured that those students who were selected to test for the reliability and the validity of the instrument were not included in the sample to be used for the study.

After carrying out the pilot testing the researcher went through the completed questionnaires to find out how the items were responded to in order to note items that had possible ambiguities, difficult to understand or simply wrongly worded. They could then be corrected before being administered in the main study. The pilot-testing analysis revealed that an item on the school of the respondent was not going to be useful to the study. All the items that were found not to be clear to the respondents or were not going to be useful in the study were deleted. For example, a question like, “in what district is your Junior Secondary School?” was deleted.

**Data Collection Procedure**

The administration of the questionnaire was done with the assistance of teachers and Assistant Heads of various schools. First, permission was sought from the Heads of the schools concerned. The researcher was then introduced to the Assistant Headmaster/mistress (Academic) who was briefed on how to go about the filling of the questionnaire. Copies of the questionnaires were then left
with the Assistant to be administered. In the case of Wesley Girls’ High School where the researcher was the Assistant Headmistress, the researcher herself administered the questionnaire. In Wesley Girls High School, the selected student respondents were grouped together in a classroom. They were carefully briefed about the purpose of the exercise and given 15-20 minutes to supply the responses. In this particular school there was a 100% return rate since the questionnaires were collected on the spot by the researcher herself.

In the case of the other schools, the researcher has to make several trips to the school before she could retrieve the questionnaires from the Assistant Heads who administered them. The overall response rate was about 91.8%.

**Data Analysis**

The data collected were edited and checked whether they were accurately and authentically done. The questionnaires were serially numbered for easy identification. This precaution was taken to ensure quick detection of any source of error when they occurred in the tabulation of the data. Items on the Likert scale were scored 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 for items with the response to a very great extent, to a great extent, to some extent, very little and not at all respectively. For the analysis to be simple and easy the responses of to a very great extent, to a great extent, to some extent, were combined. Items with “yes” and “no” responses were scored 2 and 1 respectively.

The responses to the various items in the questionnaire were then coded and analyzed using frequencies and percentages. The results were then presented in tables. The open-ended items were also analyzed by grouping the responses
into themes. In all cases, attempts were made at relating findings with existing theory and giving possible explanations for similarities or differences in the opinions of students.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study investigated the perception of students in single-sex senior high schools in Cape Coast regarding the administrative practices of their Heads. This chapter presents the results and discussion of data gathered from 382 students from five Secondary Schools in the Cape Coast Municipality.

One main instrument, a questionnaire, was used for the study. The main focus of the study was to find out how students in single-sex secondary schools in the Cape Coast Municipality perceived the administrative functions of their Headmasters and Headmistresses.

To facilitate understanding of the findings, they are grouped under four main Headings. These are:

1. Whether heads were perceived as parent figures
2. How students in single-sex secondary schools perceive the effectiveness of their Heads in the performance of their administrative practices namely, planning, directing, supervising, and evaluating.
3. The expectations of students in Boys’ schools of their Heads
4. The expectations of students in Girls’ schools of their Heads.
5. Comparison of boys and girls Expectations.

The data have been analyzed through tabular representations of frequencies and percentages, mean and graphs from for the various variables using the SPSS.
Biographical Data

Respondents were asked to indicate their programmes. The programmes the respondents indicated were General Science, General Arts, Business, and Vocational. The responses are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Programme of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Arts</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>04.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>640</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work (2008)

Table 2 indicates that majority of the respondents study General Science and General Arts (78.9%). Most young people in Ghana are made to believe that the Science and the Arts programmes are for the academically good ones, while the Vocational programme is considered to be a programme for the relatively weak students. As a result, the first class schools do not have a large number of students in the vocational program. Only 4.7% of the respondents study the vocational programme.
Boarding Status

To ascertain whether the respondents lived on campus, thereby experiencing all aspects of school life, like eating from the dining hall, information on their boarding status was sought. It is also possible to see more of the Head’s activities if one is a boarder than if one is a day student. Table 3 shows the analysis of the boarding status of the respondents.

Table 3: Boarding Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boarding Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boarder</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work (2008)

An examination of the Table 3 shows that the majority (97.6%) are boarders. This brings to light the fact that most of the secondary schools in Cape Coast are boarding schools. The respondents therefore are in a good position to appraise the administrative practices of their Heads, most of who live on the campus with the students or spend most of their day in the school.

Whether Heads are Perceived as Parent Figures

To have an idea of the type or relationship that existed between students and their Heads, respondents were asked whether their Heads were like fathers and mothers to them. The responses are indicated on Table 4.
Table 4: Whether Students Perceive their Headmaster/Headmistress as Parent Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work (2008)

Table 4 depicts that majority (81.6%) of students saw their Head as a parent figure out of the 282 respondents in the girls’ schools, (96.5%), said their Headmistress was a mother to them and out of the 358 respondents from the boys secondary schools, (81%), said their Heads were like a father to them. This implies that the Headmaster and Headmistress were seen as parents to the students.

Perceptions of Students on the Effectiveness of Heads in the Performance of their Administrative Functions

This section dealt with the extent to which students perceived their Heads as performing their administrative functions. The administrative functions are grouped under planning, organizing, directing, supervising, and evaluating.
The researcher sought to find out whether the respondents perceived their Headmasters/Headmistresses to have plans ahead of time and involved the students in the planning of school activities. The responses are indicated in Table 5. Table 5 indicates that the Headmaster/Headmistress is perceived by the majority of students (88.7%) as being involved in the identification of problems and objectives of the school. This is in line with the assertion of Moser (1986) that one of the first steps in the planning process is to define the objectives of the organization. This involves considering the various driving forces or major influences that affect or are likely to affect the organization.

In identifying the problems and objectives of the organization, the Head is perceived by majority of the respondents (52.7%) as involving students in the planning process. Only a few (9.5%) indicated that students were not involved at all. This is harmony with Abosi’s (1992) assertion that a democratic leadership style is where the decision-making process involves a group. When that is the case the result is motivation, productivity, originality, friendliness, and cooperation. Allen (1998) buttressed this when he stated that when planning, inputs must be gathered from all stakeholders who will be responsible for carrying out parts of the plan along and will own all activities including the outcome.
Table 5: Perceptions of Students on Administrative Functions of their Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head identifying problems in the school</td>
<td>70 (4.6)</td>
<td>78 (6.7)</td>
<td>128 (20.1)</td>
<td>153 (26.8)</td>
<td>209 (41.8)</td>
<td>638 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head involving students in identifying problems of the school</td>
<td>88 (9.5)</td>
<td>109 (15.1)</td>
<td>137 (22.7)</td>
<td>141 (23.8)</td>
<td>160 (28.9)</td>
<td>635 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head planning for every aspect of school life</td>
<td>86 (6.5)</td>
<td>94 (11.6)</td>
<td>146 (26.4)</td>
<td>131 (22.2)</td>
<td>170 (33.2)</td>
<td>627 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head involving students in planning termly activities</td>
<td>105 (4.5)</td>
<td>124 (18.8)</td>
<td>158 (29.3)</td>
<td>129 (21.2)</td>
<td>107 (15.1)</td>
<td>623(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head involved in planning school timetable</td>
<td>86 (9.0)</td>
<td>91 (10.4)</td>
<td>146 (25.4)</td>
<td>133 (21.9)</td>
<td>175 (33.3)</td>
<td>631 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head involving students in the planning of timetable</td>
<td>89 (9.8)</td>
<td>80 (7.3)</td>
<td>143 (24.5)</td>
<td>145 (25.0)</td>
<td>176 (33.4)</td>
<td>623 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head involving students in financial planning</td>
<td>259 (56.3)</td>
<td>116 (17.2)</td>
<td>106 (14.5)</td>
<td>75 (6.0)</td>
<td>76 (6.8)</td>
<td>632 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work (2008)
When the researcher sought the respondents’ perception on whether the Head planned the various aspects of school life, majority of respondents 195 (55.4%) perceived their Heads as planning for the school to a great extent. According to Peretomode (1992), the Head of the organization does not have to plan to formulate policies and later inform his subordinates. This was confirmed when majority 288 (81.8%) of the respondents indicated that the Heads involved students in the planning of the activities of the school. Table 5 demonstrates that majority of the respondents 200 (55.2%) believe their Heads were involved in the planning of the timetable. Only a few 33 (9.0%) felt their Heads were not involved in planning the school timetable. Concerning identification of problems and objectives of the school, a majority of the respondents (195, 52.7%) indicated that they were not involved at all.

In planning of a term’s activities, 105 (29.3%) said they were somehow involved, while 130 (36.3%) also said they were involved to a great extent. This indicates that majority of the respondents were involved in the planning of the activities of the term. This will certainly ensure the success of the school’s term’s programmes since people tend to own the things they help to create (Allen (1998). Students gave their perceptions on the extent to which they think their Heads organized activities for the term. Table 6 gives the results of the students’ perception on the extent to which their Headmasters/Headmistresses organized activities for the school during the term.
Table 6: Perceptions of Students on the extent to which their Heads Organize Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Not at all No. (%)</th>
<th>Very little No. (%)</th>
<th>To some extent No. (%)</th>
<th>To a great extent No. (%)</th>
<th>To a very great extent No. (%)</th>
<th>Total No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing responsibility to members of staff</td>
<td>71 (4.7)</td>
<td>73 (5.4)</td>
<td>122 (18.6)</td>
<td>152 (26.7)</td>
<td>218 (44.5)</td>
<td>636 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning people to defined activities</td>
<td>67 (3.8)</td>
<td>74 (5.7)</td>
<td>132 (21.4)</td>
<td>157 (28.2)</td>
<td>204 (40.9)</td>
<td>640 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling teaching and learning activities</td>
<td>74 (5.7)</td>
<td>96 (11.7)</td>
<td>143 (24.5)</td>
<td>140 (23.7)</td>
<td>179 (34.3)</td>
<td>632 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring efficient accomplishment of assignment</td>
<td>73 (5.4)</td>
<td>79 (7.0)</td>
<td>110 (15.3)</td>
<td>167 (30.6)</td>
<td>208 (41.7)</td>
<td>637 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work (2008)
According to Allen (1998) organizing entails dividing and grouping the job into tasks and assigning different people to do them. Table 6 denotes that majority of respondents 333 (89.8%) expressed the opinion that their Heads performed this function to a great extent. In the school system, there are departments, programmes and different co-curricular activities. From the table, it was realized that 334 (90.5%) of the respondents had the perception that their Headmasters/Headmistresses assigned people to be in charge of clearly defined programmes. It is the duty of the school Head to assign individuals to Head the departments and programmes and also distribute the resources available to the different groupings for the goals of the institution to be achieved. From the table it was realized that 82.5% of the respondents perceived that their Headmasters/Headmistresses scheduled teaching and learning activities in the schools through the Assistant Headmasters/Headmistresses and the Heads of departments.

According to Table 6, 97.6% of the respondents perceived their Headmasters/Headmistresses to be seeing to it that specific assignment of staff and students are effectively accomplished. These Heads go round the school to make sure assigned tasks were executed efficiently.

The researcher attempted to find out whether the students perceived their Heads as supervising the activities of teachers and students. The responses have been captured in Table 7.
Table 7: Perception of Students of their Heads as Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring regularity and punctuality of staff</td>
<td>78 (6.8)</td>
<td>88 (9.6)</td>
<td>103 (13.7)</td>
<td>130 (21.0)</td>
<td>232 (48.9)</td>
<td>631 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring regularity and punctuality of students</td>
<td>67 (3.8)</td>
<td>79 (7.0)</td>
<td>106 (14.2)</td>
<td>117 (17.2)</td>
<td>268 (57.8)</td>
<td>637 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the quality of teaching</td>
<td>70 (4.5)</td>
<td>68 (3.7)</td>
<td>95 (11.0)</td>
<td>112 (15.4)</td>
<td>291 (62.3)</td>
<td>636 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent meetings with staff on obtaining good results</td>
<td>68 (4.1)</td>
<td>69 (4.3)</td>
<td>98 (12.2)</td>
<td>133 (21.7)</td>
<td>265 (57.6)</td>
<td>613 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent meetings with students on how to cope with academic work</td>
<td>105 (14.)</td>
<td>130 (17.2)</td>
<td>140 (25.1)</td>
<td>122 (18.9)</td>
<td>143 (24.6)</td>
<td>640 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking scores</td>
<td>95 (11.0)</td>
<td>182 (18.6)</td>
<td>181 (21.1)</td>
<td>188 (23.1)</td>
<td>112 (15.4)</td>
<td>640 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting classrooms from time to time</td>
<td>111 (15.6)</td>
<td>114 (16.4)</td>
<td>142 (24.0)</td>
<td>121 (18.3)</td>
<td>148 (25.6)</td>
<td>636 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting dormitories and dining hall</td>
<td>128 (20.8)</td>
<td>102 (13.6)</td>
<td>121 (18.8)</td>
<td>122 (19.1)</td>
<td>153 (27.7)</td>
<td>626 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 7, it is realized that majority of the respondents 69.9% perceived their Headmasters/Headmistresses as performing the function of supervision in the area of ensuring quality teaching to a great extent. Only 16.4% of the respondents perceived their Heads as not supervising the punctuality and regularity of their staff.

Majority of the respondents 75.0% were also of the opinion that their Headmasters/Headmistresses held regular meetings with staff to determine effective ways of obtaining good results. According to Kadushun (1992), the effectiveness of managers is determined by their capacity to improve the work of others. In the case of the school Heads their ability to improve the work of their staff shows their effectiveness. Only 10.8% had the perception that their Heads did not meet the staff frequently. Meetings according to Owens (2001) are important in decision-making and in promoting feelings of unity and encouraging sharing of knowledge and ideas. The frequent meetings with staff are for interactions that bring out the problems teachers face in their work and in their social lives and together they try to address the problems for better performance. It is also at such meetings that members are reminded of the common goals and values which all must endeavor to pursue (Druker, 1988). Musser (1987) indicates that the participative kind of leadership is the type that encourages frequent meetings where the leader rather than taking autocratic decisions, seeks to involve others in the process of administration.

Regarding the supervision of attendance and punctuality of staff, majority of the respondents (79.2%) were of the view that their
Headmasters/Headmistresses supervised to a great extent. From the table, it is observed that the supervision of the attendance and punctuality of staff by the Headmaster/Headmistress was not as often as that of students. The table also indicated that majority of the respondents (84.1%) perceived their Heads as ensuring that students are punctual to classes and other functions to a very great extent. This indicates that a good amount of supervision goes on in the schools by the Heads. When teachers are given the needed assistance, learning and teaching become more effective. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (1998) stated that supervision is assistance for the improvement of instruction. It is therefore important that the Heads ensure the punctuality and regularity of teachers and students. This means placing emphasis on the time required for teaching and learning to ensure effectiveness. Almost 19% perceived their Heads as not checking the stores at all. This in comparison to the other supervisory duties is the least carried out. This might be because generally the Heads are more concerned directly with academic issues that the non-academic issues like feeding which is delegated to the Domestic Bursar and the storekeeper.

According to the table, 20.8% perceived their Heads as not to visit the dormitories and dining hall at all. This is significant as compared to other supervisory duties like ensuring the regularity and punctuality of students and teachers. This indicates that while they were performing their supervisory duties in ensuring academic improvement they were neglecting the rounds on domestic activities of the school.
The researcher wanted to know the perceptions of the respondents on the evaluative roles of their Heads. The respondents were to express their perceptions on the evaluating tasks that the Heads are expected to perform. The responses are indicated in Table 8.

Of all the evaluating tasks of Heads the one the respondents perceived their Head performed most is the reviewing of the academic performance of the school. This is because in Ghana the quality of a school is often determined mainly by their examination results. Of late, secondary schools are ranked according to their performance in their final examination (SSCE, WASSCE) and published. The Heads therefore are under pressure to ensure that examination results are good. Sometimes the only time the Head evaluates academic performance is when the external examination results are released. What most Heads do not do is to set the objectives and targets with staff and students before the examinations are written. What normally happens is to compare the current results to the previous year’s results.

As regards collecting of reports from students at regular intervals 47 (12.9%) of the respondents thought their Heads did not look at reports from students at all. 272 represented by 74.5% of the respondents also thought that the Headmasters/Headmistresses as evaluating to some extent. When the percentage of those who perceived their Heads evaluated to some extent is compared to the percentage of those who perceived their Head as not collecting reports from students. It can be realized that it is the least practiced.
Table 8: Perception of students on the evaluating roles of their Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Not at all No. (%)</th>
<th>Very little No. (%)</th>
<th>To some extent No. (%)</th>
<th>To a great extent No. (%)</th>
<th>To a very great extent No. (%)</th>
<th>Total No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the performance of staff</td>
<td>74 (6.0)</td>
<td>92 (11.1)</td>
<td>113 (17.1)</td>
<td>141 (25.1)</td>
<td>195 (40.6)</td>
<td>615 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting reports from students at regular intervals on school activities</td>
<td>100 (12.9)</td>
<td>99 (12.6)</td>
<td>145 (25.2)</td>
<td>134 (22.2)</td>
<td>152 (27.1)</td>
<td>630 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting staff at regular intervals to report on school activities</td>
<td>82 (8.3)</td>
<td>84 (8.9)</td>
<td>121 (19.5)</td>
<td>138 (24.4)</td>
<td>189 (39.0)</td>
<td>614 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing the performance of the school academically</td>
<td>64 (4.6)</td>
<td>62 (4.1)</td>
<td>77 (8.2)</td>
<td>126 (21.5)</td>
<td>313 (59.2)</td>
<td>638 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing the performance of school-out-of-class activities</td>
<td>86 (8.9)</td>
<td>83 (8.1)</td>
<td>113 (16.3)</td>
<td>133 (21.7)</td>
<td>219 (45.0)</td>
<td>634 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing examination results against set targets and objectives</td>
<td>109 (14.9)</td>
<td>70 (4.5)</td>
<td>81 (7.5)</td>
<td>108(14.7)</td>
<td>272 (58.40)</td>
<td>640 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was realized from the table that most of the respondents 305 (83.1) perceived their Heads to have reviewed the academic performance and analyzed the examination results. This indicates that the Headmasters/Headmistresses deal more with the staff in terms of getting feedback on academic performance.

When respondents were to indicate their perception of how the Heads assessed the performance of staff, 65.7% were of the view that their Headmasters/Headmistresses did assess their staff. The assessment of staff is important in the administration of a school. It communicates the goals of the institution and how well the goals are being met and what must be done to continue to meet or change the goals (McNamara, 1999). When the goals are not met then staff development plan must be put in place in order to improve the performance of the staff.

**Expectations of Girls’ school students of their Headmistresses**

The study sought to find out what girls in secondary schools expected from their Headmistresses, and what boys expected from their Headmasters and whether there were some differences in their expectations. The expectations of girls have been displayed in Table 9.
### Table 9: Expectations from Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Responded No. (%)</th>
<th>No Response No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head should allow students to take part in decision making</td>
<td>576 (90.0)</td>
<td>64 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should make it easy for students to approach him</td>
<td>608 (95.0)</td>
<td>32 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should respect students and staff members</td>
<td>589 (92.0)</td>
<td>51 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should be firm and strict</td>
<td>569 (89.0)</td>
<td>71 (11.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should be available and present at school activities</td>
<td>544 (85.0)</td>
<td>96 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should ensure the school rules and regulations are obeyed</td>
<td>448 (70.0)</td>
<td>192 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should visit the dining hall and dormitory</td>
<td>557 (87.0)</td>
<td>83 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should be particular about the welfare of students</td>
<td>589 (92.0)</td>
<td>51 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head must ensure punctuality and teachers and students</td>
<td>608 (95.0)</td>
<td>32 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work (2008)

From Table 9, it was observed that 90% of the girls expect their Heads to involve them in decision making in the school. Musaazi (1982) emphasized that
an efficient and effective school Head encourages students’ participation in matters relating to their affairs and is accessible to the students and shows interest in their welfare.

Most girls (89%) also said that they expect their Headmistress to be present and available in the school. According to Ozigi (2002), a successful school administrator should demonstrate that he/she is personally involved and is interested in the welfare and problems of their staff and pupils, listening sympathetically and with understanding to complaints and problems. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) for his part observed that if students in their future lives as adults are to be innovators, they must be taught in these early years how to think and do things independently. Secondly, personal opinions and initiative among students must be encouraged and respected. The expectations put forward clearly indicate a deep concern the girls have for a relationship-oriented style of leadership.

Some of the girls (89%) expected their headmistresses to be fair and firm to all students and not be partial. The presence of the headmistress in the school was also a concern to 85% of girls who responded and 70% of the girls were also expecting their headmistresses to ensure that school rules and regulations were obeyed by both teachers and students.

Another expectation of the girls (87%) of their headmistresses was that they should visit the dining hall and the dormitories. Girls (92%) also expected their headmistresses to be particular about the welfare of all students. Ninety five percent (95%) of the girls also expected their headmistresses to ensure punctuality among both teachers and students.
A high percentage of their expectations (80%) borders on idiographic dimension of leadership. This is to be expected of girls since girls tend to desire affection and attention. However, there is a caution that Musaazi, (1982) gave concerning the consequences of emphasizing too much the social need of individuals in an organization to the disadvantage of the achievement of organizational goals. In this kind of climate there is a general atmosphere of laxity and goals are hardly achieved (Abosi & Brookman Ammisah, 1992).

**Expectations from Boys**

The researcher wanted to know what the boys expected their Headmasters to do. When asked what the boy respondents expected of their Headmasters, a number of responses were given. These are displayed in Table 10.

From Table 10, it is observed that majority of the respondents (70%) wanted to be involved in the decision making processes in the school. In a democratic dispensation and an era of Child’s Rights, children are demanding more to be allowed to take part in decisions that concern them. In the secondary schools, students do not consider themselves as children. They are adolescents with ages between 14 and 19 years. They are therefore mature enough to contribute meaningfully to decisions concerning the school. They therefore demand the participative kind of leadership style that allows participation of subordinates, peers superior and other stakeholders. According to Moser (1987) there are many potential benefits from this kind of leadership that includes the fact that involvement in decision-making improves performance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Responded No. (%)</th>
<th>No Response No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head should allow students to take part in decision making</td>
<td>448 (70.0)</td>
<td>192 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should make it easy for students to approach him</td>
<td>544 (85.0)</td>
<td>96 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should be firm and strict</td>
<td>435 (68.0)</td>
<td>205 (32.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should be available and present at school activities</td>
<td>582 (91.0)</td>
<td>58 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should ensure the school rules and regulations are obeyed</td>
<td>480 (75.0)</td>
<td>160 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should visit the dining hall and dormitory</td>
<td>589 (92.0)</td>
<td>51 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head should be particular about the welfare of students</td>
<td>557 (87.0)</td>
<td>83 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head must ensure punctuality and teachers and students</td>
<td>499 (78.0)</td>
<td>141 (22.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Work (2008)
The Table also indicated that (85%) which forms a majority expected their Heads to make it easy for their students to approach them. Most of the students (68%) expected their Heads to be strict and firm on issues in the schools. The percentage of respondents who expected their Heads to be firm and strict and that of those who expected their Head to plan and evaluate were not as high compared to the percentage of those who expected their Head to allow students to be involved in planning or decision making. It is clear that students want their opinion to be heard.

Most of the respondents (92%) according to Table 10, expected their Heads to be present in the school and visit the dining hall and the dormitories to see how things are. Ozigi (2002) intimates that a successful administrator should demonstrate that he/she is personally involved and is interested in the welfare and problems of their staff and pupils listening sympathetically and with understanding to complaints and problems. The respondents also expected the Heads to be particular about the welfare of students and ensure punctuality of teachers and students as well.

The researcher wanted to know whether students preferred a new headmaster/headmistress, most of the respondents responded to this item. The result is showed on table 11.
Table 11: Whether Students wanted a new Headmaster/Headmistress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>638</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses most boys wished their headmasters were changed and new heads brought to the schools. One hundred and fifty five boys representing 44.7% of all the respondents said they wanted their headmaster to be changed, whilst only 12.4% did not want a change. Almost all the girls, 41.2% did not want their headmistress to be changed, only (11) 1.7% of the girls wished for a changed of their headmistress.

The results showed that girls had a more positive perception about their headmistresses than boys had about their headmasters. Girls in all girls’ schools trusted their headmistresses and perceived them to be effective and more caring. On the other hand, boys in all boys’ schools perceived their headmasters not to have lived up to expectation so most of them wanted a new headmaster in the school.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The research sought to find out how students in single sex secondary schools in the Cape Coast Municipality perceived the administrative behavior of their Heads and the extent to which they performed these functions.

The study also sought to examine the expectations of students concerning the performance of duties of their Heads. It also sought to discover whether students would prefer another Head.

Summary

Overview of the Study

The study looked at the history of single-sex secondary schools in Ghana and the status of Heads of Institutions over the years. The purpose of the study was stated. Research questions that led to the findings of the study, which is the perception of students and the administrative functions of their Heads, were formulated.

The methodology used for the study and the targeted population for the study was discussed. The population was made up of all the single sex secondary schools in Cape Coast Municipality, 2 girls’ secondary schools and 3 boys secondary schools. The study was based on the responses from 640 respondents purposively selected comprising (149) from Mfantsipim School, (142) from
Adisadel College, (129) from St. Augustine College, (100) from Holy Child School and (120) from Wesley Girls’ High School.

The research design adopted for the study was the descriptive survey, which was the most appropriate for conducting the investigation. The instrument used for the study was a questionnaire made up of three sections. Section A had only closed-ended items and sections B and C had both close-ended and open-ended items.

The sections included the biographic data, a Likert scale of the perceptions of students on the extent to which their Heads performed their administrative functions and items which sought to find expectations of students and whether they would prefer another Head. A pilot test was conducted to before using it to collect the main data to test the reliability of the instrument. The data were analyzed using the SPSS. Descriptive statistics were used to obtain frequencies and percentages. The data of the survey were analyzed and discussed under the subheadings directly related to research questions.

**Summary of Major Findings**

1. It was observed from the study that the Heads performed to a great extent all the administrative functions outlined in the questionnaire, namely: planning, organizing, directing, supervising, evaluating.

2. Generally students perceived their Heads as effective. However, a higher percentage of the girls thought so of their Heads.
3. The greatest expectation of the students of their Heads is allowing them to participate in school affairs and their Heads being approachable and available.

4. Of all the evaluating tasks performed by the Head to evaluate listed in the questionnaire the least practiced in the collecting of reports from students at regular intervals on school activities and the most practiced is the reviewing of the performance of the school academically.

5. On the whole the students were satisfied with their Heads and would not prefer another Head. However, more girls (95%) were satisfied with their Heads than boys (66.3%)

6. Allowing students to take part in decision making ranked the highest among all the expectations that students had of their Heads.

7. Of the administrative functions outlined in the questionnaire, ‘involving students in financial planning’ was perceived to be the function performed the least (53.9%).

8. The function that the students perceived the Heads as performing most effectively is supervising. Under the supervisory tasks improving academic standards, ensuring quality teaching was deemed the most effectively performed.

9. Of their supervisory duties the students perceived their Heads as least performing that of visiting the dining hall and dormitories

10. A higher percentage of girls stated that their Heads were effective (82%). A higher percentage of the girls stated they would not prefer another
Head. As regards the expectations of their Heads, fewer came from the girls and their expectations emphasized the idiographic dimension of leadership.

**Conclusions**

The Headmaster or Headmistress as the leader and administrator of the school organization has certain administrative functions to perform. The effective performance of these functions will go a long way in ensuring the achievement of the goals set by the school. Students as well as staff are directly or indirectly affected as their Heads perform these functions. In the performance of these functions the Head is to ensure that the kind of leadership style employed does not create tension or dissatisfaction among the staff and students. Students would want to have a say in decision-making process and be involved in activities. Female students are much more concerned about how their Headmistress should relate to them.

However, education outcomes are about the caliber of students turned out by school. Students are the main focus of all the tasks that Heads undertake. The study revealed that on the whole Heads were performing their administrative functions to a great extent. However, there were certain practices that needed to be strengthened. Aspects concerning the boarding system were the least catered for in the administrative functions.

Additionally, there were differences in the degree of effectiveness of Heads of Boys Secondary Schools and the Heads of Girls’ Secondary School. Recommendations will therefore be made which if effectively practiced will make
the Headmasters as effective as Headmistresses and their schools even more successful.

The schools used in the study are ranked among the top 10 schools in the country. The finding confirms that the Heads are effectively managing the schools; a reason for their success.

**Recommendations**

Considering the findings and conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. It is recommended that Heads of Senior Secondary Schools are given intensive orientation concerning the nature of administration in schools when they are appointed.

2. After being appointed, Heads of Senior Secondary Schools must go through a systematic scheduled in-service training to upgrade their management skills.

3. Association of Heads of Girls Senior Secondary School and Heads of Boys Senior Secondary School should be formed so that they can have the opportunity to discuss and share problems that are peculiar to them as Heads of single-sex schools.

4. Heads of Secondary Schools should endeavor to always strike a good balance between emphasizing personal needs and that of the organizational needs of the school.
5. Heads of Senior Secondary Schools should encourage easy and frequent flow of information to and from students. They should set up clear channels of communication. This will enable them to evaluate academic performance objectively.

6. Students especially in the Boys school expect enforcement of rules, therefore their Heads must be very firm and strict.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

The following are recommended for further research:

1. A comparative study of the perceptions of students from mixed secondary schools and single-sex secondary schools of the administrative functions of their Heads.

2. The perception of students of single-sex secondary schools of how administrative practices influence discipline in schools

3. The effect of administrative styles on discipline

4. A comparative study of the perceptions of students from all girls’ secondary schools and all boys senior secondary school of the administrative practices of their Heads.
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QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Introduction:

This is a questionnaire on a research seeking information on the perception of students in single-sex secondary schools on the Effective Administrative behavior of their Heads.

Any information given will be used solely for academic research purposes. You are assured of the confidentiality of your responses.

INSTRUCTION

You are kindly requested to give an answer to all questions.

Please tick and write answers in the space provided as appropriate.

SECTION 1

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

1. Sex (a) Male ( ) (b) Female ( )

2. Programme

   (a) Gen. Science (b) Gen. Arts
   (c) Business (d) Vocational

3. Are you a boarder?

   (a) Yes ( )
   (b) No ( )
SECTION B

Please express your views about the following activities in your school by picking from the scale to show the extent to which you perceive your Headmaster as effectively performing these functions.

1. Not at all
2. Very little
3. To some extent
4. To a great extent
5. To a very great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing schedules for meeting of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) P.T.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) School Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in planning for termly activities in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in planning for school timetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the problems and objectives of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving students in identifying the problems and objectives of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving teachers in the planning of the termly activities of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving students in the planning of the termly activities of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving students in the drawing of the school timetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving staff in the drawing of the school timetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving students in financial planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving staff in financial planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for every aspect of school life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating authority and responsibility to other members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining activities and assigning people to be in charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing to it that specific assignments of staff and students are efficiently accomplished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling teaching and learning activities in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving students in the management of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCALE</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIRECTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the implementation of plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding formal and informal meetings with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling the efficient use of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERVISING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the regularity and punctuality of (i) staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiming at improving academic standards by ensuring quality teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding frequent meetings with staff to determine the effective ways of obtaining good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding frequent meetings with students to find out whether they are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coping well with their academic work and life in general on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going round classrooms from time to time to see whether teachers are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classrooms and the students are learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting dormitories and dining hall once in a while to see things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for himself or herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing annual reports of the school and presenting it to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the performance of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting reports from students at regular intervals on school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting staff at regular intervals to report on school activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing the performance of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Academically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) out-of-class activities eg. sports, debates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Examination results against set target and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Do you think your Head is effectively performing his functions?

(a) Yes (   )  (b) No (   )

45. If not, what do you expect of your Head?
46. If you had your own way would you prefer some other Head?

(a) Yes ( )

(b) No ( )