

Formal Training in Educational Administration: The Perceptions and Challenges of Educational Leaders in Cameroon

Tamuh Divine Chenwi

B. A History. DIPES1. M.Ed, PhD in View,
University of Buea, South West Region Cameroon, Central Africa

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to find out the Perceptions and Challenges that Educational Leaders in Cameroon face as a result of their lack of Formal Training in Educational Administration in the Primary, Secondary and High Schools in Cameroon. The study used the Sequential explanatory mixed method design in which quantitative data is used as the basis on which to build and explain qualitative data. Data was collected with the use of questionnaires and interview guides. The sample was selected using the simple random sampling technique. The sample consisted of 112 Head Teachers and 120 Principals who returned the questionnaires from the 13 Divisions of the two English Speaking Regions of Cameroon. The interview was conducted with 14 school heads in both Primary, Secondary and High Schools. This gives a grand total of 246 respondents in this study. An analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data resulted in the following findings: The school leaders' views showed that a majority of them were not formally trained upon their appointments as school heads. They opined that formal training can enhance their preparedness as leaders. Also, the school leaders agreed that they face challenges due to their lack of formal training as they perform their functions as school heads. Based on the findings, some recommendations were made to School administrators and officials in the Ministries of Basic and Secondary Education. Current School Heads should embark on in-service formal training in order to enhance their capacities while aspiring school heads should have pre-formal training before appointments. It was also recommended that an institution for training be established to train professional school heads upon appointment. The main limitation to this study that data collection was very challenging as gaining access to school heads was a problem due to the socio-political crisis in the North West and South West Regions of Cameroon where this research was based. Furthermore, suggestions for further research were made.

KEYWORDS: Formal, Training, Educational, Administration, Perceptions, Challenges, Leaders

INTRODUCTION

The learning landscape is changing quickly and becoming more complex. This makes administrators or school leaders and teachers to be proactive as they discharge their responsibilities to meet up with the ever evolving educational landscape. The school leaders are confronted with the evolving needs of both teachers and learners. Law no. 98/004 of 14th April 1998 to lay down guidelines for education in Cameroon describes education as a national priority which is thus a vital element for both national and international development. This therefore brings the teachers and school administrators in the limelight to guarantee quality education to the citizens. One of such stakeholder in education whose functions and roles is very vital and should be highly recognized, is the Head Teacher and Principal. Mbua (2003) defines a principal (principalship) as 'the head or chief executive of a Secondary or High School which also applies to the Head Teacher or Head Master in the Primary School.

Decree no. 80/293 and circular letter no. 27/B1.App.3 and 7, states that the principal is responsible for the smooth – running of the school. Circular- Letter No. 16/B1/1464/C/MINEDUB/SG/DEMP of 21 November 2014, recalls the duties of the Head Teachers which are Administrative roles, Pedagogic roles, financial roles and Social roles which is the same to that of principals as stipulated by 'A Handbook for Heads of Secondary and High Schools' (1995/1996). These educational leaders are expected to provide quality education for all learners, and job satisfaction and motivation to the teaching and non-teaching staff.

According to Yamina Bouchamma, Marc Basque, Caroline Marcotte (n.d) training requirements for the position of school principal vary depending on the context. In some Countries, like United States, Québec and UK one must have a degree in school management or administration as a

How to cite this paper: Tamuh Divine Chenwi "Formal Training in Educational Administration: The Perceptions and Challenges of Educational Leaders in Cameroon" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-4 | Issue-1, December 2019, pp.724-748, URL: www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd29708.pdf



Copyright © 2019 by author(s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



requirement for the position of school head (Tucker & Coddling, 2002), and (Weindling & Dimmock, 2006). In Cameroon, there is no specific institution focused on training principals and head teachers. It takes a ministerial appointment or decision of the school management to make anyone a school head.

From the foregoing therefore, the choice and quality of school leaders is a serious call for concern. The question now is, since all these school leaders have to perform these functions, do they all have the competences required for these tasks? Can in-service training, on the job learning programs, mentor-mentee and annual seminars be sufficient to meet up with the challenging tasks or responsibilities in an evolving and demanding educational community? Answers to these questions are very important in bringing about sustainability in school leadership.

Statement of the problem

From numerous researches, studies have proven that there is need for mandatory pre-service and in-service training that the Head Teachers and Principals of schools have to undergo prior to appointment. This training is hoped to fortify them for the great task of administering their institutions which are fast evolving in line with the complex educational community and challenges of globalization. Unfortunately, school heads depend on what they have experienced or observed as teachers or deputies as well as also learn by trial and error. This is the atmosphere that prevails within the Cameroonian context especially in the public schools, confessionals as well as lay-private institutions. Today in Cameroon, these schools are generally witnessing an ever increasing enrollment and there is the need for proper management of the institutions by the school leaders. Cognizance of the fact that the government does not provide specific alternative certification programmes for these school leaders or that they did not probably undertake formal training in educational administration, it becomes obvious that they often face some difficulties in the discharge of their multifarious functions. Looking at the wide range of functions and roles of educational administrators, which are pedagogic functions, administrative functions, financial functions and social functions, this researcher thinks formal training in educational administration is inevitable for all school leaders especially if individual and institutional goals are to be achieved. Being trained as a teacher does not automatically make one a trained administrator. Leading an institution of learning is totally different from teaching in that institution. Besides, this researcher thinks that experience in classroom teaching is not a guarantee that one can conveniently handle or lead a citadel of learning. It is on this premise that this research seeks to investigate on how school headers who have not had formal training, carry out their versatile functions in this fast evolving educational landscape as school leaders in Cameroon. They thus certainly face some challenges as they perform their pedagogic, administrative, financial and social functions. This without doubt expresses the need for research to be done on this topic especially when in other professions, people are trained and acquire professional qualifications in their respective fields.

Objective

To evaluate how School leaders cope with the processes of school administration in Cameroon.

Background of the study

Stone and Patterson, (2005) states that leadership and the study of this phenomenon, dates far back to the beginning of civilization almost two centuries. With the passage of time, organizations and individuals have evolved from those with an authoritarian style to where people are empowered, encouraged, and supported in their personal and professional growth. Generally, the history or evolution of formal training in educational administration as well as Principalship or school leadership cannot be traced to a particular nation or exact time. Historically, the appellation has witnessed so many changes such as Head Teachers, Superintendents, Head Master and so on. The historical background focused on evolution in terms of formal training through its programs and legislations carried out by different governments which have affected the state, personality and functions of school heads.

Until 1980, most nations did not possess a clearly defined national policy on the training standards for school principals and school heads. It was only in the early 21st century that several countries became aware of the importance of specific training for school leaders (Bush, Kiggundu, & Moorosi, 2011; Bush, 2008).

Education existed from creation. In all these, the office of the principal and other school leaders, was only realized after a very long time. In the early years, principals for example worked with very minimal guidelines and depended on their own skills, vision as well as the approval of the community. Thus, no standard instructions were followed. They did not have formal training and probably were selected based on their religious, moral or political affinities. They played the role of managers, directed the curriculum, recruited teachers and ensured the progress of the school.

Over decades, school leaders training and roles have been reshaped through research and theory. From the 1950's, studies focused mainly on personality or character traits. Later, specific leadership behaviors began to be studied, with focus on leadership styles and their influence on various situations. By the 90s, the approach concentrated on the integration of variables that explained the effectiveness of leaders on their organization or structure (Abu-Hussain, 2014). Models and hypotheses were developed to enhance school principals with many reform movements in educational leadership.

Darling-Hammond, (2007); Mitgang, (2013); Mendels and Mitgang, (2013), indicate that in the last decade, much has been written on the professional growth of school leaders. This implies that formal training in educational administration is really a call for concern in line with the complex tasks of the administrators. They however, concluded that much is still expected like in management and instructional leadership responsibilities. The authors further indicate that in developing countries, the history of principals focused more on the general preparation for school leadership than on evidence program effectiveness. However, in-service training courses and conferences are few and wanting in terms of quality with no system-wide provisions or funding for initial preparation of school leaders. Personal initiatives of individual leaders have characterized training so far. Preparation of school leaders is informal, practical and happens within the workplace (Bush

& Oduro, 2006; DeJaeghere, Williams, & Kyeyune, 2009; Ibrahim, 2011).

In Alberta Canada, the number of principals kept increasing as the consciousness of the value of education was realized which led to many schools created both by government and private individuals even though it was negatively affected by the Great Depressions (Lawr & Gidney, 1973). After this period, schools began the process of developing vocational education, guidance departments and democratic leadership which started to make itself felt within the life of principalship. Gidney and Millar, (2012) posit that right up to the 1970s, over 80% of principals were males. From the 1970s, principalship took a different twist and became more complex. They were confronted with societal issues like teen pregnancy, drug abuse and alcoholism. They were expected to provide leadership in solving these non-academics and community issues thereby making the traditional tasks of school heads further compounded (Alberta, Commission on Educational Planning, 1972). Thus, different legislations to guide principals were made by the different Provincial Governments. For example in 1972, the legislation stipulated that, a Board will designate a teacher to serve as principal of each school (Alberta Department of Education, 1972, p. 4937), while in 1988, it brought out the functions or roles of principals which still prevail up to present. As far as formal training is concerned, Alberta's Commission on Learning in 2003 made landscape-changing responses which affected school heads like concerns about their skills, certification and attributes required for them. Thus, school leaders in Alberta had formal training in educational administration.

In 1921, a National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) with headquarters in Alexandria was founded to serve all elementary and middle level school principals all over the United States, Canada and beyond. Its goal was to provide administrative and instructional leadership for public and private elementary and middle schools. NAESP till today organizes national and regional meetings, produces award-winning publications, and carries out joint efforts with its 50 state affiliates; its role in the provision of educational products and services for school administrators and other stakeholders has contributed enormously in shaping the capacity of school leaders, (Bouchard, Cervone, Cheryl, Newby & Zarlengo, 2002).

Murphy (1993a) characterizes several general eras for educational administration preparation. To him, the first era, covers the time period before official training of superintendents occurred described as the Ideological Era approximately between 1820-1900. This was so because the superintendents were the ones to set the ideology for the district through their actions and beliefs. The next era was called the Prescriptive Era around 1900-1946. In this era Universities offered few courses in school administration and management functions. Carter (1997) described superintendents in this era as master educator. This was because they had to provide direction on curriculum and instruction dealing with pedagogical matters. Scientific Era came next and in it, training of superintendents evolved to include a social scientist's point of view in their curriculum. Murphy (1993a) indicates that in this era, ideas and practices were to be grounded in theory and research. Carter (1997) saw superintendent in this era as chief executive officer for the board, experts and advisors to the board to

help them interpret and enforce the new regulations. The last era according to Murphy (1993a) is the Dialectic Era from the mid-1980s and continuing until today. Here, preparation is focused on strategies and quality of the students and faculty themselves. Thus, standards have been created for teachers and educational leaders to be able to administer and interact with all stakeholders in education.

From the foregoing therefore, one sees the different stages which were probably instigated by societal changes. It should be noted that the turning point in education came when in 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in Education published a report entitled A Nation at Risk in which American schools and educators were criticized. Thus, pressure from the public, media, and politicians created awareness for reforms (Glass, 2000). This however, led to lots of inputs in the training of both teachers and educational administrators to salvage the situation. All these developments thereby affected the functioning of Head Teachers and Principals.

In Cameroon, organized secondary schools can be traced to the German era where three categories of secondary schools existed that is Middle schools (mittelschule), advanced or secondary schools (Gehobene) and seminaries (Seminar) (Fonkeng, 2010). However, focus in these schools was on its organization and curriculum and not on the school heads who were mostly foreigners like Theodore Christaller the first German teacher in Cameroon. In French Cameroon after World War 1, the educational orders signed on 25th July 1921 put education under the supervision of the Inspector of Schools and the Commissioner of the Republic. Their focus was on mass education and propagation of their language and not on pedagogic or administrative capacities of the head masters. Thus, formal training could be obtained only during training as teachers in the Teacher Training Colleges. In British Cameroon, the Education Ordinance of the British protectorate of Nigeria was applied to Cameroon. A uniform educational system for Government, Native Authority and Mission schools was passed in 1924 where programs, textbooks, educational manuals and timetables were the same (Fonkeng, 2010). They also focused on mass education, spread of the English language, curriculum, teacher training, etc. Formal training of school heads was not a point of concern. Even with the opening of Saint Joseph's College Sasse in 1939 and Cameroon Protestant College in 1949 in Bali, focus was still on the learners and very little concern on the head of the institutions who happened to be foreigners.

The proliferation of schools during the Federal period 1961-1972 indicates that Principals and Head Teachers were thus in high demand, not necessarily foreigners. Mission, private and government schools flourished in both West and East Federated states of Cameroon. We had grammar, technical and vocational colleges like Government Bilingual Secondary Grammar School at Man-o-war Bay, CCAST, Pioneer Commercial College, National High School, Longla Commercial College, Lyce'e Lecler, Lyce'e Jos, Lyce'e de Jeunes Filles which were involved in different national and international exams (Fonkeng. 2010). Primary education was even more dominant since a majority of children needed at least the basic education. The number and accessibility of primary schools to the people was more compared to that of secondary schools.

In Higher education, A National Centre for Advanced Studies was opened in 1961 and later converted into the University of Yaounde on 20th July 1962. This later saw the creation of specialized institutions like the Higher Teacher Training College in Yaounde with an Annex in Bambili. This was the foundation for professionally certified secondary and high school teachers. Thus, courses in pedagogy and administration prepared the next pedagogues and administrators or Principals. From there, the evolution of Principals and formal training has been focused on government ordinances, in service training capacity building programs, and the creation of other Higher Teachers Training Colleges for grammar, technical and commercial schools in Douala, Maroua and Kumba.

Some ordinances which affect the wellbeing and functions of the principals include "A Handbook for Heads of Secondary and High Schools" (1995/1996), which identifies them as having Pedagogic, Administrative, Financial and Social functions. This is further buttressed by Decree No. 2002/004 of 4th January, 2002 which outlines the functions, roles or duties of the different administrators at the central and external services of the then Ministry of National Education. This decree thus concerned both school heads in the primary and secondary schools. All these however, do not emphasize on formal training but however shapes the way these school heads go about their daily tasks in their institutions. It should be understood that these guides on school heads, do not exclude those in the lay private and confessional sectors who are of course part of this research.

From the Conceptual Background, it is observed that school administrators perform duties that go beyond their offices. According to Mbua (2003) Principals have administrative, pedagogic, financial and social functions. Circular- Letter No. 16/B1/1464/C/MINEDUB/SG/DEMP of 21 November 2014, also gives similar functions to Head Teachers. Their functions therefore are viewed to have so much contribution within and outside the school milieu. Formal training in educational administration therefore is imperative to equip principals carry out their versatile functions with ease and to guarantee quality in the teaching, learning and administration of schools. This training of leaders, subsequently affects the school culture and climate where they administer. A healthy school environment is a pre-requisite for a peaceful coexistence. It is on this background that this research sees that, trained administrators or school leaders would generally create good working relations with collaborators in order to achieve their individual as well as institutional goals.

Fonkeng and Tamanjong (2009) describes the principal's office as one which reflects the image of the school and as such, it is bound to be orderly and respectable. All important documents such as official and regulatory texts, syllabuses, schemes of work, charts indicating the staff and various authorities of the school, enrollment records, time tables, school rules and regulation, staff files, duty roster of other staff are filled in a rigorous manner not only for the present but also for posterity. This description can adequately apply to the functions and responsibilities of the head teachers in the primary schools.

Section 4 of the law on orientation for basic, secondary and teacher education, clearly outlines that the general goal of

education is to 'train children for their intellectual, physical, civic and moral development and smooth integration into the society bearing in mind prevailing economic, socio-cultural, political and moral factors. This is a huge task on the shoulders of educational stakeholders. School principals and head teachers, play a very vital role in the achievement of this objective. Thus, the need for their proper preparedness or formal training to handle this demanding responsibility.

According to OECD reports vol. 1, the role of school heads in the industrial age has not changed enough to deal with the complex challenges schools are facing in the 21st century. Also that the expectations of school leaders is focused on achieving results. In its opinion therefore, priority should be focused on the quality of teachers and the quality of school heads. This will ensure better practices in terms of accountability and sustainability of institutions in the face of an increasingly competitive world. For these values to be attained, the skills and knowledge of administrators will best be sharpened through formal training.

Professional development is a key concepts that defined our conceptual framework. According to Hirsh, (2009), professional development is an intensive, comprehensive and supported initiative based on improving the effectiveness of both teachers and school leaders with the ultimate goal to positively impact on learners' outcomes. Thus, processes and activities through which educators acquire professional knowledge, skills and attitudes to enrich student learning (Guskey, 2000).

In the Contextual Background, Contemporary transformations that occur in education today are very critical as they affect education directly or indirectly. In contexts where school leaders have not undergone any professional or formal training for their role beyond years of classroom teaching experience, it is probable that they may be confronted with a myriad of contemporary problems. Thus, formal training in educational administration will provide relevant knowledge, skills and competencies to meet up with these challenges. Schratz (2003) sees training as very vital for school heads because they get pressure exerted on them from a variety of contexts such as political, social and economic conditions which affects the entire school system. These challenges and external pressures and new demands need specialized forms of training and development for school leaders. This therefore equips them for better services and to be able to withstand the challenges or pressures.

In Cameroon as well as most African countries, appointment of school heads is based on longevity in teaching and teaching certificates. Little or no regard is given to leadership potentials or mandatory training programs. Crow (2006) thinks their knowledge and skills are likely going to be obsolete in meeting the complex systems in schools. Crow therefore recommends training of school heads as vital in order to build recent techniques to meet up with the changing environment.

Bush and Oduro, (2006); DeJaeghere, et al., (2009), posits that another context which instigated studies in this domain was that, the development of school heads especially in developing countries occurs in different forms, including

indirect preparation through performance of previous leadership roles. Also, in-service training courses, conferences, and personal initiatives of individual school leaders are sometimes used as yard sticks for good school heads. However, funding for these courses and programs are few and irregular in terms of quality. Thus, the school leaders learn informally and consequently cannot be up to the tasks as they are ill prepared for the job. This makes formal training of educational administrators indispensable in the Cameroonian context where these shortcomings also occur.

Another context that has necessitated increase awareness for formal training of school heads is the demand and high expectations for accountability as stated by (Lawrence Ingvarson, et al., 2006). Accountability affects the entire fabric of the educational landscape, failure of which can lead to a chaotic scenario for all stakeholders. As such, these authors made calls for more and better professional preparation programs, and greater attention to programs tailored to the needs of established school heads. They also requested for more attention in the recruitment and selection of suitable school heads if accountability and success is to be attained.

The Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA 2016-2025, sees Africa as one which will determine its destiny as the continent of the future. As such, its link to its colonial legacy system of education must be reviewed. Thus, there is need for a new African citizen who will be an effective change agent for the continent's sustainable development as envisioned by the AU and its 2063 Agenda. This strategy is driven by the desire to set up a "qualitative system of education and training to provide the African continent with efficient human resources adapted to African core values and therefore capable of achieving the vision and ambitions of the African Union. This Agenda 2063 are driven by skilled human capital. School leaders by this need to be trained for this vision to be attained since they form a pivot in the educational arena.

According to Neil Dempster, Susan Lovett and Bev Flückiger, (2011) in an OECD report on Improving School Leadership (Vol 1, p.16), there are international dimensions that can necessitate formal training. This document describes the complexities faced by contemporary schools, like issues of 'social and population mobility, technological advances and an increased focus on schools to perform, (OECD, Vol 2, p.2). These issues without doubt are also prevalent even in our Cameroon context. It is without doubt therefore, that this research suits our present context.

Starr (2009) looking at the Australian context, identifies two major influences. A market-economy which provoked structural reform, competition, consumer choice and accountability all influenced by politics and public policy as well as pressures for enhanced parental choice, emphasis on the regulation of curriculum and assessment requirements, changed roles in school governance standards for both teachers and leaders, and school performance comparisons based on student achievement. All these portray a high degree of involvement in educational issues not only by head teachers and principals but also by other stakeholders. This context thus prompted the need for formal training in

educational administration for school heads and other stakeholders.

Furthermore, in the Australian context, they were motivated by growing concern about the recruitment, preparation, continuing professional development and recognition of school leaders. This led to calls for more and better professional programs. High standards were recommended to prepare and assess the performance of school leaders (Lawrence Ingvarson, et al., 2006). In was thus, in this backdrop that the Teaching Australia - Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership commissioned the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) undertook or embarked on both local and international consultations with professional organizations and education stakeholders to critically review developments in leadership standards, leadership theory and research, and approaches to certification. The end product was thus to build a national system to prepare and assess school leadership standards. Formal training in Australia was thereafter implemented for the improvement of the capacities of school heads and effectiveness in the school milieu.

Kaufman, D. R, (2009) posits that the last century has observed a lot of dramatic changes both at the elementary and high school levels. From one room schoolhouse to much larger and complex institutions. This led to the necessity for bureaucratic structures to ensure that the specific needs of the education system be made along with specialty positions such as school counselors, librarians, and administrators. Thus, special knowledge to handle those with specific tasks in the growing institutions, was imperative. As such a wider assortment of training needs and opportunities were offered by different universities, (Clifford, 1988).

Another reason or context which prompted the emergence of formal training was described by Wilson, (1993). He brings out an aspect which is common in our educational establishments today and thereby warrants formal training of school heads to be able to deal with them. He points out that many learners bring to school complex problems that are not essentially educational. However, these problems directly affect their ability to succeed in school. These social and economic challenges include language, culture, health, poverty and abuse. Thus, 21st century school heads must embark on professional leadership programs to meet up with both the academic and nonacademic facets that affect the school system as a whole.

According to Teachers Service Commission, (2003) as stated by Jones Onyango Ogola, (2007), an effective head teacher should be able to: manage and deploy school resources efficiently; allocate school accommodation appropriately; ensure satisfactory standards of maintenance, and cleanliness of school facilities; guide curriculum implementation and change; manage staff development in schools; create professional ethos within the school by involving staff in decision-making; Supervise the teaching staff for improvement of teaching and learning; maintain good relations between the school and surrounding communities. All these skills cannot possibly be embedded in administrators from birth. But looking at the significant role or impact that the above points can contribute to education, it is therefore necessary for all school heads to be given this

knowledge. It is in this context that formal training becomes a pre-condition for one to become a school head worth the salt.

Jones Onyango Ogola, (2007) further indicates that, according to United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (1993), quality education program requires healthy, well nourished, motivated students, well trained teachers, active learning techniques, adequate facilities and learning materials, a relevant curriculum, a clearly defined and accurate assessment of learning including knowledge, skills, attitudes and values, as well as participatory governance. These are all attributes that have to be harnessed by a competent leader or manager for required goals to be achieved. In this context, formal training will be the best tool for the school leaders or managers.

One major challenge that the education community faces today is that of teaching learners with disability alongside those without disability (impairment). Also, some schools may even have staff who are physically challenged. According to Frederickson and Dine, (2000), this requires necessary support services and supplementary aid to ensure academic, behavioral and social success. Many stakeholders are faced with the challenge of dealing or handling issues related to this even though Legislations have been established on learners' rights who are handicaps. As such, they are to be included in all aspects of school life as well as identifying, reducing or removing barriers within and around the school that may hinder learning. As such, the school systems need to modify the physical and social environment so that they can fully accommodate the diversity of learning needs that learners may have. Sands, Zozleski, and French, (2000) state that, for inclusive education to take place effectively, then there must be shared responsibilities, the rights of the learner must be considered, as well as structural changes. In all these therefore, the role of the school heads is seen to be very vital. For school heads to succeed in this context, their formal training will be seen as the best weapon to sharpen their skills to meet up with this responsibility.

Also, the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien Thailand in 1990, drew action plans to improve the capacity and the performances of students. These action plans recognized that the prime responsibilities for creating an effective educational environment lies in the shoulders of the school head teachers. Without the necessary skills, many heads are overwhelmed by the task. Furthermore, the Dakar framework of Action 2000, also looked at governance and citizen participation. It regarded education as a public good. Thus, a synergy should exist between the school heads and all other stakeholders in education in strategies in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of educational developments. This context gives a lot of tasks and responsibilities to school heads. The Dakar framework also stressed on training which off course is the focus of this study.

From the Theoretical Background of this study, a theory is defined as a set of assumptions, propositions, or accepted facts that attempt to provide a plausible or rational explanation of cause-and-effect (causal) relationships among a group of observed phenomenon. The word's origin (from

Greek 'thoros', a spectator), stresses the fact that all theories are mental models of the perceived reality (Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia). Also, theories are guidelines which help us to organize our explanation, interpretation and prediction about a phenomenon under study. Some theories which are related to this research topic are; Transformation Theory, Constructivist Approach, Role Theory and the Goal setting Theory. Highlights of these theories are introduced in this chapter.

The Transformation Theory provides the necessary background and context for this study. This is so because the main purpose is to measure leadership behaviour and to demonstrate a model for leadership development. Robbins and Coulter, (2007) describes a transformational leader as a person who stimulates and inspires (transform) or creates positive change in followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes and the leader too pays attention to the concern and developmental needs of individual followers.

The Constructivist Approach refers to a set of theories made up of Cognitive Constructivism and Social Constructivism. Cognitive Constructivism deals with how an individual learner understands things, in terms of developmental stages and learning styles. While Social Constructivism emphasizes on how meanings and understanding grow out of social encounters. It also describes how the socio cultural background of learners helps them to create, discover and attain academic goals. These theories of Piaget and Vygotsky will apply effectively in this research, as the school heads have been building and administering on material which they had studied or acquired as they developed or grow in their career as well as their interaction with their environment and different stake holders in the field of education.

The Role Theory focuses on the behavior of individuals within the context of a group or organization, formal and informal. This theory operates on the principle that human behavior is guided by expectations held both by the individuals as well as by other people. Huse, (1980) points out that individuals have many assigned roles to perform. Roles are a set of rules or norms that function as plans or blueprint to guide behavior. These roles cannot be dissociated from the goals and tasks that have to be performed in the organization. In relation to this study, each member in the education community has a role to perform from the input stage to the output stage for success to be attained. This places the school leaders with a lot of responsibilities especially as he/she interacts with staff, learners, parents and other stakeholders. Thus, formal training becomes vital to improve on the school leader's roles.

Goal Setting Theory initiated by Kurt Lewin, is a motivational theory of leadership. From the word goal, it already brings to mind the fact that school leaders work with a focus to attain or achieve specific results. Locke and Latham, (2006) opine that Goal-Setting Theory can be widely applied in the field of education since education is a highly result-oriented discipline. The initiation, coordination of this goal in our schools is in the hands of the school heads. It is hoped that with formal training of these personalities, the goals will be better articulated.

Samuel, B. Bacharach, (1989) states that “a theory may be viewed as a system of constructs and variables in which the constructs are related to each other by propositions and the variables are related to each other by hypotheses.” On the other hand, John McAuley, Joanne Duberley and Phil Johnson, (2007) think that theories propose reasons in the form of cause-and effect relationships that explain the variation of a particular phenomenon in terms of the effects of the action of, or the variation in, another phenomenon – the why and the how. Based on the above, the use of theories in this work is therefore justified as cause and effect relationship is visible. This study therefore selected some theories which show a co relation with the topic of the research. It is on this premise that the theories selected for

this study can be justified. These are the Transformation Theory, Constructionist Theory, Role Theory and Goal Setting Theory.

Charry, (2012) in studying leadership, identifies nine theories of leadership. These theories are: Trait Theory, "Great Man" Theory, Contingency Theories, Situational Theory, Behavioural Theory, Participative Theory, Transactional / Management, Theory Relationship / Transformational Theory, and Skills Theory. The earlier theories were however concerned with the qualities that differentiated leaders from followers, and later theories looked at other factors associated with leadership. These leadership theories can be summarized as seen below.

Table1: From ‘Great Man’ to ‘Distribution’ Leadership

Great Man Theories	The great man theory of management is one of the most primitive theories used to develop an understanding about management and leadership. The great man theory argues that competence for management is inborn—that great leaders are extraordinary people, born with natural qualities, destined to lead and not trained to become leaders. The use of the term "great men", or heroes was highly influential and intentional since, until the latter part of the 20th century, management was considered to be a notion which is first and foremost male, military and western (Tchombe, 1997).
Trait Theories	The trait theory of management was influential from the 1900s to the 1950s and considered that managers are born, and not made. The trait theory of management is based on the measurement of remarkable patterns of practice in an individual’s behaviour - both successful and unsuccessful - and is used to visualize management and leadership effectiveness.
Behavioural Theories	Behavioural management theories give attention to what managers actually do rather than on their merits. Different behavioural patterns are observed and classified as ‘management styles’. This area of managing behaviours has certainly attracted most consideration about leadership from practicing managers than leaders themselves.
Situational Theories	This theory, influential from the 50s to the late 60s, sought to explain leaders' abilities by looking at the influence of the situation on managers' expertise and behaviours, leading to the concept of “situational

Leadership”.	
Contingency Theory	Contingency theory is a behavioural theory based on the claims that there is no best way to manage or lead an organisation. To comprehend what adds value to managers’ or leaders’ effectiveness, researchers used the “contingency model” in exploring the relationship between personality traits, situational variables, and manager or leader effectiveness variables.
Transactional Theory	Comparable to the contingency theory of management is the transactional approach which emphasises the importance of motivating and directing followers, focusing on shared benefits derived from a form of ‘contract’ through which the leader distributes such incentives as rewards or acknowledgement in return for the dedication or loyalty of the followers (Northhouse, 2001).
Transformational Theory	Leadership and Management studies of the 70s and 80s on one occasion focused on the individual characteristics of managers and leaders which power their effectiveness and the achievements of their organizational performance.
Distributed Theory	Since the 1980s management and leadership researchers have placed great importance on the call for high-quality leadership practices. The model of distributed leadership practices has been promoted, as exemplified by the National Professional Qualification (NPQH) for Headship, emphasises the role of a school leader’s and organisation performance (Harris andSpillane (2008)

Source: Ebot F. Ashu (2014) Adapted from Tchombe, 1997; Collins, 2002; Bolden *et al.*, 2003; Harris and Spillane, 2008

Generally, when one gets a reflection of past and contemporary leaders, one is tempted to say that some of them are great leaders. This is so because, they seem to have an aura that makes them different from ordinary human beings in several aspects like possessing high levels of ambition and having a clear vision of what they want to achieve. This orientation expresses an approach to the study of leadership which assumes that leaders are born and not made and they possess certain traits which were inherited as well as that great leaders can arise when there is a great need. The traits approach gives rise to questions: whether leaders are born or made; and whether leadership is an art or science. A review of these theories gives insights to the above concerns. Cognizance of the fact that Head Teachers and Principals in Cameroon do not yet have a school of training before, during or after their appointments as school heads, these leaders can be said to depend on their experiences in life and in the job as well as their character traits. It is in this light that in all the leadership theories cited above, the Transformational Theory of leadership has been selected as appropriate for this study since it is a contemporary theory.

Transformational Theory provides the necessary background and context for this study, since the main purpose is to measure leadership behaviour and to demonstrate a model for leadership development. Robbins and Coulter, (2007) describes a transformational leader as a person who stimulates and inspires (transform) or creates positive change in followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes and the leader too pays attention to the concern and developmental needs of individual followers. The foundation of transformational leadership is linked to James Macgregor Burns in 1978 in his descriptive research on political leaders. But its usage has spread into management and organizational psychology with modifications by B.M Bass and J.B Avalio (Jung & Sosik, 2002). In Burns' Theory of Transformational Leadership, Burns (1978, p.20) the author described transformational leadership as a process whereby leaders and followers are both raised to higher levels of morality and motivation such as liberty, justice, equality, peace and humanitarianism. According to Burns (1978), leadership is a process, not a set of discrete acts. It is viewed both as an influence process between individuals as well as a process of mobilizing power to reform institutions and change social systems. Meanwhile at the macro level, transformational leadership involves expressing, shaping, and mediating conflict among groups of people in addition to motivating individuals. All these are attributes expected from our school heads in Cameroon. They cannot possibly have these entirely but with training which this study advocates, more talents of charismatic leadership qualities would be seen and expressed.

Bass (1985) looks at transformational leadership in terms of the leader's impact on subordinates where trust, admiration and respect for the leader exist. Here, the followers are therefore motivated to do more than what was originally expected of them. Bass opines that a leader can transform followers by: Making them more aware of the importance and value of task outcomes, inducing them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the team and lastly activating their higher-order needs. Besides charisma, Bass (1985), also thinks that leaders, may also transform followers by serving as a coach, teacher and mentor. These

are high order needs or skills that all school heads need. In a case where a leader does not have an impact on the followers, ineffectiveness will certainly be the order of the day in such an institution. Thus, to ensure a general high standard in all school heads, training becomes imperative.

Warrilow (2012), looking at the transformational leadership theory, identified four components of transformational leadership style: Charisma or idealised influence: here, the followers identify with the leader who has a clear set of values and acts as a role model for them as well as the degree to which the leader behaves in admirable ways and displays convictions on their stands. The second is Inspirational motivation: the degree to which the leader articulates a vision that is appeals to and inspires the followers with optimism about future goals, and offers meaning for the current tasks in hand. Thirdly, we have Intellectual stimulation: the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions, stimulates and encourages creativity in the followers - by providing a framework for followers to see how they connect to the leader, the organization, each other, and the goal they can creatively overcome any obstacles in the way of the mission. The fourth is Personal and individual attention: the degree to which the leader attends to each individual follower's needs and acts as a mentor or coach and gives respect to and appreciation of the individual's contribution to the team. This fulfils and enhances each individual team members' need for self-fulfillment, and self-worth and in so doing inspires followers to further achievement and growth. These leadership styles can be best harnessed for the use of educational leaders through training for the betterment of the administration of Primary, Secondary and High Schools.

Abdul Ghani Abdullah (2005), looks at the impact that school leader's transformational leadership would have on both teachers and learners. Abdul states that it will affect the responsibility of the teachers to the school. Transformational leadership can increase teachers' motivation and this will directly or indirectly have a good impact on the students' academic performance. This view is supported by Moolenaar, Daly and Sleengers (2010), who equally stated that transformational leadership positively associated with climate and innovative school, it will lead and motivate their followers to do more than they expected in terms of extra effort and productivity

Judge & Piccolo, (2004), identifies two theories which they considered slightly similar but different. These are the Transactional vs Transformational theory. They consider that these two theories are two of the most commonly researched within academic literature. The difference between these theories is particularly evident when looking at what leaders and followers offer one another. Transformational leaders and theory offer followers a purpose beyond achieving short term goals and focus on the basic needs of their followers. Meanwhile, Transactional leaders or theory focuses on the exchange of resources and give followers something they want in exchange for something they want (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Both theories were developed by Bass (1985). From the foregoing, it is observed that transformational leadership theory is vital in this study because it stimulates and inspires (transform) or creates positive change in leaders to achieve extraordinary

outcomes and the leader also pays attention to the concern and developmental needs of individual followers.

Constructivist approach refers to a set of theories made up of Cognitive Constructivism and Social Constructivism. Cognitive Constructivism deals with how an individual learner understands things, in terms of developmental stages and learning styles. While Social Constructivism emphasizes on how meanings and understanding grow out of social encounters. It also describes how the socio cultural background of learners helps them to create, discover and attain academic goals. These theories of Piaget and Vygotsky will apply effectively in this research, as the school heads have been building and administering on material which they had studied or acquired as they developed or grow in their career as well as their interaction with their environment and different stake holders in the field of education.

This theory was propounded by psychologists like Jean Piaget, Jerome Bruner and Lev Vygotsky, It focused on two major stands or perspectives in relation to teaching and learning. These views are Cognitive Constructivism and Social Constructivism. Cognitive Constructivism deals with how a learner understands things in terms of developmental stages and learning styles while Social Constructivism emphasizes on how meanings and understanding grow out of social encounters or interactions. Generally, the idea behind the Constructivist Theory is that human learning is constructed, that learners build new knowledge upon the foundation of previous. It thus argues that people produce knowledge and make meaning based upon their experience. Two key concepts which exist within the construction learning theory and which treats the construction of an individual's new knowledge are Accommodation and Assimilation. Assimilation causes an individual to incorporate new experiences into old experiences that is the individual develops new outlooks, rethinks and evaluate what is important, ultimately altering their perceptions. This relates to formal training of educational leaders who need to acquire new and specialized knowledge in order to widen their scope about administration in line with growing complex educational landscape. Accommodation is refraining the world and new experience into the mental capacity already present. According to Piagets theory of constructivism, educational leaders are challenged to constant learning which will make them effective critical thinkers, mentors, consultants and coaches. Assimilation is the tendency to understand new experience in terms of existing knowledge. Whenever we come across something new, we try to make sense of it but upon our existing cognitive structures.

The theory applies in both formal and informal settings in the teaching learning and administrative processes in schools. Vygotsky (1978) sees learning as a continual movement from the current intellectual level to a higher level which more closely approximates the learner's potentials. This movement occurs in the "zone of proximal development" as a result of social interaction. He also sees the role of peers, adults as they converse, question, explain and make meanings as contributions to learning. This interaction shows that in the formal training of leaders, practical exercises or experimental field work are important as it also builds the capacities of the school heads. Vygotsky,

further identifies three themes that form the framework of his theory which are (1) a reliance on a genetic of development method in which, the learner interacts and gains knowledge (externally) and then internalizes it. (ii) He claims that higher mental processes in the individual have their origin in social process. These ties to the concept of "zone of proximal development (Z.P.D). (iii) That mental processes can be understood if only we understand the tools and signs that mediate them. Changing a stimulus situation is the process of responding to it establishes mediation. This implies that any higher mental function necessarily goes through an external stage in the development because it is initially a social function.

To Masello, et al., (1993), they look at social constructivism theory from the perspective of culture. The theory deals with interactions of people from different cultural backgrounds. As such, the authors identify three ways by which the cultural tool can be passed from an individual to another. These are; through imitative learning where one tries to copy or imitate another; by instructed learning which deals with remembering the instructions of the teacher and using it to self-regulate; and through collaborative learning where peers strive to understand and work together to learn a specific skill. This applies to this study in that, school heads are not to work only in their area of origin. Transfers and appointments will make them work in different parts of the country. Understanding the cultures would help the educational leaders to succeed in whatever area there are sent to work. Besides, their subordinates and learners are from diverse cultural backgrounds. Thus this theory supports formal training with interest on culture. As such school heads must imitate others who should serve as role models or mentors, collaborative learning with their peers and instructed learning which emphasize formal training seen as a need for educational leaders.

Annika Austin, (2012), in looking at Leadership Training in the Systemic Constructionist Approach, indicated that systemic constructionism is a compatible framework to have in leadership trainings. The author identifies three pillars of leadership: knowledge, support, skill and will. Knowledge increases the understanding of an organization's values, strategy and goals, procedures. Support means collegial support, including the networking of leaders exchanging ideas. Lastly, skill and will means the attitude, skills and roles, conditions of professional leadership, self-knowledge, evaluation of one's work, communication and collaboration competence and ways of provoking strategic thinking. These pillars of leadership cannot be attained very easily. But with formal training, most of it could be articulated with little difficulty since training broadens the mindset of the leader. Systemic thinking emphasizes the importance of developing tools that allow practitioners observe and work with the connectedness of people, patterns of interaction, meaning making and context. (Barge 2012). Campbell suggests that systemic thinking represents a particular perspective toward describing and explaining lived patterns of behavior: "systemic thinking is a way to make sense of the relatedness of everything around us. In its broadest application, it is the way of thinking that gives practitioners the tools to observe the connectedness of people, things, and ideas: everything connects to everything else." (Campbell 2000, 7.). Educational leaders are not islands. They operate in a community which also relates to their social functions.

Training will certainly contribute in their development to meet up with their task.

Christina Curnow et al., (2006) conducted a research which aimed at implementing an innovative training approach that incorporated advanced learning technologies/theories to facilitate faster, deeper learning with respect to leadership. They considered these theories relevant and timely because in leadership positions, the importance of cognitive and interpersonal skills training takes on greater importance than physical or technical skills. Even though the authors noted that all the theories were not mutually exclusive, their final learning application incorporated themes from several learning theories. Amongst others, Constructivism/learner-centered education was one of the theories used. Constructivism was defined as a theory of knowledge and learning in which knowledge is actively “constructed” by the learner through actively processing information and experiences (Dimock & Boethel, 1999).

Dimock and Boethel (1999) identified some major tenets which include: Learning involves building understanding and making sense of new experiences, not memorizing facts. Learning is embedded in the situation or context in which it was learned. Knowledge is constructed by the learner by making elaborations and interpretations as he or she learns. It is dependent on the knowledge and experiences the learner brings to the situation. The authors also stated that experience and prior understanding has a role in learning new information and that social interaction has an important role in learning. A long period of education is needed to become a professional. This information comes from classes, books, from other experts, and from experience. This forms the foundation of their knowledge. This shows that the foundations obtained by teachers, best applies to teaching and thus educational leaders need their own foundation which constructivism theory advocates. This study by Christina Curnow et al., though related to the army, applies to education for it also stresses on constructing knowledge formally and informally.

Role theory is a perspective in sociology and in social psychology. This theory considers most of everyday activity to be the acting out of socially defined categories. Lattimore et al., (2004:61) defines roles as a collection of everyday activities of the people. Others see the role in role theory as a behavior associated with a social position, or a typical behavior. Thus, each social role is a set of rights, duties, expectations, norms and behaviors that a person has to face and fulfill. School heads fall very squarely in this theory since they have identified roles to perform in their different establishments as well as towards other stakeholders in education.

Role theory of leadership is generally regarded as a basic link between an individual and a group, which forms the basis of social systems. These interactions, make it possible for both group and individual members’ aims as well as the institutional aims to be easily achieved or realized faster. A theoretical framework for organizational role theory was developed by Katz & Kahn (1966, 1978). This framework provided insight into the task functions of groups and their members alongside with the psychological and social facets of group behavior. They regarded roles as patterns of behavior which are established by interaction of members of

a social unit. It is noted that these roles are not static but however, evolve as group members exchange interactions and thus construct meaningful relationships. School leaders acknowledge that their educational environments are evolving as they interact with different stakeholders who equally have different viewpoints.

Sheard & Kakabadse, (2002), developed a perspective on leadership by using an ethnographic methodology in which the roles of leaders were expressed in terms of four distinct categories legitimate, social, task and macro which every individual should exercise at least one of them. According to Sheard & Kakabadse, a legitimate leader was one who was publicly appointed to achieve the objectives of the institution. A social leader is one who builds a network of relationships with other group members while task leaders are those who derive their legitimacy to lead other group members from the formal allocation of responsibility for delivering a specific task by the group’s legitimate leader. Meanwhile, macro leadership role is one played by a senior executive when interacting with the group. Thus, a group that is generally successful in gaining productive contributions from its members through effective roles and positive norms will be better placed to achieve organizational goals, (Sheard and Kakabadse, 2007).

Neuberger (2002), identifies three approaches in role theory of leadership. The structuralistic approach where an individual is considered as being permanently influenced by behavioral expectations. The person is typically seen as the focal point of an indefinite number of social relationships. This applies to school heads who stand out tall in their position and influence the behavior and actions of other stakeholders in their institutions. The second approach according to Neuberger, is the functionalist approach which focuses on the social network the individual or leader in our context is embedded in. In this approach, leadership roles do not exist anymore. Rather, only requirements of the system or institution are expected to be met by people holding different positions, regardless of whether they are leaders or followers. What matters is that the task is fulfilled because different functions coexist for the common good of the establishment. The third approach, is symbolic interactionism. Here, the behavior of an individual is viewed as an outcome of his/her biography as well as the subjective efforts to make sense out of experienced facts and to follow his/her own interests. The roles within a group therefore emerge or are developed through interaction or active participation, (Seers, 1989). Simpson and Carroll (2008), states that a “role is itself emergent and inherently incomplete, allowing selves not only to perform, but also to improvise and play with the multiplicity of roles that they encounter in their social and inter subjective experiences”. In all, each of the approaches cannot be used in isolation even though the structuralist views are dominant. From the foregoing, it is thus observed that school administrators are expected to understand the three approaches in order to effectively lead their ever growing and complex institutions. These views seem to be supporting formal training in which school leaders can better appreciate these approaches.

Elif Şesen, (2015), in looking at the role theory, focuses on public relations, which is said to contribute to the understanding of the practitioners’ multifunctional roles. Elif states that practitioners herein referred to as educational

leaders, need new strategies to respond to organizational, social and environmental demands. This is because they are concerned with developing the public image of the organization, dealing with the society, media or managing issues of the institution. These are responsibilities that are challenging and thus need training, skills and better understanding of the role theory especially as citizen participation cannot be separated from education.

Patricia Eileen Murillo, (2013), in her study on teacher leadership, looked at role theory from different directions. She besides role theory, also brought out the relationships between role conflict and role ambiguity which all together affected teacher leadership in public schools in North Carolina. It identified some precursors to role theory to include studies of division of labour, complying with rules, status, social forces, interaction, and various theories of self (Biddle & Thomas, 1966). Bess & Dee, (2008), identifies that roles are interdependent and complimentary. As such misunderstandings are bound to exist. This accounts for the concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity. All these are visible in our educational establishments as well as among educational administrators. Thus, role theory adequately reflects this research.

Goal Setting Theory of Motivation for leadership was first initiated, by Kurt Lewin. It was later formulated by Dr. Edwin Locke an American psychologist in the 1960s when he published an article titled "Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives." Alongside Dr. Gary Latham, they in 1990 produced a groundbreaking book called "A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance," which actually x-rayed the whole notion of goal setting as a motivational theory of leadership. A goal is the aim of an action or task that a person consciously desires to achieve or obtain (Locke & Latham, 2002). Oxford English Dictionary, (2010), p. 517 defines a goal as the object to which effort or ambition is directed; the destination of a journey. It is an end or result towards which behavior is consciously or unconsciously directed. Locke & Latham, (2006) opine that Goal-Setting theory can be widely applied in the field of education since education is a highly result-oriented discipline. Specifically, this theory ties with this study because education has goals and educational administrators are charged with the implementation and realization of this goal. Also, the theory deals with task performance. Being at the head of a citadel of learning is not for fancy but to bring out outstanding results for the pleasure of all. Law no. 98/004 of 14th April 1998 to lay down guidelines for education in Cameroon clearly outlines the goals of education.

Besides the national and even international goals, different institutions of learning have set out their own goals and objectives as well as put in place roadmaps for their attainment. It is believed that an inductive relationship thus exists between goal setting and improved production performance for desired outcomes to be achieved. In the context of this study, educational leaders who want to come out as outstanding school heads, must set individual goals as well as ensure that their collaborators understand and accept the institutional goals. Formal training therefore comes into aid these leaders with the necessary inputs to attain their objectives.

Fred C. Lunenburg (2011) classifies goals into specific and difficult but attainable goals as opposed to nonspecific, easy or no goals at all. Thus, he believes that challenging goals will mobilize energy, lead to higher effort, and increase persistent effort. Furthermore, Fred posits that goals are stated, they motivate people to develop strategies that will enable them to perform at the required goal levels. Educational leaders certainly have set high achievement levels and will certainly have to motivate their collaborators to offer their best. This is so because accomplishing the goal can create more satisfaction and further motivation, and conversely, frustration and lower motivation if the goal is not attained. Fred citing DuBrin, (2012); Greenberg, (2011); Newstrom, (2011), identifies some practical suggestions that have to be considered by leaders when attempting to use goal-setting to enhance motivation and performance. These are: Goals Need to Be Specific, Goals Must Be Difficult but Attainable, Goals Must Be Accepted, Feedback Must Be Provided on Goal Attainment, Goals Are More Effective When They Are Used to Evaluate Performance, Deadlines Improve the Effectiveness of Goals, A Learning Goal Orientation Leads to Higher Performance than a Performance Goal Orientation and Group Goal-Setting is As Important As Individual Goal-Setting. If educational administrators should apply the above suggestions, then all the stakeholders in this sector without doubt will be highly motivated to perform their various tasks for the betterment of the entire institution. Thus, a leader without a goal cannot be successful.

According to Edwin A. Locke and Gary P. Latham in giving out new directions on goal setting theory, they believe that positive relationship between task performance and goal difficulty can be achieved if and only if all persons are committed to the goal, have the requisite ability to attain it, and do not have conflicting goals. Furthermore, these goals are outcomes that are valued to be realized in the future. As such, the present conditions have to be seriously considered before formulating these goals. Educational leaders must think ahead of other stakeholders. They must be equipped with the skill to handle collaborators and be able to side line other conflicting goals that might jeopardize their administration. Significantly, they identified the benefits of having goals by institutions. These include the fact that it will motivate workers to use their existing ability, it may automatically "pull" stored task-relevant knowledge into awareness, as well as motivate people to search for new knowledge especially when they are confronted by new and or complex tasks. It goes without saying therefore that goals cannot be separated from educational leaders. Their visions for their establishments would therefore enable them to achieve these benefits as indicated by the authors.

Smith, Ken G. and Hitt, Michael A. (2005), posit that goal setting rests on the premise that goal-directedness is an essential element of human action and that conscious self-regulation of action, though volitional, is the norm. They also indicated that, goal effects are mediated by three relatively automatized mechanisms being a focus on the desired end with the exclusion of other goals, regulation of both physical and cognitive efforts needed to attain the goal as also stated by Wegge and Dibbelt, (2000), and persistence of effort through time until the goal is attained. These mediators cannot possibly be seen by all. To sort out and effectively organize them, needs extra efforts and skills. It will be thus

easier for administrators who have had formal training in educational administration to deal with this than aspiring or those not trained. Besides the mediators, they also identified some moderators that serve as catalyst in goal setting theory. These are people who need feedback regarding their progress in order to see if they are “on target”. Secondly, that peoples commitment is a prerequisite for goals to be effective as echoed by Seijts and Latham, (2000); they must be “real” goals and the people should have satisfaction from their accomplishments.

Babette Bronkhorst, Bram Steijn, and Brenda Vermeeren, (2013), use the case of the Dutch Municipality to express a relationship between Transformational Leadership, Goal Setting, and Work Motivation. Note should be taken that Transformational leadership is a leadership theory which is believed to be widely used by most administrators. As such, the authors stated that this leadership style will positively affect the goal-setting process, which in turn will affect work motivation. They also posit that, transformational leadership will indirectly affect the setting of goals in a public sector work context by reducing red tape and organizational goal conflict. The underlying principle here is that “effective leaders transform or change the basic beliefs or assumptions, values, and attitudes of collaborators so that they are willing to perform or achieve beyond the minimum levels specified by the organization” (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990, p. 108). Another important factor is that goal setting mediates this relationship, with transformational leaders being able to set more challenging and more specific goals. These leaders are considered to be able to reduce perceptions of procedural constraints among their collaborators or subordinates so that such constraints should not hamper the use of goal setting. A transformational leader is expected: To show individualized consideration by diagnosing and elevating the needs of each follower, to become a source of admiration (idealized influence), to stimulate their followers to see the world from new perspectives (intellectual stimulation), and to provide inspirational motivation and thus, meaning and a sense of purpose about what needs to be done. All these give credit to this leadership style as it positively affects work motivation by enhancing the choices made by collaborators or subordinates in terms of devoting effort to certain tasks and their willingness to persist in these tasks. From the foregoing, it is observed that transformational leadership, goal setting, and work motivation have largely been seen as positive.

Conversely, negative effects in this relationship have been identified to include the fact that it is biased toward certain stakeholders (top management and customers) at the expense of employees. Van Wart, (2012), criticizes and warns of the over-emphasis on universal applicability and other critics think that burn-out risk maybe involved. Thus the relation is not all roses. In spite of this, Perry et al. (2006, p. 509) note that goal setting is “the single most researched and dominant theory of employee motivation in the field.” In all, transformational leaders influence goal clarity and boosts employee mission valence by fostering employees’ public service motivation and perceptions of goal clarity.

Zainudin Abu Bakar, et al. (2014), carried a study on learners and the teacher to show how the goal setting theory can be applied in a classroom setting in Malaysia. They saw this

theory as one of the prominent ones that has been widely used in educational settings to enhance the teaching and learning transaction. Thus, all educators were called upon to make use of this theory. Anderman, (2011), indicated that goal setting is essential for achievement in learning processes as well as encourages students’ self-improvement in different aspects of learning since it plays a very important or essential component of decision making which relates to the mental processes that result in selection of appropriate actions to make accomplishment. The application of this theory motivated the learners more than ever before because it made learning to become more visible and clear. Here teachers should define the students’ needs in learning, prepare and implement effective pedagogy, create specific learning goals for students and classroom activities, monitor students’ progress, and lastly determine whether the students achieved the goals. Thus without goals or appropriate goals, learners are not motivated or their drive to learn decreases. Correct goals suited to the learning level of learners can intrinsically and extrinsically stimulate or motivate the learners and also create a continuous improvement classroom setting that benefits both teachers and learners especially when there is feedback. Even though Zainudin Abu Bakar, Lee Mei Yun, Ng SiewKeow, Tan Hui Li did their study in a classroom setting, it is realized that their focus was on goals. It should be noted that classrooms do not operate in isolation from the school heads who are the instructional leaders. This therefore makes this study relevant in our context because the teachers’ goals as well as that of the learners are coined from the overall goal of the institution manned by the school heads. It goes without saying therefore that this theory affects all the different facets and stakeholders directly or indirectly.

NCSSFL, (2010). It identified two general goal orientations that students can adopt: a task-focused orientation which has an intrinsic focus on learning and improving and an ability-focused orientation which has an extrinsic focus on external rewards. As such, motivation is seen as a driving force behind achievements. If a teacher is disgruntled, teaching and learning will certainly be affected negatively. The goals set would not be fully or may not be attained at all. In this context, school heads have a responsibility to ensure the understanding of the institutional goals, encourage teachers and learners to identify their individual goals and provide an enabling environment for all these set goals to be achieved. School leaders could also bring in innovative programs. Thus, a deeper level of engagement by the learners, teachers and school heads, promotes internalization of the connection between effort and achievement and failure would be avoided. Since there are short and long term goals, it therefore calls for full involvement of these parties with the educational leader who certainly is more experienced or trained formally, to make material, moral or professional inputs.

Staffan Holmberg (2014) looks at Principals' goal-setting and actions while managing their schools. The author’s main focus was to analyze specificity of locally-created goals and the principal’s performance-affecting behaviors in meetings, considering the set goals of their institutions in some municipalities in Sweden. It was realized that most of the goals written in the schools’ work-plans lacked specificity. Also, that principals talked about their goals while leading their staff at meetings, and they changed their behavior

towards a more performance-affecting management style while doing so. Even though schools have multiple members and different levels of intervention or controls, the principal is considered as a pivot who can influence the different stakeholders and, in turn, increase school efficiency (Ross & Gray, 2006, Pont, Nusche & Moorman, 2008). The school goals are supposed to be operationalized and made sure that they are achieved with the school heads directing. It was noted that formulating goals in Swedish institutions according to the study was a very vital exercise because the Swedish law and policy considers successful schools as those that are achieving high academic and social goals (Höög, Johansson & Olofsson, 2005). Beside the academic and social goals, there are external goals like accountability, effectiveness and local democracy, which school leaders need to safeguard. They have to also adapt their goals to local conditions.

Ärlestig, (2008) identified communication as a problem amongst teachers and the school heads which affects the realization of school goals. It was noted that even if principals reflected on teaching and learning objectives, their teachers did not feel that this was being sufficiently communicated to them. Thus, Principals or school heads need to lead towards specific goals which should be clearly expressed, monitoring, communicating, give feedback on performance and take responsibility for organizational outcome. Staffan Holmberg then concluded that in meetings, principals mostly talked about work without relating it to performance. It also noted that locally-created goals occupied less than one third of total meeting time. This goes to say that school administrators should in the management of their schools, relate their work to performance and the goals should be echoed often to ensure focus in order to avoid distractions which might affect negatively the achievement of the set goals.

Peter A. Heslin, Jay B. Carson, and Don Vande Walle examined practical applications of goal setting theory to performance management. They posit that goal setting is a key or vital ingredient for effectively coaching employees so as to ensure high performance. So goals have to be set and not that employers and employees should strive to simply

“do their best”. (Locke, 1966). They also stated that, through motivational processes, challenging goals would often lead to valuable rewards like recognition, promotions, and/or increases in income from one’s work. When goals are set, it relieves boredom by imbuing work with a greater sense of purpose. Peter A. Heslin, and co. further indicated that specific challenging goals do not, however, necessarily lead to such desirable personal and organizational outcomes. Their work instead stated that, the results from goal setting depend critically on issues pertaining to goal framing, goal commitment, team goals, task complexity and feedback. Thus, if these factors are well articulated by educational leaders, the authors believe that it would enable effective performance management.

METHODOLOGY

A Sequential explanatory mixed method design was deemed necessary for this study. Explanatory designs are described as a two stage design which sees quantitative data being used as the basis on which to build and explain qualitative data. The quantitative data informs the qualitative data selection process which is a great strength in that it enables researchers to specifically pinpoint data that is relevant to specific research project.

This study was carried out in the North West and South West Regions of Cameroon. The target population therefore was made up of all the Head Teachers and Principals in the Public, Denominational and Lay Private institutions in these Regions. According to official records in the Regional Delegations of Basic and Secondary Education in the South West and North West Regions for the 2016/2017 beginning of year report, there are 1451 Head Teachers in the South West Region with 876 in Public Schools, 219 in Denominational Schools and 356 in Lay Private Schools. In the North West, there are 2070 Head Teachers with 1259 in Public Schools, 554 in Denominational Schools and 257 in Lay Private Schools. In Secondary Education, there are 551 Principals in the North West with 412 in Public Schools, 61 Denominational Schools and 78 in Lay Private Schools. In the South West Region, there are 372 Principals with 254 in Public Schools, 33 in Denominational Schools and 85 in Lay Private Schools.

Table1: Distribution of Head Teachers by Regions

S/N	Region	Head Teachers in public schools	Head Teachers in Denominational schools	Head teachers in Lay private schools	Total per Region.
1	North- West	1259	554	257	2070
2	South- West	876	219	356	1451
Total	02	2135	773	613	3521

Source: 2016/2017 School Mapping Statistics for North- West and South- West Regional Delegation of MINEDUB

The table above describes the number of Head Teachers of Primary Schools in the North West and South West Regions of Cameroon. It shows that the North West had 2070 Head Teachers and the South West had 1451. Both Regions thus had a total of 3521 Head Teachers.

Table2: Distribution of Principals by Regions

S/N	Region	Principals in public schools	Principals in Denominational schools	Principals in Lay private schools	Total per Region.
1	North- West	412	61	78	551
2	South- West	254	33	85	372
Total	02	666	94	163	923

Source: 2016/2017 School Mapping Statistics for North- West and South- West Regional Delegation of MINESEC

The table above describes the number of Principals of Secondary Schools in the North West and South West Regions of Cameroon. It shows that the North West had 551 Principals and the South West had 372. Both Regions thus had a total of 923 Principals of schools.

The sample for this study is made up of 246 School Heads divided into 118 Head Teachers and 128 Principals, selected using the multistage random sampling technique from 2 Divisions of the North- West and 2 Divisions of the South- West Regions of Cameroon. To get the Schools and their leaders for the Sample, I identified the Divisions to be used without any specific criteria. In each of the Divisions, the schools were randomly sampled by tagging their names into containers. A Tag was drawn from each of the containers and the process repeated until the proportionately required number of schools from each Division was obtained. The result is shown below.

Table3 Distribution of the sample of schools/ Head Teachers per Division in the North- West and South- West Regions

No.	Divisions	No. of schools/ Accessible population	No. of schools selected/ Sample of Head Teachers
1	Mezam	470	41
2	Momo	191	12
3	Fako	440	48
4	Meme	338	17
Total	04	1439	118

The table above shows the number of Head Teachers who actually took part in this study. From the four Divisions selected, 118 Head Teachers responded to the questionnaires or took part in the interview for this study.

Table4; Distribution of the sample of schools/ Principals per Division in the North- West and South- West Regions

No.	Divisions	No. of schools/ Accessible population	No. of schools selected/ Sample of Head Teachers
1	Mezam	146	41
2	Momo	64	16
3	Fako	109	47
4	Meme	91	24
Total	04	410	128

The table above shows the number of Principals who actually took part in this study. From the four Divisions selected, 128 Principals responded to the questionnaires or took part in the interview for this study. From the above tables, it is observed that all the Head Teachers and Principals in the selected schools therefore constituted the sample population of this study.

Data for this study was collected through an interview guide and a questionnaire. These instruments were constructed in conformity with the objective of this study.

The distribution and collection of the questionnaire was done by friends, classmates, teachers, some school heads and the researcher in person. But the interviews were conducted by the researcher himself. The sampled schools were visited and the administration consulted. In most areas where the questionnaire was administered by the researcher, the school administrators showed him round the school before responding to the questionnaires. In other situations the school heads collaborators collected the questionnaires and administered them later in situations where the school heads were not present. The researcher, however, collected them later for analysis.

The data obtained from the research instrument was analyzed both descriptively and inferentially. Open ended and interviews were analyzed using the process of thematic analysis whereby concepts or ideas were grouped under umbrella terms or key words. The structured items of the questionnaires was done by first doing an item-by-item and then section analyses.

Descriptively, simple and relative frequencies (percentages) per response Option were calculated and used to describe the trends in respondents' responses. Relative frequencies or percentages were calculated using the formula
 Relative frequency (percentage) of a response option =
 $\text{Response Frequency} \times 100\% = \text{Total frequency}$

Inferentially, the chi square statistics were used to compare and contrast findings with respect to defined categorization of respondents. For example by Principals/ Head Teachers. This uses two parameters - the chi square statistics and the degree of freedom, where:

Chi square (χ^2) = $\sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$ where O = observed frequency,
 E = expected frequency and \sum = 'Sum of
 Degree of freedom (df) = (c-1) + (r - 1) or (c + r - 2).
 c = number of columns and r number of rows in the contingency table.

FINDINGS

The findings from the analysis of the questionnaire are as follows:

Section A: Demographic Information**Table5: Gender**

		Male	Female	Total
Head Teachers	f	72	40	112
	%	64.3%	35.7%	100%
Principals	f	90	30	120
	%	75.0%	25.0%	100%

More than two-thirds (64.3%) of the Head Teachers and three-quarters (75.0%) of the Principals are male. This shows that a majority of the school administrators (Head Teachers and Principals) are male.

Table6: Highest academic qualification of the School Leaders.

Qualifications		O/A Levels	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate	Total
Head Teachers	f	69	40	03	00	112
	%	61.6%	35.7%	02.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Principals	f	21	75	24	00	120
	%	17.5%	62.5%	20.0%	0.0%	100.0%

With reference to the academic qualifications of school administrators, more than three-fifths (61.6%) and one-third (35.7%) of head teachers hold GCE and Bachelor's degree respectively; with about one-fifth (02.7%) holding Master's Degree. On the other hand, five-eighths (62.5%) and one-fifth (20.0%) of the Principals are holders of Bachelor's and Master's Degrees, respectively; with a small but significant 17.5% of them holding A/L. None of the school heads and principals are doctorate degree holders.

Table7: Highest professional Qualification.

Qualification		CAPIEMP	DIPES I	DIPES II	None	Others	Total
Head Teachers	f	78	03	00	28	03	112
	%	69.6%	02.7%	00%	25%	02.7%	100.0%
Principals	f	00	15	35	46	24	120
	%	0.0%	12.5%	29.2%	38.3%	20.0%	100.0%

With regard to the professional qualifications of school administrators, about seven-tenths (69.6%) of Head Teachers hold the professional certificate obtained from the Teacher Training Colleges (the CAPIEMP). Small proportions (more than one-fiftieth-02.7%) respectively hold the first cycle secondary school teachers' certificate - DIPES I as well as other certificates. On the other hand, one-eighth (12.5%) hold the first cycle secondary school teachers' certificate - DIPES I, about three-tenths (29.2%) hold the second cycle secondary school teachers' certificate - DIPES II. Also, nearly two-fifths (38.3%) of the Principals are non-professionals and one-fifth (20.0%) are holders of other professional qualifications.

Table8: Longevity as school heads.

Longevity		0 - 4	5 - 9	10 -15	16+	Total
Head Teachers	f	23	35	26	28	112
	%	20.5%	31.3%	23.2%	25.0%	100.0%
Principals	f	21	42	24	33	120
	%	17.5%	35.0%	20.0%	27.5%	100.0%

While about one-fifth (20.5%) of head teachers have served for less 4 years, more than three-tenths (31.2%) of them have worked for 10 to 15 years and one-quarter (25.0%) for more than sixteen years. Also, more than one-fifth (23.2%) of the head teachers have served for close to 15 years and 1/4, that is, (25%) respondents have served as school heads from the range 16 years and above. On the other hand, more than half (52.5%) of the Principals have served for up to nine years, one-fifth (20.0%) have served for 10 to 15 years and more than one-quarter (27.5%) for more than 16 years.

Table9: Longevity as teacher before becoming a school head.

Longevity		0 - 4	5 - 9	10 -15	16+	Total
Head Teachers	f	14	33	39	26	112
	%	12.5%	29.5%	34.8%	23.2%	100.0%
Principals	f	06	27	36	51	120
	%	05.0%	22.5%	30.0%	42.5%	100.0%

In relation to longevity as teacher before becoming a school head, more than two-fifths (42.0%) of the head teachers taught for less than ten years, more than one-third (34.8%) taught for 10 to 15 years and more than one-fifth (23.2%) taught for more

than 16 years before being appointed as head teachers. On the other hand, more than one-quarter (27.5%) of principals taught for less than ten years, three-tenths (30.0%) for 10 to 15 years and more than two-fifths (42.5%) taught for more than 16 years before being appointed. This shows that more head teachers are appointed after comparatively shorter lengths of service than principals.

Research Question

School Leaders’ Challenges in the discharge of their functions/roles as school administrators:

In looking at the challenges that these school leaders may face in the discharge of their duties, this section identified their pedagogic, financial, administrative and social functions. This section evaluates their views to ascertain whether in the absence of this training, they flow very well in their responsibilities.

A. Pedagogic functions:

Item1: Table10: Monitoring the performance of all staff members is easy.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	34.0	66.0	2.24	Disagree
Principals	109	32.1	67.9	2.32	Disagree
Trained School Heads	11	36.4	63.6	2.09	Disagree
All three categories	232	33.2	66.8	2.27	Disagree
Critical mean value				2.50	

In reaction to the ease of monitoring of the performance of teachers, about two-thirds (66.8%) of all the three categories of school leaders disagree (mean opinion of 2.27). This disagreement is almost the same amongst the three groups.

Item2: Table11: I provide the required materials to enhance successful teaching and learning.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	80.4	19.6	3.08	Agree
Principals	109	75.2	24.8	3.10	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.00	Agree
All three categories	232	78.9	21.1	3.09	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

While almost four-fifths (78.9%) of all the respondents agree to the fact that they provide the required materials to enhance successful teaching and learning, the Trained School Heads (100.0% and a mean of 3.08) do so more than the Head Teachers (80.4% agreement and a mean opinion of 3.08) and the Principals (75.2% and a mean of 3.10).

Item3: Table13: I regularly ensure in-service training for staffs’ professional growth.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	89.3	10.7	3.32	Agree
Principals	109	78.0	22.0	2.96	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.45	Agree
All three categories	232	84.5	15.5	3.16	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

With reference to the regular provision of in-service training for staff professional growth, more than four-fifths (84.5%) of all three categories of respondents agreed (a mean opinion of 3.16). However, the agreement of the Trained School Heads (100% with a mean opinion of 3.45) is comparatively more significant than those of Head Teachers (89.3% and a mean opinion of 3.32) and that of the Principals (78.0% and a mean opinion of 2.96).

Item4: Table14: As leader, I have mastered the instructional goals to be attained by my institution.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	100.0	00.0	3.47	Agree
Principals	109	93.6	06.4	3.23	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.45	Agree
All three categories	232	97.0	03.0	3.36	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

In response to their mastery of the instructional goals to be attained by their respective institutions, the agreement was unanimous amongst the Head Teachers and the Trained School Heads, they unanimously agree (100% and mean opinions of 3.47 and 3.45 respectively) while more than nine-tenths of the Principals did so (93.6% and a mean of 3.23). Hence, all the three categories of school leaders strongly agreed (97.3% and a mean opinion of 3.36).

A. Administrative functions:**Item5 Table15: Official meetings with different stake holders in the school are easily coordinated and followed up**

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	31.3	68.7	2.29	Disagree
Principals	109	37.6	62.4	2.29	Disagree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.54	Agree
All three categories	232	37.7	62.3	2.35	Disagree
Critical mean value				2.50	

With reference to the ease of the coordination of official meetings with different stake holders of the school, varied views emerged. While the Trained School Heads agree (100%) and a mean opinion of 3.54, the School Heads and the Principals both disagreed (respectively with 68.7% and 62.4% disagreements and a mean opinion each of 2.29). This gives an overall disagreement for the three categories of school leaders (62.3% disagreement and a mean opinion of 2.35).

Item6: Table16: I delegate specific functions to the appropriate subordinates.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	100.0	00.0	3.61	Agree
Principals	109	93.6	06.4	3.59	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.54	Agree
All three categories	232	97.0	03.0	3.60	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

In reaction to the delegation of specific functions to appropriate subordinates, all the three categories of school leaders strongly agree (97.0% and a mean opinion of 3.60). Comparatively, all the Head Teachers and Trained School Heads unanimously agree (100% agreement and mean opinions of 3.61 and 3.54 respectively) while almost all the Principals (93.6% and a mean opinion of 3.59) did agree.

Item7: Table17: School programs are compatible with the organizational structure of the school.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	80.4	19.6	3.17	Agree
Principals	109	80.7	19.3	3.15	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	72.8	27.2	3.09	Agree
All three categories	232	80.2	19.8	3.16	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

More than four-fifths (80.2% and a mean of 3.16) all the respondents agree that school programs are compatible with the organizational structures of their schools. The variation of this opinion amongst the three categories of school leaders seems to be insignificant, but for Trained school Heads whose agreement is comparatively the lowest with 72.8% and mean of 3.09.

Item8: Table18: Administrative documents are adequately and accordingly referenced and filed.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	53.6	46.4	2.48	Disagree
Principals	109	55.0	45.0	2.52	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	54.4	45.6	2.63	Agree
All three categories	232	54.3	45.7	2.51	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

In reference to the fact that administrative documents are adequately and accordingly referenced and filed all the respondents (three categories) reluctantly agree (54.3% and a mean opinion of 2.51). This reluctant agreement seems to hold throughout the three categories, except for Trained School Heads whose agreement is comparatively the highest by mean.

A. Financial Functions:**Item 9: Table 19: I am versed with all budgetary heads in the school.**

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	52.7	47.3	2.48	Disagree
Principals	109	69.7	30.3	2.96	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	72.7	27.3	3.18	Agree
All three categories	232	61.6	38.4	2.74	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

More than three-fifths (61.6%) of all the responding school leaders agree (mean opinion of 2.74) that they are versed with all the budgetary heads in their schools. Comparatively, this agreement is most noticeable amongst the Trained School Heads (72.7% agreement and a mean opinion of 3.18) than amongst the Principals (69.7% and a mean opinion of 2.96) and Head Teachers (52.7% agreement and a mean opinion of 2.48).

Item10: Table 20: I execute budgets based on official budgetary regulations.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	70.5	29.5	2.70	Agree
Principals	109	49.6	50.4	2.80	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.27	Agree
All three categories	232	62.0	38.0	2.66	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

More than three-fifths (62.0%) of all the school leaders averagely agree (mean opinion of 2.66) that their budgets are executed based on official budgetary regulations. However, this opinion is unanimous amongst Trained School Heads (100% agreement and a mean of 3.27), above the average amongst Head Teachers (70.5% and a mean of 2.70) and below average amongst Principals (49.6% and a mean of 2.80). This shows a spread in the opinions of the school leaders over the execution of school budgets according to official budgetary regulations.

Item11: Table21: All school financial transactions are approved by the PTA, SMB, and Bursar as the case maybe.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	89.3	10.7	3.17	Agree
Principals	109	64.2	35.8	2.85	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.72	Agree
All three categories	232	78.0	22.0	3.05	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

More than three-quarters (78.0%) of all the respondents agree (mean of 3.05) that all school financial transactions are approved by the PTA, SMB and the Bursars. Comparatively, this agreement is most profound amongst Trained School Heads (100% and a mean opinion of 3.72), above the average in School Teachers (89.3% and a mean opinion of 3.17) and least and below the average amongst Principals (64.2% and a mean opinion of 2.85). This implies that trained school heads are more accountable than head teachers and principals in their financial transactions.

Item12: Table22: School programs are adequately financed as stipulated by hierarchy.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	50.0	50.0	2.44	Disagree
Principals	109	44.0	56.0	2.44	Disagree
Trained School Heads	11	81.8	18.2	3.00	Agree
All three categories	232	48.7	51.3	2.46	Disagree
Critical mean value				2.50	

While more than four-fifths (81.8%) of the Trained School Heads agree (mean opinion of 3.00) that school programs are adequately financed as stipulated by hierarchy, both the Principals and the Head Teachers disagree. Conclusively, the evidence from all the three categories of school leaders put together shows that school programs are not adequately financed as stipulated by hierarchy (51.3% disagreement and a mean opinion of 2.46).

Item13: Table23: I initiate income ventures for the school.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	47.3	52.7	2.47	Disagree
Principals	109	56.9	43.1	2.56	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	100.0	00.0	3.18	Agree
All three categories	232	54.3	45.7	2.55	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

In relation to initiating income ventures by school heads in their institutions, Head Teachers disagreed (52.7% disagreement and a mean opinion of 2.47) while Trained School Heads unanimously agree (100% and a mean opinion of 3.18) and Principals averagely agree (56.9% agreement and a mean opinion of 2.56). Conclusively, all the school leaders averagely agree that they initiate income ventures for their schools (54.3% agreement and a mean opinion of 2.55).

A. Social Functions:

Item14: Table24: All stakeholders who visit the school are satisfied with my exchanges with them.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	90.2	09.8	3.23	Agree
Principals	109	80.8	19.2	2.96	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	72.7	27.3	3.00	Agree
All three categories	232	84.9	15.1	3.09	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

This item witnessed a general agreement. From all three categories, over four-fifth (84.9% with a mean opinion of 3.09) agreed that all stakeholders who visit their schools leave with satisfaction. Comparatively, nine-tenth (90.2% and a mean opinion of 3.23) of Head Teachers and over four-fifth (80.8% and a mean opinion of 2.96) of Principals both agree. The view of the Trained School Heads where close to three-quarters (72.7%) of them agreed (mean opinion of 3.00) was the least.

Item15: Table25: I ensure that the school climate and culture are good for education.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	93.8	06.2	3.35	Agree
Principals	109	69.7	30.3	2.85	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	63.6	36.4	2.63	Agree
All three categories	232	81.0	18.9	3.08	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

The reaction to ensuring that the school climate and culture are good for education saw a general agreement; the highest being amongst Head Teachers, with more than nine-tenth (93.8%) of them agreeing (mean opinion of 3.35). However, although both the Principals (69.7% agreement and a mean of 2.85) and the Trained School Heads (63.6% agreement and a mean opinion of 2.63) also agreed, their opinions were below the general situation of 81.0% agreement and a mean opinion of 3.08.

Item16: Table26: The school and community cooperate in the use of each other’s facilities/resources.

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	28.5	71.5	2.15	Disagree
Principals	109	33.9	66.1	2.23	Disagree
Trained School Heads	11	72.7	27.3	2.90	Agree
All three categories	232	33.2	66.8	2.22	Disagree
Critical mean value				2.50	

With reference to the school and community cooperating in the use of each other’s facilities and resources, two-thirds (66.8%) of all the respondents as well as more than seven-tenths (71.5%) of the Head Teachers and about two-thirds (66.1%) of the Principals generally disagree (with mean opinions of 2.22, 2.15 and 2.23 respectively). Nevertheless, close to three-quarters (72.7%) of Trained School Heads agreed (mean opinion of 2.90). This means that schools and communities do not generally cooperate in the use of each other’s facilities and resources. This is quite disturbing, given that the school cannot survive today without the community.

Table27: Summary of Section C

Category	n	% agree	% disagree	Mean value	Decision
Head Teachers	112	68.4	31.6	2.85	Agree
Principals	109	63.4	36.6	2.78	Agree
Trained School Heads	11	83.0	17.0	3.11	Agree
All three categories	232	66.8	33.2	2.82	Agree
Critical mean value				2.50	

In summary, about two-thirds (66.8%) of school leaders agree (mean opinion of 2.82) that they face challenges in the discharge of their duties/roles in the pedagogic, financial and social domains as a result of the lack of pre formal training. This opinion is comparatively most profound amongst Trained School Heads (83.0% agreement and a mean opinion of 3.11), above the average amongst Head Teachers (68.4% agreement and a mean opinion of 2.85) and below the average amongst the Principals (63.4% agreement and a mean opinion of 2.78).

The chi square test that follows is intended to test whether or not the respondents’ opinion that they face challenges in the process of discharging their duties as a result of their lack of formal training as leaders depends on the category of respondent (school leader).

Ho: The respondents’ decision that they face challenges in the discharge of their duties/roles in the pedagogic, financial, administrative and social domains as a result of the lack of pre formal training does not significantly depend on the category of respondent.

Ha: The respondents’ decision that they face challenges in the discharge of their duties/roles in the pedagogic, financial, administrative and social domains as a result of the lack of pre formal training significantly depends on the category of respondent.

Table28: Contingency Table

Category	SA	A	D	SD	Total
Head Teachers	31 (30)	46 (44)	23 (26)	12 (12)	112
Principals	28 (30)	41 (43)	29 (25)	11 (11)	109
Trained School Heads	4 (3)	5 (4)	1 (3)	1 (1)	11
Total	63	92	53	24	232

Table29: Chi square Statistic

	O	E	O - E	(O - E) ²	(O - E) ² ÷ E
1	31	30	1	1	0.0333
2	46	44	2	4	0.0909
3	23	26	-3	9	0.3462
4	12	12	0	0	0
5	28	30	-2	4	0.1333
6	41	43	-2	4	0.0930
7	29	25	4	16	0.6400
8	11	11	0	0	0
9	4	3	1	1	0.3333
10	5	4	1	1	0.2500
11	1	3	-2	4	1.3333
12	1	1	0	0	0
	$\chi_{cal}^2 =$				3.4533

df = (c - 1) (r - 1) = (4 - 1) (3 - 1) = 3 × 2 = 6; At df = 6 and sl = 0.05, $\chi_{crit}^2 = 12.592$ and $\chi_{cal}^2 = 3.453$

$$\chi_{cal}^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(O - E)^2}{E} \right] = 3.4533$$

Since $\chi_{cal}^2 = 3.453$ is less than $\chi_{crit}^2 = 12.592$, H_0 is retained and H_a is therefore rejected.

Hence, at a 5% level of significance (sl = 0.05), the respondents' decision that they face challenges in the discharge of their duties and roles in the pedagogic, financial, administrative and social domains as a result of the lack of pre formal training is statistically the same or similar across the different categories of school leaders.

It has also been found out in this research that, School Leaders face challenges as they discharge their duties in their respective schools. This challenge is due to their lack of pre- formal training upon their appointment. This confirmed the alternative hypothesis which stated that School leaders face challenges as they perform their task as Educational administrators as a result of the absence of pre- formal training. This task referred to their pedagogic, administrative, financial and social functions. This implies that, administering the schools is far from being effective. Denise Vaillant (2014). posits that, the responsibilities and tasks of school heads are enormous with new leadership policies to be adapted and applied to new environments irrespective of socio-economic and cultural considerations. As such, the expectations of school leaders in relation to their tasks is very high and so the levels of training or professional development, should be reconsidered for them to become better educational and administrative managers. Another implication is that the school heads' relation with other stakeholders and school community as a whole, might not be very cordial. Chen. (2014). describes schools as complex organizations plagued with many difficulties which are observed by the different stakeholders and structures. Thus, trained leaders will handle them with ease. According to Albritton, 1999; Croissant, 2005; and International Crisis Group, (2007), in the emergence of violence like the case of Southern Thailand in January 2004 which is common amongst us, leadership abilities are needed to maintain and ensure the security of the institutions, personnel as well as managing the schools during this social crisis in the socio-cultural, economic and political atmosphere. All these challenges can be averted by formal training on a wide variety of programs.

Conclusion

The school leaders generally expressed the view that they face challenges in the course of performing their functions which stem from the absence or lack of formal training in educational administration before they were appointed. These challenges relate to their inability to effectively perform their Pedagogic, Financial, Administrative and Social functions with ease. This therefore, seems to suggest that the current school heads need to be formally trained in specially organized in-service programs if desired output is expected to be achieved in our Primary, Secondary and High Schools. This training is however, more important for aspiring school heads.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abu-Hussain, J. (2014). *Leadership styles and value systems of school principals*. American Journal of Educational Research, 2(12), 1267-1276.
- [2] Adams, D. (1997). "Defining Educational Quality," *Educational Planning* 9(3): 3-18
- [3] Alberta Commission on Educational Planning. (1972) *A choice of futures: Report of the Commission on Educational Planning (The Worth Report)*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- [4] Alberta's Commission on Learning. (2003). *Every child learns, every child succeeds: Report and recommendations*. Edmonton: author. Retrieved from <http://education.alberta.ca/departement/ipr/commission/report/printable.aspx>
- [5] Albritton, R. B. (1999). *Political diversity among Muslims in Thailand*. Asian Studies Review, 23(2), 232-246.
- [6] Alkin, M. C. (1992). *Encyclopedia of educational research: volume 1*. New York: MacMillan.
- [7] Amanda, C., & Mary, A. B. (2013). *Principals: What Are Their Roles and Responsibilities?* University of Wyoming.

- [8] Anderson, R., & Dexter, S. (2005). *School technology leadership: an empirical investigation of prevalence and effect*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 41(1), 49-82.
- [9] Anne, F., & Militello, W. (2016). *Preparing School Leaders to Work With and in Community*. School Community Journal, 2016, Vol. 26, No. 2 Available at <http://www.schoolcommunitynetwork.org/SCJ.aspx>
- [10] Årlestig, H. (2008). *Communication between principals and teachers in successful schools*, PhD. Dissertation, Umea University, Sweden
- [11] Asan, V.W. (2015). *Leadership Style: School Perspective in Cameroon*
- [12] Auerbach, S. (2009). *Walking the walk: Portraits in leadership for family engagement in urban schools*. School Community Journal, 19(1), 9-31. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcommunitynetwork.org/SCJ.aspx>
- [13] Babette, B., Bram, S., & Brenda, V. (2013). *Transformational Leadership, Goal Setting, and Work Motivation: The Case of a Dutch Municipality*, Review of Public Personnel Administration 2015, Vol. 35(2) 124-145
- [14] Bacharach, S.B. (1989). *Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation*. Academy of management review, 14 (4), 496-515.
- [15] Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioural Change*. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- [16] Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [17] Barnett, B. (2001). *The professional induction of beginning principals in Colorado*. American Educational Research Association, Seattle Washington,
- [18] Beasum, C., Kerry, C., & Kerry, T. (2003). *The role of classroom Assistants*. Birmingham: National Primary Trust.
- [19] Bellamy, G. T., Crockett, J. B., & Nordengren, C. (2014). *Preparing school leaders for every student's learning* (Document No. LS-2). Retrieved from University of Florida.
- [20] Bennaars, G.A., Otiende, J.E., & Boisvert, R. (1994). *Theory and Practice of Education*, Nairobi Kenya, East African Educational Publishers.
- [21] Bess, J., & Dee J. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice*. Two volume set. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- [22] Biddle, B., & Thomas, E. (1966). *Role theory: Concepts and research*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- [23] Bill, D. (2014). *Addressing Current and Future Challenges in Education*, International Center For Leadership in Education.
- [24] Bill, M. (2003). *School Leaders Challenging Roles and Impact on Teacher and School Effectiveness*. OECD Commissioned Paper, University of Tasmania.
- [25] Bisshcoff, T., & Sayed, M.K. (1999). *The changing role of the principal of a public primary school: a financial school management perspective*. South African Journal of Education. Vol 19, No 4:310-314.
- [26] Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003). *Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, purposeful engagement*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 39(4), 468-503. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03255561.
- [27] Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and Management Development in Education*. London: Sage.
- [28] Bush, T., Kiggundu, E., & Moorosi, P. (2011). *Preparing New Principals in South Africa: The ACE School Leadership Programme*. South African Journal of Education, 31, 31-43.
- [29] Bush & Oduro, 2006; DeJaeghere, Williams, and Kyeyune, 2009; Ibrahim. (2011). *New principals in Africa: preparation, induction and practice*. Journal of Educational Administration. Vol 44 (4), 359-375.
- [30] Byrne, D. (1978). *The senior high school principalship, Vol. I: The national survey*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals
- [31] Cameroon (1998). *Law No. 004 of 14 April 1998 to lay down guidelines for the organization of education in Cameroon*.
- [32] Cameroon, Circular No.15/08/MINESEC/CAB of August 19th 2008
- [33] Candi, L. R. (2016). *Administrator Perception of Management Skills Comparing Traditionally and Alternatively Certified Teachers*. Southeastern University – Lakeland.
- [34] Capper, C. A., Teoharis, G., & Sebastian, J. (2006). *Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice*. Journal of Educational Administration.
- [35] Caputo, A., & Rastelli, V. (2014). *School improvement plans and student achievement: Preliminary evidence from the Quality and Merit Project in Italy*. Improving Schools, 17(1), 72-98. DOI:10.1177/1365480213515800
- [36] Chappuis, S., Chappuis, J., & Stiggins, R. (2009). *Supporting teaching learning teams*. Educational Leadership, 66(5), 12-16.
- [37] Carnes-Holt, K., Range, B., & Cisler, A. (2012). *Teaching about the principal and school counselor relationship: ELCC 2.1a*. International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 7(2). Retrieved from <http://www.ncpeapublications.org/volume-7->
- [38] Carter, G. R., & Cunningham, W. G. (1997). *The American school superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [39] Charol, S. (1987). *Training School Administrators: The Making of the Man in the Principal's office Source: Teacher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 2, Women and Teacher Education (SPRING 1987), pp. 59-67, Caddo Gap Press.
- [40] Charry, K. (2012). *Leadership Theories - 8 Major Leadership Theories*. Retrieved March 23, 2014.

- [41] Chen, G. (2014). "10 Major Challenges Facing Public Schools," Public School Review.
- [42] Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. G. (1988). *Ed school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [43] Coombs, P.H. (1970). *The World Educational Crisis: A system Analysis*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- [44] Croissant, A. (2005). *Unrest in South Thailand: Contours, causes, and consequences since 2001*. Contemporary Southeast Asia, 27(1), 21-43.
- [45] Crow, G.M. (2006), *Complexity and the Beginning Principal in the United States: Perspectives on Socialisation*, Journal of Educational Administration 44(4): 310-325.
- [46] Daresh, J., & Male, T. (2000). *Crossing the Border into Leadership: Experiences of Newly Appointed British Head Teachers and American Principals*, Educational Management and Administration, 28(1), 89-101.
- [47] David, O. (2013). *Leadership Preparation for School Principals: The Place of Certification*, University of Manitoba.
- [48] Day, T., & Tosey, P. (2011). *Beyond SMART? A new framework for goal setting*. Curriculum Journal, 22(4), 515-534. oi:10.1080/09585176.2011.627213
- [49] Deanna, J. S., Kozleski E. B., & French N. K. (2000). *Inclusive Education for 21st century*. London: Thomson Learning Publishing Company.
- [50] DeJaeghere, J.G., Williams, R., & Kyeyune, R. (2009). *Ugandan secondary school head teachers' efficacy: What kind of training for whom?* International Journal of Educational Development. 29, 312-320.
- [51] Denise, V. (2015). *School leadership, trends in policies and practices, and improvement in the quality of education*. Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2015.
- [52] DeVita, C. (2010). *Four big lessons from a decade of work*. In Wallace Foundation (Ed.), *Education leadership: An agenda for school improvement*, 2-5. Washington DC: The Wallace Foundation National Conference.
- [53] Disraeli, M. H. (2009), *Training Programme for Secondary School Principals: Evaluating its Effectiveness and Impact*, University of the West Indies.
- [54] Doll, R. C. (1983). *Supervision For Staff Development: Ideas and Application*. Newton, MA, Allyn and Bacon.
- [55] Doran, G.T. (1981). There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives. Management Review, 70(11), 35-36.
- [56] DuBrin, A. J. (2012). *Essentials of management*. Mason, OH: Cengage South-Western. Duke, D.L. (1987). *School Leadership and Instructional Improvement*. New York, NY: Random House,
- [57] E. Donald, Bouchard .et al. (2002). *Chronicles: A History of the Development of the Principals' Leadership Network. Addressing the Leadership Challenges faced by Principals*. Copyright ©2002 Brown University. All rights reserved.
- [58] Elif, S. (2015). *Role Theory and its Usefulness in Public Relations*, European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 4, No. 01.
- [59] Falih, M., Alsaaty & Archie, M. (2015). *High school leadership: The challenge of managing resources and competencies*, Journal of Case Studies in Education Volume 8.
- [60] Fonkeng, G. E. (2010). *The History of Education in Cameroon.1844-2010*. Maryland Printers Bamenda.
- [61] Fred, C. L. (2011). *Goal-Setting Theory of Motivation*, Sam Houston State University, International Journal of Management, Business and Administration Vol 15, number 1.
- [62] Frederick, E. A., & Tom Bisschoff. (2015). *Leadership and Management Development Programmes in Cameroon for primary school leaders*. International Journal of Education and Social Science www.ijessnet.com Vol. 2 No. 12
- [63] Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- [64] Fullan, M. (2001). *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York; Teachers College Press.
- [65] Gamage, D., & Sooksomchitra P. (2004). *Decentralization and school based management in Thailand*. International Review of Education, 50, 289-305.
- [66] Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium*. American Association of School Administration. (2000).
- [67] Goldstein, A. (2002). *How to fix the coming principal shortage*. Time.com. <http://www.time.com/time/columnist/goldstein/article/0,9565,168379,00.html>
- [68] Green, R. L. (2010). *The four dimensions of principal leadership: A framework for leading 21st century schools*. Washington, DC: Allyn and Bacon
- [69] Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behavior in organizations* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- [70] Greenlinger, J. A. (2013). *Minding the gap: baby boomer superintendents' leadership and support of millennial principals* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on June 11, 2013, from <http://hdl.handle.net/10211.2/3215>.
- [71] Gregory Stone, A., & Kathleen Patterson. (2005). *The History of Leadership Focus. Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Regent University
- [72] Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating Professional Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [73] Halil, I. (2000). *From Policy into Practice: The Effects of principal Preparation Programs on Principal Behavior*. Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University.
- [74] Hargreaves, A., Halász, G., & Pont, B. (2007). *School leadership for systemic improvement in Finland*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1-44.

- [75] Hart, A.W. (1993). *Principal Succession: Establishing Leadership in Schools*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- [76] Hart, J. (1993). *Successful financial planning and management in schools*. UK. Longman Group.
- [77] Helena, S.N. (2013). *The Role of School Head in Enhancing Students Academic Performance in Community Secondary Schools in Mbeya Urban*. Open University of Tanzania.
- [78] Herzberg, F. (2009). *One more time: How do you motivate employees?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- [79] Hirsh, S. (2009). *A New Definition*. Journal of Staff Development, 30, 10-16.
- [80] Hobson A, et al. (2003). *Issues for Early Headship: Problems and Support Strategies*. Nottingham, England: National College for School Leadership.
- [81] Hochbein, C., & Perry, J. A. (2013). *The role of research in the professional doctorate. Planning & Changing, 44*, 181-195.
- [82] Höög, J., Johansson, O., & Olofsson, A. (2005). *Successful principalship: the Swedish case*. Journal of Educational Administration. vol. 43 no. 6. pp. 596-606
- [83] Horng, E, L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010). "Principal's Time Use and School Effectiveness," American Journal of Education 116(4), 491-523.
- [84] Huse, E.F. (1980). *Organisation Development and Change*. St Paul, MN; West Publishing Company.
- [85] International Crisis Group. (2007). *Southern Thailand: The impact of the coup*. Asia Report No. 129, March 15, 2007
- [86] Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief School State Officers.
- [87] Irungu, J.M. (2002). *Head teachers' preparation and support in financial management: A study of public secondary schools in Nakuru municipality, Kenya*. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kenyatta University, Nairobi.
- [88] Isaac Nyang'au Atebe. (2009). *The Actual and Expected Role of the Head of Department as Perceived by Head Teachers and Secondary School Heads of Department in Kakamega East District*. Kenyatta University. Kenya
- [89] Ishara, H. (2007), *The Financial Management Role of Principals in Section 21 Schools in South Durban, Kwazulu Natal*. University of South Africa.
- [90] J.L. Cornelius & Joe P. Cornelius *The Challenges of Public School Administrators in the New Millennium*. Tennessee State University and Columbia State Community College
- [91] J. L. Nkata, (2005). *Emerging Issues in Education Management in Developing Countries in the 21st Century*, Masah Publishers, Kampala, Uganda.
- [92] Jones, O. O. (2007), *Challenges Faced by Head Teachers in the Management of Free Secondary Education: Implication for Quality- A Case of Usigu Division in Bondo District Kenyatta University*.
- [93] Joseph King' Ori. (2012). *Challenges Facing Public School Heads in the Management of School Projects: A case of Mathira Constituency*. Kenyatta University
- [94] Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organisations*, Wiley, New York. Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organisations* (2nd Ed.), Wiley, New York
- [95] Kaufman, D.R. (2009). *Perceptions of Educational Administration Pre-Service Training by Former Illinois Superintendents Currently Serving as University Professors*. Illinois State University.
- [96] Kenneth et al. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement. University of Minnesota, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Wallace Foundation
- [97] Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundation of Behavioral Research, Administration Today* Columbus Charles Merrill Co. (2nd Edition)> Holt Rinlialt and Winston Inc New York.
- [98] Kipng'etich, K., & Ahmed, O. (2012). *Head teachers' Perception of Their Roles in Secondary Schools in Kenya: A Study of Kericho Day Secondary School in Kericho County, International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 2 No. 23*.
- [99] Kombo, D. K., & Tromp, D. L. A. (2006). *Proposal and thesis writing*, Nairobi; Paulines publications Africa
- [100] Kothari, C. P. (2006). *Research Methodology* New Delhi: Wiley Eastern limited.
- [101] Lattimore, D., Baskin, O., Heiman, S. (2004). *Public relations: The profession and the practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- [102] Lawr, D., & Gidney, R. D. (1973). *Educating Canadians*. Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- [103] Lawrence Ingvarson, et al. (2006). *Standards for School Leadership*. A Critical Review of Literature., Australia.
- [104] Leithwood, K. (1992). *The principal's role in teacher development*. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves, (Eds.), *Teacher Development and Educational Change*, pp. 86-103. London: The Falmer Press.
- [105] Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). *A review of transformational school leadership research (1996-2005)*. American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada.
- [106] Locke, E. A. (1966). *The relationship of intentions to level of performance*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 60-66.
- [107] Locke, E.A. (1968). *Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3(2), 157-189
- [108] Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [109] Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (2002). *Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey*. American Psychologist, 57, 705-717

- [110] Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [111] Macmillan, R (1998). *Approaches to Leadership: What comes with experience?* Educational Management & Administration. 26 (2): 173-184
- [112] Makura, A. H. (2010). *The Challenges Faced by Female Primary School Heads: Zimbabwe*.
- [113] Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: AddisonWesley.
- [114] May, T. (2001). *Social Research: Issues, Methodes and Process*. Open University Press Buckingham 160.
- [115] Mberia, A. W. (2009). *Challenges Facing Head Teacher's In Administration of Inclusive Education in Public Primary Schools in Nairobi West District*. University of Nairobi Kenya.
- [116] Mbise, G.L. (2012). *The Impact of School Management On Provision Of Quality Secondary Education In Tanzania: The Case Study of Four Secondary Schools in Temeke District*. (An unpublished Masters dissertation), Open University of Tanzania.
- [117] Mbua, F.N. (2003). *Educational Administration; Theory and Practice .The management of Organisations and Individuals*. Design House Limbe.
- [118] Mendels, P., & Mitgang, L. (2013). *Creating strong principals*. *Educational Leadership*. April, 2226.
- [119] Mitgang, L. (2012). *The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- [120] MINEDUC. (1995/96). *Handbook for Heads of Secondary and High Schools*. Yaounde, AMA.
- [121] Mutuva, S. N. (2012). *Challenges Faced by Secondary School Head Teachers in Leadership and Management of Human Resources in Nzaui District- Makueni County, Kenya*. Kenyatta University.
- [122] Myers, E. & Murphy, J. (1995). "Suburban Secondary School Principals' Perception of Administrative control in Schools," *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(3), 14.
- [123] NASSP., & NAESP (2013), Leadership Matter
- [124] NCSSFL (National Council of Supervisors for Languages). (2010). *LinguaFolio*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncssfl.org/links/index.php?linguafolio>
- [125] Neil, D., S. L., & Bev, F. (2011). *Literature review: Insights. Strategies to develop school leadership*, aitsl.
- [126] Newman, R. (2012). *Goal setting to achieve results. Leadership*, 41(3), 12-38.
- [127] Newstrom, J. W. (2011). *Organizational behavior* (13th ed.). New York, NY: McGrawHill.
- [128] Northfield, S. (2013). *The novice principal: Change and challenges*. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*. ; 142: 158-182.
- [129] Nyaboga Nyagaka et al. (2016). *Analysis of the Challenges Faced by Principals in the Management of Support Staff in Public Secondary Schools in Nyamira County, Kenya*. Quest Journals Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science Volume 4.
- [130] OECD. (2001b). *Report on Hungary/OECD seminar on Managing Education for Lifelong Learning*, 6-7 December 2001, Budapest
- [131] OECD (2008). *Improving school leadership*. Volume 1: *Policy and Practice*. OECD Publishing. DOI 10.1787/9789264044715-en.
- [132] OECD (2008). *Improving school leadership*. Volume 2: *Case studies on system leadership*. OECD Publishing. DOI 10.1787/9789264044715-en.
- [133] Okumbe, J. A. (1998). *Educational management: theory and practice*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.
- [134] Olowoselu, A., & Aishatu, S. B. (2015), *Challenges to Secondary School Principals' Leadership in Northern Region of Nigeria*, *British Journal of Education* Vol.3, No.3, pp.1-5, March 2015
- [135] Patricia, E. M. (2013). *Role Theory and the Enactment of Teacher Leadership*, Western Carolina University
- [136] Perry, J. L., Mesch, D., & Paarlberg, L. (2006). *Motivating employees in a new governance era: The performance paradigm revisited*. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 505-514
- [137] Pfaff et al. (2014). *Exploring new graduate nurse confidence in interprofessional collaboration: a mixed methods study*. *Journal of Interprofessional Care* Volume 28.
- [138] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). *Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- [139] Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving School Leadership*. Volume 1: *Policy and Practice*. Paris: OECD.
- [140] Prashant, J. (2016). *Leaders in Education Program: The Singapore Model for Developing Effective Principal-ship Capability*. *Current Issues in Comparative Education (CICE)* Volume 19, Issue 1, Fall 2016.
- [141] Preserve Articles (2012). *What is the difference between school Administration and Educational Administration*. Retrieved from <http://www.preservearticles.com> .
- [142] Robert, B. M., Matthew, J. M., & Ann, S. (2001). *The Evolving Role of Educational Administrators*. Laval University, Quebec City.
- [143] Rockoff, J. E. (2004) 'The Impact of Individual Teachers on Student Achievement: Evidence from Panel Data', *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 94.2: 247-52
- [144] Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). *School Leadership and Student Achievement: The Mediating Effects of teachers Beliefs*. *Canadian Journal of Education*, vol. 29. no. 3. pp. 798-822
- [145] Schleicher, A. (2012), Ed., *Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the World*, OECD Publishing

- [146] Schratz, M. (2003), *From Administering to Leading a School: Challenges in German Speaking Countries*, Cambridge Journal of Education 33(3): 395-416.
- [147] Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Learning Theories: An Educational Perspective* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.
- [148] Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2000). *The construct of goal commitment: Measurement and relationships with task performance*. In R. GoYn and E. Helmes (eds.), *Problems and Solutions in Human Assessment*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- [149] Semra, K. G., & Yusuf, Y. (2016). *Views of School Administrators Related to In-service Training Activities*. University Journal of Educational Research 4(3): 516-523-2016, <http://www.hrpub.org>
- [150] Sheard, A. G., & Kakabadse, A. P. (2002), "*Key Roles of the Leadership Landscape*", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol.17, Issue 2, pp. 129-144
- [151] Sheard & Kakabadse. (2007). *A Role Based Perspective on Leadership as a Network of Relationships*. Journal of Management Development, 2007, 26 (4) pg 331-352
- [152] Smith, K.G., & Hitt, M. A. (2005), *Great minds in management: the process of theory development*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- [153] Sinay, E., Ryan, T. G., & Walter, S. (2016). *Research series on school effectiveness and school improvement: Goal setting*. (Research Report No. 16/17-05). Toronto, Ontario, Canada:
- [154] Spillane, J.P., & Healey, K. (2010). "*Conceptualizing school leadership and management from a distributed perspective: An exploration of some study operations and measures*". *Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), pp. 253-281.
- [155] Staffan, H. (2014). *Principals' goal-setting and actions while managing*. PhD Thesis Uppsala University Sweden.
- [156] Starr, K. (2009), *Confronting leadership challenges: Major imperatives for change in Australian education*. In N. Cranston., & L. Ehrich. (Eds.) *Australian school leadership today* (pp. 21-38). Brisbane: Australian Academic Press.
- [157] Sunny, B., & Kim, B. (1992). *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Project Management*
- [158] Titanji, P. F. (2017). *Understanding Educational Organizations and Leadership*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press.
- [159] Tucker, M. S., & Codding, J. B. (2002). *The Principal Challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [160] Tugba, T. et al. (2013), *Certain Developed Countries' School Manager Training Models and In The Light Of These Models Suggestions For Turkey's School Manager Training*, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 131 (2014) 236 – 243
- [161] UN, (1992). *World programme of action concerning disabled persons*. New York: UN
- [162] UNESCO, (1993). *Report in Quality Education for All*. New Delhi: UNESCO.
- [163] UNESCO, (2008). *A View Inside Primary Schools. A World Education Indicators (WEI) cross-national study*. Montreal: UNESCO-UIS.
- [164] UNESCO, (2009). *The new roles of secondary school head teachers*. UNESCO.
- [165] UNICEF, (2001). *Situational analysis of children in Tanzania*, Dar es Salaam: Dogodogo street children project.
- [166] Valenza, K. (1996). *Concerns of school principals*. Parent News. [On-line] Available: <http://www.edweek.org/sreports/tc/admin/ad-n.htm>
- [167] Van, W.M. (2012). *Leadership in public organizations. An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Sharpe
- [168] Wallace Foundation, (2009), *Education Leadership: An Agenda for School Improvement*. Wallace Foundation
- [169] Walker, K., Anderson, K., Sackney, L., & Woolf, J. (2003). *Unexpected learning by neophyte principals: Factors related to success of first year principals in schools. Managing Global Transitions*. 2003; 1(2): 195-213
- [170] Wegge, J., & Dibbelt, S. (2000). *Effects of goal setting on information processing in letter-matching tasks*. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle Psychologie*, 47: 89-114
- [171] Weindling, D., & Dimmock, C. (2006). *Sitting in the "Hot Seat": New Head teachers in the UK*. Journal of Educational Administration.
- [172] Wilkerson, K. (2010). *School counselor reform and principals' priorities: A preliminary content analysis of the National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP) bulletin (1997-2007) informed by guiding documents of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA)*. *Education*, 131(2), 419-436.
- [173] Wilson, P. T. (1993). *Pushing the edge*. In M. M. Milstein (Ed.), *changing the way we prepare educational leaders*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- [174] Workneh, A. & Tassew, W. (2003). *Teacher Training and Development in Ethiopia; Improving Education Quality by Developing Teacher Skills, Attitudes and Work Conditions*.
- [175] Wren, J. T. (1995). *The leaders companion: Insights on leadership through the ages*. New York: The Free Press.
- [176] Zhixin, S., David, G., & Elliot, M. (2003). *Professional Preparation and Development of School Leaders in Australia and the USA*. *International Education Journal* Vol 4, No 1, <http://iej.cjb.net>