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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate principals’ leadership behaviours in relation to teacher job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. More specifically, the study sought to establish the relationship among four principal leadership behaviours: directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented in relation to teacher job satisfaction. Gender differences in both principal leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction were also studied. Path Goal Theory of leader effectiveness formed the theoretical framework. Principals’ leadership behaviours formed the independent variable for the study while teacher job satisfaction was the dependent variable. The study adopted a correlational research design and was conducted in Nairobi County. The target population was all the principals and teachers in public secondary schools in Nairobi County in the year 2014. The sample consisted of 270 participants selected from 45 schools; 45 principals and 225 teachers. Of the principals, 15 were male and 30 were female; while of the teachers, 81 were male and 144 were female. Purposive and simple random sampling procedures were used in the selection of principals and teachers. The study used questionnaires developed by the researcher to seek information on participants’ biographical data. Adapted Leader Behaviours Questionnaire and Teacher Job Satisfaction scales were used to measure principals’ leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction respectively. A pilot study was carried out to ascertain the validity and reliability of the research instruments. Two principals and ten teachers selected from two public secondary schools in Nairobi County participated in the pilot study. Reliability coefficient for the principals’ questionnaire was .89 and .91 for teachers’ questionnaire. Both descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were used to analyze data. Results showed that there was positive and significant relationship between secondary school principals’ leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Findings showed that 59.52% of the principals showed achievement oriented leadership behaviour, 16.67% supportive, 9.52% supportive and achievement oriented, 7.14% directive and achievement oriented, 2.38% directive and 2.38% participative leadership behaviours. Findings on overall teacher job satisfaction showed that 64.68 % of the teachers had high job satisfaction while 35.32% had low job satisfaction. There were significant gender differences in principals’ leadership behaviours in favour of males. Findings showed that there were no significant gender differences in the overall teacher job satisfaction. A major implication and recommendation of the study was that since principals’ leadership behaviours have significant relationship with teacher job satisfaction, principals should endeavor to use leadership behaviours that give teachers’ job satisfaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Analysis of variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOLB</td>
<td>Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLB</td>
<td>Directive Leadership Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBQ</td>
<td>Leadership Behaviours Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLB</td>
<td>Participative Leadership Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB</td>
<td>Supportive Leadership Behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJSQ</td>
<td>Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

1.1 Overview

The chapter focuses on background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitations and limitations of the study and assumptions of the study. The theoretical and conceptual frameworks as well as operational definition of key terms are also given.

1.2 Background to the Study

A leader is the person who mobilizes other people to undertake collective action in pursuit of a common goal (Samuel 2005). Principal leadership behaviours affect all schools’ learning situations including teachers’ job satisfaction (Hezibola, 2008, Asuquo, 2007). Studies by United States Education Department (1997) and by Bogler (2001) in Montreal, Canada established that teachers’ job satisfaction is strongly correlated to participation in decision making and influence over school policy. In South Africa, Steinberg (1993) found that the management approach of the principal was one of the major determinants of teachers’ job satisfaction. Findings by the National Teachers’ Organization of South Africa (2002) reported that 65.5 per cent of teachers were dissatisfied with “poor” leadership behaviours.

Administrators’ leadership behaviours have changed over time. Planning and financial accounting are no longer accepted as the only qualities of an effective
leader. Soft skills, teamwork, communication and the ability to motivate and mobilize, all of which impact teachers’ job satisfaction are becoming the skills increasingly desired in leaders. Since relationships are fundamental, Dinham (2008) emphasized professional development and teacher inclusion in decision making as crucial to successful school leadership. In his research, Billingsley (2005) found that teachers with positive perceptions of their principals’ leadership behaviours also had job satisfaction. As reported by Awiti (2009) leadership and school management issues have raised concern globally and locally. UNESCO (2006) and Mbiti (2007) recognized the important role played by school management in achievement of school goals and its implications on the overall performance of both teachers and students. Job satisfaction is also positively related to motivation, job commitment, life satisfaction, mental health and job performance and negatively correlated to absenteeism, turnover, and perceived stress (Judge, Parker, Colbert, & Ilies, 2001; Spector, 1997). The principal’s leadership behaviours play an important role in determining productivity among the teachers in the school.

The principal has to balance between the jobs being performed and the personal needs of the teachers. It is necessary to have staff who are focused as far as the critical job tasks are concerned and who are comfortable as individuals. The leadership behaviours the principal engages in determine and set the school climate which may facilitate or hinder academic performance. Likewise, schools with satisfied teachers are likely to be more productive in terms of effective teaching and consequent academic performance than those
with unsatisfied teachers. Vecchio, Justin and Pearce (2008) defined job satisfaction as one’s feelings and thinking towards his/her work. As in the case of other attitudes, one’s attitude towards their job is greatly influenced by experience, especially stressful experiences. Similarly, a teacher’s expectations about the job and communication from others can play an important role to a person’s level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an appraisal of the perceived job characteristics, work environment and emotional experiences at work. As McShane and Glinow (2007) stated, job satisfaction represents an employee’s evaluation of the job and work context. There is no doubt that teachers will experience greater work satisfaction and higher morale when they are viewed by their principals as the professionals they perceive themselves to be (Goodlad, 2004). Satisfaction with work life among teachers translates into job satisfaction which may in turn lead to less stress, reduced turnover, high realization of the schools’ goals and objectives leading to better academic performance. Studies in countries like Uganda, Tanzania, Gambia and Kenya by Barret (2005) and Hedges (2002) found that many teachers were teaching not because of internal motivation but rather due to lack of other openings elsewhere.

In Kenya, schools like all other organizations are advancing in complexity with different factors impacting on school management and performance. Consequently, challenges arise for principals as school leaders to create enabling working environments in order to give teachers job satisfaction by applying appropriate leadership behaviours. Momaanyi (1996) and Sisungo
(2002) found that teachers with high job satisfaction exhibited characteristics such as: (i) low in turnover, (ii) always present in school, (iii) highly efficient and effective and (iv) friendly to the administration. On the other hand, teachers with low job satisfaction: (i) had apathy, (ii) worked towards promotions to other positions with better prospects or quit their jobs resulting in high teacher education costs (iii) were hostile to the administration (iv) had reduced academic performance (v) valued material rewards (vi) made frequent transfer requests (vii) and were regular absentees. According to Nkonge (2009) the teacher has become the object of constant ridicule by both the pupils and the public. Okumbe (1998) stated that teaching is regarded as “employment of last resort” by most school leavers and university graduates. He concluded that in Kenya’s public schools, poor teacher morale and stressed teachers have become perennial problems.

Unless this trend is checked, the country may fail to equip learners with relevant skills yet this is one of the flagship projects of Kenya Vision 2030 (Republic of Kenya, 2007; Njeru & Orodho, 2008). One of the ways of boosting teacher morale is through the principal’s leadership behaviors since these can lead to satisfaction or dissatisfaction with work life among the academic staff (Owalabi, 2006. For effective change in schools, leadership is the key. The foregoing suggests that teachers in Kenyan public schools may be dissatisfied with their jobs. This study sought to establish the relationship between leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction in Nairobi County.
1.3 Statement of the Problem

There is high value attached to secondary school education by both the Government and parents in Kenya. At this level of education learners are prepared for advanced studies, further training and the world of work. The social pillar in Kenya’s Vision 2030 envisions delivery of quality education for the country to attain development. The highest budgetary allocation in the 2014/2015 financial year is to education; more so to teacher salaries. The expected output from this investment is academic achievement. Many factors have been blamed for the low morale of teachers in public secondary schools and the resulting poor academic performance in Kenyan public secondary schools amongst them lack of facilities, students’ indiscipline and an overloaded curriculum. It is however possible that those other less researched management factors such as the quality of leadership in schools may also lead to lack of job satisfaction among teachers and consequently poor academic performance. One such factor is principals’ leadership behaviour which in turn affects teacher job satisfaction. When teachers are dissatisfied with their work, they may not be productive and this may eventually affect academic performance.

Studies on the role of leadership behaviours and their effect on employees’ job satisfaction have been carried out in industrial organizations with very little on how principals’ leadership behaviours impact on teacher job satisfaction in Kenyan public schools. Such a study may serve as the missing link in the explanation of teacher job dissatisfaction in public secondary schools. Four
principal leadership behaviours: directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented were examined in relation to teacher job satisfaction. Directive leadership behaviour has a positive correlation with job satisfaction of inexperienced teachers who need role and task clarity. Supportive leadership behaviour has its most positive effects on job satisfaction for teachers when their work is highly structured, stressful, frustrating or dissatisfying. Participative leadership leads to role clarity and hence higher teacher job satisfaction. Achievement oriented leadership behaviour appeals to teachers who have high need for autonomy and self-control. Applied appropriately these four leadership behaviours may address teacher challenges at the work place. This study therefore examined the relationship between principals’ leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Nairobi County.

1.4 Purpose of the study

The main purpose of this study was to find out how principal leadership behaviours impact teacher job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. The principal behaviours were categorized as directive, supportive, participative or achievement-oriented. The study also explored if there existed significant gender difference in principal leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study sought to achieve the following objectives:
i. To establish the leadership behaviour of the principals under investigation.

ii. To investigate the relationship between directive leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

iii. To examine the relationship between supportive leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

iv. To evaluate the relationship between participative leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

v. To find out if there is any relationship between achievement leadership behavior and teacher job satisfaction.

vi. To establish if there are gender differences in principals’ leadership behaviours.

vii. To find out if there are gender differences in teachers’ job satisfaction.

1.6 Research Hypotheses

The study was guided by the following hypotheses

$H_{a1}$: There is a significant relationship between directive leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

$H_{a2}$: There is a significant relationship between supportive leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction

$H_{a3}$: There is a significant relationship between participative leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.
H₄: There is a significant relationship between achievement oriented leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

H₅: There is a significant gender difference in principals’ leadership behaviours.

H₆: There is a significant gender difference in teacher’s job satisfaction.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

In this study the following assumptions were made:

i. The respondents provided honest responses on the questionnaire items.

ii. Teachers were aware of the concept of their job satisfaction, its components and determinants.

iii. Application of each leadership behaviour has a relationship with teacher job satisfaction.

iv. That both leadership behaviours of principals and teachers’ job satisfaction can be measured by use of survey questionnaire.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The study was restricted to public secondary schools in Nairobi County. According to Kenya National Examinations Council, in 2013 KCSE about 41% of the students in Nairobi County managed D+ and below giving a combined mean score of 6 (C plain). This may be considered to be poor since the minimum entry requirement to university is C+. The findings may therefore not be generalizable beyond the specific population from which the sample was
drawn. All items in the study were based on self-report of the respondents. The study adopted a correlation design which though good in establishing positive or negative relationships, sometimes brings forth spurious outcomes. Correlation studies can suggest that there is a relationship between two variables but cannot prove causality.

1.9 Delimitations of the Study

Although there are different types of schools this study was delimited to surveying only public secondary schools in Nairobi County. In leadership, school principals may use varying approaches but the current study focused on four leadership behaviours: directive, participative, supportive and achievement-oriented in relation to teacher job satisfaction. Only principals who had served for three years in their current stations participated in the study.

1.10 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study may be useful to policy makers in equipping principals with the requisite skills in leadership behaviours necessary for a conducive teaching and learning environment to ensure that teachers have job satisfaction. To have job satisfaction teachers need direction, support, consultation and challenge provided by the leadership. When applied appropriately, the four leadership behaviours: directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented share these qualities may provide teacher job satisfaction. Directive principal leadership tells teachers what they are supposed to do and when. Application of this behaviour has the most effect
when the staff’ roles and task demands are ambiguous and intrinsically satisfying. When using supportive leadership behaviours the principal shows concern for teachers’ wellbeing and personal needs. This behaviour is especially needed in situations in which tasks or relationships are psychologically or physically distressing. Participative behaviour involves leaders’ consulting with teachers and asking for their suggestions before making decisions. This behaviour is predominant when staff are highly personally involved in their work. The achievement oriented principal lets teachers know what is expected of them to perform at their highest level and shows confidence in their ability to meet this expectation. Findings on each of the four leadership behaviours: directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented may be applied by principals and administrators to improve teacher job satisfaction.

1.11 Theoretical Framework

Path Goal Theory by House (1971)

Path Goal theory suggests that leaders may not only use varying behaviours with different subordinates but might use different behaviours with the same subordinate in different situations. The theory suggests that depending on the subordinates and situations, different leadership behaviours will increase acceptance of the leader by subordinates; level of satisfaction and motivation to high performance. Based on situational factors, Path Goal theory proposes a fourfold classification of leader behaviours as described below.
Directive leader tells subordinates exactly what they are expected to do. This leadership characterizes a principal who tells teachers about their task, including what is expected of them, how it is to be done and the time to complete the task. Such a principal also sets standards of performance and defines clear rules and regulations for the teachers. In a school organization, directive leadership is appropriate when the task is complex or ambiguous, formal authority is strong and the work group provides job satisfaction. Supportive leadership shows concern for subordinates’ wellbeing and personal needs. A principal exercising this leadership is friendly, approachable and attends to the wellbeing and human needs of teachers. Supportive leadership is appropriate when the task is simple, formal authority is weak and the work group does not provide job satisfaction. A participative principal consults teachers, obtains their ideas and opinions and integrates their suggestions into decision making. Participative leadership is appropriate when teachers do not want autocratic leadership, have internal locus of control and follower ability is high; when task is complex, authority is either weak or strong and satisfaction from colleagues is either high or low.

Achievement oriented leadership sets clear and challenging goals for subordinates. In a school organization, such a principal establishes a high standard of excellence for teachers and seeks continuous improvement. In addition, an achievement oriented principal shows a high degree of confidence in teachers. This leadership is appropriate when teachers are open to autocratic leadership, have external locus of control and their ability is high; when task is
simple, authority is strong and job satisfaction from colleagues is either high or low.

1.12 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1 shows that the main variables of this study were principal leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction. The anticipated interrelationship among these variables is also shown. A teachers’ job satisfaction may be influenced by the leadership behaviours of the principal. When an inexperienced or unsure teacher must perform an unstructured task, the leader must use a directive communication approach. When the teacher is skilled but lacks confidence or commitment while performing a structured task, the principal leadership behaviours must be supportive to give the teacher job satisfaction. When the teacher is unsure and the task is unstructured, the leader/principal must use a participative communication behaviour designed to elicit ideas from the teachers. Lastly, if a skilled teacher must perform an unstructured task, the leader must use an achievement-oriented communication style designed to show confidence in the teacher so as to perform well.

Teacher job satisfaction was divided into nine factors: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and recognition.
Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework Diagram
1.13 Operational Definition of Terms

**Autocratic/ Directive Leadership:** refers to authoritative behaviours where the principal makes decisions for the staff without consultation.

**Participatory/transformational Leadership:** refers to democratic and interactive leadership. Principal encourages teachers to express their opinions before he/she makes decision.

**Gender:** biological state of being male or female.

**Job expectancies:** an employees’ psychological state where the employee expects that effort expended will lead to effective performance.

**Job satisfaction:** an attitude towards the job of teaching, working conditions, general atmosphere of the school, and interaction with superiors and colleagues.

**Leadership behavior:** approach adopted by the principal to deal with situational demands in running public secondary schools.

**Organizational behavior:** administrative practice that seeks to understand and use knowledge of human behavior in social and cultural setting for the improvement of organizational performance.

**Principal (head teacher):** the chief executive in the public secondary school who must have served for 3 years.
Role ambiguity: lack of clarity about expected behaviour from a job or position.

School climate: the conditions or quality of the learning environment, which are created and maintained by the values, beliefs, interpersonal relationships, and the physical setting shared by individuals within the school community.

Structured task: refers to a task with clear goals, few correct or satisfactory solutions and outcomes, few ways of performing it and clear criteria of success.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections. Section one reviews literature on the role of principal leadership behaviours in secondary school, teacher job satisfaction and gender and job satisfaction. The second section is a review of literature based on the objectives of the study. The chapter concludes with a summary review.

2.2 Principal leadership behaviours

According to Marie and Neal (2011) leadership behaviour is a pattern of behaviours leaders prefer to use. Mosadeghrad and Yarmohammadiand (2006) defined leadership as a series of attitudes, characteristics and skills used by leaders in different situations in accordance with individual and organizational goals. There are as many leadership approaches as there are principals. Some of these leadership behaviours include autocratic, bureaucratic, charismatic democratic situational, transactional and transformational. The current study aimed to evaluate leadership behaviours from a behavioral perspective supported by four leadership behaviours of leader effectiveness which are directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented.

Principals use different behaviours in different situations and with different teachers to motivate them to perform at their utmost potential. According to
Mosadegharad and Yarmohammadian (2006) a leader may adapt leadership behaviours to fit different situations.

Roul (2012) carried out a study on principals’ leadership behaviours in secondary schools of North Shoa, Ethiopia. The study employed a descriptive survey method. Out of a population of 30 secondary schools, 10 were selected through stratified random sampling technique. Data for the study was collected through questionnaire, interview, and focus group discussions. Data was analyzed through SPSS using frequency counts, percentages, correlation matrix and the t-test. From the findings laissees-faire leadership style was the dominant leadership style among principals of secondary schools in the zone. The sample was drawn from a rural setting and there was therefore need to compare the findings with an urban setting as intended by the current study. Moreover, the study was based on a culturally different country and given that Kenya is geographically different, a similar study was needed in order to report on the cross-cultural differences and similarities if any.

In a recent related study Ngwala, (2014) carried out a study in Kangundo Sub-County, Kenya. Among other objectives, the study aimed to establish the leadership behaviours used by secondary school principals. A sample size of 20 principals and 160 teachers was identified for the study. The study employed a descriptive survey design which was found to be convenient as it ensured that the data obtained gave answers to the research design. The study targeted principals and teachers in public secondary schools and used stratified random sampling. Data was collected by use of questionnaires. A pilot study was
conducted to pre-test the reliability and validity of the instrument. The findings established that secondary school principals used a mix of autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire approaches. The study recommended that principals should not depend on only one leadership style in running their institutions but rather use a blend of the different leadership styles for better outcomes in their schools. Like the current study, Ngwalas’ study used both principals and teachers to establish principal leadership behaviours. However, this study treated behavioral approaches administratively while the current study used four leadership behaviours (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented) from a psychological construct. Further, the study recommended that principals use a blend of behaviours in their daily endeavors. The four leadership approaches of the current study are by their nature situational; applicable by the principal depending on the teacher and the prevailing circumstance.

Another study was carried out by Odundo and Rambo (2013) on dimensions of leadership behavior of public secondary school teachers in Nyanza County, Kenya. Primary data was sourced from 213 secondary school teachers in Kisumu, Siaya, Kisii, Nyamira, Migori and Homa Bay in Nyanza region of Kenya. Both quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques were applied to analyze the data. Quantitative analysis generated descriptive statistics, cross-tabulations with chi-square, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and binary logistic regression. The findings showed that some leadership behaviours negatively influenced teachers’ job motivation while others had a
positive influence. Variables having negative influence included public criticism, use of threats and fault-finding. Leadership behavior variables having a positive influence on teachers’ motivation included recognition of effort, participation in staff meetings and guidance on pedagogy, among others. The study concluded that although teachers’ job motivation is a multifaceted aspect, the leadership behaviours adopted by school principals play a big role in influencing it. The study called for effective leadership as an indispensable component of the wider education reforms for better pedagogical processes suiting the economic needs of the 21st century. This study was done in a rural setting covering six counties; there was therefore need for the current study in an urban and cosmopolitan environment to inform on principal leadership behaviours.

Musera, Achoka and Mugasia (2012) studied the perception of secondary school teachers on the principals’ leadership styles. The sample had 133 teachers drawn from 13 secondary schools in Kakamega Central District, Kenya. The tool for data collection was questionnaires. Descriptive statistics was used for data analysis. The findings of this study revealed that the dominant type of leadership style of the sampled schools was transformational or supportive leadership behaviours. This study was carried out in a rural setting in Kenya and there was need therefore to carry out a similar study in Nairobi County which is not only urban but is a cosmopolitan city. Furthermore this study used only teachers while the current one used both
principals and teachers to assess the leadership behaviours of principals in Nairobi County.

2.3 Directive leadership behaviour and teachers’ job satisfaction

A few studies were found to have directly investigated the relationship between leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction. Yilmaz (2007) carried out a study to establish the relationship between leadership behaviours and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. The sample consisted of 200 teachers. The study adopted a survey design. Data were gathered using Leadership Behaviours Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale. The findings indicated significant and positive relationship between sub-dimensions of teacher organizational leadership and directive leadership behaviours of school administrators. This study was carried out in a rural setting. There was therefore need to carry out a study in Nairobi County to evaluate the relationship between directive leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction.

Another study was done by Riffat-un-Nisa Awan and Bigger (2008) premised on the leadership behaviours of degree college principals’ and job expectancies in Punjab, Pakistan. The population comprised 285 degree colleges and 13,821 staff. The sample size was 1,020 teachers drawn from 170 government degree colleges. Random procedure was used to select the participants. The study adopted a quantitative approach to examine the four Path-Goal leadership behaviours: directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented. The instruments used were a combination of questionnaires. Data was analyzed.
using Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) and Univariate Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA).

The findings showed that support for House’s Path-Goal Theory was limited. Directive leadership contributed negatively to job satisfaction. Directive leadership was also found to have contributed negatively to job satisfaction under the categories of supervision, colleagues and job in general when the task was structured. The findings were consistent with the Path-Goal Theory that subordinates are more satisfied with directive leaders in an unstructured task. High directive leadership was found to have positive effect on subordinates’ job expectancies in cases where subordinates were highly stressed. This finding further concurred with the Path Goal theory that teachers without much knowledge of their work are more motivated when they work with a directive leader who clarifies the role and provides guidance to the subordinates. There are nine factors that affect teacher job satisfaction in the Path Goal Theory. These are supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, and responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and recognition.

The findings showed that directive leadership contributed negatively in job satisfaction under the factors of supervision, colleagues and job in general when the task was structured. This finding was consistent with the Path Goal Theory that subordinates are more satisfied with directive leaders in an unstructured task. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between directive leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction, subscales of teacher job satisfaction were based on university staff and there was need to compare
the findings when secondary school staff were used. Moreover, the study sample was drawn from a setting culturally and geographically different from the current one. There was need therefore for the current study to establish the relationship of directive leadership and teacher job satisfaction in Nairobi County, Kenya.

A study by Akoth (2011) investigated the influence of head teachers' leadership behaviours on job satisfaction among public school teachers in Migori District, Kenya. Satisfactory leadership behavior has been an issue of concern in the district in the course of enhancing teacher effectiveness and extra effort towards performance. The sample comprised all teachers in the 128 public primary schools. The study adopted an ex-post facto design. Data was gathered using questionnaires. Descriptive statistics was used in data analysis through Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Findings revealed that satisfaction of teachers had a relationship with principals’ leadership behavior and teachers in schools which practiced transformational or supportive type of leadership rated their principals highly as compared to principals who applied more of transactional or directive leadership.

Based on the findings, the study concluded that principal leader’s behaviours could be used interchangeably to suit circumstances as stated in the situational theory. Since this study was set in rural Kenya there was need for a similar study in an urban, indeed a cosmopolitan setting in order to compare the similarities or differences of findings, if any.
2.4 Supportive leadership behaviour and teachers’ job satisfaction.

Supportive leadership helps to build and maintain effective interpersonal relationships. A principal who is considerate and friendly toward teachers is more likely to win their friendship and loyalty leading to formation of emotional ties that make it easier to gain cooperation and support from teachers to whom the principal must turn to get the work done. As established by Yukl (1998) and supported by Hulpia, Devos & Rosseel (2010), teachers derive satisfaction working with a principal who is friendly, cooperative and supportive.

The findings indicated that supportive leadership behaviours lead to increased teacher job satisfaction as exemplified by the time and skills teachers devote towards attaining school goals. Lenka (2012) carried out a study on frustration and work motivation of secondary school teachers as a correlate of leadership behaviours of their principals in Rampur City, India. The sample comprised 80 teachers and 20 principals who were selected randomly. Work Motivation Questionnaire and Leadership Behaviours Descriptive Questionnaire were used to collect data. Findings confirmed that where there was a supportive and cooperative head teacher, teachers performed their jobs with zeal. Supportive leadership had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction in cases where the subordinates had low need for achievement. Teachers were more satisfied with high supportive leaders in a structured task situation. These results confirmed the Path Goal Theory that when subordinates (teachers) have a task that is structured or routine, a supportive and considerate leader
motivates a subordinate by minimizing the negative aspects of the work environment. These findings were also in line with the theory that subordinates without much knowledge of their work are more motivated when they work with a supportive leader who shows considerate behaviours and reduces the uncertainties of the work or school environment. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between supportive leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction the sample was based on students from a different country and there was need to compare the findings when Nairobi County students were used. Furthermore, the study was based on a sample from a developed country and given that Kenya is a developing country, a similar study was needed in order to report on the cross-cultural differences and similarities if any.

Nguni, Sleegers and Denessen (2006) studied the relationship between the transformational or supportive leadership style of the school principal and teacher job satisfaction. Among other objectives, the researchers set to establish the indirect effects of transformational/supportive leadership on organizational commitment and organizational behaviours and job satisfaction. The study was conducted in public primary schools in Tanzania. It included 700 primary school teachers selected from 70 schools located in five districts. A total of 545 teachers appropriately responded, with a return rate of 78%. The sample teacher population consisted of 83% female and 17% male. Instrumentation consisted of a 95-item Likert-type questionnaire that sought to examine school leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational
citizenship behavior as related to job satisfaction of teachers. The current study sought to establish the relationship between supportive leadership and teacher job satisfaction using questionnaires based on Likert scale. School leadership was surveyed through questions gleaned from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ); organizational commitment was surveyed through the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ); organizational citizenship behavior was measured through the Smith Questionnaire; and job satisfaction was measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Questionnaires were administered to teachers at selected schools during a faculty meeting, and separate envelopes were provided in which teachers could place their questionnaire in for anonymity purposes. Multiple regression analyses were performed to assess the effect of transformational and transactional leadership factors on the job satisfaction level.

Results indicated that both transformational/supportive and transactional leadership factors influence the outcome variables of organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and teacher job satisfaction; however, varying degrees of influence were evident on the outcome variables. The findings confirmed that the group of supportive leadership behaviors had strong to moderate positive effects on value commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction. Transactional leadership behaviors had no significant effects on value commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and had only a positive effect on commitment to stay. The results demonstrated that individual leadership factors with regard to supportive and
transactional leadership have varying degrees of influence on outcome variables. The supportive leadership dimension of charismatic leadership particularly, had the greatest influence and accounted for a large proportion of variation in value commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and teacher job satisfaction. With regard to the transactional leadership dimensions, the contingent reward component had a positive influence on job satisfaction; however, it was noted to have a negative influence on commitment to stay. Although the findings revealed the relationship between aspects of supportive leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction, the sample was based on primary school teachers and there was need to compare the findings when secondary school students were used.

2.5 Participative leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction

Participative leadership is to the Path Goal Theory of leader effectiveness what democratic style is to administrative leadership. Both involve the teacher in discussions before the principal undertakes changes in the running of the institution. However, participative behaviours goes further and appeals to the sense of affiliation of the teacher making him/her feel a sense of belongingness that appeals to the teachers’ sense of belonging; thus giving the teacher job satisfaction. This in turn ensures task delivery towards the set goals for the school. Studies have been done to establish how participative leadership relates with teacher job satisfaction, such as the one by Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe (2008). The study was also conducted to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the principals’ perceived leadership behaviours
and teachers’ morale and teacher job satisfaction. Two questionnaires were used; the Excellent Principal Inventory and the Purdue Teacher Opinion Questionnaire. The findings showed that leadership behavior clearly impacted teacher morale, and a positive relationship between leadership behavior and teacher morale was evident in several areas. Findings concluded that teacher morale could be predicted on the basis of the leadership approach adopted by the principal. Principals who used a participatory style of leadership were more likely to have more satisfied and productive teachers than principals who used an autocratic style of leadership. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between participative leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction, the sample was drawn from a developed country. Given that Kenya is a developing country, a similar study was needed in order to report on the cross-cultural differences and similarities if any.

These findings concurred with those of Monyazi (2012), whose study investigated the level of job satisfaction and leadership behaviours of the teachers of all categories in Botswana. A survey research design was adopted in the study. The population was all the primary, junior and secondary school teachers. The sample comprised 500 teachers selected randomly. A modified version of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was used to collect data. The results indicated that teachers were generally satisfied with their jobs. Participatory leadership behaviour by principals was most preferred and had significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between participative leadership and teachers’ job
satisfaction, the sample was drawn from across primary, junior and secondary school teachers and there was need therefore to compare the findings when only secondary teachers were used.

Nadarasa and Thuraisingam (2014) carried out a study designed to investigate the effects of principals’ leadership behaviours on teachers’ job satisfaction of secondary schools in Jaffna District. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. Questionnaire was used to collect data which was analyzed using regression analysis and correlation analysis. Findings of this study stated that participative leadership was found to have positive and significant impact on teachers’ job satisfaction. The findings of this study revealed the relationship between participative leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction. Since the sample for this study was drawn from teachers from different countries and there was need for a similar study with Kenyan to in order to report on cross-cultural differences and similarities if any.

In a related study, Obina, Mbona and Acire (2012) examined the relationship between head teachers' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in Uganda, Rwanda, Kenya, Burundi and Tanzania. Among other objectives, the study sought to examine the effect of participative leadership behaviours on teachers’ job satisfaction. The current study also sought to establish the relationship between participative leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction. The study was based on experts’ workshops in East Africa, frequent media reports, Internet search and the researcher's experience over the low level of teachers' job satisfaction in government aided secondary schools. The study used a cross
sectional descriptive design where both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed. Using a combination of self-administered questionnaires and interview guides for head teachers, results showed that participative leadership style positively affected teachers' job satisfaction. The findings also indicated that autocratic leadership style affected teachers' job satisfaction negatively. The study recommended that head teachers should practice participative leadership styles in school so as to promote job satisfaction and allow teachers prepare to work effectively. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between participative leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction, the sample was based on teachers from different countries and there was need to compare the findings when Kenyan students were used. Furthermore, these findings were based on teachers’ data only. The current study involved both principals and teachers to report on the similarities or differences if any.

King’ori (2013) explored the link between the style of leadership adopted by principals and job satisfaction of their teachers in secondary schools in Embu County, Kenya. The study sought to establish whether principals' leadership styles stimulated teacher job satisfaction. The study was guided by the transformational leadership theory, to test whether teachers under a principal who exhibited the transformational leadership styles of initiative, consideration and participative management had higher levels of job satisfaction than those working under principals who did not. The current study was guided by the Path Goal theory of leader effectiveness to evaluate the relationship between participative leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction. Descriptive survey
design was used with a target population of 142 principals and 2130 teachers from public schools. Stratified random sampling was used to select 20 principals and 100 teachers who participated in the study. Data was collected using principal and teacher questionnaires and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics and presented using frequency distribution tables and bar graphs.

The findings showed that different leadership behavior factors had different impacts on teacher job satisfaction. The researcher found that the dominant leadership style was democratic. This study however did not indicate which leadership style influenced higher or lower teacher job satisfaction. The current study intends to find out which leadership style influences teacher job satisfaction. Ndiku, Simiyu, and Achoka (2009), carried out a study on improving decision making in schools through teacher participation in Busia, Kenya. This study was designed to investigate the extent to which teachers were involved in decision making in comparison to their desired level of participation. An ex-post facto study was designed. One hundred and twenty three teachers responded to the participatory decision making questionnaire. Data was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

Results established that teachers desired greater involvement in decision making than they were currently allowed. It was recommended that school principals should increase the extent to which they involved teachers in decision making to improve on the quality of decisions and boost their morale in their performance of duty. Although the study revealed the relationship
between participative leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction, the sample was
drawn from a rural setting and there was need to compare the findings when an
urban setting was used.

A study carried out by Sigilai (2010) sought to establish the relationship
between head teachers’ leadership styles in public primary school management
in Bomet district, Kenya. A correlation research design was used. The study
had a sample of 120 head teachers selected from a population of 174 head
teachers of public primary schools in the county. Simple random sampling
techniques were used. Questionnaires were used in collection of data which
were analyzed using Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) version
11.5. Frequencies and percentages were computed to determine the most
preferred leadership style among head teachers, and to determine head
teachers’ effectiveness and influence on teacher job satisfaction. Pearsons’
product moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship
between independent and dependent variables in the study. All statistical tests
were subjected to tests of significance level based on alpha (a) = 0.05.

The findings showed that there was no statistically significant relationship
between head teachers’ leadership styles and their effectiveness in school
management. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship
between participative leadership behaviours, the sample was based on teacher
from primary schools and there as need to compare the findings when
secondary school teachers were used.
In a related study, Mwangi, (2013) study investigated the effects of leadership behaviours on teacher job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya. The target population of the study was 21 public secondary schools registered in Nakuru County. A non-probability sampling method was used. The study purposively selected 7 public secondary schools and 20 respondents from each of the schools as being representative of the target population. Data was collected using the questionnaire method. Quantitative data was analyzed through the use of descriptive statistics which included frequencies, percentages and means as measures of central tendency, while the qualitative data was analyzed through the use of content analysis. Data was presented using tables and bar charts. Among the key findings were that none involvement of teachers in decision making affected their job satisfaction.

Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between participative leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction, the sample was based on teachers from a rural setting and there was need to compare the finding when urban teachers were used.

2.6 Achievement oriented leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction

A study of head teacher’s leadership behaviour in relation to teacher job satisfaction was done in primary schools in Mathira division of Nyeri District, Kenya. (Gatere, 1998). The major concern of the study was to determine the relationship if any, between head teacher leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction. Four dimensions of head teacher leadership behaviour that
contributed to overall school climate were identified and employed in the study. The current study sought to evaluate achievement leadership behaviour and teachers’ job satisfaction using the Path goal theory of leader effectiveness. These dimensions were production emphasis, consideration, aloofness and thrust. The current study evaluated the relationship between achievement oriented behaviour and teachers’ job satisfaction. The study was a replication of a similar one done by Holder (1985) in the public elementary schools in the school district of Columbus, Ohio, United States of America. The replication was carried out in primary schools in Mathira division of Nyeri District in the Republic of Kenya. Ex-post facto research design was used.

The findings of the study indicated that a statistically significant positive relationship existed between the level of teacher job satisfaction and the strength by head teacher leadership behaviour dimensions of achievement-orientation. Further analysis revealed that only the head teacher leadership behaviour dimension of thrust contributed significantly to teacher job satisfaction. Although the finding study did not use the Path-Goal Theory, the leadership behaviour is that of achievement-orientation. The current study sought to establish the relationship, if any, between achievement leader behaviour and teachers’ job satisfaction in Nairobi County.

Njeri (2011) carried out a study on the effects of public secondary school head teachers' leadership styles on teachers' levels job satisfaction in Tetu district, Nyeri, Kenya. The objectives of the study were to identity the head teachers' leadership styles used in public secondary schools in Tetu district, to determine
the levels of job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Tetu district; establish head teachers' leadership styles associated with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers in public secondary schools; and examine whether teachers' personal characteristics (age, gender, work experience, and levels of education) affect their levels of job satisfaction. The study employed a descriptive survey design. The study targeted all the head teachers and teachers in the 30 secondary schools in Tetu district. Simple random sampling was used to select 28 head teachers while stratified random sampling technique was used to select 169 teachers (six teachers per school). The study employed questionnaires as the main instrument for data collection. A pilot study was conducted to pre-test the reliability and validity of the instrument. Data was both quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative data was edited then coded, entered, analyzed and interpretations made out of the information gotten.

The study established that the most used leadership styles by head teachers in Tetu District were democratic and laissez-faire. It was established that the head teachers sometimes engaged in autocratic leadership, which the teachers did not like and led to job dissatisfaction. Findings did not establish any use of achievement oriented leadership. Although the findings of this study established a relationship between achievement oriented leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction, the study sample was based on primary school teachers from a rural setting and there was need to compare findings when secondary school teachers from an urban setting were used.
2.7 Principals’ gender and leadership behaviours

Not much research was found to have been specifically done on the area of gender leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. The focus also has been on the west (Wright, 1998, Ayodo, 2011) with an unsatisfactory emphasis of the issue in the orient and Africa. This is despite the fact that the west is well versed on gender matters that developing countries like Kenya are still grappling with. Yet, studies show that job satisfaction is influenced by the employees’ personal attributes such as gender (Choon, 2001). Rajaeepour (2012) designed a study to investigate the relationship between female principals’ management style and teacher job satisfaction. A co-relational research design was used.

The study focused on a girls’ high school in Isfahan, Iran. The managers had to have been in the school for at least one year to ensure that they had had time to affect teacher job satisfaction in the school. Statistical population was 2581 female teachers of girl high schools during 2006-2007 school years. The sample comprised 150 teachers and 125 managers with a return of 83%. Two Likert-type questionnaires were used to gather data; one for the managers and one for the teachers. Data were analyzed using SPSS Version 15. The correlation coefficient was calculated to evaluate the relationship between variables. There was significant positive relationship between gender and leadership style of the manager. The sample for this study was based on a sample drawn from a different culture and there was need for a similar study to report on the cross-cultural differences and similarities if any.
Morris and Beth (2011) carried out a research on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviour. The study set to examine effects of gender that could be discerned about principal leadership behaviour. 360-degree evaluation tool was used. The study involved 34 principal and 238 teachers from 18 districts across the state of Louisiana. Descriptive statistics and t tests were used to analyze data. There were no statistically significant differences in the effects of gender of administrator. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between principals gender and leadership behaviours, the study was based on a sample from a developed country and given that Kenya is a developing country, a similar study was needed in order to report on the cross-cultural differences the similarities and differences if any.

Choon (2001) carried out a research on gender differences in leadership styles of principals in secondary schools in Pahang, Malaysia. The purpose of the study was to investigate gender differences in male and female teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ leadership behaviours as perceived by teachers. A questionnaire was administered to a stratified cluster sample of 400 teachers consisting of almost equal numbers of male and female teachers from twenty randomly selected secondary schools. Data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Weak but significant negative relationships were observed between principals’ perceived leadership styles with principals’ gender, and consideration, but a moderately strong negative correlation with initiating structure. Although teachers’ job satisfaction was
strongly correlated with consideration behaviours and weakly correlated with initiating structure, there was a weak significant negative correlation between teachers’ job satisfaction with teachers’ gender and principals perceived leadership styles based on a significance level of 0.05. Based on the findings of this study it was recommended that similar studies be conducted on a nation-wide basis and whose findings would be the basis of developing training programmes for prospective school principals. Although the findings of this study revealed the relationship between principals’ gender and leadership behaviours the study was based on a sample drawn from a developed country and given that Kenya is a developing country, a similar study was needed in order to report on the cross-cultural differences and similarities if any.

A study by Omeke and Onah (2012) was designed to investigate the influence of principals’ leadership styles on secondary school teachers’ job satisfaction in Nsukka education zone of Enugu State, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. By application of stratified random sampling technique, a total of 28 public secondary schools were drawn from three local government areas in the zone. There were 280 classroom teachers (10 from each school) used as respondents for the study. The instrument for the study was a four-point Likert type questionnaire. Data was analyzed using mean and standard deviation while t-test was used to test the hypotheses. The significance level was 0.05. The results revealed that the principals adopted three leadership styles in their administration namely; autocratic laissez faire and democratic according to their dominance. Teachers irrespective of head
teacher’s gender agreed that only democratic leadership enhances their job satisfaction. The relationship

Jaafar and Osman (2014) carried out a research to find out the differences of leadership styles between headmasters and headmistress in six primary schools in Perlis and Kedah, Pakistani. The research was also conducted in order to identify the level of job satisfaction among teachers under the administration of headmasters and headmistresses. The study also focused on the distinction of teacher’s job satisfaction level based on demography factors such as gender, service category, age and teaching experience. The measurement tool used in this study was Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) formulated by Ohio State University and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The sample involved 303 respondents from six primary schools in Perlis and Kedah, Pakistani. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 12 was used to test the results. The test applied in this research was t-test, ANOVA and Pearson correlation.

The results showed there was no significant difference between leadership behaviours of headmasters and headmistresses were similar in task structure dimension and consideration dimension. In addition, results indicated a significant difference of teachers’ job satisfaction level between the leadership of headmasters and headmistresses based on t test. Based on findings from the mean frequencies, findings indicated that the level of teachers’ job satisfaction was higher under the administration of headmasters than of the headmistresses. Further, results also established that the leadership style of consideration
dimension has a significant and high relationship in the teachers’ job satisfaction level compared to task structure dimension when using Pearson correlation method. Both these dimensions had a positive and significant relationship. This means, when the leadership styles in these both dimensions are high, the teachers job satisfaction level is also increased. The results showed that the both dimensions in leadership style are very essential in determining the teacher’s job satisfaction level. The headmasters / headmistress, who apply their leadership appropriately, increased teachers’ job satisfaction level. The findings of this study revealed the relationship between principals’ gender and leadership behaviours but the sample was based on teachers drawn from a different country and a similar study was needed to compare the findings when teachers from Kenya were used.

In another study, Ntide (2014) carried out a comparative analysis of leadership styles and behavior of male and female heads of schools in Kasulu District, Tanzania. One hundred and ninety participants were sampled purposively from 22 public primary schools. A multi-method data collection strategy including interviews, questionnaire and documentary analysis, was deployed. The data collected were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. The descriptive statistics used included frequency tables, charts, mean scores, and t-test. Overall, results revealed that, participative, democratic, team management and authoritative leadership styles were deployed by both male and female heads of schools in running primary schools. Similarities and differences were observed in terms of frequency and manner in which those leadership styles were used.
by male and female school heads. Both male and female heads of schools used the same amount of task oriented leadership behavior. However, female heads showed more task oriented leadership behavior than male heads. The study thus recommends addressing the situation of gender imbalance in schools’ leadership so as to utilize the revealed leadership talents and skills of female heads of schools.

Ayodo (2011) carried out a study on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among female principals in public secondary schools in Rachuonyo North and South Districts, Kenya. The purpose of the study was to assess job satisfaction among female principals. The study adopted descriptive survey and correlation research designs. The sample had 280 participants. Questionnaires, interviews schedule; observation and document analysis guides were used to collect data. The study established that most female principals were dissatisfied with principal ship due to perceived unequal treatment with their male counterparts. The study concluded that the level of job satisfaction among female principals was low but could be improved upon by addressing factors that led to job and leadership.

A study by Akoth (2014) investigated the influence of headteachers' leadership styles on job satisfaction among teachers in public primary schools in Migori District. The study adopted an *ex post facto* design. The research instrument used was validated by the senior lecturers at the University of Nairobi. Reliability of the instrument was done through a test-retest. The target population was 128 public primary schools in Migori District. The study
gathered the data using questionnaires which guided in the collection of data together with the objectives. Descriptive statistics was used in data analysis from the tables gathered by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The study revealed that satisfaction of teachers had a relationship with leadership styles, where schools that practiced participatory and transformational type of leadership rated their head teachers highly. Headteachers' age, gender and teaching experience did not have a direct bearing on any leadership style but high professional qualifications had effect on transactional leadership style. The study also revealed that most head teachers were males in most public schools. Although this study revealed the relationship between principal gender and leadership behaviours, the sample was based on rural principals and there was need to compare the findings when urban principals were used.

Karanja, Mugwe and Wanderi (2011) carried out a study on effects of leadership style on job satisfaction of teachers in secondary schools in Dundori zone, Nakuru County, Kenya. The study was conducted between May and November, 2010. The population included 274 teachers in the 17 secondary schools with a student population of 4557 including 2956 girls and 1601 boys. A random sample of 115 teachers and 11 head teachers was drawn from 12 selected schools. Data was collected using a self-structured questionnaire and in-depth interview schedule administered to teachers and head teachers, respectively. The questionnaires were pilot-tested to validate and determine its reliability. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential
statistics with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5 for Windows. The findings indicated that there was no gender difference in principal’s leadership behaviours. The current study sought to establish whether there are gender differences in principal leadership behaviours.

A study was carried out by Saeed (2011) on effect of female principal’s management leadership behavior on teacher’s job at Isfahan-Iran, girl’s high schools in Iran. The aim of this study was to determine the management behaviours of female managers based on the four styles: directive, executive, benevolent autocrat and bureaucrat and their effects on job satisfaction of teachers in girl’s high schools in Isfahan in the academic year of 2006-2007. The research method used in this study was correlational descriptive. The sample had 150 participant teachers selected randomly from a population of 2591 teachers. The data collection tools included two researcher-made questionnaires which were about the management styles and job satisfaction, with 37 and 41 questions respectively. The questions were based on the Likert scale type. The content validity of the questionnaires was 0.81 while the reliability was 0.92 based on the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient. To analyze the data descriptive analysis and inferential statistics were used.

The results of the study showed that only directive and executive leadership behaviours had a significant positive influence on the teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers had different views about the directive style based on their gender and the level of education. In terms of executive style, there is a different view among the teachers based on their teaching experience. This study was based
on a sample drawn from rural principals and a similar study was needed in 
order to compare the findings when urban principals were used.

2.8 Teachers’ gender differences and job satisfaction

Empirical studies are inconclusive on whether there is a correlation between 
personal factors such as demographic characteristics affect job satisfaction and 
are treated as such in this study. A study by Xuong-Kiet Vuong and Minh- 
Quang Duong (2013) sought to ascertain job satisfaction level between male 
and female faculty at the Vietnam National University of Ho Chi Minh City. 
The purpose of the study was to ascertain job satisfaction level of academic 
members in Vietnamese universities. The study used a questionnaire to survey 
a sample of 200 academic members drawn randomly from five colleges of the 
national university. Data was analysed using SPSS Version 13.0. The t-test was 
used to examine the job satisfaction level between male and female faculty in 
Vietnamese universities.

The findings showed male faculty members were more satisfied than their 
female counterparts. Although the findings of this study established gender 
differences between male and female faculty members, the sample was based 
on university faculty and there was need to compare the findings when 
secondary school teachers were used.

In a related study Iqbal, Asif, Akhtar and Saeed (2007) carried out a study to 
compare the level of job satisfaction between male and female secondary 
school teachers in Pakistan. Six facets of job satisfaction were developed to
compare gender, age, teaching experience, and location of the school with teachers’ job satisfaction. The population comprised all public sector secondary school teachers working in Lahore District. Data were collected using Job Satisfaction Scale for Teachers (JSST). Data was analysed using one way ANOVA and t-test. Findings of the study indicated that female teachers were more satisfied with work and supervision aspects of the job when compared with male teachers. Although the findings of this study revealed the differences between male and female teachers, given the geographical differences, a similar study was needed to compare the similarities or differences if any.

Kimengi (1993) carried out a study to investigate attitudes towards teaching and job satisfaction of both male and female teachers in Nandi, Uasin-Gishu and Tranzoia Counties in Kenya. The study adopted ex post facto design. The participants were 324 secondary school teachers from 27 schools selected randomly from the three counties. Nine secondary schools were from each of the selected counties to participate in the study. Two instruments: Teachers Attitudes towards Teaching and Teachers’ Job satisfaction Scale were used. The statistical package or social sciences was used to analyse the hypotheses. Data was analysed using t-test. The findings of the study indicated no significant difference between the means of male and female overall job satisfaction scores. Although the findings of this study showed the differences between male and female aspects of job satisfaction, given that the study
covered three counties in rural Kenya, a similar study in an urban setting was necessary to compare the differences if any.

Anderson, John, Keltner and Kring (2001) investigated whether (and why) female teachers in Danish schools have higher teacher job satisfaction than male teachers. Based on a survey with 3439 teachers from 85 Danish schools, it was shown that female teachers have higher self-efficacy and job satisfaction, and that these gender differences are partly explain by the female teacher’s higher level of empathy. The findings further showed that the differences between male and female teachers did not depend on the proportion of female teachers at the specific school or on the gender of the school principal. The study was based on a sample drawn from a developed country and given that Kenya is a developing country, a similar study was needed in order to report on the cross-cultural differences and similarities if any.

Menon and Reppa (2011) investigated the association between individual gender characteristics and teacher job satisfaction in secondary education in Cyprus. The study focused on two individual characteristics commonly linked to job satisfaction in the literature, namely, gender and years of experience. A short version of a questionnaire was administered to a sample of secondary school teachers. The use of factor analysis resulted in the identification of the following seven factors which represent different aspects of job satisfaction: school climate, key stakeholders, support and training, participation in school management, student/school progress, professional development and employment terms. Experienced teachers report significantly higher job
satisfaction on two of the identified dimensions (key stakeholders and participation in school management). The differences between men and women were not significant on all dimensions of job satisfaction, pointing to the absence of a link between gender and job satisfaction. The current study aimed to evaluate teachers’ gender differences and job satisfaction.

Mbwiria (2010) carried out a study to investigate the leadership styles of male and female secondary school teachers’ job satisfaction in Imenti South District, Kenya. The study sought to establish what factors stimulated and sustained teachers’ job satisfaction. The study was guided by the transformational leadership theory. The independent variable was principals’ leadership styles. The intervening variables were teachers’ gender and teaching experience. The study used descriptive survey design targeting all the 54 principals and 468 teachers from the 54 public secondary schools in Imenti South district. Stratified random sampling was used to select 48 schools, from which 48 principals and 240 teachers were selected to participate in the study. Data was collected using two questionnaires, one for principals and one for teachers. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data obtained, including frequency counts, means, percentages and ANOVA.

The analyzed data was presented in summary form using frequency distribution tables, bar graphs and pie charts. However, the demographic variable, gender had an impact on career commitment of teachers. Female teachers were found to have a higher level of career commitment than their male counterparts. Although this study established the differences between
male and female teachers, the sample of the study was drawn from rural Kenya. A similar study with a sample drawn from an urban setting was therefore needed to compare the similarities or differences if any. This study was set in rural Kenya and there was need to carry out a similar study in an urban setting to compare the similarities and differences if any.

2.9 Summary and gap identification

From the foregoing review of related literature it is evident that majority of the studies reviewed on principals’ leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction were done in developed countries. Furthermore, many of these studies drew their samples from universities, colleges and/or primary schools. Many of the reviewed studies were also done in rural settings. Some of the findings reported on the studies on relationship between leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction have been contradicting and inconclusive. Furthermore, many of the studies reviewed were skewed towards administration yet psychological behavior is an important element in leadership because it affects the learning environment. There was therefore need for a study to be conducted in secondary schools in Kenya, in order to contribute to understanding the relationship of the two variables which were; principal leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction

Based on the literature reviewed, the following predictions are made:

i. There is a significant and positive relationship between principal leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction.
ii. There is a significant and positive relationship between directive principal leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

iii. There is a significant and positive relationship between supportive principal leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

iv. There is a significant and positive relationship between participative principal leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

v. There is a significant and positive relationship between achievement oriented principal leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction.

vi. There are no significant gender differences in principals’ leadership behaviours.

vii. There are no significant gender differences in teachers’ job satisfaction.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology which was used to generate and analyze data in the study. The chapter covers the following areas: research design, variables, and location of the study, population, sampling, instrumentation, data collection techniques, data analysis and logistical and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design and Locale

3.2.1 Research Design

This study used a correlational research design. Ary, Jacobs, Razahieh and Sorensen (2006) defined correlational design as both quantitative and bivariate. The quantitative element in correlational research is the inquiry which uses operational definitions to generate numeric data to answer predetermined hypothesis or questions. Unlike qualitative research, quantitative research minimizes researcher or contextual bias by limiting the framework to the analysis of objective data (Cooper & Scindler, 2008). A bivariate correlation helps examine the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables and is an appropriate study because it examines variables in their natural environment and does not include researcher- imposed treatments (Simon, 1969). According to Tabachnick and Fidel (2007) correlation studies conduct research after the variations in the variables have occurred naturally. The researchers’ intent for this study was to establish the relationship between
leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction. A correlation design was thus deemed as the most useful for determining the relationship between these two variables and was most appropriate for this study.

3.2.2 Research Variables

In this study the research variables were:

i. The independent/predictor variable was principal leadership behaviours. Leadership behaviours were measured under four leadership behaviours: directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented. Leadership behaviours were measured by an adapted Leader Behaviours Questionnaire with 24 items. There were six items for each leadership behaviours, See Appendix iv

ii. The dependent/response variable was teacher job satisfaction which was measured by use of an adapted Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire which had 77 items. Teacher job satisfaction was measured using nine factors of job satisfaction: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement and security. The cut off scores for job satisfaction were 65-264 for low (dissatisfied) and 265-330 for high (satisfied).

3.2.3 Study Locale

The study was carried out in Nairobi County. Nairobi is the capital and largest city in Kenya with an approximate population of 4 million occupying around
150 square kilometers (see Appendix V). At the time of the study, the County Director of Education’s records showed that there were a total of 78 public secondary schools in the county. According to the 2013 K.C.S.E statistics, out of the maximum 12 points, the Nairobi County combined mean grade score was approximately 6 points which is equivalent to a mean grade of C (plain). In Kenya, the minimum grade requirement for entry into public university is C+. Thus, the general academic achievement of students in public secondary schools in Nairobi County may be considered to be poor by the stakeholders in the education sector who expect secondary school students to excel in their studies to enable them continue to universities for acquisition of requisite skills for the country’s economic development. The poor academic achievement may be attributed to teachers’ job dissatisfaction as noted by Chitiavi, (2002) and (Republic of Kenya, 2010) that there is a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and academic achievement.

In Kenya’s public schools, poor teacher morale and stressed teachers have become perennial problems (Nkonge, 2009). Unless this trend is checked, the country may fail to equip learners with relevant skills yet this is one of the flagship projects of Kenya Vision 2030 (Republic of Kenya, 2007; Njeru & Orodho, 2008). The highest budgetary allocation in the 2013/2014 financial year was to education; principals’ leadership behaviours affect overall teacher job satisfaction more so to teachers’ salaries. Griffin (1996) documented statistically that, job commitment and the resultant academic performance. A study on the relationship between principal leadership behaviours and teachers’
job satisfaction was therefore needed in Nairobi County to help in addressing the poor academic achievement among the majority of the students in public secondary schools.

3.3 Population of the Study

The target population was all the 78 principals’ and 1759 teachers in the 78 public secondary schools in Nairobi County. The accessible population was 45 principals and 225 teachers from 45 public secondary schools. The 45 schools had principals who had served in the current stations for a minimum period of five years, which were the criteria for inclusion in the study. According to statistics obtained from Nairobi County Director of Education office in the year 2014, out of a teacher population of 1759 teachers (1,222 female and 537 male. Male teachers were fewer than female teachers by 38 percent.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size Determination

3.4.1 Sampling Techniques

Two types of sampling procedures were employed in this study; purposive sampling and simple random sampling. Purposive sampling was used to select the schools’ principals who had served 3 years. The researcher obtained a list of schools from the County Education Office, listing the number of years each principal had served in the school. Only principals who had served for three years and above in the current station were selected for inclusion in this study. Forty five principals were thus selected. To get the required number of participant teachers per school, the researcher first obtained the list of all the
teachers in public secondary schools in the county from the County Director of Schools. Secondly, paper folds equal to the required number of female participants in each school were written “yes” and the rest left blank. The papers were then placed in a basket and thoroughly mixed. The female teachers who were gathered in their respective staffrooms in their schools were asked to pick a paper fold randomly. The female teachers who picked paper folds written” yes” were then briefed on the contents of the consent letter.

Thirdly, for the selection of male teacher participants, the researcher went through the list of teachers provided by the County Director of Education with every principal. There was a shortage of male teachers in some of the schools selected to participate in the study. Furthermore, distribution of the teachers by gender was not even. In some schools, the researcher used simple random selection through paper folds similar to that of the female teachers to obtain the required number of male participants. In other schools, the researcher used purposive method to select male teacher participants.

A sample of 270 participants was selected; 45 principals (30 female, 15 male) and 225 teachers (144 female and 72 male).

3.4.2 Sample Frame

The actual sample size of schools and participant principals and teachers in the study is presented in the sample frame Table 3.1
Table 3.1

Sample Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: F=Female, M= Male

Source: County Director of Education Office, Nairobi 2014

Data in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 show that the sample size for principals and teachers was approximately 15% of the teacher population in Nairobi County public secondary schools. According to Gorard (2001) a sample size of between 10 to 20 percent of the study population is considered appropriate for research study. The sample in the current study was therefore considered appropriate.

3.5 Research Instruments

The study utilized two questionnaires: Leader Behaviours Questionnaire and Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.

3.5.1 Leader Behaviour Questionnaire

Leader Behaviour Questionnaire (House, 1974) was used to measure principal leadership behaviours and was divided into two parts. The first part consisted
of demographic data (age, gender, professional qualifications, length of stay and teaching experience) while the second part sought information on principal’s leadership behaviours. The Leader Behaviours Questionnaire formed the second part of the instrument. The instrument, which is in the public domain, was adapted and modified to suit the context of the study. Path Goal Leadership Questionnaire is an instrument with 20 items. These were increased to 24 and as a result each of the four leadership behaviours had 6 items each giving a total of 24 items in the questionnaire. The weighting of each item was equal. Further, the word” I” was substituted with “Principal” in all the items to make it a more acceptable questionnaire. Leader Behaviours Questionnaire had 24 items which were rated using Likert scale ranging from strongly agrees which had a score of 5 to strongly disagree with a score of 1, See Appendix II.

3.5.2 Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

The teacher’s questionnaire was divided into three parts. Part one sought to collect demographic data (age, gender, professional experience and teaching experience of the teachers. Part two of the questionnaire sought information on participants’ perceptions of principal leadership behaviours using the Leader Behaviours Questionnaire. Part three of the questionnaire utilized Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Lester (1982), See Appendix III. The survey was chosen because it is suitable for use in any academic setting. The instrument was adapted and modified to suit the context of the study. In all the items of the questionnaire, the word” Leader” was replaced with the word
“Principal” and “subordinate” was replaced with “teacher”. The changes were in line with the terms commonly used in educational organizational settings. The instrument had 77 item surveys with 5 Likert scale responses. The alpha coefficient (Cronbach) reliability was 0.93. Coefficients of internal consistency were 0.92 (supervision), 0.82 (colleagues and work itself), 0.83 (working conditions), 0.80 (pay), 0.73 (responsibility), 0.81 (advancement), 0.71 (security), and 0.74 (recognition). Coefficients for scales ranged from 0.71 (security) to 0.92 (supervision). Content validity was performed through a panel of judges. The data was validated using a split sample technique. Construct validity was obtained through factor analysis.

A nine factor analysis was performed using criterion. The nine factors were: 14 items on supervision (19,73,47,11,27,71,52,34,65,70,14,62,6,56); 10 items on colleagues (22, 57, 77, 17, 48, 35, 43, 63, 60, 45) 8 items on working conditions (3, 64, 20, 40, 18, 31, 29, 10) 7 items on pay (53,2, 72, 42, 67, 5, 76) 8 items on responsibility (75, 69,74,44,24, 39, 21, 61) ; 8 items on work itself(30, 28, 51,33, 8, 54, 13, 55) ;5 items on advancement (59, 37, 1, 23,9 ) ; 3 items on security (25, 15, 32); and 3 items on recognition (16, 7, 58).

3.6 Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out in two public secondary schools in Nairobi County with two principals and four teachers. Using information from the pilot study, items which were in the original questionnaire but were found to confuse participants were modified. For example, professional qualification and master of education were included in the demographic section.
Furthermore, the pilot study was used to determine the validity and reliability of the research instruments.

3.6.1 Validity of the Instruments

Content validity of the instrument was assured through peer review with the help of supervisors. Items that were retained were only those that measured principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction. For instance, item number two was modified to read day to day in place of normal for clarity.

3.6.2 Reliability of the Instruments

The reliability of the instrument was measured by using Cronbach alpha test.

The reliability for the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) for the principal was found to be 0.89 and this was considered to be high. This is shown in Table 3.2

Table 3.2

*Cronbach’s Alpha for Principals’ LBQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.89</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key: N= number of items*

Similarly, the reliability for the Leader Behaviours Questionnaire as perceived by the teachers was considered to be high since alpha coefficient of 0.91 was found as indicated in Table 3.3
Table 3.3

*Cronbach’s Alpha for Teachers’ LBQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.91</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** N = number of items

### 3.7 Data Collection

#### 3.7.1 Actual Data Collection

The researcher administered the instruments during official working hours or at any appropriate time as agreed with the school administration. The participants were given instructions on the completion of the three scales. It took participants about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

### 3.8 Data Analysis

The quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires were coded for statistical analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). After completion of data entry, data cleaning was done in order to ensure that there were no outliers or improper entries which might contaminate the findings. Descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used in the presentation of the results. The descriptive statistical procedures were used to describe the characteristics of the participants and summarize the data collected. The following 11 items had factor loadings of below 0.30. (4, 12, 26, 36, 38, 41, 46, 49, 50, 66, 68). They were therefore not included in any further statistical analysis. They are filter items. Scores within 66-264 points
were considered dissatisfied, within 265-330 satisfied. Descriptive statistical procedures were used for objective one while the relevant inferential statistical procedures were used to test hypotheses for objectives two, three, four, five, six and seven. The specific null hypotheses tested were:

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between directive leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficient at p< 0.05 was used to test this hypothesis.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between supportive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficient at p< 0.05 was used to test this hypothesis.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between participative leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficient at p< 0.05 was used to test this hypothesis.

H₀₄: There is no significant relationship between achievements oriented leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficient at p< 0.05 was used to test this hypothesis.

H₀₅: There is no significant gender difference in principals’ leadership behaviours. To test this hypothesis t – test for independent samples was used.

H₀₆: There is no significant gender difference in teacher’s job satisfaction. To test this hypothesis t–test for independent samples was used.
3.8.1 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

As part of logistics the following was done:

i. Research Authorization: In order to be able to collect data from the sampled schools, the researcher obtained a research authorization letter and research permit from the National Council for Science and Technology.

ii. Familiarization Meeting: After obtaining research permit, the researcher through permission of the County Director of Education met principals of the sampled schools during a scheduled principals’ meeting. Dates and times for the researcher to visit the sampled schools were agreed.

On the day of data collection, the researcher ensured the following ethical considerations were assured:

i. The researcher explained the purpose of the research to the participants and sought their consent to participate in the study, See Appendix I.

ii. The participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity of their responses.

iii. The researcher also assured the participants that there would be no risks involved due to their participation in the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the findings are presented, interpretations and discussion of the results given in line with the stated study objectives and hypotheses. The chapter is organized into three main sections. The first section is introduction, the second section is general and demographic information, the third section is results, interpretation and discussions.

4.2 General and Demographic Information

This section gives the general information on the return rate of the questionnaires and demographic data on principals’ and teachers’ gender, age, length of service, and professional qualifications.

4.2.1 Questionnaire Return Rate

The researcher visited all sampled schools and administered the questionnaires to the respondents and ensured that all the questionnaires were properly filled and collected. The return rate for the principals’ and teachers’ questionnaires were 93.3 % and 89.3% respectively as shown in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1

Questionnaires’ Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42 (93.3)</td>
<td>45 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: M- Male, F- Female, TR- Total Returned, TS- Targeted Sample, ( ) – Percentage

From Table 4.1, a total of 42 principals; 14 male and 28 female returned the questionnaire translating to 93.3 % of the actual sample size used. The questionnaire return rate for the teachers was 201 comprising 62 male and 130 female translating to 89.3 % of the actual sample size used.

4.2.2 Demographic Data on Principals’ and Teachers’ Age, Gender, and Professional Qualifications

The principals’ and teachers’ ages and professional qualifications were cross tabulated with gender and the results are presented in Table 4.2
### Table 4.2

*Age, Gender and Professional Qualifications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>DD Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Dip</th>
<th>B.ED</th>
<th>M.ED</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>Mph</th>
<th>Ph. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**: DD-Demographic Data, F- Frequency, %-Percent, B.ED-Bachelor of Education, M.ED-Master of Education, MPhil- Masters in Philosophy, PhD- Doctor of Philosophy, NR-No Response

The data in Table 4.2 revealed that over half of the principals were aged 46 and 55 (61.9 %), 5 male and 21 female. The next concentration was principals aged
56-60 (26.2%), 6 male and 5 female. The third group by age concentration was those principals aged 36 to 45 years (11.9%), 3 male and 2 female. There was no principal in 25 and 35 years of age (0%) years.

Data in Table 4.2 revealed that majority of teachers’ ages were between 36 and 45 (45%); 26 male and 60 female and 2 candidates (2%) with no response. The second category was composed of teachers between 45 and 55 (30%); 8 male and 51 female with 1 non-response which was equated to (1%) no response. In the third category were teachers aged between 25 and 35 at (18%) comprising 11 male and 14 female with 1 candidate (1%) no response. The fourth category were teachers aged 56 to 60 (5%); 3 male and 3 female with non-response 2 which was equated to (1%).

The findings revealed that the principals under investigation had the following professional qualifications: master of education degree (38%); 6 male and 10 female, bachelor of education (29%); 7 male and 5 female, master of arts (21%); 2 male and 5 female, doctor of philosophy (12%); 0 male and 5 female. There was no principal holding diploma certificate or master of philosophy degree certificate. Regarding the teachers professional qualifications, data revealed that majority of teachers had bachelor of education degrees (57%); 44 male and 66 female. The second category in professional ranking was master of arts (18%); 5 male and 28 female. Diploma certificate level (7%) had 8 male and 6 female. Master of philosophy had (1%) teachers comprising 1 male and 0 female. Doctor of philosophy had (1%) teachers; 0 male and 1 female.
Majority of the teachers had bachelor of education degree 112 (57%), 44 male and 66 female, with a non-response of 2; then master of arts 34 (18%), followed by master of education (17%), 3 male, 27 female and 3 no response; diploma had 14 (7%), 8 male, 6 female; master of philosophy and doctor of philosophy and had 1 and 2 teachers’ each (1%).

4.2.3 Demographic Data on Respondents’ Gender, Teaching Experience and Length of Service

The participants’ teaching experience and length of service were cross-tabulated with gender and the results are indicated in Table 4.3
Table 4.3
Respondents’ Gender, Teaching Experience and Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DD</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 yrs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of Service

| < 1 yr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 19 | 43 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 84 | 42 |
| 3-5 yrs | 9 | 21 | 11 | 26 | 20 | 48 | 19 | 10 | 47 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 70 | 35 |
| 6-10 yrs | 4 | 10 | 6 | 14 | 10 | 24 | 5 | 3 | 22 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 14 |
| >ten yrs | 1 | 2 | 11 | 26 | 12 | 29 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 10 |
| Total | 14 | 33 | 28 | 67 | 42 | 100 | 62 | 31 | 129 | 65 | 9 | 5 | 201 | 100 |

Key: DD- Demographic Data, F- Frequency, < less than, > more than, yr. = year
Data in Table 4.3 revealed that the longest teaching experience for the respondent principals was 21 to 30 years with 26 principals (62%), 13 male and 13 female followed by 11 to 20 years with 15 principals (36%), 2 male and 13; then 6 to 10 years with 1 principal (2%), a female. There was no principal at the two levels 3-5 or under one year (0%).

Results in Table 4.3 further revealed the teaching experience and gender of the participant teachers. The category with the longest teaching experience was 11-20 years with 117 participants (58%), 30 male and 81 female. Second highest was categories 3-5 years with 29 participants (14.1%) 15 male and 7 female. The third category was 6-10 years of teaching experience with 28 participants (14%), 7 male, 19 female and 2 no response. The fourth category, participants 21-30 years had 14 participants (7.2%), 2 male and 12 female. The last category, with less than 1 year of experience had 13 participants (7.0%), 8 male and 5 female.

As regards length of service and gender of participant principals, the following was revealed. The highest category for length of service was 3-5 years which had 20 participants (48%), 9 male 11 female. The second category was those with more than 10 years of service which had 12 principals (29%), 1 male and 11 female. The third category in length of service was 6-10 years with 10 participants (24%), 4 male 6 female. There was no participant principal with less than 1 year of service (0%).

Table 4.3 revealed the length of service and gender of participating teachers as follows: Majority of teachers had length of service of less than one year with
84 participants (42%), 37 male and 43 female. There were 4 no responses. The second highest category was 3-5 years with 70 participants (35%), 19 male, 47 female. There were 4 no response. The next category was 6-10 years of service which had 28 teachers (14%), 5 male, 22 female. There was 1 no response. Last, the category under ten years of service had 19 teachers (10%), 1 male, 17 female and 1 no response.

4.3 Results of the Study

The results of the study were presented in line with the objectives of the study. The relevant descriptive statistics for each objective was given, followed by the specific inferential statistics used to test the null hypothesis stated. Finally, a discussion of the findings was given.

4.3.1 Secondary School Principals’ Leadership Behaviours

The purpose of this objective was to establish the leadership behaviours demonstrated by secondary school principals under study. The principal leadership behaviours were analyzed to get the range, mean, standard deviation and skewedness. The results were presented in Figure 4.1
The results in Figure 4.1 revealed that in terms of dominant leadership behaviours, the principals viewed themselves as follows: achievement oriented leadership behaviours (59.52%), supportive leadership behaviours (16.67%), supportive and participative leadership behaviours (9.52%), directive and achievement oriented leadership behaviours (7.14%), directive leadership behaviours (2.38%) and participative and directive and participative leadership behaviours (2.38%).

**Figure 4.1 Principals’ Assessment of Their Leadership**

**Key:** DLB= Directive Leadership Behaviours, SLB=Supportive Leadership Behaviours, PLB= Participative Leadership Behaviours, AOL= Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours, %= percentage
The researcher further analyzed the data from participating teachers in order to establish their views on principals’ leadership behaviours. The findings are shown in Figure 4.2

**Figure 4.2 Teachers’ Assessment of Principals’ Dominant Leadership**

**Key:** DLB= Directive Leadership Behaviours, SLB=Supportive Leadership Behaviours, PLB= Participative Leadership Behaviours, AOL= Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours, %= per cent age

The highest frequency of principal leadership behaviour scores as viewed by teachers was 48.26% in achievement oriented leadership behaviours. This was in concurrence with the principals’ views of their own dominant leadership behaviours.

The second highest frequency score of 21.89 was found in the directive leadership behaviours scores followed by supportive leadership behaviours.
with a mean score of 12.44. This was followed by supportive and achievement leadership behaviours 2.99% which tied with directive leadership behaviours and achievement oriented leadership behaviours. Directive leadership behaviours and supportive leadership behaviours scored 1.49% as did directive leadership behaviours and participative leadership behaviours; and participative leadership behaviours and supportive leadership behaviours as well as participative leadership behaviours, supportive leadership behaviours and achievement oriented leadership behaviours.

The findings supported those of earlier studies by and Ngwala (2014) and Rambo (2013) which stated that a leader may adapt and even combine various leadership behaviours to fit different situations. The samples used in Mosadegharad and Yarmohammadian (2006) study were similar to the one used in the current study in terms of the level of schooling. Thus, irrespective of cross-cultural differences and study locations, principal were found to be eclectic in their use of leadership behaviours. The situation determines the behaviours or combination of behaviours the principal adopts. However, the reviewed studies (Roul, 2012; Ngwala 2014; Odundo & Rambo, 2013) were skewed towards administrative leadership leaving a behavioral gap. The findings of the reviewed literature concur with the current study’s findings that principals may use different leaderships sometimes and at other times use a mix of different leadership approaches.

Further, some of the reviewed studies like (Odundo and Rambo 2013) concur with the current study that leadership factors such as recognition of effort,
participation and support have positive influence on teachers’ motivation, hence job satisfaction.

4.3.2 Relationship between Directive Leadership Behaviours and Teacher Job Satisfaction

The purpose for this objective was to establish the relationship between secondary school principals’ directive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. To achieve this objective, a descriptive analysis of the job satisfaction scores was done and the results are presented in Table 4.4

Table 4.4

Descriptive Statistics on Job Satisfaction Scores

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>196.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>201.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>201.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>27.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>203.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>270.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: N= Number, Std. = standard
Results in Table 4.4 show that the range of job satisfaction scores was 203.00 with minimum and maximum scores of 67.00 and 270.00 respectively. The mean job satisfaction score was 196.38, the median and the mode were equal at 201.00, the standard deviation was 27.32 and this was considered to be large. Thus, the scores were widely spread and this is supported by the range which was also found to be large. Negative coefficient of skewness (sk = -2.12) indicated that most teachers had high scores on overall job satisfaction.

The overall job satisfaction was further used to categorize the teachers into falling either within high or low job satisfaction categories. The results of this analysis are presented in Figure 4.3
Figure 4.3: Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Level

From Figure 4.3, it was observed that majority of the teachers (64.68 %) were classified as high in job satisfaction while 35.32 % fell in the low job satisfaction category. The cut off scores were 132 for low and 189 for high teacher job satisfaction. In order to achieve the stated objective, the following null hypothesis was tested.

H01: There is no significant relationship between principal’s directive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction.
To test this hypothesis, the data was subjected to a bivariate correlation analysis by use of the Pearson’s product moment correlation co-efficient. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.5

**Table 4.5**

*Pearson r for Directive Leadership Behaviours and Job Satisfaction Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>DLB Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.16*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Key:** DLB= Directive Leadership Behaviours

The results in Table 4.5 show that there was a positive and significant relationship between secondary school principals’ directive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction $r (201) = 0.16, p< 0.05$. The null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore the data provided evidence that there was a significant relationship between principals’ directive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction.

The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire had nine factors which measured the overall job satisfaction score. These factors were: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and recognition.
A bivariate correlation analysis was done using Pearson’s r in order to establish the factors that had a significant relationship with secondary school principals’ directive leadership behaviours. The finding is given in Table 4.6

Table 4.6

Pearson’s r for Directive Leadership Behaviours and Factors of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DLB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** N= Number

The results in Table 4.6 show that directive leadership had significant and positive relationship with two factors of job satisfaction, which were supervision and pay. The values were $r(201) = 0.24, p< 0.05$ and $r(201) = 0.17, p< 0.05$ respectively.

This finding seems to confirm those of earlier studies by Yilmaz (2007), Riffat-un-NisaAwan and Bigger (2008) and Akoth (2011), which reported a positive relationship between principal directive leadership behaviours and teacher job
satisfaction. Two of the samples used in the reviewed studies were different from the current study in terms of the educational levels of the participant. Yilmaz (2007) drew his sample from primary schools while Riffart-un-NisaAwan and Bigger (2008) drew their samples from degree colleges and both are from region whose geographical and cultural settings may be different from the current study. The study by Akoth (2011) though set in Kenya was like those of Yilmaz (2007) and Riffart-un-NisaAwan and Bigger (2008) set in the rural regions unlike the current study whose setting is urban and cosmopolitan in nature.

The samples used by Yilmaz (2007) and Akoth (2011) were drawn from public primary schools while the sample by Riffat-un-NisaAwan and Bigger (2008) was drawn from degree college teachers. The results showed that irrespective of cross-cultural, different study locations and different sample levels, principal directive leadership was found to be positively correlated to teacher job satisfaction. Like the current study, Riffat-un-NisaAwan and Biggers’ (2008) study adopted the Path Goal Theory. However, in the area of factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction, Riffats’ findings indicated that directive leadership contributed negatively in job satisfaction factors such as supervision, colleagues and the job itself. The finding of the current study established that directive leadership behaviours contributed negatively in teacher job satisfaction only in the categories of supervision and pay.
4.3.3 Secondary School Principals’ Supportive Leadership Behaviours and Teacher Job Satisfaction

The purpose of this objective was to establish the relationship between secondary school principals’ supportive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. In order to achieve the stated objective, the following null hypothesis was tested.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between secondary school principal’s supportive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction.

To test this hypothesis, the data was subjected to a bivariate correlation analysis by use of Pearson’s product moment correlation co-efficient. The results are indicated in Table 4.7

**Table 4.7**

*Pearson r for Supportive Leadership Behaviours and Job Satisfaction Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLB</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Key**: SLB - Supportive Leadership Behaviours, N= Number

The results in Table 4.7 show that there was a positive and significant relationship between principal’s supportive leadership behaviours and teacher
job satisfaction, $r (201) = 0.18$, $p< 0.05$ revealed a significant positive relationship. The null hypothesis was thus rejected. Therefore the data provided evidence that there was indeed a positive relationship between secondary school principal’s supportive leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction.

Teachers’ job satisfaction was measured on nine factors for the overall job satisfaction score. These factors were: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and recognition. A bivariate correlation analysis was done using Pearson’s $r$ in order to establish the factors that had a significant relationship with the secondary school principals’ supportive leadership behaviours. The finding is given Table 4.8

**Table 4.8**

*Pearson r for supportive Leadership Behaviours and Factors of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 0.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Key**: SLB= Supportive Leadership Behaviour
The results in Table 4.8 show that supportive leadership had significant relationship with two factors of job satisfaction, which were supervision and working conditions. The values were \( r (201) = 0.34 \) and \( r (201) = 0.18 \) respectively.

Research on supportive leadership has been premised on management leadership styles (Lenka, 2012; Musera, Achoka & Mugasia, 2012) leaving a behavioral gap yet teacher job satisfaction is attributed to attitudes. The three studies (Lenka, 2012; Musera, Achoka & Mugasia, 2012) were conducted outside Kenya. There was need therefore to carry out the current study to rule out geographical and cultural differences. The study by Lenka (2012) was premised on the Path Goal Theory like the current one. The findings also concurred that where there was a supportive principal, teachers enjoyed their job. The principal using supportive leadership behaviours displays considerate behaviours thus reducing the uncertainties of the work. Nguni, Slegger & Densen (2006) concurred with the current findings that transformational or supportive leadership behaviours, had strong moderate behaviours on job commitment.

### 4.3.4 Participative Leadership Behaviours and Teacher Job Satisfaction

The purpose of this objective was to establish the relationship between supportive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. In order to achieve the stated objective, the following null hypothesis was tested.

**Ho2:** There is no significant relationship between principal’s participative leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction.
To test this hypothesis, the data was subjected to a bivariate correlation analysis by use of Pearson’s product moment correlation co-efficient. The results are shown in Table 4.9

**Table 4.9**

_Pearson r for Participative Leadership Behaviours and Job Satisfaction Scores_  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>PLB</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Key:** PLB= Participative Leadership Behaviours, N= Number

The results in Table 4.9 show that there was a positive and significant relationship between principal’s supportive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction, \( r (201) = 0.20, p< 0.05 \) revealed a significant positive relationship. The null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore the data provided evidence that there was indeed a positive relationship between secondary school principal’s participative leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction.

The Teachers’ Job Satisfaction matrix had nine factors which measured the overall job satisfaction score. These factors were: supervision, colleagues,
working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and recognition.

A bivariate correlation analysis was done using Pearson’s r in order to establish the factors that had a significant relationship with the principal participative leadership behaviours. The finding is given Table 4.10

Table 4.10

*Pearson r for Participative Leadership Behaviours and Factors of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Key:** N= Number, sig= significant, PLB= Participative Principal Leadership
The results in Table 4.10 show participative leadership behaviours had significant and positive relationship with factors of job satisfaction, which were supervision, colleagues, working conditions and pay. The values were $r(201)=0.34$, $p<0.05$, $r(201)=0.14$, $p<0.05$, $r(201)=0.18$, $p<0.05$, and $r(201)=0.15$, $p<0.05$.

The findings of the current study concur with those of Robinson (2008), Monyazi (2012), Ndarasa and Thuraisingam (2014), Ndiku et al (2009), Sigalai (2010), Mwangi (2013) Obina, et al (2012), Kingori (2013) that participative leadership behaviours positively affected teachers job satisfaction. However, Ndiku et al (2009) while concurring with the positive effect of supportive leadership on job satisfaction noted that teachers desired greater involvement in decision making than currently given. The studies were carried out outside Kenya, Robinson (2008), Monyazi (2012), concurred with the current study findings on the need for teachers to be involved in decision making thus ruling out geographical or cultural differences for belongingness and affiliation which come with being involved in decision making. Studies done in Africa Monyazi (2012), Ndiku et al (2009), Mwangi (2013) Obina et al. (2012) and Kingori (2013) were mainly ex post facto and surveys yet survey designs can better explain the relationship between the variables, bringing us near to causality.
4.3.5 Relationship between Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours and Teacher Job Satisfaction

The purpose of this objective was to establish the relationship between achievement oriented leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. In order to achieve the stated objective, the following null hypothesis was tested.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between principal’s achievement oriented leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction.

To test this hypothesis, the data was subjected to a bivariate correlation analysis by use of Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient. The results are shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11

*Pearson r for Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours and Job Satisfaction Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO LB</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO LB</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 1 .14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 201 201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** AOLB= Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours

The results in Table 4.11 show that there was a positive and significant relationship between principal’s achievement oriented leadership behaviours
and teacher job satisfaction $r (201) = 0.14, p< 0.05$ revealed a significant positive relationship. The null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore the data provided evidence that there was indeed a positive relationship between secondary school principal’s achievement oriented leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction. The Teachers’ Job Satisfaction had nine factors which measured the overall job satisfaction score. These factors were: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security and recognition. A bivariate correlation analysis was done using Pearson’s $r$ in order to establish the factors that had a significant relationship with the principal achievement oriented leadership behaviours. The finding is given Table 4.12

**Table 4.12**

*Pearson’s $r$ for Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours and factors of job satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.26**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** AOLB= Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours
The results in Table 4.12 show that achievement oriented leadership behaviours had significant and positive relationship with a factor of job satisfaction, which was supervision. The value was $r(201) = 0.26$, $p<0.05$.

These findings of the current study concur with those of Gatere (1998), Obina (2012) and Njeri (2011) that a significant positive relationship exists between the level of teacher job satisfaction and the strength by the leadership behaviours dimensions of achievement orientation.

The principals’ dimension of thrust contributed significantly to teacher job satisfaction. The studies by Gatere (1998) and Njeri (2011) as well as those of Obina et al (2012), which though regionally representative because of drawing from six countries including Kenya were all from rural settings unlike the current study which has not only an urban setting but a cosmopolitan one as well being set in the capital city of Kenya. The current study therefore sought to fill the urban gap. None of the studies adopted the Path Goal Theory of; yet the theory is premised on leader effectiveness through four leadership behaviours including achievement oriented leadership behaviours. Obina (2012) established that autocratic leadership style affected teachers’ job satisfaction negatively failing to concur with the finding that the achievement oriented principal drives teachers hard towards set goals but gives teachers confidence that they can achieve results.
4.3.6 Principals’ Gender and Leadership Behaviours

The purpose of this objective was to establish principal gender and leadership behaviours. To achieve this objective, a descriptive analysis of the principals’ leadership behaviours’ scores taking into consideration gender differences was done and the results are presented in Table 4.13

Table 4.13

Descriptive statistics of Gender differences in Leadership behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOLB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: N=Number, DLB=Directive Leadership Behaviours, SLB=Supportive Leadership Behaviours, AOLB=Achievement Oriented Behaviours
Results in Table 4.13 show that males had higher mean scores than females in all the four leadership behaviours. The highest mean score for males of 26.3 was found in achievement oriented leadership behaviours while the lowest mean score was found in the participative leadership behaviours with a mean score of 23.7, with standard deviation of 3.8 and 4.9 respectively. The highest mean score of 24.9 with a standard deviation of 5.6 for the females was also found in the achievement oriented leadership behaviours. The lowest mean score of 21.6 with a standard deviation of 4.9 was also in the participative leadership behaviours scores.

In reference to the sixth objective of the study which was to test gender differences in principal leadership behaviours the following null hypothesis was stated:

\[ H_{05}: \text{There are no significant gender differences in principal leadership behaviours} \]

To test this hypothesis, t-test for independent samples was done and the findings presented in Table 4.14
Table 4.14

t-test for independent samples for gender differences in leadership behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLB</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLB</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOLB</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** DLB = Directive Leadership Behaviour, PLB = Supportive Leadership Behaviour, PLB = Participative Leadership Behaviours, AOLB = Achievement Oriented Leadership Behaviours

The results in Table 4.14 show that there were significant gender differences in favour of males in three out of the four leadership behaviours. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. It was only in achievement oriented leadership behaviours where gender differences were not significant (t= -1.8, df= 190, P> 0.07).

The findings concur with those of Beth and Morris (2011), Choon, (2001) and, Omeke & Ona (2012), whose studies showed that there was significant gender differences in principal leadership behaviours. The gender differences were found to be in favour of male just like the current study established. Studies reviewed either looked at job satisfaction in general without delineating it to
teachers or only considered gender as a confounding variable that must be included in the study (Choon, 2001; Morris & Beth, 2011; and Ayodo, 2011).

The focus has also been on the west (Morris & Beth 2011) with unsatisfactory emphasis of the issue in the orient and Africa (Choon, 2001; Ayodo, 2011), yet the west is fairly well versed on gender matters that developing countries like Kenya need to address. Nevertheless, Kenyan studies on gender in the workplace (Ayodo 2011), need to be backed up by other emerging studies like the current one, to strengthen their reliability.

4.3.7 Gender Differences in Teacher Job Satisfaction

The purpose of this objective was to establish gender differences in teacher job satisfaction. The participants’ job satisfaction scores were analyzed in order to find the mean and standard deviation and the results are summarized in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender differences in Job Satisfaction Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.15, it was observed that in overall job satisfaction males had a higher mean than females. The actual mean scores were 197.2 and 196.4 for males and females respectively.
In line with the stated objective the following null hypothesis was tested in order to determine if the observed mean differences were significant.

H₀₆: There are no significant gender differences in teachers’ job satisfaction

To test this hypothesis, t-test for independent samples was done and the findings presented in Table 4.16

Table 4.16

*Independent t-test for Gender differences in Mean Job Satisfaction Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** T-t-test, D- difference, Sig. - significance

Results in Table 4.16 show that there were no significant gender differences in the overall Job satisfaction scores (t= 0.19, df= 190, P> 0.05). The null hypothesis was therefore not rejected. Thus male and female teachers had similar scores for job satisfaction and neither of them can be said to have had a higher or lower job satisfaction than the other.

The overall teacher job satisfaction scores were obtained from the different factors of job satisfaction. Further analysis was done in order to get the mean
and standard deviation scores in all the nine factors of teacher job satisfaction.

The findings are given in Table 4.17.

**Table 4.17**

*Description of Gender Differences in Means of Factors of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleagues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Itself</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advancement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** N - Number, Std – Standard Deviation
The results in Table 4.17 show that males had higher mean score than females in supervision, colleagues and work itself. On the other hand, females had higher mean score than males in responsibility, advancement and recognition.

Further analysis was done to determine if there were significant gender differences in the nine factors of job satisfaction. The scores were subjected to the t-test of independent samples and the findings are presented in Table 4.18

**Table 4.18**

*Independent t-test for Mean Differences in Factors of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors of Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** T- t-test, Df- difference, Sig. - significance

The findings in Table 4.18 reveal that gender differences in the mean scores of the nine factors of teacher job satisfaction were not significant. This finding supports those of Hughes (2000), Mbwiria (2010, and Iqbal and Akhatar.
(2007) that there is no significant gender difference in teacher job satisfaction. The samples of Hughes, (2000), Iqbal and Akhhatar (2007 and Anderson, 2011) were all drawn from different cultural and geographical settings from the current study. Mbwiria’s (2010) sample although Kenyan, had a rural setting. Like Hughes (2000), Rosner (1990) and Bass (1998) the current findings concurred established that more female principals used relationship-oriented leadership behaviours while more job satisfaction than teachers whose principals adopt task-oriented approaches. Relationship-oriented behaviours for females were established in the current study where females had higher mean score than men in job factors such as responsibility, advancement and recognition. Males on the other hand, had higher mean score than female in task oriented job factors such as supervision, colleagues and work itself, supporting Fiedlers’ contingency theory that female leaders are more relationship oriented while males are more task oriented relationship.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section summarizes the findings of the study; the second section shows the implications of the findings, in the third section conclusions are drawn based on the findings and finally the fourth section gives the study recommendations for policy and further research.

5.2 Summary

The study was designed to establish the relationship between secondary school principals’ leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. To this end, four leadership behaviours: directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership behaviours were The study also explored gender differences in principal leadership behaviours as well as in teacher job satisfaction.

The first objective of the study sought to establish the leadership behaviours of secondary school principals under study. Both principals and teachers confirmed achievement oriented leadership as dominant at (59.52, and (48.26%) respectively. Principals were found to use each one of the four leadership behaviours alone or they adopted an eclectic approach depending on the situation.

The second objective of the study was to establish the relationship between secondary school principals’ directive leadership behaviours and teacher job
satisfaction. Majority of the teachers were classified as high in job satisfaction (64.68%) while (35 %) fell in the low satisfaction category.

The third objective of the study was to establish the relationship between principals’ supportive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Findings of the study indicated that there was a positive and significant relationship between principals’ supportive leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Supportive leadership had significant relationship with two factors of job satisfaction, which were supervision and working conditions.

In the fourth objective, the study sought to establish the relationship between participative leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Results showed a significant positive relationship between participative leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Participative leadership behaviours had significant relationship with the following factors of job satisfaction of supervision, colleagues, working conditions and pay.

The fifth objective of the study sought to evaluate the relationship between achievement oriented leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Results showed a positive and significant relationship between participative leadership behaviours and teacher job satisfaction. Results revealed that achievement oriented leadership had significant relationship with one factor of job satisfaction which was supervision.

The sixth objective of the study was on principals’ gender and leadership behaviours. Males had higher mean scores than females in all the four
leadership behaviours. There were significant gender differences in favour of males in three out of the four leadership behaviours. It was only in achievement oriented leadership behaviours where gender differences were not significant.

The seventh objective of the study set to investigate gender differences in teacher job satisfaction. In overall job satisfaction, males had a higher mean than females; 197.2 and 196.4, respectively. There were no significant gender differences in the overall job satisfaction scores. Gender differences in the mean scores of the nine factors of teachers’ job satisfaction were not significant.

5.3 Conclusions

The results of this study presented some evidence of the existence of the hypothesized relationship between principal leadership behaviours and teachers’ job satisfaction. All four leadership behaviours were found to have significant positive relationship with teachers’ job satisfaction. Directive leadership was not preferred by experienced teachers while it is useful to inexperienced teachers seeking direction. Supportive leadership, being a caring approach, appeals to teachers when they need belongingness. Since participative leadership involves teachers in discussions it gives teachers ownership of decisions made in the school. Although achievement oriented leadership pushes and demands results from teachers but when the principal gives confidence in the teachers’ ability here is reassurance. Applied appropriately, each behaviours has its place in giving teachers job satisfaction for the expected students’ learning outcomes
The study showed that gender is one of the factors that may account for differences in principal leadership behaviours. There were significant gender differences in three out of the four leadership behaviours and they were found to be in favour of males. This has significant implications on principal leadership and principals themselves and those charged with their appointment Teachers Service Commission and Ministry of Education need to take note of these gender differences. Although gender difference among teachers was not established, males still had a higher mean than females in overall teacher gender job satisfaction differences.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations for policy and further research were made.

5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

i. School principals should endeavor to adopt leadership behaviours that will create an enabling environment for teacher job satisfaction to maximize academic results.

ii. Trainers, for example, Kenya Education Staff Institute should consider introduction of courses for training principals to the understand relationship between academic results and teacher job satisfaction.

iii. Intervention programs should be put in place before appointment of school principals to prepare them for the new role they assume on appointment.
Iv. The Ministry of Education, Teachers Service commission and institutions of higher learning should work together so that research findings to improve principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction is shared for academic performance. A special task force within the Teachers Service Commission should be set up to ensure that there is gender equity in the posting and distribution of teachers in schools in Nairobi County. The proportion of male teachers in boys, girls or mixed schools was skewed in favor of women.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

The following suggestions were made for consideration for future research:

i. There is need for further research to identify how specific factors of job dissatisfaction can be mitigated. Pay as a Factor central to teachers’ job satisfaction is beyond the principal and yet it has psychological and economic implications on academic achievement

ii. Further studies should be done to replicate the current one. The current study only used questionnaire instrument for data collection. A triangulation approach using focus group discussions, interviews and even observation method may add further knowledge to the relationship between leadership and teacher job satisfaction not only in Nairobi but the whole country

iii. A similar study should be done with principals and teachers of private schools.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Consent to Participate in the Study

Kenyatta University

School of Education

Educational Psychology Department

TITLE: Correlates of Principals’ Leadership Behaviours and Teacher Job Satisfaction in Public Secondary Schools in Nairobi County, Kenya

RESEARCHER: Naomy Wambui Wangai Reg.no: E83/1063/2007 (Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychology); School of Education, Kenyatta University, P.O. Box 43844, Nairobi, Kenya.

Purpose and background

The researcher intends to investigate Correlates of Principals’ Leadership Behaviours and Teacher Job Satisfaction in Public Secondary Schools in Nairobi County, Kenya

Procedure

All Principals, deputy principals, heads of department and teachers, in selected public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya will form the study population. Piloting of the instruments will be done at two of the public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya but not included in the study. Data will be collected using questionnaires. Data analysis will be done and thesis compiled in order to fulfill the requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychology Kenyatta University.
Benefits

There will be no direct benefits for participating in the study. However, the findings of the study will be used to inform the policy makers and researchers on the inter-play of Correlates of Principals’ Leadership Behaviours and Teacher Job Satisfaction in Public Secondary Schools in Nairobi County, Kenya.

Risks

There is no risk involved in choosing to participate in the study.

Confidentiality

All information will be considered private and confidential.

Right to participate

Your participation is entirely voluntary. If you consent to participate, kindly indicate so by signing this form.

For participant

I agree to participate in this study.

NAME……………………SIGNATURE……………………DATE………….
Appendix II: Principals’ Questionnaire

This questionnaire has two parts. You are requested to fill in all the sections taking into account the instructions given. The information provided will be treated with confidentiality.

PART I: Demographic Information

Instructions

The purpose of this section is to request you to provide honest information that applies to you. Please tick as appropriate [ √ ]

Your age: 25-35[ ] 36-45[ ] 46-55[ ] 56-60[ ]

Sex: Male [ ] Female [ ]

Qualification: Diploma [ ] Bed [ ] MA [ ] MPhil [ ] PhD [ ]

Position in school:

Principal [ ]

Deputy Principal [ ]

Head of Department [ ]

Teacher [ ]

Number of years of teaching experience:

2-5 years [ ] 6-10 years [ ] 11-20 years [ ] 21 – 30 years
Length of service at the current station

Less than one year [ ] 2-5 years [ ] 6-10 years [ ] over 10 years [ ]

Part II: Principal Self Rating

Read each item carefully. Think about how frequently you engage in the behaviour described by the item. Tick in one of the boxes following the item to show the answer you have selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Never 1</th>
<th>Seldom 2</th>
<th>Occasionally 3</th>
<th>Often 4</th>
<th>Always 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal lets group members know what is expected of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal is friendly and approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal encourages continual improvement in members’ performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal schedules the work to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal consults with members when faced with problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal puts suggestions made by members in to operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal lets others know what is expected of them to perform at their highest level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Principal gives serious consideration to what members have to say before making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Principal treats all group members as his equals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Principal asks for others suggestions concerning how to carry out assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Principal maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Principal asks for our suggestions concerning how to carry out assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Principal demonstrates confidence others ability to meet most objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Principal consults with his/her subordinates before taking action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Principal emphasizes attainment of results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Principal looks out for the personal welfare of group members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal ensures that group members follow standard rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Principal asks members for suggestions on what assignments should be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Principal is willing to make changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Principal convinces subordinates that they can succeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Principal explains the way my tasks should be carried out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Principal helps me overcome problems which stop me from carrying out my tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Principal explains the way my tasks should be carried out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Teachers’ Questionnaire

This questionnaire has three parts. You are requested to fill in all the sections taking into account the instructions given. The information provided will be treated with confidentiality.

Part I Demographic Information

Please tick as appropriate. [ √ ]

Your age: 25-35 [ ] 36-45[ ] 46-55[ ] 56-60[ ]

Sex: Male [ ] Female [ ]

Qualification: Diploma [ ] Bed [ ] MA [ ] MPhil [ ] PhD [ ]

Position in school:

Deputy Principal [ ]

Head of department [ ] department Guidance counseling teacher [ ]

Academic teacher [ ]

Assistant teacher [ ]

Number of years of teaching experience:

Less than one year [ ] 2-5 years [ ] 6-10 years [ ] 11-20 years [ ] 21 – 30 years

Length of service under the current principal

Less than one year [ ] 2-5 years [ ] 6-10 years [ ] over 10 years [ ]
Part II Teachers’ Rating of Principal

Read each item carefully. Think about how frequently your principal engages in the behaviour described by the item. Tick in one of the boxes following the item to show the answer you have selected.

Part III: Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)

Please rate your level of agreement with each statement on the following scale by ticking as appropriate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher income is adequate for normal expenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When instructions are inadequate, I do what I think is best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Insufficient income keeps me from living the way I want to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My immediate supervisor turns one teacher against another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No one tells me that I am a good teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The work of a teacher consists of routine activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am not getting ahead in my present teaching position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Working conditions in my school can be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If I could earn what I earn now, I would take any job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor offers suggestions to improve my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Teaching provides for a secure future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I receive full recognition for my successful teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I get along well with my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The administration in my school does not clearly define its policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Working conditions in my school are comfortable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Teaching provides me the opportunity to help my students learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I like the people with whom I work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Teaching provides limited opportunities for advancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>My students respect me as a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I am afraid of losing my teaching job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Teaching involves too many clerical tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor does not back me up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teaching is very interesting work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Working conditions in my school could not be worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Teaching discourages originality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>The administration in my school communicates its policies well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I never feel secure in my teaching job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Teaching does not provide me the chance to develop new methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor treats everyone equitably.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My colleagues stimulate me to do better work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My students come to class inadequately prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Teaching provides an opportunity for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor watches me closely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I am responsible for planning my daily lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Physical surroundings in my school are unpleasant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I do not have the freedom to use my judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I am well paid in proportion to my ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>My colleagues are highly critical of one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I do have responsibility for my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45.</strong></td>
<td>My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46.</strong></td>
<td>Teaching provides me an opportunity to be my own boss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47.</strong></td>
<td>My immediate supervisor provides assistance for improving instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48.</strong></td>
<td>I do not get cooperation from the people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49.</strong></td>
<td>My immediate supervisor is not afraid to delegate work to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50.</strong></td>
<td>Behaviour problems interfere with my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51.</strong></td>
<td>Teaching encourages me to be creative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52.</strong></td>
<td>My immediate supervisor is not willing to listen to suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>53.</strong></td>
<td>Teacher income is barely enough to live on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54.</strong></td>
<td>I am indifferent toward teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55.</strong></td>
<td>The work of a teacher is very pleasant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56.</strong></td>
<td>I receive too many meaningless instructions from my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>57.</strong></td>
<td>I dislike the people with whom I work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58.</strong></td>
<td>I receive too little recognition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>59.</strong></td>
<td>Teaching provides a good opportunity for advancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60.</strong></td>
<td>My interests are similar to those of my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61.</strong></td>
<td>I am not responsible for my actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor makes available the material I need to do my best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Working conditions in my school are good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor makes me feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I prefer to have others assume responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Teacher income is less than I deserve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I go out of my way to help my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I try to be aware of the policies of my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>When I teach a good lesson, my immediate supervisor notices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Teaching provides me with financial security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor praises good teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>I am not interested in the policies of my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I get along well with my students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Pay compares with similar jobs in other school districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>My colleagues seem unreasonable to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You.
### Appendix IV: Scoring Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership behaviours</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>1+4+6+12 + 18 + 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>5+9+13+15 + 19 + 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>2+7+10+17 + 20 + 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented</td>
<td>3+8+11 + 14 + 16 +21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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