Original Paper

Analysis of Leadership Styles on School Administration in Public Secondary Schools in Delta Cental Senatorial Districts, Delta State, Nigerial

Rowell Ubogu (Ph.D.)[1][*]

[1] Institute of Education, Delta State University, Abraka

[*] Rowell Ubogu (Ph.D.), Institute of Education, Delta State University, Abraka

Abstract

This paper, analyses Leadership Styles on School Administration in Public Secondary Schools in Delta Central Senatorial Districts. The study consented to use the descriptive survey research design, with two research questions and one hypothesis. The population size for the study was all the teachers from 179 public secondary school in Delta Central Senatorial District. Selecting five male teachers and five female teachers at random from each school, the sample size used for the study was 1,790 public secondary school teachers. Fifty copies of the questionnaire were administered to teachers in public secondary schools in Delta North Senatorial District outside the study area, and the data obtained were analysed with Cronbach alpha yielding a coefficient of 0.86. Frequency and mean were also used. The Pearson Correlation was further used to test for the statistical significance between variables at a 0.05 significance level. The study showed that to an average extent, the level of school administration in public secondary schools in Delta State is effective, and that that as leadership style increases, the effectiveness of school administration decreases and vers-a-visa, therefore exemplifying that with the introduction of more autocratic leadership style the effectiveness of school administration tends to dwindle, but however there exists a significant relationship between leadership styles and school administration in public secondary school in Delta State. The researcher recommends care should however be taken on the measure or mix of the leadership style used by school administrators.

Keywords

leadership styles, and school administrators

1. Introduction

Throughout the pages of history, society has always and will continue to witness its affairs being piloted by certain entities considered to be unique and of notable character, or considered worthy of the calling. This trend has continued to shaped the lifestyle of mankind since the dawn of the early ages. Society as we know it, exist solely through a structure defined and organized by members more concerned with its stability, organization and effective functionality. Such members oversee its affairs, formulate policies, draft laws, and binding principles with the sole purpose of maintaining the togetherness and the coexisting of such society. It is against this back drop that the concept of a leader and leadership theories emerge. A leader therefore is a personality that defines guidance, channelling resources to achieve a preconceived or a desired objective. Wong (2007) explained that a leader is an individual "who influences a group of people towards the achievement of a goal". Adding that a mnemonic for this definition would be 3P's-Person, People and Purpose (portraying the person, influencing people, to achieve a purpose), further buttressing that, a leader by its meaning is one who goes first and leads by example, so that others are motivated to follow. This therefore being the basic requirement, a leader, must be a person deeply devoted to the cause or goal that he or the group is determined to achieve even if he/she is followed by no one. Răducan and Răducan (2014) pointed out that the leader has to be seen as an assembly of attributes of the role the person has in a group, and at group's level, as an interaction process. Gary (2008) Organizational behavior, Economică, București (Ed., p. 37), without denying the importance of individual characteristics in getting a prestigious position, believes that other two factors are determining the leading characteristics: "in reality, the leader exists according to the need of a group of people, and according to the nature of the situation where this group is trying to act". The existence of a leader comes not from personal qualities but from the characteristics of the group in question and the real situation he is part of. Adlam (2003, p. 204) highlighted that leadership is a rather complex concept. This has become exceptionally accurate as a result of several theories being adopted to provide meaning to the phrase. However, leadership, according to Fayemi (2008, p. 3) is "the ability to take an initiative, to motivate, to influence, to direct and control the thoughts, the opinions and the actions of the follows in any given society towards the achievement of purposeful desired ends". The conventional standpoint of the perceived concept of leadership is to induce conformity, reverence and cooperation of its followers. Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn (2000, p. 287) portrays this attribute of leadership as a case of interpersonal influence that get individuals, or groups of people to do what the leader wants to be done. Therefore, by implication, the leader's primarily focus is on what he/she wants to achieve from people therefore, followers' input becomes irrelevant and rebuffed with regards to what it is to be done. Reporting Sashkin and Sashkin's (2003, p. 39) and Holly and Miskel's (2001, p. 393) definitions of leadership appear to be a more recent perspective. They define leadership as the art of transforming people and organisation with the aspiration of improving the organisation. Leaders in this perspective delineate duties, elaborate why the task is to be embarked upon and completed; supervise the activities of followers', ensuring that

78

subordinates or members of the group have what is takes in terms of skills and resources to execute the task. Such leaders create personal relationship between themselves and their subordinates within the group; thereby aligning, motivating and inspiring them to increase productivity amongst the group. This premise therefore is based upon the reformation the leader introduces that produces "positive change in the organisation, groups, interpersonal relationships and the environment" (Oyetunji, 2009).

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Leadership Styles

The style of leadership adopted is considered by some researchers (for example, Maicibi, 2006, p. 126) to be particularly important for achieving organisational goals and evoking performance among subordinates. Despite the widespread acknowledgment of the importance and value of leadership, when studying the leadership literature (Mandiya, Machera, & Karodia, 2014), Cheng and Mullins (2002), explained that leadership styles are related with leaders' personal characteristics or traits and appropriate combination of personal characteristics (which) leads to effective leadership that in turn influences the performance of an institution. The impact of traits differs according to situation/environment and therefore the leaders effectively evaluate their leadership styles in order to improve performance of institutions by managing institutions differently depending with the situation (Holly & Miskel, 2012). Leadership style is therefore defined "as the pattern of behaviours that leaders display during their work with and through others" (Hersey, 2006, p. 130). A leadership style assumed by a leader or a manager in an organisation can also be influenced by the nature and quality of employees in the workplace. Leaders employ different styles according to the nature and quality of their subordinates. Rearticulating Mandiya, Machera, and Karodia (2014), a leadership style adopted by an administrator of high skill or knowledgeable professionals would differ from the leader ship style adopted by an administrator of average or low skill professionals. Griffin et al. (2006, p. 61) observed, that the style of the leader may vary, as may the content of the leader's vision and the context in which it takes root. This is consistent with the position and arguments of Yukl (2008, p. 722), paraphrasing that leaders must be prepared to modify their leadership behaviour, this includes their competitive policy, and the formal structures they operate upon, in order to circumvent the challenges that besets them in an increasingly turbulent and uncertain environment.

According to Zehira et al. (2011), leadership styles can be classified into two major groups: the mechanistic based leadership approach and the humanistic based leadership style; rearticulating that the dynamic changes which takes place within and outside the organization, has further positively stimulated leaders to modify their leadership ideologies from the more orthodox mechanistic technique to a more humanistic driven leadership technique in order to achieve predetermined goals and organizational objectives (Brown, 2003; Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006; Ismail, Zainuddin, & Ibrahim, 2010). The traditional leadership style or approach according to (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006; Yousef, 2000) is reported to be tenaciously affected by the orthodox management theory while most

79

leaders incline to adopt the mechanistic based leadership technique in handling subordinates, and supervising them within the organization. This leadership style is widely practiced in organizations that operate in a stable market environment, focusing on internal organizational environments and (giving) less emphasis to high commitment human resource practices (Coulter & Robbins, 2008; Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, Hollenbeck, Barry, & Wright, 2007; Ismail, Zainuddin, & Ibrahim, 2010).

Shedding more light, rearticulating Zehira et al. (2011), the humanistic based leadership perspective emphasizes factors depicting the quality of the relationship with followers such assympathy and concern, mutual-trust, open suggestion policies, stimulating interaction between leader and follower, consultative and democratically aligned with subordinates (Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, & Kramer, 2004; Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004). Adding that this leadership style is generally operational in organizations that thrive in a dynamic market environment, concentrating on external competitiveness and emphasizing more on higher performance of human resource practices (Berson & Avolio, 2004; Coulter & Robbins, 2008; Mondy, 2009; Ismail, Zainuddin, & Ibrahim, 2010).

Other leadership styles according to Mandiya, Machera, and Karodia (2014) includes, Participative Leadership Style; also known as democratic leadership (where) all members of a team are involved in identifying essential goals (and) are given the task to develop procedures or strategies to achieve the established goals. From this vintage point, participative leadership is best described as a leadership model that depends to a large extent on the leader assuming the role of a facilitator than basically issuing orders or making assignments. These views are consistent with the positions or arguments of Beatty and Quinn (2007, p. 3), who argue that leaders must ensure that people have clear, shared priorities. They must work to develop a climate that generates common understanding. By giving workers a voice in decisions, participative leaders build organisational flexibility and responsibility and help generate fresh ideas (Goleman, 2000, p. 16). Elucidating that, the Authoritative Leadership Style, is perceived as an expert in the company, able to clearly identify the goals that will lead the organisation to success. Elucidating further, that the authoritarian leadership style is also referred to as directive leadership style or coercive leadership style by some scholars.

Liu et al. (2003, p. 152) pointed out, that the authoritative leadership tries to establish followers as compliant subordinates by relying on such behaviours as command and direction, assigned goals, and punishments. Followers have little direction over the job and are rarely allowed to participate in decision-making. Authoritative leadership inhibits an organisation's flexibility and dampens employees' motivation (Goleman, 2000, p. 18). However, it is important to indicate that authoritative leadership is useful in some leadership scenarios that demand the use of authority. On the other hand, Mandiya, Machera, and Karodia (2014) added that Supportive Leadership Style (which is also referred to as the coaching style by certain scholars), focuses more on personal development than on immediate work-related tasks. It works well when employees are already aware of their weaknesses and want to improve, but not when they are resistant to changing their ways (Saowalux & Peng, 2007, p. 45). The supportive style of leadership has therefore, a rational approach and presupposes that the top level

manager of the company has a vision and all it takes to realise it but, at the long run, developing a strategy is equally as important as a means of rationalising management decision and guide its of actions via the services of the employee.

This leadership style is based on the premise that "in order to influence people in an organisation successfully, leaders must design their message to appeal to the heads and hearts of those they are trying to influence as well as to those individuals' desires for personal and professional growth and for the success of the organisation as a whole" (Grayson, 2002, p. 13). Adding further, that the "Laissez Faire Leadership Style also known as the 'hands off' style, is one in which the manager provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible" (Stanfield, 2009). This leadership style portrays and tilts towards empowering the employee to act instinctively and make decisions on behalf of the organisation resolving any complex issues that may or may not arise as they go along their leadership functions.

2.2 Leadership Theories

In 2008 Yukl, proposed a theory of strategic leadership, positing that it should explain how top executives influence the organisational processes that determine a firm's financial performance and long-term survival (Boal & Hooijberg, 2000; Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996). Explaining that the theories should take into consideration the influence of top level executives on the achievement of strategic objectives, competitive strategy adopted, the formal structure imposed, the management systems and programs, the corporate culture; and the members' skills and motivation. Stating that the theory should also include relevant aspects of the situation that influence the actions and decisions of top executives (Osborn et al., 2002), adding that the theory should also consider how multiple leaders in an organisation share power and interact with each other to influence performance (Gronn, 2002; Pearce & Conger, 2003), adding that the theory should help to bridge the gulf between the leadership and management literatures.

Thus rearticulating the "Flexible Leadership Theory" (FLT) which was introduced, necessitated by the lack of a more comprehensive theory of strategic leadership that embraces significant ideas from several distinct literatures. The flexible leadership model basses it ideology primarily around the premise of the organisation on four different stages or variables sets, which includes organisational effectiveness; performance determinants; situational variables, and leadership decisions and actions. Adding that the effectiveness of an organisation is the extent to which the organisation is able to thrive, achieve its objective, thereby retaining income, resources, and asset value; (which are) key indicators for business firms include long-term profit growth, return on investment, and stock returns. Adding further, that the effectiveness of an organisation depends on three primary performance determinants and they include efficiency and process reliability; human capital; and adaptation to the external environment. The performance determinants (hinged upon the discretion of the leader's decision making processes) are influenced by the decisions and actions of a firm's leaders. The comparative importance of the performance determinants, and how difficult it is to influence them, are affected by

81

aspects of the situation such as the type of organisation or industry, turbulence in the external environment (resource availability, intensity of competition, economic, political, or technological change), and constraints on executive action (involving oversight by owners or government agencies, or stemming from legal restrictions)" (Yukl, 2008).

Aligning these theories with behaviours, and how leadership is executed in organizations, Men (2010) explained that current leadership theories indicate that leadership behaviors can be categorised into two main styles: transformational leadership and transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1997, 2000). Adding that Transformational leadership is the most studied leadership style across disciplines; (portraying charisma in leadership), the Transformational leaders are charismatic. They inspire followers appealing to their ideology and moral values by creating and representing an inspiring vision of the future (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This variety of leadership styles involves the construction of an emotional attachment between the leader and follower or subordinate. Elucidating further, that Transformational leaders take a real interest in the well-being of their employees. Jin (2010) explained that transformational leadership style incorporate the rudiments of empathy, sensitivity, compassion, relationship building, and innovation. Adding that it fosters a climate of trust, nurtures employees' confidence, and encourages their individual development. In concurrence, Aldoory and Toth (2004) pointed out that, transformational leadership includes the elements of participative decision making and sharing of power.

2.3 Ideology of School Administration

The word "administration" takes its roots from the native Latin word "minister", which refers to "service rendered for the welfare or benefit of others", with an orthodoxy implication of taking charge of or carry out a task. It is described by The American Association of School Administration as the totality of "the processes through which appropriate human and material resources are made available and made effective for accomplishing the purpose of an enterprise". School administration therefore entails the duties assigned to an individual or group of individuals to take charge of an academic institution and render service for the benefit of the immediate environment which includes students, teachers and the general public in this regard. Established by a number of processes which in itself are termed administrative, the school exist solely via the process of organising and controlling both internal and external factors or variables which includes, number of students accepted into the school, number of student—teacher ratio, staff salary, appropriate curriculum, time allotted for teaching and learning activities amongst others.

Abdulrahman-Yusuf (2017), buttressed that school administration can simply be explained in a straight forward statement as looking after the complete affairs related to school; describing it as the managerial skill necessary for its smooth functioning and execution. The concept of school administration from the Glossary of Education (2012), portray it as "the task of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling human or material resources within a school, college, or university. This definition relies upon the fact that the school as an educational institution has its own administrative unit saddled with the task of

planning, directing, organising and controlling. This unit of administrators based in the school system comprise of the principal as the head of school administration, the vice principal (deputizing on behalf of the principal when absent), the Head of Departments, form masters and subject teachers, as it is in the case of secondary level of education". Abdulrahman-Yusuf (2017) added that School administrators are responsible for developing and preserving the educational experience of teachers and students. Their duties also includes but not limited to, selecting suitable curriculum materials and models, managing school finances, and collaborating with the existing community.

In specific terms, school administration is a premise of both educational pedagogy and modern concepts of management science, portraying its conceptualization as both a means to an end and an end in itself, translating educational policies into instructional models, materials and curriculum, while maintaining its exigencies and efficiency, effectively upholding the etiquette of professionalism the discipline deserves. While administration aims at overseeing people, directing their activities via a systematic or a methodological approach, the school in this premise refers to the construct where administration occurs, involving both internal factors; students, teachers, curriculum and infrastructure; and external factors; parents, environment, patrons, philanthropic organisations and the government. Spillane and Kenney (2012) explained that school administrators are not passive receptors of their environments. Rather, they enact their environments; that is, they "construct, rearrange, single out, and demolish many objective features of their surroundings (Weick, 1979, p. 164)". School leaders (or school administrators) as mid-level managers (Harris, 2002; Hatch, 2001; Leithwood et al., 2004; Louis et al., 2010; Spillane et al., 2002) occupy a somewhat unique situation: their work focuses in at least two directions in the organisational administrative hierarchy.

On the one hand, school leaders (or school administrators) are dependent on their institutional environment for the legitimacy of their organisation (or institution)—local school council, school district, state, parents, and local community. On the other hand, they are also dependent on classroom teachers and students for the organisational integrity of their buildings. Without the cooperation of teachers and students, the coherence, integration, and self-consistency of their school is likely to fall apart. Elucidating further that organisational integrity and organisational legitimacy are interdependent: in a changing institutional environment, legitimacy is increasingly tied to student achievement as measured by standardized tests aligned, more or less, with district and state standards. Adding that, in dealing with pluralistic institutional environments requires institutional work that falls, broadly, into two main categories (Kraatz, 2009). First, there is organisational legitimacy as school leaders strive to gain the support of diverse stakeholders by demonstrating to those stakeholders of their school's "cultural fitness" and in pluralistic organisations such school leaders (or administrators) have to convince diverse stakeholders that the organisation is legitimate—a "real" school (or institution—as expected by stakeholders).

2.4 Administrative Roles and the Nigerian Context

Administrative role defines the nature and type or discipline in which the context of administration is to be performed. The role of administration is residential upon the basis of the environment where the school or institution is located. Omolaja (2009), explained that it is self evident that administration must take place in any social setting; be it as small as a family unit or as large as the universe. Portin et al. (2006) elucidated that the learning improvement imperative for school leaders (or school administrators), their role conceptions, authority allocation, and related issues has implied the pressing influence of developments in the environments in which school leaders work; these developments include the changing face of the communities served by the schools, the policy actions of the federal and state government, and the policy responses of local jurisdictions. Zvogbo (2005a) quoted Mintzberg (1973) who identified the administrative or managerial roles as consisting of interpersonal roles, information roles, as well as decision-making roles; one can conclude that administration broadly encapsulates people, their activities and their interpersonal relationships in a systematic structure (the organization, residential within the environment) that it is intentionally designed.

Omolaja (2009) buttressed that since, it has become widely acknowledged that there is the universality of administration; the implication of this claim is that administrative duties and responsibilities tend to remain constant irrespective of the location and time where and when they are performed ceteris paribus. However, from experience, nothing remains the same except the change itself. Stating further that, since culture differs across national boundaries and over time, administrative responsibilities also differ in mode of performance. Hence, administrative practice in Nigeria is dependent on the Nigerian culture while administrative practice in Europe or in Asia is also dependent on the culture of the respective continents. This assertion implies that the practice of administration (administrative roles) is a function of cultural pattern of behavior of the administrator; which implies non-homogeneity of administration. Portin et al. (2006) explained that of particular importance are demographic trends and imperatives (involving Increasing socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity), Achievement and accountability pressures (involving the press for improving student achievement, especially test scores stemming from federal and state policies), School choice and competition (involving the critique of public schooling and the growth in alternatives to public schooling), Local reform and restructuring, (involving experimentation with district-wide and school-specific reforms to meet high expectations and address enduring deficiencies in schooling), and the Dynamics of the leadership (involving the crisis of administrator recruitment, preparation, and associated policies).

Administrative roles and practices in Nigeria therefore are basically depicted by the cultural context, which has over the years been succinctly modelled to suit her own managerial predisposition based on this context portraying the function of the custom and traditions of the Nigerian people. Omolaja (2009) explained that because of the cultural background of the Nigerians; administrative practice in the country may be said to be at variance from the ideal practice especially when compared to the European model.

84

2.5 Statement of the Problem

Based on the premise that both concepts of leadership styles and administrative roles are executed within the confines of the school as an organizational institution and located within the immediate environment or society, Omolaja (2009) lamented that organizational politics has become the permanent culture of every modern organization or society; whether in Europe or in Africa, the impact of organizational politics is being felt significantly. However, in Nigeria undue attention is being paid to organizational politics and other subjective variables giving room for mediocrity against meritocracy. This is affecting the corporate performance of the Nigerian Organizations both in the private sector and in the public sector; because of the federalism and its concomitant societal systems of federal character; quota and representative mechanism, people who would not normally qualify to be in positions are being put in positions of authority. Moja (2000) buttressed that "other problems (exists and they are as a) result of a complex combination of need for greater access to education on the part of the society and political pressure on politicians to satisfy their constituencies, in return for continued political support; (and) as a result, political decisions (are being) taken in a number of areas including staff and administration appointments", thereby, altering the natural course of events in Nigerian public schools and undermining the leadership style developed by seasoned and experienced school administrators. Bett et al. (2016) added that many previous studies on schools' management found that schools that achieve high success in academics are led by the headmaster (school administrators) who has the qualities of effective leadership. Oyetunji (2009) submitted that the head teacher's (school administrators) leadership style is significant in creating and sustaining a positive school climate; to corroborate this claim O'Hanlon and Clifton's (2004, p. 3) study indicates that "the head teacher can promote or destroy a school through the climate he/she creates" via the administrative roles employed. Chika (2008) explained that secondary school principals in Nigeria seem too busy with all the day-to-day responsibilities of running their school and they do not seem to have enough time to practice instructional leadership as expected. Sheahan (2013) added that "not all school administrations are effective at what they do. Problems may arise that can lead to a breakdown in the education system and diminish the learning experience of students". It is therefore against this backdrop that this research was carried out to analyse leadership styles on school administration in secondary schools in Delta Central Senatorial Districts, Delta State, Nigeria.

3. Research Questions

1) What leadership styles do school administrators in public secondary schools in Delta State exhibit?

2) To what extent is the level of school administration in public secondary schools in Delta State effective?

3.1 Research Hypotheses

1) There is no significant relationship between leadership styles and school administration in public secondary school in Delta State.

85

3.2 Methodology

The study consented to the use of a descriptive survey research design, based on the fact that it involves observing, recording, describing, and classifying a natural phenomenon or observable fact; contrasted with hypothesis-driven research, which is focused on testing a particular hypothesis by means of experimentation (Casadevall & Fang, 2008). The population size used for the study is a total of all teachers from 179 public secondary school in Ethiope East, Ethiope West, Okpe, Sapele, Udu, Ughelli North, Ughelli South, and Uvwie Local Government Areas (LGA), in Delta Central Senatorial District, Delta State, Nigeria. Selecting five male teachers and five female teachers at random from each school, the sample size used for the study was one thousand, seven hundred and ninety (1790) public secondary school teachers, from Delta Central Senatorial District, Delta State, Nigeria. The questionnaire was the research instrument employed for this study with the aim of gathering quantitative data. The sample questionnaire was endorsed by two—Test and measurement consultants from the Department of Guidance and Counselling, Delta State University, Abraka, and the College of Education, Agbor, both located in Delta State, Nigeria. To ensure the internal constancy of the instrument, fifty copies of the questionnaire were administered to teachers in public secondary schools in Delta North Senatorial District outside the study area, and the data obtained were subjected to the use of Cronbach alpha yielding a coefficient of 0.86. The data obtained for the research was subsequently analyzed using frequency and mean based on a four point scale of SA = Strongly Agree (4 points), A = Agree (3 points), D = Disagree (2 points), and SD = Strongly Disagree (1 point), selecting 2.50 as an average midpoint value. The Pearson Correlation was used to test for the statistical significance between variables raised with regards to the research hypothesis at a 0.05 significance level.

3.3 Results

Research Question 1: What leadership styles do school administrators in public secondary schools in Delta State exhibit?

Table 1. Respondent's Take on Research Question One "Leadership Styles School Administrators in Public Secondary Schools in Delta State Exhibit"

S/no	Variable Description	SA	%	A	%	D	%	SD	%	FX	N	Mean	Remark
1.	Our school administrator likes to make decisions alone without the input of other teachers (Autocratic)	693	38.72	487	27.21	359	20.06	251	14.022	5202	1790	2.906	Agree
2.	School administrators	714	39.89	479	26.76	378	21.12	219	12.235	5268	1790	2.943	Agree

	in our institution does not like anyone to challenging their authority or decisions (Autocratic)											
3.	Our head teacher likes to focus only on getting the job done (Task-oriented)	821	45.87	394	22.01	299	16.7	276	15.419	5340	1790	2.983	Agree
4.	Head teachers in our school actively define the work that is to be done and the roles required (Task-oriented)	763	42.63	482	26.93	357	19.94	188	10.503	5400	1790	3.017	Agree
5.	School administrator in our institution always puts structures in place, and plan, organize, and monitor the work of other teachers (Task-oriented)	842	47.04	431	24.08	317	17.71	200	11.173	5495	1790	3.070	Agree
6.	Our head teacher inspires others and based on that expects the best from every other teachers (Transformational)	369	20.61	315	17.6	638	35.64	468	26.145	4165	1790	2.327	Disagree
7.	School administrator in our institution communicates to other teachers on a deep, emotional level (Charismatic)	295	16.48	366	20.45	521	29.11	608	33.966	3928	1790	2.194	Disagree
8.	Head teachers in our	358	20	391	21.84	468	26.15	573	32.011	4114	1790	2.298	Disagree

	school articulates a compelling or captivating vision in other teachers which reflects in their work (Charismatic)												
9.	Our school administrator stimulates and arouses strong emotions in other teachers to get work done (Charismatic)	442	24.69	382	21.34	477	26.65	489	27.318	4357	1790	2.434	Disagree
10.	In our School the head teacher is very rigorous and does not take suggestions from other teachers (Bureaucratic)	565	31.56	478	26.7	394	22.01	353	19.721	4835	1790	2.701	Agree
11.	In our School the principal always ensures that other teachers follow procedures precisely (Bureaucratic)	669	37.37	507	28.32	353	19.72	261	14.581	5164	1790	2.885	Agree
12.	In our School the principal always ensures that everything is done in an exact, specific way to ensure safety and/or accuracy	732	40.89	481	26.87	363	20.28	214	11.955	5311	1790	2.967	Agree
13.	School administrators in our institution always ensures that ideas move freely amongst other teachers	606	33.85	459	25.64	446	24.92	279	15.587	4972	1790	2.778	Agree

88

S/no	Variable Description											Mean	Remark
	in the school and problems are openly discussed (Democratic)												
14.	School administrators in our institution are always open to suggestions and other possible ways of getting things done from other teachers (Democratic)	422	23.58	363	20.28	492	27.49	513	28.659	4274	1790	2.388	Disagree
15.	School administrator in our institution do not supervise other teachers but reminds us to be intuitive in their work (Laissez-Faire)	339	18.94	474	26.48	478	26.7	499	27.877	4233	1790	2.365	Disagree
	Overall mean											2.684	Agree

Displayed in Table 1 above are the variables listed on items 1-15 with regards to research question one, showing that all the variables measured returning a mean value above the predetermined 2.50 midpoint average used to determine the level of the variable, thereby indicating that the respondents agree that those areas were leadership styles school administrators exhibit, except for variables on item 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, and 15, where the mean levels were below the 2.50 midpoint average indicating that the respondents disagree in these areas that such leadership styles were not exhibited. However, the overall mean of 2.684, was obtained, which is also higher than the predetermined 2.50 midpoint value used to determine the average level of the group variable, therefore supporting the respondents claim that the above are leadership styles school administrators in public secondary schools in Delta State exhibit.

Research Question 2: To what extent is the level of school administration in public secondary schools in Delta State effective?

Table 2. Respondent's Take on Research Question Two "Extent at which the Level of School Administration in Public Secondary Schools in Delta State is Effective"

S/no	Variable Description	LE	%	AV	%	LE	%	NE	%	FX	N	Mean	Remark

1	Curriculum are properly covered in time for revision by teachers	762	42.57	413	23.07	348	19.44	267	14.916	5250	1790	2.933	Average Extent
2	Teachers salary and welfare properly catered for	696	38.88	488	27.26	377	21.06	229	12.793	5231	1790	2.922	Average Extent
3	Students educational needs are properly catered for	599	33.46	483	26.98	382	21.34	326	18.212	4935	1790	2.757	Average Extent
4	Renovation of dilapidated infrastructure	287	16.03	328	18.32	544	30.39	631	35.251	3851	1790	2.151	Low Extent
5	Replacement of outdated and worn out books in the school library	378	21.12	382	21.34	497	27.77	533	29.777	4185	1790	2.338	Low Extent
6	Maintaining the Public Image of the school to the external community	651	36.37	583	32.57	442	24.69	114	6.3687	5351	1790	2.989	Average Extent
7	Upholding discipline and fair judgement for both teachers and students	704	39.33	541	30.22	417	23.3	128	7.1508	5401	1790	3.017	Average Extent
8	Properly articulating and transferring educational policies received from governmental agencies down to the hierarchy of teachers below	672	37.54	488	27.26	397	22.18	233	13.017	5179	1790	2.893	Average Extent
9	Strictly complying to the use of recommended text by curriculum reviewers	721	40.28	477	26.65	382	21.34	210	11.732	5289	1790	2.955	Average Extent
10	Strictly adhering to	688	38.44	395	22.07	374	20.89	333	18.603	5018	1790	2.803	Average

	pre-developed marking schemes											Extent
11	Supervising and Monitoring the development of lesson notes by sub teachers	497	27.77	479	26.76	422	23.58	392	21.899	4661	1790	2.604	Average Extent
12	Ensuring favourable educational climate within the school for both teachers and students	531	29.66	425	23.74	487	27.21	347	19.385	4720	1790	2.637	Average Extent
	Group mean											2.750	Average Extent

Note. Key: LE = Large Extent (3.50-4.00), AE = Average Extent (2.50-3.49), LE = Low Extent (1.50-2.49), NE = No Extent (0.00-1.49).

In Table 2 above are the variables listed on items 1-12 with regards to research question two, showing that all the variables measured returning a mean value above the predetermined 2.50 based on our mean rating model explained above and used to determine the extent at which the level of school administration was effective. It was however shown that respondents agreed that to an average extent, school administration was effective in all areas listed above except for variables on items 4 and 5, where the items scored below 2.50 and based on our mean rating model above, it is concluded that those areas of school administration listed were to a low extent effective. However, the Table also shows an overall mean of 2.750, which is also based on our mean rating model above and used to determine the extent at which the level of school administration was effective, it can therefore be concluded that extent at which the level of school administration in public secondary schools in Delta State is effective to an average extent.

Research Hypotheses

H_0: $\rho = 0$ There is no significant relationship between leadership styles and school administration in public secondary school in Delta State.

H_1: $\rho \neq 0$ There is a significant relationship between leadership styles and school administration in public secondary school in Delta State.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation between Leadership Styles and School Administration in Public Secondary School in Delta State

Correlations

		leadership styles	school administration
leadership styles	Pearson Correlation	1	-.676[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.016
	N	1790	1790
school administration	Pearson Correlation	-.676[*]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	
	N	1790	1790

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 shows the bivariate Pearson Correlation for the coefficient, r, at a 0.05 significance which aims a measuring the strength and direction of the linear relationship between pairs of the continuous variables leadership styles and school administration. The table shows that there is a statistical correlation between leadership styles and school administration based on the (r) value of -0.676. However the minus sign (-) before the (r) value of 0.676 indicates that as leadership style increases, the effectiveness of school administration decreases and vers-a-visa, therefore exemplifying that with the introduction of more autocratic leadership the effectiveness of school administration tends to dwindle. However, the correlation (r) of -0.676 undoubtedly indicates that our null hypotheses e rejected and the alternative hypotheses accepted, thereby indicating that there is a significant relationship between leadership styles and school administration in public secondary school in Delta State.

3.4 Discussion of Findings

Based on the research finding within the study, it is discovered that school administrators in Delta state likes to make decisions alone without the input of other teachers, and does not like anyone to challenging their authority or decisions, following the autocratic leadership style. In a similar study, by Mandiya et al. (2014), the results from the interviews shows that most of the respondents highly believed that their performance was assessed by their supervisors alone; and that performance measurement was conducted the authoritative way, where a few or no employees are consulted when the supervisors are conducting performance appraisals; and that during the interview sessions, most participants believed that authoritative leadership brought about performance the autocratic way, yet other forms of leadership would approach the employee from a more humanistic manner.

The study further showed that head teacher in Delta State likes to focus only on getting the job and actively define the work that is to be done and the roles required, and always puts structures in place, and plan, organize, and monitor the work of other teachers. Also following the task-oriented leadership style or strategy as (Gupta, 2006) explained that it represents an organisation's chosen mode for interacting with its task environment. Furthermore the study showed that head teacher in Delta State do not inspires others teachers following the Transformational leadership style, and do not communicate to other teachers on a deep, emotional level and do not articulates a compelling or captivating vision in other

teachers which reflects in their work and do not stimulates and arouses strong emotions in other teachers to get work done following the Charismatic style. However, the head teachers in Delta State are very rigorous and do not take suggestions from other teachers and ensures that other teachers follow procedures precisely following the Bureaucratic leadership style.

Also School principals in Delta State always ensures that everything is done in an exact, specific way to ensure safety and/or accuracy, and that ideas move freely amongst other teachers in the school and problems are openly discussed following the Democratic leadership style but are not always open to suggestions and other possible ways of getting things done from other teachers, and finally they supervise other teachers yet reminding them to be intuitive in their work following the Laissez-Faire leadership style.

The study also showed that to an average extent, the level of school administration in public secondary schools in Delta State is effective, and that that as leadership style increases, the effectiveness of school administration decreases and vers-a-visa, therefore exemplifying that with the introduction of more autocratic leadership the effectiveness of school administration tends to dwindle, but however there is a significant relationship between leadership styles and school administration in public secondary school in Delta State.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

It is evident therefore that there is a correlation between leadership style and school administration, but care should however be taken on the measure or mix of the leadership style used by school administrators due to the fact that the study has shown that as leadership style increases, the effectiveness of school administration decreases and vers-a-visa, using a classical example that with the introduction of more autocratic leadership style, the effectiveness of school administration tends to dwindle. The researcher therefore recommends that school administrators should be properly oriented on the pros and cons of the different leadership style they adopt while performing their school administrative functions.

References

Abdulrahman-Yusuf, M. (2017). *School Administration in Nigeria: Bringing the Past to the Fore.* Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/12774087/SCHOOL_ADMINISTRATION_IN_NIGERIA_BRINGING _THE_PAST_TO_THE_FORE

Adlam, R. (2003). *This Complex Thing, Leadership, in Police Leadership in the Twenty First Century* (pp. 204-222). Winchester: Waterside Press:.

Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(1), 5-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003

93

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment and Moderating Role of Structural Distance. *J. of Organizational Behaviour*, *25*, 951-968. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003

Beatty, C., & Quinn, L. (2007). Making strategy real: Bringing people towards a common cause. *Leadership in Action*, *27*. https://doi.org/10.1002/lia.1199

Berson, Y., & Avolio, J. (2004). Transformational Leadership and the Dissemination of Organizational Goals: A Case Study of a Telecommunication Firm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(5), 625-646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.07.003

Bett, D. R., Wambugu, P. W., & Fedha, F. M. (2016). Selected Head Teachers Leadership Styles and Their Influence on Pupils Academic Performance in Primary Schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Recent Research in Social Sciences and Humanities (IJRRSSH)*, *3*(1), 272-283.

Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2000). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 515-549. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6

Boomer, L. G. (2014). *Leadership, Management and Administration*. Boomer Consulting, Inc. Retrieved April 25, 2014, from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/20140425142012-6864846-career-curveballs-leadership-manage ment-and-administration

Brown, B. B. (2003). *Employees' Organizational Commitment and Their Perception of Supervisors' Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Uni*.

Casadevall, A., & Fang, F. C. (2008). Descriptive Science. *Infection and Immunity*, *76*(9), 3835-3836.

Cheng, Y. C., & Mullins, A. (2002). Leadership and Strategy. *The Principles and Practice of Educational Management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Chika, P. E. (2008). Principals' Instructional Leadership Roles and Effects on Teachers' Job Performance: A Case study of Secondary Schools in Asaba Metropolis, Delta State, Nigeria. *A Journal for Social Science*, *16*(1), 13-17.

Coulter, M., & Robbins, S. P. (2008). *Management*. Malaysia: Prentice Hall.

Fayemi, A. K. (2008). A philosophical Appraisal of leadership and Development in Nigeria. In T. Edoh, & T. Wuam (Eds.), *Leadership, Accountability and Development in Post-Independence Africa*. Lapai: Department of History and Archeology, IBB University. https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.00743-08

Finkelstein, S., & Hambrick, D. C. (1996). *Strategic leadership: Top executives and their effects*. Minneapolis: West Publishing.

Gary, J. (2008). Organizational behavior. In *Economică, Bucureşti* (p. 37).

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*.

Grayson, C. (2002). *How can leaders learn to influence others in their organizations—Their bosses,*

94

peers, and subordinates? Leadership in Action. John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Griffin, M. A., & Rafferty, A. E. (2006). Refining Individualized Consideration: Distinguishing Developmental Leadership and Supportive Leadership. *J. of Occupational and Organizational Psyc.*, *79*, 37-61. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X36731

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 423-451. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0

Gupta, A. K. (2006). SBU strategies, corporate-SBU relations, and SBU effectiveness in strategy implementation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *30*, 39-70.

Harris, A. (2002). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts. *School Leadership & Management*, *22*(1), 15-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430220143024a

Harris, A. (2005). Distributed leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), *The Essentials of School Leadership* (pp. 160-172). Paul Chapman Publishing, London, 556 JEA 50,5

Hatch, T. (2001). Incoherence in the system: Three perspectives on the implementation of multiple initiatives in one district. *American Journal of Education*, *109*(4), 407-437. https://doi.org/10.1086/444334

Herman, J. L. (2004). The effects of testing on instruction. In S. H. Fuhrman, & R. F. Elmore (Eds.), *Redesigning Accountability Systems for Education* (pp. 141-166). Teachers College Press, New York, NY.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (2006). *Management and organisational behaviour: Leading human resources* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Holly, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2012). *Educational Administration: Theory Research practice*. New York: McGrawHill co. Inc.

Ismail, A., Zainuddin, N. F. A., & Ibrahim, Z. (2010). Linking Participative and Consultative Leadership Styles to Organizational Commitment as an Antecedent of Job Satisfaction. *Unitar E-Journal*, *6*(1).

Kraatz, M. S. (2009). Leadership as institutional work: A bridge to the other side. In T. B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organizations* (pp. 59-91). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511596605.003

Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 243-275), Sage Publications, London. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200387.n10

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How Leadership Influences Student Learning: A Review of Research for the Learning from Leadership Project*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Liu, W., Lepak, D. P., Takeuchi, R., & Sims, H. P. (2003). Matching leadership styles with employment

modes: Strategic human resource management perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, *13*, 127-152. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00102-X

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K. A., Wahlstrom, K., Anderson, S. E., Michlin, M., Mascall, B., Gordon, M., Strauss, T., Thomas, E., & Moore, S. (2010). *Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Maicibi, N. A. (2006). *Human Resource Management Success: The Tip for HRM Theorist and Practitioners*. Makerere University, Printery, Kampala Uganda.

Mandiya, W., Machera, R., & Karodia, A. M. (2014). An Assessment of the Different Leadership Styles on Business Performance: A Case Study of TM Hypermarket in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics, and Management Studies*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.12816/0007339

Men, L. R. (2010). *Measuring the Impact of Leadership Style and Employee Empowerment on Perceived Organizational Reputation*. Institute for Public Relations. Retrieved from http://www.instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/KEPRRA-the-Impact-of-Leadership-Style-and-Employee-Empowerment-on-Perceived-Organizational-Reputation.pdf

Moja, T. (2000). *Nigeria Education Sector Analysis: An Analytical Synthesis of Performance and Main Issues*. January, World Bank.

Mondy, R. W. (2009). *Human resource management*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B. N., Hollenbeck, J. R., Barry, G., & Wright, P. M. (2007). *Human Resource Management: Gaining a Competitive Advantage*. New York: McGraw- Hill Companies.

O'Hanlon, J., & Clifton, D. (2004). *Effective Principals: Positive Principles at Work*. Maryland: Scarecrow Education.

Omolaja, M. A. (2009). Administrative Practice in Nigeria: Implications for National Development. *Economic Analysis*, *1-2*, 53-64.

Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 797-837. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00154-6

Oyetunji, C. O. (2009). *The relationship between leadership style and school climate in Botswana secondary schools*. University of South Africa, Pretoria, Institutional Repository.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Portin, B. S., Alejano, C. R., Knapp, M. S., & Marzolf, E. (2006). *Redefining Roles, Responsibilities, and Authority of School Leaders*. Centre for the Study of Teaching and Policy; University of Washington, October. Retrieved from http://www.ctpweb.org/

Rad, A. M. M., & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2006). A Study of Relationship between Managers' Leadership Style and Employees' Job Satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, *19*(2), 11-28. https://doi.org/10.1108/13660750610665008

Răducan, R., & Răducan, R. (2014). Leadership and Management. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *149*, 808-812. https://doi.org/10.1108/13660750610665008

Saowalux, P., & Peng, C. (2007). *Impact of Leadership Style on Performance: A Study of Six Sigma Professionals in Thailand*. International DSI/Asia and Pacific DSI.

Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Organisational Behaviour* (7th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Shakeshaft, C., Brown, G., Irby, G., Grogan, M., & Ballenger, J. (2007). Increasing gender equality in educational leadership. In S. Kelin, B. Richardson, D. A. Grayson, L. H. Fox, C. Kramarae, D. Pollard, & C. A. Dwyer (Eds.), *Handbook for achieving gender equality through education* (2nd ed., pp 103-129). Florence, KY: Eribaum.

Spillane, J. P., & Kenney, A. W. (2012). School administration in a changing education sector: The US experience. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *50*(5), 541-561. https://doi.org/10.1108/13660750610665008

Stanfield, A. W. (2009). *Defining Effective Leadership: Lead in Whatever You Do*. Tate Publishing and Entreprises. Retrieved from http://ww8.tatepublishing.com/

Tatlah, I. A. (2013). Leadership Styles and Practices and their Impact on School Administration: A Case of Primary Schools from Punjab, Pakistan. *Life Sci. J.*, *10*(9s), 271-276.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Wong, A. S. L. (2007). *Definition of a Leader*. Retrieved 9th October, 2017, from http://www.vtaide.com/gleanings/leader.htm

Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational Commitment: A Mediator of the Relationships of Leadership Behaviour with Job Satisfaction and Performance in A Non-Western Country. *J. of Managerial Psyc.*, *15*(1), 6-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940010305270

Yukl, G. (2008). How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 708-722. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.09.008

Zehira, C., Ertosunb, O. G., Zehirc, S., & Müceldilid, B. (2011). The Effects of Leadership Styles and Organizational Culture over Firm Performance: Multi-National Companies in Istanbul; 7th International Strategic Management Conference. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *24*, 1460-1474.

Zvobgo, R. J. (1997). *The State Ideology and Education*. Gweru: Mambo Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.032