

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Influence of Principals' Management Styles on Secondary School Facilities in Rivers State Nigeria

Ogie, Love Ibiobu

Department of Social Science Education, Faculty of Education, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria

Abstract:

The study examined the influence of principals' management styles on secondary school facilities, classroom teacher's performance and PTA willingness to donate school facilities in Rivers State. A survey research design was employed for the study. The population of the study consists of 494 principals of both senior and junior secondary schools in the 23 Local Government Area of the State. A sample of 250 principals were drawn from the population through simple random sampling technique. Three research questions and three hypotheses were put forward to guide the study. A structured questionnaire containing 21 items termed influence of principals' management styles (PMS) was used for data collection. The questionnaire was validated by experts in measurement and evaluation as well as the research supervisor. Data collected for the study were analyzed using regression analyses for the hypotheses while mean and standard deviation was used to answer the research questions. The result reveals that in Rivers State, public secondary school principals are autocratic in managing school facilities and this had a negative impact on their teachers' participation, their relationship with the PTA /Host Community and on the overall, their efficiency in management of the school facilities. The study recommends that it is high time public secondary school principals consider a change of mind and attitude regarding their management styles by adopting those management styles that will foster and encourage cordial relationship between the principals, the classroom teachers and PTAs'. Furthermore, secondary school educational authorities were called upon to ensure that the school supervisory unit of the Ministry of Education, Rivers State Government in conjunction with the post primary schools board should ensure regular school facilities Audit in secondary schools. Their attention was also drawn to the fact that they should design and conduct frequent training / workshop programmes that will enhance the principals' management skills for a better leadership and relationship with subordinate and host communities.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the Study

The need for effective management of both human and material resources in secondary schools cannot be over-emphasized. Whenever there is a goal to be achieved, there is a need for effective resources management. One major responsibility of the school principals is to ensure efficient and effective management of the resources/ Facilities of the school entrusted in their care. School facilities according to Ogonu (2001:133) facilitate effective teaching and learning in the school, while Agwaranze (2008: 434) opined that school facilities are those materials and physical plants which facilitate teaching and learning in the educational institutions. The facilities are divided into direct teaching facilities and non-direct teaching facilities. The direct teaching facilities are the instructional materials that facilitate teaching and learning while the indirect are those components that make the school environment conducive for teaching and learning. Whether direct or indirect, they constitute a strategic in the school functioning, hence they should be properly managed and maintained, adopting appropriate management styles.

Management has to do with the coordinating and controlling of materials and human resources and effective utilization. Reeser in Okunamiri (2010:5) asserted that management is the utilization of physical and human resources through co-operative efforts, and it is accomplished by performing the functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling. While Solomon (2012:213) referred management as the process of optimal utilization of business resources in a suitable environment in order for organizational objective to be accomplished. The school principal is saddled with the responsibility of planning how the facilities will be properly managed, which of the facilities are due for serving; controlling as to which one is to be used and the one not to be used. Effective utilization, planning, and coordinating can be achieved through co-operate effort. The school manager cannot succeed without the effort of the subordinates. They way and manner in which the principal treats subordinates is his management style. The focus of this study is principals' management styles of secondary school facilities. Hornby (2006:523) defines style as a particular way in which something is done. It can also be defined as the charismatic way of making a decision and relating with subordinates.

The decisions here are on how school facilities will be properly managed. The school facilities to be managed among others include, school building, land, school farms, school fields, school laboratories, office furniture, fitting and equipment and school sporting

equipment as well as school records. Effective learning cannot take place in the absence of these facilities. They must not only be available, but must be adequate and properly managed. According to Asiabaka (2010:404) “these facilities play a pivotal role in actualization of the educational goals and objectives by satisfying the physical and emotional need of staff and students of the school”. Considering the importance of school facilities, they should be ranked equal with the management of other school resources such as human and financial resources.

School administration effect their control of the total school facilities by holding to established standards. These standards may be excellent, average, or poor, depending on what the ministry of education or the secondary school board demand. Another major factor in control is the measurement of performance of selected tasks performed by school employees, to assess whether or not the standards of performance are being met. Monitoring is an essential control factor in management. In the area of school maintenance, for example, a good inspection programme is essential as it reduces the number of emergency repairs.

Realizing the importance of school facilities to learning, Government has invested much in providing them in all secondary schools of the State in a bid to enhance effective teaching and learning and improve the entire educational system. (Odili 2003:8) School principals as the head of administration and accounting officers of secondary schools, are vested with the responsibility of ensuring that school facilities are properly managed.

Management of secondary school facilities involves proper storage and security, ensuring that they are kept in good condition after usage. There should be regular repairs and maintenance, replacement of faulty ones and protection from internal and external vandalism. It also involves general maintenance of the whole school environment, including trees, foot paths, garden, school land, building and other physical infrastructures. The principal can not achieve this alone, he need the assistance of the classroom teachers.

It is disheartening to observe that school principals pay less attention to the management of secondary school facilities which are key players in teaching and learning, and will not want classroom teachers to assist them in managing these facilities. Nwagwu as cited in Asiabaka (2010:403) noted that “several studies have shown that a close relationship exist between the physical environment and the academic performance of students” while Ogunnasuju as cited in Asiabaka (2010:404) maintained that “the quality of education that children receive bear a direct relevance to the availability or lack of physical facilities and overall atmosphere in which learning takes place” therefore there is a great need to improve management of these facilities.

Research findings have shown that there is no best known management style of school facilities, hence there is the need for situational or contingency approach in this case. The situation, the environment and the circumstance in which the manager finds himself should determine the approach to be adopted. Manilla (2005: 179) opined that no one style basically could be said to be the panacea for all organizational problems since a closer look will show an interplay of other styles where leader has achieve some success. While Kossen (1978:160) state that different kinds of work situations often require different kinds of leaders and styles for Uketui (2010:238) “A knowledge of the different leadership styles may be used in helping the principal to achieve the goals of the school”. From the various contributors on this issue, it is clear to understand that the style find to be good in in one organization, environment or circumstance may not be good in another.

The researcher in this work looked into the various management styles adopted by secondary school principals in managing school facilities and their influence on these facilities in Rivers State secondary schools.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Considering the importance of school facilities in teaching and learning, Government has not relented in providing these facilities to enhance teaching and learning. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), Multi-National Companies and individuals complement Government effort in this regard, yet there are complains for lack of facilities in the secondary schools. In as much as we can not deny these efforts, there are yet problems with school facilities management.

Over the years there have been consistent lamentation in the mass media by some groups and individuals of the rapid decay of school facilities in Rivers State which has resulted to lack of these facilities in our schools. They are of the view that management styles of principals are not good enough to bring about desirable condition of facilities in secondary schools particularly in Rivers State. This unfortunate anomalies has aroused great concern to members of the public, Government, PTA and facilities donors. At this point, it may be wrong to heap the blame on some principals who have not been able to come out with sustainable management styles that can help direct the affairs of schools relatively well. In view of this, the question below becomes very important to this study. What type of management styles do principals adopt to bring about effective management of secondary school facilities? Secondly, to what extent has principals’ management styles influence secondary school facilities in the area of procurement, maintenance and utilization? To be able to answer these questions there is need to investigate these issues so as to obtain data for making an objective judgement about the management style appropriate for principals.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the influence of principals’ management styles of facilities in senior and junior secondary schools in Rivers State. Specifically, the study is to:

1. Find out the management styles adopted by secondary school principals’ in managing secondary school facilities.
2. Ascertain if principals’ management styles allow teachers participation in secondary school facilities management.
3. Ascertain if principals’ management styles encourage PTA to donate facilities to secondary schools in Rivers State.

1.4. Research Questions

The following research questions were posed to guide the study:

1. What are the management styles adopted by secondary school principals, in facilities managements?
2. To what extent do principals, management styles involve classroom teachers' and vice principals participation in secondary school facilities management?
3. How do principal's management styles encourage PTA to donate facilities to secondary schools in Rivers State?

2. Research Design and Procedure

The discussion in this chapter will be done under the following sub-headings: research design, population of the study, sample and sampling techniques, instrument for data collection, validity of instruments, reliability of the instruments, administration of instrument, method of data collection and method for data analysis.

3. Result Presentation, Analysis and Interpretations

This chapter deals with the presentation of analyzed data from the research questions and hypotheses stated in this study. The data and results of each research questions and hypothesis are presented in tables.

3.1. Research Question 1

What are the most common management styles adopted by principals in school facilities management in Rivers State.

S/N	ITEMS	Mean	SD	DECISION
1	Most secondary school principals use democratic management styles in managing school facilities.	2.96	0.92	Agree
2	Most secondary school principals are autocratic in managing school facilities.	3.01	0.81	Agree
3	Laissez-faire management style is the most common style Adopted by principals in managing school facilities.	2.46	0.80	Disagree
4	School principals use transactional style in managing school Facilities.	2.38	0.97	Disagree
5	Pseudo-democratic styles is the most common styles adopted by principals in managing school facilities.	2.30	0.86	Disagree
6	Contingency / situational management styles is the most Popular style adopted by principals in managing school facilities.	3.00	0.78	Agree
7	School principals manage the school facilities alone.	2.87	0.79	Agree
	Grand Mean and Standard Deviation	19.00	5.93	

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation on the most common management styles adopted by principals in school facilities management in Rivers State

Note: Criterion cut-off point = 2.5

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation on the most common management styles adopted by principals in school facilities management in Rivers State. The respondents were in agreement with items 1, 2, 6 and 7. Item 2 "most secondary school principals are autocratic in managing school facilities (M=3.01; SD=0.81)" was rated the common management styles adopted by principals, this was followed by item 6 "contingency/situational management styles (M=3.0; SD=0.78)" followed by item 1 "most secondary school principals democratic management styles in managing school facilities (m = 2.96 SD = 0.81) and the least commonly adopted management styles is item 7 "school principals manage the school facilities alone (M=2.87; SD=0.79)". Invariably the respondents are not in one accord with items 3, 4 and 5 which implies that "Laissez-faire management style (M=2.46; SD=0.80), "Transactional style (M=2.38; SD=0.97) and "Pseudo-democratic styles (M=2.30; SD=0.86) respectively are not commonly used by school principals in management of school facilities.

3.2. Research Question 2

To what extent do principal's management styles involve classroom teacher's participation in secondary school facilities management in Rivers State.

S/N	ITEMS	Mean	SD	DECISION
1	School principals involve classroom teachers in facilities management decisions making.	2.20	0.87	Disagree
2	School principals listen to complaint from teachers and students about school facilities.	2.39	0.93	Disagree
3	Teachers are not happy in implementing the decisions they were involved in.	2.70	0.97	Agree
4	Teachers are resourceful because they are satisfied with principals' management style.	3.04	0.65	Agree
5	Teachers are able to make alternative (local facilities) for teaching and learning because of principals management styles.	2.85	0.82	Agree
	Grand Mean and Standard Deviation	13.18	4.24	

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation on the extent principal's management styles involve classroom teacher's participation in secondary school facilities management in Rivers State

Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation on the extent principals’ management styles involve classroom teachers’ participation in secondary school facilities management in Rivers State which indicates that the respondents were in agreement with items 3, 4 and 5 while they were not in unity with items 1 and 2. Furthermore, item 4 “teachers are resourceful because they are satisfied with principals’ management styles (M=3.04; SD=0.65)” was rated the highest, this was followed by item 5 “teachers are able to make alternative (local facilities) for teaching and learning because of principals management styles (M=2.86; SD=0.82)”. The least is item 3 “teachers are not happy in implementing the decisions they were involved in (M=2.70; SD=0.97).

3.3. Research Question 3

How do principal’s management styles influence PTA willingness to donate facilities to secondary schools in Rivers State.

S/N	ITEMS	Mean	SD	DECISION
1	Principals relate well with PTA.	2.29	0.84	Disagree
2	School principals always give PTA free hand in managing PTA. funds.	2.21	0.97	Disagree
3	School principals allow community members use school facilities like school fields and classroom so that they will respond whenever they are called to donate towards school facilities.	2.37	0.84	Disagree
4	School principals involves PTA in fund raising for acquisition of school facilities.	3.03	0.73	Agree
5	School principals render a detailed account of the use of money realized from school facilities donations.	2.29	1.14	Disagree
Grand Mean and Standard Deviation		12.20	4.52	

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation on how principal’s management styles influence PTA willingness to donate facilities to secondary school in Rivers State

Table 3 shows generally that the principals are not in cordial relationship with the PTA as such has no influence on PTA willingness to donate facilities to the school. The principals only involve the PTA when it comes to “fund raising (M=3.03; SD=0.73)”.

3.4. Testing of Hypotheses

- HO₁: There is no significant difference between principal management styles and effective management of school facilities in Rivers State.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	7548.560	12	629.047	799.652	.000
Within Groups	186.436	237	.787		
Total	7734.996	249			

Table 4: Summary of Analysis of Variance on the difference between principals’ management styles (PMS) and effective management of school facilities (EMSF) in Rivers State
S=significant; NS=not significant

Table 4 indicates that there was a highly statistical significant difference between principals’ management styles (F1, 249=799.625; p-value=0.000 < 0.05) and effective management of school facilities (EMSF) in Rivers State.

Hence the hypothesis accepted which implies that the PMS have a very big role to play on EMSF. Management styles determine the effective facility management. Hence we conclude that there is a significant difference between principals’ management styles and effective management of school facilities in Rivers State.

- HO₂: There is no significant influence of principals’ management styles (PMS) on teachers’ participation in school facilities management (TPSFM) in Rivers State.

Variable	N	Mean	SD	r _p	r ²	Adj. r ²	F- Change	p-value	Remark
TPSFM	250	13.18	3.98	0.982	0.965	0.965	6858.048	0.000	S
PMS	250	18.996	5.57						

Table 5: Summary of Regression Analysis on the influence of principals’ management styles (PMS) on teachers’ participation in school facilities management (TPSFM) in Rivers State

Table 5 shows that the PMS (r_p= 0.982) had a strong and positive influence on TPSFM. The PMS contribution towards TPSFM was 96.5%. Furthermore, the p-value=0.000< 0.05 indicates that there was a highly statistical significant influence of PMS (M=18.996; SD=5.57) on TPSFM (M=13.18; SD=3.98). Hypothesis (H₁) accepted at 0.05 level of significance, hence we conclude that there is a significant influence of PMS on TPSFM in Rivers State.

- HO₃: There is no significant influence of principals’ management styles (PMS) on PTA willingness to donate facilities (PTAWDF) to schools in Rivers State.

Variable	N	Mean	SD	r_p	r^2	Adj. r^2	F- Change	p- value	Remark
PTAWDF	250	9.90	3.22	0.984	0.967	0.967	7352.29	0.000	S
PMS	250	18.996	5.57						

Table 6: Summary of Regression Analysis on the influence of principals' management styles (PMS) on PTA willingness to donate facilities (PTAWDF) to schools in Rivers State.

Table 6 shows that the PMS ($r_p=0.984$) had a strong and positive influence on PTAWDF. The PMS contribution towards PTAWDF was 96.7%. Furthermore, the $p\text{-value}=0.000 < 0.05$ indicates that there was a highly statistical significant influence of PMS ($M=18.996$; $SD=5.57$) on PTAWDF ($M=9.90$; $SD=3.22$). The null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) accepted at 0.05 level of significance, hence we conclude that there is a significant influence of PMS on PTAWDF in Rivers State.

3.5. Discussion of Findings

The results of this study were discussed based on the variables over which data was collected, analyzed and presented in the previous chapter, these include management styles, principals. Management styles, classroom teachers, PTA and secondary school facilities.

The result of the findings showed that among the various management styles discussed in the study principals used autocratic situational and democratic management styles more. The findings further showed that autocratic style is good in the sense that decisions are made speedily without delay, for situational, it showed that no one style is suitable in all situations, while democratic style is good because principals' are involved in decision making. Since they participate in the decision making they are happy to implement the decisions.

The finding revealed that if principals' suitable management styles that are teachers inclusions, teachers will be very willing to make use of improvised facilities for teaching. It further revealed that principals' ability and willingness to flex in facilities management policies will bring about effectiveness in managing school facilities since it has been opined that there is no single management style that is suitable in all situations.

The finding further revealed that PTA and host communities do not donate facilities to secondary schools because school principals do not involve them in spending PTA funds and no proper accounts are rendered after spending.

3.6. Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the influence of principals' management styles of facilities in public senior and junior secondary school in Rivers State. The result of this study reveal that principals' management styles have a major influence on management of school facilities. Considering the relatively low sample size that was used in this study, the study cannot be said to be conclusive without considering other factors that could influence the management styles of the public secondary school principals. Therefore, this conclusion could be considered as a trend and not a definite generalization. Statistically significant difference and influence were observed between all factors (Effective management, Classroom teachers, PTA and Secondary school facilities) considered in relation with principal management styles.

3.7. Recommendations

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

1. Secondary school principals' should have a change of mind and attitude regarding their management styles.
2. Policy makers and secondary school educational authorities to ensure constant school facilities audit.
3. Policy makers need to formulate a definite, explicit and workable management styles for the principals that could encourage a cordial relationship between them and their subordinates.
4. Attention of the secondary school educational authorities was also drawn towards designing training and workshop programmes for the principals that will enhance principals' management styles for a better leadership and relationship with host communities.

4. References

- i. Agwaranze, D.I. (2008), Improving the management of facilities in schools: A recipe for quality education in Nigeria; Okigwe, Whyten Publishers.
- ii. Asiabaka, I. P. (2010). Facilities Management in Schools in Anukan, I. M; Ogbona, R. N. O. & Okunamiri P. O. (eds) Educational Management, Owerri: Effect versatile.
- iii. Hornby, A.S. (2006). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (7th Ed), London: Oxford University Press.
- iv. Kossen, Stan (1995). The Human side of Organisations. San Fransisco: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.
- v. Minilla, B.B. (2003), Fundamentals of Educational Planning and Administration, Concepts, Issues and practices, Port Harcourt: Pear Publishers.
- vi. Odili, P. (2003). Secondary school funding in Rivers State. The Beam News Paper, January 23 – 29:8
- vii. Ogunu M. (2000). Introduction to Educational Management. Benin Mabogun Publishers.
- viii. Okunamiri P. O. (2010). Concepts to Educational Administration and Management, in Anukam, I. L., Ogbonna, R. N. O. Okunamiri, P. O. (eds). Educational Management, Owerri: EeHech versatile.
- ix. Solomon I. (2012), Entrepreneurship Education in the 21st Century, Arochukwu: Ossy Computers.