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ABSTRACT

High quality teaching staff is the cornerstone of a successful educational system. To attract and retain quality teaching staff, sessional papers 12 of 2012 and 14 of 2012 urged head teachers to establish strategies for ensuring high teacher job satisfaction in schools. In Catholic private schools, research has raised concern over low teacher job satisfaction levels resulting to high teacher turnover rates of between 15% and 25% annually. This research aimed at establishing the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. The objectives of the study were to determine the level of teacher job satisfaction, the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices, and the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction components. The study was guided by the path goal theory. Path goal theory recognizes that the actions of a leader (head teacher) have direct influence on the subordinates (teachers). Mixed methods research approach was used. The mixed method approaches combine quantitative and qualitative data in a single study. This study adopted the convergent parallel design. In this design quantitative and qualitative research is conducted simultaneously in a single study. The target population was 74 head teachers and 1184 teachers in the 74 Catholic private primary schools in Nairobi and Nakuru dioceses. Stratified sampling was used to categorize schools into two strata, the urban and rural schools. From each stratum, 40% of the head teachers and 20% of teachers were sampled. Simple random sampling was used to sample two teachers from each of the 6 teaching subjects. The study sampled 31 head teachers and 248 teachers. The research instruments were questionnaires for head teachers and teachers, interview guide for head teachers and focus group discussion guide for teachers. Content validity was determined by seeking expert judgment from specialist in Educational Management. Cronbach alpha was used to ascertain reliability of the instruments. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically while Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study established that the nature of work, coworkers, supervision and communication had highest levels of job satisfaction. Dissatisfaction emanated from pay, contingency rewards and fridge benefits. Supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices had the highest influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Head teachers’ leadership practices had insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with pay, nature of work, communication and coworkers. Teachers’ job satisfaction component that was highly influenced by head teachers’ leadership practices was supervision. Directive leadership practices had no significant influence on any job satisfaction component. The study recommends that the Catholic institutions formulate by-laws to regulate school processes for-example teachers’ pay, promotions and fringe benefits. In addition induction courses and regular in servicing of head teachers is recommended. The study suggests further study be conducted on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction in more Catholic private schools and tertiary institutions. Further, a study on the influence of the school managers on teachers’ job satisfaction in Catholic private institutions is recommended.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the background to the study, statement of the problem, the objectives of the study, research questions and hypothesis. It also provides the purpose of the study, its significance, limitations and delimitations. The chapter also presents the theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definition of key terms.

1.2 Background to the Study

The quest for effective school leadership has over time provoked a wide range of propositions and views. It has also elicited a variety of descriptions. Some scholars describe an effective school leader as a person who creates an atmosphere conducive to learning (Grisson & Loeb, 2011). Others are of the opinion that effective school heads are concerned with the promotion of staff development. Effective leaders are said to be ardent in supervising and protecting teachers’ instructional time (Edmonds, 1979; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Effective school leadership involves a combination of multiple leadership approaches. A report by the Wallace Foundation (2013) on school leadership says that effective school leader’s major concern is to shape the school vision for academic success and create a climate conducive to education. The effective leaders also promote leadership in others, improve instruction and manage people, data and processes. In summary effective school heads are meticulous in both instructional and administrative duties.
According to Eliophotou (2014), effective school heads influence and inspire their teachers by providing meaning and purpose of the teachers. Exceptional performances are recognized and rewarded accordingly. Heads of schools also challenge their teachers constantly to be more creative and critical in their service delivery. In addition, effective school heads are role models of the expected behaviour in the school. They therefore create school cultures that promote improvement and growth through word and deed. Ultimately, they command the trust and confidence of their teachers.

The school head is usually held accountable for all that takes place within the school environment. Leithwood & Sun (2009) assert that the school heads influence teachers’ expectations and standards. They have the power to influence the way teachers think, plan and conduct their teaching and learning practices, self-efficacy, commitment, a sense of well-being and job satisfaction. The head teacher facilitates teacher’s organizational loyalty and trust, all of which account for their job satisfaction. In improving the schools, effective school heads diagnose individual and organizational needs. For optimal teachers’ performance, they select appropriate strategies to enhance the improvement of schools. This is done in well-thought-out combinations and sequences ensuring that chosen strategies reinforce and support each other.

Successful school heads, define their values and vision, raise expectations and set direction. Consequently, they build trust and confidence of the teachers. They do this by reshaping the conditions for teaching and learning, restructuring parts of the organization, redesigning leadership roles and responsibilities. In addition, they enrich the curriculum, enhance teacher quality and the quality of teaching and learning. The head teachers strive to create internal collaboration and strong relationships outside the
school community. The sequencing, timing, ordering and combination of the strategies differ from school to school, but the visions and values are similar (Day, Sammons, Hopkins, Harris, Leithwood, Qing & Eleanor, 2010).

A study by Hallinger (2003) revealed that school heads spend most of their time supervising, coordinating and evaluating curricula and instruction. They also build a conducive teaching and learning environment; by facilitating teachers’ professional development and by framing and communicating school goals. In addition, they create strong linkages within and outside the school community. Therefore, effective leadership in school is geared towards facilitating instruction and learning in schools through involvement of all stakeholders (Grisson & Loab, 2011).

When examining the instructional duties, Hallinger & Murphy (1985) divided them into three broad classifications namely: defining the school mission, managing the instructional programme and promoting a positive school culture. The head teacher is therefore assigned the responsibility of ensuring that the school mission exists and it is communicated to the staff. The head teacher also listens attentively and responds promptly to questions and concerns of staff members. He or she is accessible, provides help when needed and appreciates and recognizes the teachers. In addition, the head teacher demonstrates respect for and acceptance of diverse perspectives, encourages creativity, provides required teaching and learning resources and materials. Moreover, school heads offer constructive criticism and encourage teachers’ professional development (Lyons, 2010).
Lyons (2010) study in New York middle schools revealed that teachers in schools where head teachers worked closely with them, were more satisfied. Thus, the study recommended the establishment of structures which provided for head teachers and teachers collaborative working environment. Being the overall leader in a school, the head teacher should provide guidance and advisory services in all school matters and induct new teachers into the school system. Therefore, effective school leadership implies that the head teacher is largely involved in modeling, mentoring and monitoring the expected behaviour (Southworth, 2009).

Through a meta analysis of schools in United states of America, Marzano, Waters & Mc Nutty (2005) found that the head teacher had the responsibility of setting the school direction, climate, encouraging high levels of professionalism and morale among the teachers. DiPaola & Hoy (2008) concured with Marzano et al. (2005) that setting directions, developing people, engaging in collaboration and using data and research are indicators of an effective head teacher.

After examining the instructional and administrative responsibilities entrusted to a school leader in Ghana, Hupati (2009) concluded that school leadership is a complex and multi-dimensional range of activities that a school head assumes or delegates to others to promote quality teaching and learning in a school. A research by Wango & Gatere (2012), when they examined the responsibilities vested on the head teachers in Kenya, they established that the head teacher was wholly responsible for all activities in a school. These activities include curriculum implementation, human resource leadership, student welfare, establishment of effective communication and financial resource leadership.
1.2.1 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction

The school heads influence every aspect of school environment. Effective head teachers recognize that they are accountable for the psychological, physiological and emotional wellbeing of all members of the school community. The head teacher ensures teachers wellbeing is maintained by creating amicable working relationships especially between them and the teachers, and encouraging healthy relationships among teachers.

Research has revealed that teachers trust in the school contributes to a great extent on teacher job satisfaction. Bas (2012) examined the relationship between performances of school principals and organizational trust perceptions of teachers in Nigde, Turkey elementary schools during 2009/2010 academic year. The study revealed that leadership in a school was associated with teachers’ trust of the school organization and their job satisfaction. The study further revealed that formulating the school vision, managing instructional program and managing conducive teaching and learning environment determine the trust and by extension teacher job satisfaction.

Bas (2012) findings were reinforced through a wider study conducted by Rew (2013) in twenty one countries spread through East and Southeast Asia, Europe, Central and South America, Middle East, and Oceania which found that by managing a conducive teaching and learning environment, and teacher collaboration one instills a sense of belonging. Teachers are constantly empowered to believe in their effectiveness. A teacher who believes he or she is more effective is more likely to experience greater job satisfaction.
One overriding aspect of an effective school leader is engaging in consultation while making decisions. The importance of teacher consultation was revealed through a study of more than 50,000 Chicago public school teachers by Allensworth, Ponisciak, & Mazzeo (2009). The study found that teachers were more likely to stay in schools where they had more influence on school decisions. Allensworth et al. (2009) findings correlated Ladd’s (2009) study in North Carolina on teachers’ perceptions of their working conditions. In addition to teachers influence in the schools, the study established that teachers’ perception of the school leadership ability to improve their working conditions predicted teachers’ job satisfaction. Such perceptions determined their intentions to remain or leave their schools or change careers.

A study by Murat (2012) in Turkey revealed that head teachers’ actions had the power to positively or negatively influence teachers’ attitudes towards their work. They did this by redesigning work contexts to match teachers’ expectations in relation to equity, justice, pedagogy, organizational efficiency and interpersonal relations. They also influenced their self-concept and self-image. Such actions resulted to either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction among teachers. The findings of Allensworth, et al. (2009), Ladd (2009) concurred with Adeyemi and Adu (2013) study in Nigeria which concluded that the more head teachers’ shared authority with staff by delegating authority the better the level of job satisfaction among the teachers. Consequently, they vehemently concluded that teachers’ job satisfaction was indeed a function of the school head.

A study in Zimbabwe by Masuku (2011) established that amicable working relationships between school heads and teachers and among teachers reduced possible
stress and tension caused by unfavorable microeconomic and macroeconomic environment. To bridge the gap between head teachers and teacher, the head teacher collaborates and works with and through teachers to achieve schools vision and goals. Teachers are motivated and satisfied in their jobs when they perceive that their ideas and contributions to the school are appreciated. The head teachers’ influence therefore extends well beyond the school. The head teacher serves as a link between the school community and the outside community. The effective head teacher is consequently called upon to steer the school towards excellence by creating a conducive working environment both inside and outside the school.

1.2.2 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in Kenya

Effective school leadership provides a synergy through which teachers aspirations and job satisfactions are enhanced (Gitaka, 2014). Poipoi & Sirma (2010) conducted a study in Busia, Kenya, the objectives of the study were to find out factors that influenced teachers to join the teaching profession, and the strategies used by school leadership to motivate them. The study established that teachers were more satisfied in schools with good working environment. They also expressed satisfaction in schools with improved terms and conditions of service. In addition, the study found that providing opportunities for growth and development through training and promotion are effective and efficient job satisfiers.

Head teachers effective school leadership has therefore been a concern in Kenya. In response to the challenge of ineffective head teachers’ leadership practices, National
Committee on Education Policies (NCOEP) recommended the establishment of Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) formally (Kenya Education Staff Institute, KESI) set up in 1981. The institute was mandated to offer in-service courses to head teachers. Initially the institute offered in-service courses to primary school head teachers (Gitaka, 2014), indicating the dire need for effective school leadership at primary school level. A task force formed by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology in 2011 found that a major challenge facing education was high teacher turnover especially from mid to higher job levels. Schools reported high teacher turnover occasioned by either changing careers or schools. The task force noted a glaring evidence of teacher job dissatisfaction. Evidence gathered indicated that staff/teachers management from the school to national levels played a major role in promoting teachers’ job dissatisfaction. The report went on to explain that staff needs were not met. This led to low job interest, morale, motivation and ultimately job dissatisfaction. (MOEST, 2012).

The questionable levels of teacher job satisfaction were explicitly addressed in sessional paper No. 12 of 2012 on Aligning Education and Training to the Constitution of Kenya (2010), Kenya Vision 2030 and Beyond and sessional paper no 14 of 2012 on reforming education training sectors in Kenya. The sessional papers concurred with Ministry of Education Science and Technology findings that low teacher motivation and job dissatisfaction led to high teacher turn over. The sessional papers went on to explain that low levels of teacher job satisfaction threatened the quality of education. They recommended that measures had to be put in place both at the institutional and national
levels to curtail the high attrition rates, which apparently were more rampant among the more experienced teachers (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

A study by Mainga (2012), equally established disturbing job attrition levels of 30 to 40% annually in Kasarani division, Nairobi. Teachers cited job satisfaction as the prime factor leading to job attrition. School working environment, work load, salary and school leadership were the main determinants of teacher job satisfaction. It is worth noting that out of the four factors leading to job dissatisfaction, three were attributed to the school leadership. Consequently sessional papers No. 12 of 2012 and 14 of 2012 called on policy makers and school heads to put in place strategies for addressing teacher motivation and job satisfaction at the school and national levels (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

Concern on leadership influence has equally been questioned in private schools. Makokha’s (2014) study in schools offering British curriculum in Nairobi, Kenya revealed that most teachers were not satisfied with their jobs. Teachers expressed dissatisfaction with school policies on career progression, promotion, reward and management which are primary roles of the school head. Teachers in these schools also expressed dissatisfaction with the school’s working conditions which squarely depended on the head teacher. An earlier study by Mueni (2005), in Catholic private secondary schools in Nakuru found that school heads were engrossed in managing instructional processes while teachers’ needs were put into oblivion. Although the structures and learning seemed to be in place, teachers demotivation and job dissatisfaction was evident. Consequently, the schools recorded high teacher turnover rates. Similar phenomenon was experienced in Meru Catholic Diocese, through a study
by Njeru (2009) in Catholic Church managed secondary schools. The study established that failure of school heads to create favourable working environment coupled with lack of teacher motivation and incentives accounted for massive teacher turnover experienced in the schools, a clear indication of job dissatisfaction.

Information provided in the background has revealed undeniable consensus that teachers are the cornerstone of a successful educational system. Attracting and retaining high caliber of teachers is a primary requisite for all learning institutions. Although the government has put in place measures of increasing teacher job satisfaction through salary and other benefits increments, schools continued to report cases of high teacher attrition rates, bringing to question the levels of teacher job satisfaction (MOEST, 2012).

It is evident from the background review that school heads in private schools have more powers to formulate and implement school policies. However, it is disturbing to note that even in these schools teacher job satisfaction levels are questionable. Notably, most of the research in Catholic private schools has concentrated on secondary schools, creating a need to focus on primary schools which is the foundational base for learning. The explored background has therefore motivated the investigation of the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private primary schools.
1.3 Statement of the Problem

Studies from around the globe have continually re-affirmed the fact that quality education delivery is synonymous to quality and satisfied teaching staff. In Kenya, teachers’ job satisfaction has been called to question through recent task force reports and sessional papers Nos. 12 of 2012 and 14 of 2014. These policy documents have expressed concern over the evident lack of job interest, low morale and motivation leading to high teacher attrition rates and lack of commitment among the teachers. It is however conspicuous that there are no studies which indicate the extent to which head teachers’ leadership practices have influenced teacher job satisfaction levels as identified by the policy documents. Studies and annual reports from Catholic private schools have likewise indicated troublesome teacher job satisfaction levels and turn-over rates of between 15% and 25% annually. Some teachers have been discontinued for lack of job commitment and non-performance while others have gone for greener pastures, bringing to question their job satisfaction status. Head teachers in Catholic private schools are solely responsible for teachers’ wellbeing, with little interference from the school management. There is a need to investigate the extent to which head teachers’ leadership practices have influenced the manifested teacher job satisfaction levels. Most studies so far reviewed have relied on the quantitative approach. Consequently, the studies do not provide an in-depth examination of the variables which would be provided by a mixed method approach.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction in Catholic private primary schools, with a view to
informing educational leadership practice in Catholic schools in particular, and Kenya in general.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To establish the influence of head teachers’ directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools

2. To determine the teachers’ job satisfaction levels in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools

3. To determine the influence on head teachers’ leadership practices on different components of teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools

1.6 Research Questions

The research questions that guided the study were:

1. How do the head teachers’ in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools practice directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership?

2. What is the level of teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools?
1.7 Study Hypothesis

The following hypothesis guided the study.

1. H01: Directive practice has no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic primary schools

2. H02: Supportive leadership practice has no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic primary schools

3. H03: Participative leadership practice has no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic primary schools

4. H04: Achievement leadership practice has no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic primary schools

5. H05: Head teachers leadership practice have no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic primary schools

6. H06: There is no significant difference in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on different components of teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic primary schools

7. H07: There are no significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in urban and urban schools in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic primary schools

The use of both research questions and hypothesis was appropriate for the study since the research was qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative research required an in depth inquiry of the variables which were guided by research questions. Research questions also facilitated the understanding of head teachers’ leadership practices and teachers’ job satisfaction characteristics through means and frequencies. Research hypothesis
guided the determination and the magnitude of the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction by the use of inferential statistics.

1.8  **Significance of the Study**

Establishing the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction could be significant in the following ways:

1. The finding that teachers’ job satisfaction was mainly influenced by head teachers’ supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices may provide Catholic Education Department (CED) with a basis for formulating future policies on school leadership in Catholic schools.

2. The Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST) may be provided with research evidence on the aspects of leadership practices that have a positive influence on teacher job satisfaction. This could guide the formulation of policies on school leadership.

3. Quality Assurance and Standards (QAS) Directorate may be guided on most effective head teachers’ leadership practices that may positively influence teacher job satisfaction. These practices could be reinforced when conducting in service courses and seminars for head teachers.

4. Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) could benefit from the findings during the preparation of its modules for in-service training for school administrators. In this case the study will provide the most salient leadership practices that influence teacher job satisfaction that could be included in the training modules.
5. Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) may be guided on themes to emphasize on effective school leadership when making curriculum for teacher training institutions.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

This study assumed that:

1. The head teachers were wholly responsible for the practices of leadership practices in the schools.

2. The head teachers and teachers would provide accurate, valid and reliable information on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction.

3. The sampled head teachers would respond to their questionnaires without giving their deputies or anyone else to do it on their behalf.

1.10 Limitations of the Study

Limitations are potential weaknesses in a study in which the researcher has little or no control over (Marlin, 2011). Limitations therefore affect the application or interpretation of the results. The limitations of this study included:

1. The inability to cover all regions of the study adequately. This is because of insecurity experienced in some parts of Nakuru Catholic Diocese for-example East Pokot and Baringo areas which are under the jurisdiction of Nakuru Diocese. To address the limitation the researcher liaised with head teachers of the affected regions to determine the best time to go there.
2. The inability of the researcher to cover all leadership practices of school leadership. This is because there are quite diverse practices to be covered in one study. To address the limitation, the researcher was guided by the leadership practices advocated by the path goal theory and the salient leadership practices recommended by prominent school leadership scholars.

3. Another limitation was resistance from some head teachers to allow research assistants in their schools. This meant the researcher herself had to administer the research instruments.

1.11 Delimitations of the Study

Delimitations of a study are the characteristics that define the scope or boundaries of the study (Marlin S. 2011). The study was delimited to;

1. The school head teachers of Catholic private primary schools in Nakuru and Nairobi Dioceses. The school heads are vested with the responsibility of carrying out leadership duties in the schools. Therefore, they were in the best position to provide answers as to what they perceive as elements of effective leadership practices, and identify the practices they perceive to influence teacher job satisfaction.

2. The teachers because they are directly affected by the actions and decisions of the head teacher, that bring about job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. They could accurately articulate and identify the leadership practices that influence their job satisfaction.
1.12 Theoretical Framework

The Path goal theory developed by House (1971) is one of the theories that guided this study. According to the path goal theory, an effective leader considers the needs of the followers and creates a friendly atmosphere to work in. House proposed four approaches to leadership namely: directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership. In directive leadership, the leader assumes that the followers do not know what is expected of them, and therefore provides them with specific directions (Robin, 2012; Luthans, 2011). Directive leadership is important when the followers are involved in ambiguous tasks. The ability to perform through the guidance of the leader increases their job satisfaction (Vecchio, 2006).

In supportive leadership, the leader is friendly and appreciative of the followers’ efforts. When leaders offer support especially if the tasks allocated are frustrating, job satisfaction is increased among the followers. In participative leadership, the leader makes consultations when making decisions which affect the followers. When decisions are eventually made, their suggestions are taken into consideration. Therefore, followers are satisfied that their ideas are appreciated. In achievement oriented leadership, the leader sets challenging goals for the followers and shows confidence in the ability of the followers to attain these goals. The satisfaction emanates from the leaders’ recognition of the ability of the followers to attain the goals of challenging tasks (Vecchio, 2006; Luthans, 2011). In all approaches to leadership, the prescribed goals are achieved through the leaders’ ability to give clear guidelines, rules and procedures for getting the work done (Robin, 2012).
Path goal theory provides a framework for the leader’s performance of leadership functions by removing any workplace obstacle that hinders goal attainment. In effective leadership, the four approaches to leadership can be used by the same leader in different situations (Robin, 2012; Vecchio, 2006; Luthans, 2011).

Path goal theory has been criticized for placing a great deal of responsibility on leadership. It has also been blamed for promoting a culture of dependency among the followers. In addition, it has been criticized for failing to recognize the ability of the followers. Despite the criticisms, path goal theory is grounded on the fact that leaders’ actions have direct influence on followers’ job satisfaction and performance of assigned duties and responsibilities (Northhouse, 2010).

The path goal theory was most suitable for this study because; first, it helped the researcher to acknowledge the school leader, who is the head teacher and the most important factor in a school organization. Secondly, it proposed that the leader should provide directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership to the followers (Vijayaragavan, 2008). In providing such leadership, the head teacher therefore defines the school goals and clarifies the direction which the school should take. The head teacher also eliminates obstacles and provides support to the followers who are mainly the teachers. The head teacher selects appropriate approaches for the school while at the same time focusing on teacher job satisfaction (Hallinger, 2003).
1.13 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework illustrates the researcher’s conceptualization of both the independent and dependent variables (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2009). The illustration in Figure 1.1 shows the interrelations between the variables of the study.

**Independent variables**

**Head teachers’ leadership practices**

- **DIRECTIVE**
  - Provide performance standards
  - Clarify rules and procedures
  - Monitoring teachers performance

- **SUPPORTIVE**
  - Considering teachers needs
  - Creating friendly work environment

- **PARTICIPATIVE**
  - Consulting teachers
  - Valuing teachers opinions in making decisions

- **ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTED**
  - Encouraging teachers to set high goals
  - Elevating teachers standards of excellence
  - Expressing confidence in teachers ability to perform

**Intervening variables**

- **School governance**
- **Professional training**
- **Teachers’ motivation**
- **School policies**
- **Employment policies**
- **Job security**

**Dependent variable**

**Teachers’ job satisfaction**

- supervision
- Working conditions
- Pay
- Fringe benefits
- Contingent Rewards
- Communication
- Promotion
- Coworkers
- Nature of work

**Figure 1.1: Influence of head teachers' leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction.**
The independent variables in the study are the head teachers’ leadership practices. The head teacher steers the whole school community by performing several leadership practices. In this study, the leadership practices have been grouped into four broad classifications. The leadership classifications are directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. In directive leadership, the head teacher provides teachers with performance standards while at the same time giving clear deadlines of completing allocated tasks and the expected levels of performance. The head teacher also clarifies rules and procedures and often reminds the teachers to follow the set rules and procedures and actively monitors teachers’ performance by providing frequent feedback on their performance. Further, in directive leadership the head teacher educates teachers on methods of improving performance and rewards teachers who achieve set targets. In supportive leadership, the head teacher considers teachers personal needs and is always careful not to hurt teachers’ personal feelings. The head teachers creates friendly work environment through helping teachers solve problems that hinder performance as well as by being approachable and patient with teachers. In addition the head teacher gives special treats to teachers, recognizes and celebrates teachers’ achievements.

In participative leadership, the head teacher regularly consults teachers before making decisions that affect them, through consultations head teachers are enabled to identify problems faced by teachers either individually or as a group. Further, the head teacher seeks for suggestions on tasks to be performed and how to perform those tasks. The head teacher also values opinions by first listening receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions, either formally in official meetings or informally during interactions at different times. In achievement oriented leadership the head teacher informs teachers
of the highest performance expectations and challenges teachers to exceed the performance targets. The head teacher facilitates the achievement of the targets by providing teachers with detailed work plans and frequently reviewing teachers’ progress in achieving set targets. The head teacher also propels the teachers continued improvement of performance by organizing teachers into work groups. In achievement oriented leadership the head teacher boosts teachers’ morale to exceed their set targets by expressing confidence in teachers’ ability to achieve set goals and allowing teachers to work without much supervision. The practices of these school leadership practices has direct influence on variables advanced by Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959), namely the motivator and hygiene factors of job satisfaction. These are the intervening variables of job satisfaction which include how they perceive supervision, working conditions, pay satisfaction as well as contingent rewards.

1.14 Operational Definition of Key Terms

This section gives a definition of the significant terms as used in the context of the study.

**Catholic private Primary School:**

An institution of learning that offers basic education as defined in Basic Education Act 2012 which are owned by the Catholic Church. The Catholic education policy refers to these schools as Catholic private schools

**Head teacher:**

The person vested with the responsibility of coordinating the process of teaching and learning in a primary school.
**Leadership practices:**
A series of activities that a head teacher performs to guide and facilitate the achievement of school goals.

**Job satisfaction:**
A feeling of inner gratification with a particular job.

**Teacher job satisfaction:**
A feeling of inner gratification that a teacher experiences with various facets of his or her job.

**Urban Schools:**
These are schools located in major towns within the two Catholic Dioceses of Nairobi and Nakuru.

**Rural schools:**
Schools mainly located at the periphery of towns and in villages in the two dioceses.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The literature review is organized under the following themes; the concept of leadership and school leadership, teacher job satisfaction, influence of school leadership on teachers job satisfaction, directive leadership and job satisfaction, supportive leadership and job satisfaction, participative leadership and job satisfaction, achievement oriented leadership and job satisfaction. Finally, a summary of the reviewed literature.

2.2 The Concept of Leadership

The concept of leadership has been in existence for centuries. Its origin is traced to the works of Aristotle. According to Aristotle leadership is a deliberate effort by leaders to respond to the ethos (character), logos (reason) and pathos (emotions) of the followers (Shay, 2000). Interest in the study of leadership increased during the early twentieth century. Scholars studied and classified leadership in various ways. Northhouse (2010) observed that there are already over sixty five (65) classifications of leadership.

One of the earliest leadership classifications in the 20th century was the trait approach (Draft, 2008). Although widely used in the 1930s and 1940s, the approach traces its origin from the ancient Greek and Romans. The focus behind trait approach was the notion that leaders were born and not made. Some scholars referred the traits approach as great-man theory. This is because its focus was on qualities and characteristics possessed by great social, political and military leaders. Scholars have often cited the
qualities possessed by Gandhi and Lincoln as examples of leaders classified as being endowed with special traits (Cole, 2004).

Cole (2004) continues to argue that behavioural approach to leadership was developed as a critique of the trait approach between the 1940s and 1950s. Behavioral approach to leadership argued that great leaders were made and not born. According to behavioral approach, leadership is considered as an observable process which determines the behaviours associated with the leaders’ ideas. The leader-subordinate relationship is characterized by mutual trust, respect and two way communication. The approach focuses on the functions and responsibilities of leadership, the actions of the leader and the nature of the group(s). It assumes that leadership skills can be learned, developed and perfected.

Koontz & Weihrich (2009) identified three categories of leadership behaviours that facilitated job satisfaction among the followers. The first leadership behaviour was task performance. The leader was concerned with the quality and quantity of output, accuracy, speeds and procedures. The leader facilitates the performance of tasks by providing the required resources. In the second leadership behaviour the leader focuses on satisfaction of group members or team maintenance needs. This leads to a feeling of comfort and members feel appreciated. Lastly, the leader allows followers’ participation in decision making. The leader values the ideas and contributions of the followers. Embracing the three categories of leadership behaviours was associated with powerful teams.
The contingency or situational approaches emerged between 1960s and 1970s. The contingency or situational Approaches focus on the situational factors which influence leadership. The proponents of contingency or situational approaches argued that the leadership style adopted by leaders interacts with characteristics of the situation to determine leadership effectiveness (Lussier, 2010). Draft (2008) affirms that a leader has to make certain considerations about the existing situation before determining the leadership behaviour to adopt. The leader’s behaviour varies from situation to situation and therefore leaders should analyze the situation and decide on the right leadership style.

Addressing the concept of contingency approach to leadership, Cole (2004) explained that a variety of forces determined the leadership behaviour. These forces include personal forces such as the leadership inclinations; forces of the followers such as their willingness to be influenced and the forces in the situation in which the group finds itself in terms of the activities and time pressure. Contingency/situational approaches are prescriptive. They inform the leader what to do in different situations and what not to do in other situations. The stress of contingency approaches is on the situation prevailing at the time and not limited to personality. An effective leader responds to their subordinates’ needs and change their styles as need arises (Leithwood and Reihl, 2003).

Another approach to leadership was path goal (House, 1971). According to the path goal approach, the main function of a leader is to set and clarify goals with the subordinates, and then help them find the best path for achieving the goals by removing foreseen obstacles (Robin, 2012). According to House (1971) cited in Koontz and Weihrich (2009) the leader assists the followers to attain their goals and provides
necessary direction and support. They therefore perceive desired goals and embark on making it possible for their followers to achieve them.

Vijayaraga (2008) observes that the proponents of the Path goal approach advanced that it leads to four types of leadership approaches, first, directive leadership in which the leader is expected to define tasks and responsibilities, set performance targets, clarify rules and regulations, provide guidance and monitor performance. The second leadership approach is the supportive leadership in which the leader is expected to establish healthy interpersonal relationships with the group. He or she should strive to understand and share in their aspirations and feelings while at the same time showing concern for the welfare of the group members and promoting group cohesiveness. The participative leadership was the third leadership approach where the leader is expected to keep the followers informed on relevant tasks, goals and situations. The leader is also expected to involve the followers in making decisions, which implies consulting them often. Finally, the achievement-oriented leadership advocates for the leader to develop and utilize skills and talents of group members. Such leadership gives the followers freedom to be innovative in performing their duties.

The path goal approach urges that by clarifying the paths or the means by which followers perform their jobs, and reducing frustrating obstacles, the leader increases the followers’ job satisfaction (Vijayaragan, 2008). From the 1970s there was a leadership paradigm shift towards an integrative approach (Luisser, 2010). Scholars viewed leadership as an amalgamation of several approaches, that is, the trait, behavioural and contingency/situational approaches. They argued that a single approach would not
adequately explain the leader-follower relationships, a combination of traits and
dbehaviours accounted for successful leadership. It was observed that same leadership
behaviours had different effects on followers, depending on the situation (Luisser,
2010).

Most classifications of leadership identify two functions namely, exercising influence
and setting directions (Leithwood & Reihl, 2003). The leader influences how followers
interpret events, chooses the group’s objectives, organizes work activities and maintains
relationships within the group. The leader motivates the followers and strives to
promote overall job satisfaction. Northhouse (2010), however, singled out influence as
the most commonly accepted component of leadership. He went ahead to elaborate that
influence is a process in which one individual influences others towards attainment of
group or organizational goals. Lussier (2008) concurred with Northhouse and
concluded that leadership can only exist where there is a leader and followers. The
outcome of leadership is a purposeful and goal directed change in followers’ behavior.
Northhouse (2010) brings out the fact that expert knowledge, values, structure, and
skills are essential for a leader. The leader is called upon to inspire the followers to work
together to achieve set school goals. A leader’s focus is to get work done through
people.

Building vision and setting directions is one of the core functions of successful
leadership. Leaders have therefore to mobilize and work with others to achieve the
organization’s goals. It is important to note that leaders do not merely impose goals on
followers, but work with others to create a shared sense of purpose and direction.
Leaders also work through and with other people to establish the conditions that enable others to be effective. Therefore, leadership affects the organization’s goals either directly or indirectly (Leithwood and Reihl, 2003). Karp (2013) viewed leadership as a social process where someone assumes leadership by taking and earning a right to lead. Uncertain situations in organizations create a need for leadership and provide a context for leadership. A leader is therefore not a title but a process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individuals and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives. Some characteristics of leadership include: developing the organizational vision, setting direction and strategic thinking (Yulk, 2006).

Effective leaders exhibit exceptional abilities and high principles of ethical and moral conduct. The followers are influenced by the leaders’ behaviour (Lussier, 2010). They provide a vision for their organization and prioritize subordinates’ needs as compared to their own needs. Such leaders inspire subordinates by offering appealing visions of the upcoming circumstances, enriching subordinates’ aims and stimulating passion and optimism. These leaders motivate a team spirit among the subordinates, convey clear expectations and express dedication to objectives and a collective vision (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Involvement according to Amin, Shah & Tatlah (2013) is a major ingredient of successful leadership. The leader strives to have a consensus on the organizational goals and the procedures of attaining such objectives. The leader seeks the followers’ agreement on the aims of the organization, rewards for achievement of those aims and compensation when performance of the objectives is fulfilled. Failure to reach a consensus, coercion is used (Northouse, 2010).
Northhouse (2010) asserted that an effective leader strives to provide conducive working environment while at the same time recognizing the unique potential of each member. To accomplish assigned tasks, the leader inspires creativity and innovativeness and encourages them not only to challenge their viewpoints, but those of the leaders and the institution. Effective leaders understand the work that needs to be done and can relate to the people who help to do the job. A great leader makes a conscious effort to understand the subordinates, how they feel, their thought processes, and device the most effective way to influence them. Effective leaders operate under three levels namely: their visible behaviour, their conscious thought and their values, assumptions, beliefs, and expectations about the way the world either is or should be (Clawson, 2009).

According to Osland, Turner, Kolb, & Rubin (2007), a leader has to build an organizational foundation of purpose, vision and core values by which his and her subordinates operate under. The leader takes on the mantle of teacher, mentor, and steward who empowers people to create new mental models of reality. Mental models are the deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take actions. Meadows (2008) referred to mental models as the mindsets of the organization of society. Successful leaders exhibit common personal traits that explain their effectiveness. Those traits are: open mindedness and willingness to learn from others; flexibility; persistence particularly in pursuit of high expectations and achievement for all; resilience; and optimism (Leithwood, Harris and Hopkins, 2008).
2.3 School Leadership

School leadership involves complex and multidimensional tasks that the leader either performs or delegates to others to promote teaching and learning in the school (Hupati, 2009). According to Leithwood & Reihl (2003), building a vision, setting standards, providing of direction, setting directions are main functions of an effective school leader. It is however important to note that effective school leaders do not impose goals on the staff, instead they work with teachers to create a shared sense of purpose and direction for the school. They establish conditions that facilitate teacher’s effectiveness. Commonly agreed elements of an effective leader include Setting directions, redesigning the school and developing people (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe and Meyerson, 2005).

One of the main activities when setting directions for the school is to develop shared goals and visions for the school. Locke & Latham (2002) defined a goal as the objective or aim of an action. A goal therefore refocuses on a persons’ purpose. Goals guide the magnitude of performances, quality standards required and rate of performance of activities in the institution. Bandura (1997) put it clearly that goal setting affects our level of motivation, our beliefs about what we are capable of learning or the level at which we are capable of performing, and our own self-evaluation and therefore our job satisfaction.

According to Robinson et al (2008) goals in a school setting motivate and satisfy when people affected understand and value the goals. The goals should therefore be specific and unambiguous and they can be easily assessed and evaluated; people should perceive
their capacity to meet the goals. This implies that they believe current resources can sufficiently steer the achievement of the goals and are confident they would be facilitated and supported to achieve the goals. The school leader therefore does not only ensure that the vision is clearly articulated, shared, understood and acted upon by all, but also demonstrates the vision and values in everyday work and practice. The leader likewise motivates and works with others usually staff members to create a shared culture and positive climate.

According to Onyango (2001), the school leader sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and the morale of teachers. Any success or failure is attributed to the school principal. Onyangos’ view supports the assertion that the head teacher is responsible for teachers’ motivation and job satisfaction. According to Zafar, Umar, Rahmat & Javed (2009) school leadership is based on two assumptions, first, the head teacher is the main instructional leader and secondly the head teacher implements the leadership functions that are sometimes shared and sometimes not shared. Hallinger & Murphy (1985) identified three main dimensions of leadership which he termed as instructional leadership, they include defining the schools’ mission, managing the instructional program and promoting a positive school-learning climate. In the first dimension according to Hallinger (2011) the head teacher’s role is mainly concerned with coordinating with staff to ensure that the school has a clear mission/goal. Therefore the instructional leader provides guidance for the schools program, and describes the general understanding of the school mission and vision. The effective leader in a school is therefore the one who understands the mission and goals of the schools and clearly communicates them to the staff (Zafar et al. 2009).
Teachers must be aware of these goals, this means that the goals must be clear, measurable, achievable, and should focus on instruction and learning. Successful implementation of this dimension requires the head teacher to model the goals and include teachers as collaborators in their development and dissemination (Hallinger, 2003). Partlow (2007) says that higher achievement may indicate that the head teacher is able to engender a culture in the school where all stakeholders have a shared mission, vision and purpose and work towards them collectively. A powerful vision fosters change by helping to direct, align and inspire actions. Visions create identity, guidance, and inspiration.

In setting and communicating the schools goals, the school leader organizes and restructures the school programme. This is what Hallinger (2011) refers to as the second dimension of instructional leadership. One of the aims of effective leadership is to improve classroom instruction by positively influencing the teacher instructional behaviour, beliefs, knowledge and practices and competencies (Rew, 2013). A school leader/head teacher develops the strategies for bringing the goals into reality by allocating resources. He or she works directly with teachers to improve curriculum delivery and instruction. Coordination of the curriculum involves head teachers’ activities that provide the opportunities for staff collaboration and the alignment of curriculum to standards and goals established (Hallinger, 2011).

The third dimension, according to Hallinger & Murphy (1985) is promoting a positive school learning climate. It is made up of five functions. One of the functions is to
promote positive learning climate and protecting instructional time. Zafar et al. (2009) posits that in protecting the instructional time, first, the head teacher organizes regular meetings with the staff for planning instructional process which includes making of teaching schedules. Instructional leaders guard against frequent interruptions of teaching and learning process. He or she also discourages time wastage by emphasizing on full utilization of allocated time for instruction.

The school leader creates conditions conducive for staff development by encouraging teachers to acquire new skills. He or she strives to create a culture in which teachers talk with each other about teaching and learning (Hallinger, 2011). Such an environment allows teachers to feel comfortable when observing each other as they teach. Teachers also offer peer evaluations on best ways of improvement. Effective instructional leaders encourage teachers to plan, design, research and evaluate the school curriculum. Teacher professional development also involves creating time for teachers to share experiences, knowledge and skills acquired from any professional training attended. The school leader ensures constant presence to support teachers in the times of inevitable frustrations in the school and recognizes their efforts (Reitzug, West & Angel, 2008). This is what Hallinger & Murphy (1998) referred to as maintaining high visibility. The head teacher is therefore a facilitator of teacher growth. He or she does this through collaborative inquiry with teachers, creating opportunities for reflection discourse and professional growth.

Robinson (2010), summarized the leadership functions in a school into two, namely: direct and indirect functions. The direct functions include setting goals and leading
teachers, teaching and instruction. The indirect activities are organizing instructional program and protecting instructional time. In a research on perception of teachers on school leadership functions in elementary school in Turkey, Bas & Mustafa (2010) using a semi-structured interview technique, established five themes of instructional leadership, these included: determination of schools purpose, management of instruction, evaluation of students, support to teachers, and Creation of a regular learning and teaching environment. An effective school leader redesigns the schools program and develops people. In redesigning the school program, the head teacher creates a productive school culture, modifies the school structures that facilitate the work and builds collaborative processes of working. By developing them the head teacher enables teachers to perform their jobs effectively by offering intellectual support through coaching and in service training. The head teacher also stimulates teachers to improve their work by recognizing excellent performance while at the same time role modelling the expected behaviour.

2.4 The Concept of Job Satisfaction

Newstrom (2007) describes job satisfaction as a set of favourable or un-favourable feelings and emotions with which employee view their work. Spector (2008) viewed Job satisfaction as the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs. Spector’s definition borrows heavily from a definition proposed by Locke (1976), which is widely accepted. Locke viewed job satisfaction as pleasurable or positive emotional feeling that emanates from ones job experiences. Such feelings inspire an employees’ choice of remaining in the job or leaving. Apart from emotional aspects of a job, Job satisfaction involves a cognitive dimension. Cognitive
components of job satisfaction are the beliefs regarding ones job. These include the belief that a job is mentally and physically demanding and challenging resulting from the level of involvement in the job (Bernstein & Nash, 2008). Aamondt (2009) cited Weiss and Shaw study where the subjects viewed a training video where assembly line workers either made positive or negative comments about their job. The study found out that the subjects who were shown the positive video enjoyed performing the job tasks more than the subjects who viewed negative video. Apart from emotional cognitive dimensions, research has shown that personal beliefs also accounts for job satisfaction. A study in Lousiana by Jakuback (2017) in Baton Rouge Catholic Diocese private schools established a strong link between teachers’ personal beliefs, job satisfaction and retention.

Job satisfaction is therefore a complex process that involves amalgamation of emotional, cognitive and social dimensions of a job. While executing leadership functions a leader should strive to strike a balance of the three dimensions. Such a balance in schools would create sense of trust, confidence, enthusiasm and high teacher morale (Masuku, 2011). It is important to note that job satisfaction differs from one work aspect to another and from one individual to another. One employee may feel that pay rate is extremely important while another may feel social relationships are more important. One may feel that demanding and challenging work is important while others may tend to disagree with such a proposition. While such differences actually exist, generally, high job satisfaction motivates workers to exert more effort in their assigned tasks in fulfilment of the organizations goals. To attract the right quality of employees and retain them, organizations must strive to optimize the job satisfaction of the existing
employees (Mosadegh, Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Studies have shown that satisfied teachers devote their energies to the improvement of the schools and the success of students. A study conducted in Japan by Mahmood (2004) on the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of secondary school teachers indicated that failure or success of the teaching learning process depended on the level of teachers’ job satisfaction. The study reinforced the fact that school leaders should aim at achieving high levels of teacher job satisfaction at their schools.

2.5 Influence of school leaders on teachers’ job satisfaction

Johnson, Kraft & Papay (2012) cited in Armstrong (2012) reports that research from the project on the next generation of teachers at Harvard Graduate school of Education examined how working conditions predict teachers’ job satisfaction and career plans. The study found that working conditions were most important factor in teacher job satisfaction. Teachers who taught in favorable work environments were reported to be more satisfied and less likely to transfer or leave the profession than their peers in schools with less favorable conditions. Zafar et al. (2009) observed that while teachers working conditions requirements such as safe facilities, adequate resources, and lesson preparation time were important, the study found out that the three most important elements for teacher job satisfaction are; collegial relations, or the extent to which teachers report having productive working relationships with colleagues, The extent to which teachers reported that their school leaders were supportive and create environments conducive to learning and the extent to which school environments are characterized by mutual trust, respect, openness and commitment to students’ achievement.
Using administrative and survey data on North Carolina schools, Ladd (2009) found that teachers' perceptions of school leadership, measured through school-level averages of responses to school climate surveys, are most predictive of teachers' intentions to remain in the school or to find alternative jobs. Ladd’s (2009) finding is in tandem with meta-analysis of 70 empirical studies by Marzano, Waters, & McNulty (2005) the study found out that schools administration was one major determining factor of teacher retention in schools. The same finding were found in New York through a study by Boyd, Crossman, Lankford &Wyckoff (2009) which sought to find out influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions in New York City. The study established that teachers’ dissatisfaction emanated from school administrators failure to encourage professional collaboration among teachers, recognize and appreciate teachers, involve teachers to solve school or departmental problems, consult and seek teachers opinion in developing the school mission and collaborate with teachers to meet curriculum standards.

The study made it explicit that failure of school administrators to embrace effective leadership led to devastating teacher attrition from the schools. Similar findings were also found in Nigeria by Korb & Akintude, (2013). Their study sought to investigate job satisfaction amongst teachers and also identify factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction. The study established the prime factor for teacher job satisfaction was cordial relationships between the school leader and teachers and among teachers. This could only be achieved through effective communication which is emphasized in instructional leadership. Another leadership activity that was reported to have positive influence on teacher job satisfaction was provision of instructional materials (Korb &
Akintude, 2013). Contrary to a popular believe that teacher pay levels determined the level of job satisfaction among teachers (Mengistu, 2012), the studies by Boyd (2012); Korb & Akintude (2013) exonerated monetary considerations from being prime factors leading to teacher attrition.

A study by Jakuback (2017) in Catholic diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana parochial schools examined teachers’ perceptions that influenced their job satisfaction and retention decisions. According to the study, teachers’ satisfaction in their jobs and their retention decisions were influenced by their experience of collaborative support among the teachers. Further, their job satisfaction emanated from the head teachers strong leadership that created an environment of trust and respect for one another. Boyd et al. (2009) posited that schools administrators needed to be more proactive in identifying and articulating the schools mission and goals. They also needed to motivate teachers through professional development, allocating resources, and more important establishing open channels of communication with the teachers.

2.6 Directive leadership and job satisfaction

Directive leadership is defined as the process of providing the subordinates with a guideline for decision making and action that is in favor with a leader’s perspective (Fiedler & Garcia, 2005; Sagie & Yemini 2017). It is also commonly perceived as a task oriented behavior, with a strong tendency to control discussions, dominate interactions, and personally direct task completion (Cruz, Henningson & Smith, 2009). Leaders who give directives to subordinates, focus less on participation as compared to leaders who takes subordinates’ development as the most important part of effective
leadership (Fiedler, 2005; Sagie, 2017). This leader therefore, makes organizational members to be more dependent and inflexible, facilitating them to be less initiative (Euwema, Wendt & Van Emmerik, 2007).

Wachira, Gitumu and Mbugua (2017) established that teacher job satisfaction is influenced by head teachers in directing teachers’ through guiding and controlling them on how to carry out school tasks. This finding confirms those of earlier studies by Yilmaz (2007) which reported a positive relationship between principal directive leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. Mulwa and Kyalo (2013) conducted a study on head teachers’ leadership behavior and its influence on pupils’ performance at Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) in Central Division of Machakos District, Kenya. One of her findings was that directive behavior was dominant in the most of schools in the district which had a negative influence on the pupils’ performance in KCPE. Kimani (2012) also conducted a study on the influence of head teachers’ leadership behaviour on pupils’ performance at KCPE in Kinangop District, Kenya. From the study the researcher found out that head teachers’ leadership behavior of consideration moderately influenced pupils performance in KCPE. Bell, Chan and Nel (2014) studied the impact of participative and directive leadership on organizational culture. The results showed that a combination of participative and directive leadership had no significant impact on organizational culture. Nevertheless, participative leadership had a stronger effect on organizational culture than when combined with directive leadership.
2.7 Supportive leadership and job satisfaction

Giessner, Dawson and West (2013) established that supportive leadership was associated with increase in work force satisfaction. It was also positively related to reduction in job stress, employee performance and job satisfaction. Adeyemi and Adu (2013), Mwangi, (2013), also found that supportive leadership was widely practiced in schools which led to willingness of teachers to work for extra hours. Rafferty and Griffin (2014) conducted a conceptual study on supportive leadership. The aim of the study was to understand whether leaders created interest among employees, assisted independent decision-making, allowed learning from mistakes and provided a realistic set of plans to guide actions. The findings in the study showed that supportive leaders helped to facilitate goal accomplishment by guiding subordinates to be effective and learn in their roles.

Xie and Li (2011) examined the effects of supportive leadership on employee brand building behavior. The authors conducted HLM path analysis to test the effect of supportive leadership on the employee brand building behavior. The results showed that organizational supportive leadership had a significant effect on the employee brand building behavior. The study recommended that firms should encourage supportive leadership climate to improve the employee brand building behavior which would lead to a positive brand image. Banai & Reisel (2007) carried out an empirical research to examine the relationships between supportive leadership and job characteristics and workers’ alienation in 6 countries (Cuba, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Russia, and the United States). It was found that supportive leadership and job characteristics were related to alienation. Newton and Maierhofer (2005) also found that higher levels of supportive leadership predicted higher levels of well-being.
2.8 Particpative leadership and job satisfaction

In participative leadership practice, the school head teacher recognizes teachers’ ability and talents in leadership by involving them in the school administrative process Wachira (2017). The ultimate idea behind participative leadership practice, is to achieve school effectiveness through collaborative effort and joint decision-making involving the head teachers and teachers. In his study, Wambane (2015) found that participative leadership improved school processes. In their study on impact of participative leadership on organizational outcomes, Sagie, Zaidman, Amichai-Hamburger and Schwartz (2012) found that participative leadership led to high levels of team outcomes as it solicited different ideas from team members. The scholars concluded that participative leadership increases organizational and team effectiveness. Lumbasi, K’Aol and Ouma (2016) studied the effect of participative leadership on the performance of COYA senior managers in Kenya. It adopted a descriptive correlational design. The population was made up of the 13 companies that won COYA during the years 2010 to 2013. The findings indicated that the application of a participative leadership positively affects the performance of employees.

According to Krause, Gebert and Kearney (2007) there is a positive correlation between participative leadership and employee performance. Somech (2006) also observed a positive correlation between participative leadership with team innovation. Gong, Huang and Farh (2009) indicated that participative leadership was positively related to organizational performance. Miao, Newman and Huang (2014), Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Organ (2006), found that in a trustful relationship based on participative leadership, subordinates reciprocated their supervisor’s recognition of their abilities and fair
treatment with more commitment in their job performance. Meta analytical work by Dirks and Ferrin (2002) found similar results, clearly demonstrating that trust in a supervisor was significantly related to subordinate job performance and job satisfaction.

Sinani (2016) also established that participative leadership style has a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction. The level of employee's motivation, job satisfaction and innovation is higher when participative leadership used. Satisfaction emanated from the fact that their opinions, comments and suggestions were sought for decision-making at the institutions. Wachira, Gitumu and Mbugua (2017) established that when the head teachers remained accommodative of other teachers’ opinions, through participative leadership, they also encouraged interpersonal relationship, urged the group to beat its past target, and the teachers were satisfied with their work.

2.9 Achievement oriented leadership and job satisfaction

In achievement oriented leadership, the leader sets challenging goals for the followers and shows confidence in the ability of the followers to attain these goals. The satisfaction emanates from the leaders’ recognition of the ability of the followers to attain the goals of challenging tasks (Vecchio, Bullis and Brazil, 2006; Luthans, 2011). Fayyaz, Naheed and Hasan (2014) studied the effect of task oriented and relational leadership style on employee performance; moderating impact of communicator competence. Results indicated a strong positive and significant association between supervisor's communication competence, task and relational leadership styles and employee performance. Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman and Humphrey (2011) found that achievement oriented behaviors improve performance-related leadership outcomes and
relational-oriented behaviors improve affective criteria such as follower satisfaction with the leader. Yukl (2012) also found that task-related behaviors ensure that people, equipment, and other resources are efficiently used in order to accomplish objectives. The study also established that use of goal oriented leadership style enhances member skills, and commitment to the mission of the organization. Obina (2012) and Njeri (2011) concurred that a significant positive relationship exists between the level of teacher job satisfaction and the strength by the leadership behaviors’ dimensions of achievement orientation.

In his study, Negron (2008) noted that achievement-oriented leadership style was suited for unclear tasks and teachers who may need a morale booster to increase their confidence in ability to accomplish the given goal. The achievement oriented leadership challenges teachers to seek continuous improvement. According to Northouse (2013) achievement-oriented leadership sets clear and challenging goals for subordinates nevertheless, Lussier and Achua (2010) found out that achievement-oriented leadership style is best applicable when followers are open to leadership, have external locus of control, and follower’s ability is high hence tasks completion therefore head teachers in schools makes clear and challenging goals. Yukl (2012) found that task-related behaviors ensure that people, equipment, and other resources are efficiently used in order to accomplish objectives. His study also established that use of goal oriented leadership style enhances member skills, and commitment to the mission of the organization. Tabernero, Chambel, & Curral (2009) examined the role of task-oriented versus relationship-oriented leadership in relation to the development of normative contract and group performance. The results showed that the leaders’ behavior
influenced the development of normative contracts, group processes, and performance. Task-oriented leadership had positive effect on both the development of transactional and relational normative contracts, respectively. Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey (2011) conducted a study focusing on leadership behaviors and effectiveness. In this study, it was found that behaviors were important predictors of overall leader effectiveness and subordinates job satisfaction.

2.10 Summary of reviewed literature and identified knowledge gap

It is evident that most researches on teacher job satisfaction found school factors including the working conditions, teacher student relationships, school leadership exerted a lot of influence on the whole school fraternity. The school leader is vested with the task of ensuring that all systems symphony smoothly to ensure satisfaction of all school stakeholders (Ladd, 2009; Boyd et al. 2009; Johnson, Kraft and Papay, 2012). However, the influence of school leaders on teacher job satisfaction is missing from the studies. This study therefore sought to study the influence of the school leader, who is the head teacher on teacher job satisfaction.

It is noted with concern that some studies which sought to establish levels of teacher job satisfaction, Mengitsu (2012) sought views of one group only. The studies therefore lacked objectivity owing to the fact that the researchers only got one sided view on the issue of teacher job satisfaction. To be more objective, the current study collected views of both teachers and head teachers. Some studies sought to identify the relationship between of styles of leadership and teacher job satisfaction Haruni & Mafwimbo (2014), Gitaka (2014). They however failed to examine leadership features that traverse
all leadership styles namely: reforming school purpose, managing learning process and managing learning environment.

Most research concentrated on the levels of job satisfaction among teachers while others focus on factors that influence teacher job satisfaction (Korb & Akintunde, 2013; Adeyemi (2013); Abiodun. & Gbadebo, 2012; Mainga, 2012). Although school leadership has been acknowledged to be pivotal in a school, these researches failed to examine the influence of school leadership on teacher job satisfaction which was the focus of this study. The reviewed literature found that most studies among teachers in Catholic private schools were conducted in secondary schools (Mueni 2005, Njeru 2009), while the studies that made an attempt to conduct their studies in elementary schools (Jakuback, 2017), respondents were mainly drawn from teachers’ secondary schools. Therefore, this study is exclusively based on teachers in Catholic private primary schools. Finally, the studies reviewed used quantitative approach, consequently, lacking an in-depth examination which would have been provided by a mixed method approach. To be more objective, this study triangulated qualitative and quantitative data.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a detailed outline of how the study was executed. It outlines the overall methodological framework, specifically it covers the research design, locale, population, sampling procedures, sample size, instruments, data collection procedures, validity, reliability, piloting, data analysis and ethical issues.

3.2 Research Design

This study used mixed methods research design. The mixed methods research design is an approach that combines quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study (Creswell & Clark, 2011). In mixed research design, data is collected and analyzed by combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in a single study, (Creswell & Clark, 2011; Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2009). Qualitative approach enabled the researcher to gain deeper understanding of the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction (Jwan & Ongo’ndo, 2013). Quantitative approach brought out influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction. According to Cresswell and Clark (2007), mixed methods research design allows the researcher to collect comprehensive evidence of the problem and also answer questions that a single method cannot answer. In addition, in encouraging the use of mixed methods research reduced biasness.

Mixed methods research in this study was motivated by the desire to answer all research questions in the study adequately by triangulating the qualitative and quantitative data
(Kamindo, 2008). The strength of mixed methods approach as advanced by Creswell & Clark (2011) and Gay, Mills & Airasian, (2009) propelled the researcher to use the design in this study.

The study adopted convergent parallel design (Creswell & Clark (2008), which is also referred the QUAN-QUAL design (Gay et al., 2009). Cresswell and Plano (2011) advocated for convergent parallel design when there is a need to collect and analyze qualitative and quantitative data for better understanding of the problem. In the endeavor to establish the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction in Catholic private primary schools, Convergent parallel design was the most appropriate due to the unique management structures of these schools and the neatly closed nature of these schools’ management, one type of data source could not have presented a true picture of the problem.

Creswell and Clark (2011) points out that in convergent parallel mixed methods design contradictory views on a research problem are easily revealed and clarified. Convergent parallel mixed methods design enabled the researcher to collect different but complementary data on the same topic. It also facilitated a better understanding of the problem. Convergent parallel mixed methods design therefore enabled the researcher to look for convergence, divergence, contradictions or relationships of two sources of data (Creswell and Clark, 2011). Using the convergence parallel design qualitative and quantitative data was collected at the same time; data was analysed separately and then merged during interpretation (Barbour, 2011). Figure 3.1 shows graphical
representation of data collection, analysis and interpretation in convergence parallel mixed methods design.

Figure 3.1: Data collection, analysis and interpretation process
Source: Adapted from Creswell and Clark, 2011

3.2.1 Variables

The independent variable in the study was the head teachers’ leadership practices. In a school environment the head teacher performs several leadership practices. In this study, the leadership practices were grouped into four classifications. These practices include; directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices.

The practices of these schools’ leadership has direct influence on variables advanced by Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959), namely; the motivator and hygiene factors of job satisfaction. These are the intervening variables of job satisfaction. The dependent variable was teachers’ job satisfaction which emanated from teachers’ perception and feelings of their intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction.
3.3 Location of the Study

The study was carried out in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic Dioceses. A policy guideline for Catholic schools in Kenya is to empower the local communities by employing majority of their teachers from the locality (Kenya Catholic Conference of Bishops, 2014). The Nakuru Catholic Diocese provided a wide variety of teachers’ views and perception of different leadership practices and how they influenced their job satisfaction. Notably, Nakuru Diocese is the only one in Kenya which traverses through Kenya highlands, Semi-arid and arid regions of Kenya. It covers areas in Naivasha, Nakuru, Baringo and East Pokot. Such a composition provided the study a wide variety of perception of leadership practices applicable to different communities’ and environs. The Nairobi Diocese presents a cosmopolitan composition of teachers. Such compositions provided a wealth of information on how different leadership practices were applicable and were perceived by a wide range of people in urban areas. Further, data on Catholic school from the Catholic Education Secretariat indicated that Nairobi had the largest number of Catholic private schools followed by Nakuru Catholic Diocese. The two dioceses accounted for about 70% of all catholic private schools in Kenya. A study in the two dioceses therefore gave a representative sample of the other Dioceses in Kenya.

3.4 Target Population

The target population was composed of all 78 head teachers and 1240 teachers in the 78 Catholic private primary schools in Nairobi and Nakuru dioceses. The head teachers were chosen because they are entrusted with the responsibility of making decisions as regards to the day to-day administration of the school with little interference from the
school managers. The head teachers were therefore in the best position to articulate accurately their leadership experience and how it influenced teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers were very important component of this study. Head teachers’ actions have direct implications on them, and influence their job satisfaction. Data from Catholic Secretariat education department in 2014 indicated that there are 78 Catholic private primary schools in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic dioceses. From the 78 Catholic private primary schools, forty three (43) schools were located in urban areas while thirty five (35) schools were in rural areas. Table 3.1 illustrates the target population.

Table 3.1: The target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Catholic Education Secretariat, 2015

3.5 Sampling design and sample size

3.5.1 Schools

The researcher used stratified random sampling to categorize the schools into two strata, the schools from urban and rural areas. Gay et al., (2009) recommends a sample size higher than 20% for smaller populations. The same proposition is supported by Orodho (2009) who asserts that for a sample to be representative, it should have close approximation of the target group. To have a close approximation of the target group in this study, 40% of the schools in each stratum were selected to participate in the
study. This implied a total of 31 schools, which is 17 schools from urban and 14 schools from rural areas, were sampled for the study. Simple random sampling was used to select the schools which participated in the study. Names of schools in each stratum were written on pieces of paper and mixed in a basket. The researcher picked randomly the names of schools until the required number was arrived at.

3.5.2 Head teachers

Head teachers from all thirty (31) sampled schools participated in the study. In convergent parallel designs, Creswell and Plano (2011) recommends that the individuals who participate in qualitative study be drawn from the same individuals who participated in the quantitative study. Criterion sampling was used to sample the head teachers who participated in qualitative study. Criterion sampling enables the researcher to select a sample that represents the range of potential participants in a setting (Gay et al., 2009).

The study sample for qualitative data was drawn from each of the four strata (areas), Nairobi Diocese (urban and rural) schools and Nakuru Diocese (urban and rural) schools. Gay et al., (2009) further recommends conducting an in depth interview with a sample of between 4 to 10 when the population under study is small. Simple random sampling was used to select four head teachers who participated in the qualitative study, one head teacher from each stratum.

Simple random sampling method was used to sample the head teacher to participate in qualitative research in each stratum. To ensure that every head teacher within each
stratum had an equal and independent chance of being selected, lottery method was used where each head teacher in a stratum was written on a piece of paper. The paper was folded and then dropped in a container. After thoroughly mixing the papers, one piece of paper with a head teacher’s name from each stratum was picked to participate in the in-depth interviews. Table 3.2 illustrates the head teachers sample size.

Table 3.2: Head Teachers sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Samples size</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.3 Teachers

Proportionate sampling was used to sample twenty percent (20%) of teachers in each stratum. This implies that a total of 248 teachers were sampled for the study. Teachers from urban schools were 142 while 106 teachers were sampled from rural schools. Stratified sampling was used to classify teachers into male and female. Simple random sampling was used to select 20% of teachers from each sampled schools. From each school, ten percent of the teachers represented the male and ten percent represented female teachers.

Homogeneous sampling was used to sample teachers who participated in focus group discussion. According to Gay et al., (2009), the homogenous sampling is most
appropriate when studying a group of people from similar backgrounds. This is because it reduces variation, while at the same time facilitating group interviewing. For the purpose of providing a study group with similar backgrounds teachers from one school from each stratum were randomly sampled to participate in the qualitative research from each of the four strata’s (areas), Nairobi Diocese (Urban and Rural) and Nakuru Diocese (urban and rural).

For a focus group discussion, Barbour (2011) proposed a sample of between 6 to 8 participants as sufficient. In this study simple random sampling was used to sample six teachers from one school in each stratum. The teachers were grouped into two strata, male and female. Three (3) male and three (3) female were sampled to participate in focus group discussion from each sampled school. Simple random sampling method was used to sample the school whose teachers participated in qualitative research in each stratum. To ensure that every school within each stratum had an equal and independent chance of being selected, lottery method was used where each school in a stratum was written on a piece of paper, the paper was folded and then dropped in a container. After thoroughly mixing the papers, one paper was picked from the container and the name on the paper was the school to participate in the study.

Simple random sampling method was used to sample teachers in selected schools. Using the lottery method, names of teachers in the school were written on a piece of paper. Coloured papers were used to separate male and female teachers. These were folded and then dropped in a container. After mixing the papers, papers of different colours were picked to identify three male teachers and three female teachers in sample
schools were selected for the study. Table 3.3 illustrates the teachers sample size in each stratum.

Table 3.3: Teachers sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Samples size</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Research Instruments

Three instruments were used for data collection; a questionnaire for head teachers and teachers, interview guide for head teachers and focus group discussion guide for teachers. The job satisfaction survey (JSS) questionnaire was used for measuring job satisfaction levels among the teachers (Spector, 1994).

3.6.1 Head teachers’ leadership practices questionnaire

Quantitative data for head teachers was collected through questionnaires. The head teachers’ questionnaire consisted of two sections. These are section A and B. Section A contained demographic information of the head teacher, these included the head teacher’s the age, gender, professional qualifications and the years of leadership in their current school.
Section B sought to establish the frequency of the head teacher’s performance of leadership practices. The questionnaire had a list of head teacher’s leadership practices. The head teachers were required to rate on a 5 point likert scale the frequency of performance ranging from 1 “Never”, 2 “Rarely”, 3 “Undecided”, 4 “Often” and 5 “Always”.

3.6.2 Head teachers’ interview guide

An interview guide was used to provide the researcher with an in-depth understanding of the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction. The interview guide enabled the interviewer to ask the same questions to sampled respondents while leaving room for divergence and probing. The interview guide also enabled the interviewer to follow-up answers given by respondents to explore meanings on areas of interest as they emerged.

3.6.3 Teachers’ Questionnaire

The teachers’ questionnaire consisted of three sections; sections A, B, and C. Section A contained demographic information of the teacher, these were the teacher’s age, gender, professional qualifications and the years of teaching at their current school.

Section B sought to establish the frequency of the head teacher’s performance of leadership practices. The questionnaire had a list of head teacher’s leadership practices. The teachers were required to rate on a 5 point likert scale the frequency of performance ranging from 1 “Never”, 2 “Rarely”, 3 “Undecided”, 4 “Often” and 5 “Always”.
Section C sought to establish teachers’ job satisfaction levels. The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 6 “Agree very much”, 5 “Agree moderately”, 4 “Agree slightly”, 3 “Disagree slightly”, 2 “Disagree moderately” and 1 “Disagree very much”. The responses were summed up and averaged to create a total score for the level of satisfaction.

3.6.4 Teachers’ focus group discussion guide

Focus group discussion seek to find shared understanding from several people (Gay et al., 2009). The focus group discussion enabled the researcher to follow-up answers given by respondents to explore meanings on areas of interest as they emerged. It further enabled probing and clarification on responses provided by the participants. Probing and seeking clarification on statements made revealed important information for the study.

3.7 Validity

Gay, et al., (2009) describes validity as the degree to which a test measures what is supposed to measure and allows appropriate interpretation of the scores. In other words validity is concerned with whether the data or information gathered is relevant.

To establish content validity of the research instruments, expert review proposed by Gay et al, (2009) was used. The researcher sought the views from the two supervisors, who are experts in the area of school leadership. Their views were considered and the questionnaires revised accordingly. The researcher also sought the expert review from the Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) human resource officer. The TSC is charged
with teacher management in schools and therefore their insights helped to make the questionnaire suitable for the study (TSC policy, 2012).

3.7.1 Reliability

According to Kerlinger (2008) reliability is the dependability, predictability, stability, consistency and accuracy of the data. Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the internal consistence of the instruments. Cronbach Alpha was developed in 1951 by Lee Cronbach. It provides a measure of the internal consistency of a test or scale; it is expressed as a number between 0 and 1 (Mohsen & Reg, 2011). Cronbach's alpha is the most recommended measure of internal consistency when using Likert- scale type of questions (Gay, 2009). Since both the teachers and head teachers’ questionnaires contained a multiple likert type of questions Cronbach Alpha was most suitable for estimating the internal consistency of the research instruments. The table 4 indicates the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for head teachers and teachers’ questionnaires.

Table 3.4: Reliability of the instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers questionnaire</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers questionnaire</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gay et al., (2009) explains that an alpha coefficient value differs with the type of test, although an alpha coefficient higher than 0.7 is an acceptable measure of reliability, for standardized tests an alpha value higher than .90 is recommended. (Mohsen & Reg, 2011) contents that there are different propositions of the acceptable values of alpha,
and they range from 0.70 to 0.95. Nester and Schutt (2015) concurs that in measuring internal consistency, an alpha coefficient of between .70 and .80 is considered acceptable reliability coefficient.

The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.841 and 0.810 for teachers and head teachers’ questionnaires respectively. The alpha coefficient values indicated a high level of internal consistency and reliability of the research instruments. The coefficient values falls within the range recommended by (Mohsen & Reg, 2011), and Nester and Schutt (2015). The calculated coefficient values which were higher than (.07) were deemed reliable.

3.8 Pilot-testing

Pilot testing was used to reinforce the validity of the instruments. The research instruments were pilot tested using a sample of respondents who were not part of the study sample. The researcher randomly selected two schools, one school in each stratum (Urban and Rural) for pilot testing. The instruments were administered to the school head teacher and the teachers. Pilot testing enabled the researcher to identify ambiguous questions and statements. Through their response, the head teachers and the teachers revealed deficiencies in the questionnaires for-example unclear instructions, insufficient space to write responses, clustered questions and wrong numbering. The instruments were modified to accommodate the necessary changes given the feedback from the pilot.
3.9 Data Collection Techniques

Data for the study was collected in five phases. Phase one involved applying for authority to conduct the research from the National Council for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). The authority to conduct research in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic Dioceses, private primary schools was sought from the Education secretaries in each diocese. The education secretaries were requested to write an introductory letter to the sampled schools briefing the head teachers about the purpose of the study. Names of the Catholic private primary schools were identified from the education secretary’s office. The process of sampling the schools was made using the list provided by the Catholic education secretary.

In phase two the researcher trained research assistants for the purpose of collecting quantitative data. The researcher visited the sampled schools in the company of research assistants to meet the head teachers and brief them about the study and introduce the research assistant. The research assistant was then left in the field to facilitate the signing of consent forms by the head teacher and teachers expressing their willingness to participate in the study. The questionnaires which were pre-coded with assigned identification number were issued to the respondents. Interviews with the sampled head teachers and focus group discussion teachers were conducted during the time of collecting questionnaires. The process took three weeks.

In the third phase quantitative and qualitative data was collected in Nairobi Catholic private schools. The data collection process followed the same procedure as in Nakuru. That is seeking permission from the Catholic education secretary, training the research
assistant, visiting the school with research assistant and administering questionnaires. Interviews with the sampled head teachers and focus group discussion teachers were conducted when collecting questionnaires. The process also took three weeks.

3.10 Data Analysis

Data collected was both quantitative and qualitative. The questionnaires were sorted to identify if there were any that were incomplete and to verify the number of questionnaires received from the respondents. Once sorting was completed, the second step involved coding the questionnaires. Coding of the questionnaires facilitated entry of data into the SPSS software package for data analysis. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Means and frequencies were the descriptive statistics which helped the researcher know the essential characteristics of each data set (Tanner, 2012). Regression analysis was used to determine if the dependent variable (teachers’ job satisfaction) was predicted by the independent variables (head teacher’ leadership practices) Orodho (2009) points out that regression analysis was best suited for inferential statistics when a researcher intended to establish if an independent variable predicts a given dependent variable.

Qualitative data was analyzed thematically. Jwag and Ongondo (2011) explain that thematic analysis involves identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns or themes within the data. In this study raw data was transcribed using pre-determined coding categories which were related to research questions. Using the coded data, the researcher was able to capture ideas, views and intuitions of the respondents in relation to each research question. Riessman (2008) asserts that qualitative data seeks to put
together the “big picture” about experiences or events as the participants understand them.

3.11 Ethical and Logistical Considerations

The researcher ensured quality and integrity of the research by ensuring that sampled participants in this study were treated with dignity, respect, and their privacy highly respected. In the constitution of Kenya (2010), every citizen is guaranteed the right to privacy. Orodho (2009) observes that the researcher should have ethical consideration when conducting and reporting research work by ensuring respect for both the truth and persons involved in a study. The researcher therefore acknowledged all writings and researches cited appreciation of the fact that they both guided and shaped this study. Plagiarism was eliminated by ensuring proper referencing and citations of all the works used. Integrity of the researcher was maintained throughout the research process.

The participants in this study were requested to conceal their identities during the research process. This further safeguarded their privacy and reinforced their confidentiality. In addition, the researcher ensured no data can be linked to specific persons by substituting names with pseudonyms. Anonymity of the subjects protected them from victimization and embarrassment further enhancing confidentiality.

The researcher ensured the respondents participated in the study willingly. Their withdrawal from the study was respected. The respondents were requested to sign a letter of consent which proved that they participated in the study without coercion. In addition, the researcher ensured that the respondents’ human rights and public relations were observed by strictly following and observing protocol. The researcher adhered to
Mien and Decorum while at the same time upholding good mannerisms during the research activity. In addition, the researcher observed appropriate chains of command while in the field (Orodho, 2009, & Constitution of Kenya, 2010).
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in Catholic private primary schools, with a view to informing educational leadership practices. The study was conducted in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic Dioceses, Kenya. The results of the study were presented based on the objectives which were:

1. Establish the influence of head teachers’ directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools
2. Determine the teachers’ job satisfaction levels in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools
3. Determine the influence on head teachers’ leadership practices on different components of teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools

For contextualizing of the findings, the chapter begun with demographic information of the respondents. This was followed by objective based sections which formed the key thematic areas of the study. These were; head teachers directive leadership practices, head teachers supportive leadership practices, head teachers participative leadership and head teachers achievement oriented leadership. The study also examined the levels of teachers’ job satisfaction and the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction components. Further, the study examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices in relation to the school category.
4.1.1 Response rate

To ensure that all the distributed questionnaires were returned, the questionnaires were not left with the respondents for later collection. The researcher waited for them to be filled and checked to certify that they were properly filled. All distributed questionnaires were collected, therefore positing a 100% return rate.

4.1.2 Demographic Information of the Respondents

Demographic information examined the respondents’ school location, gender, professional experience and duration of service at a school. Although Hinic, Grubor and Brulic (2017) study in Serbia found that teachers’ job satisfaction did not differ according to teachers demographic characteristics, several studies such as Korb & Akintunde (2013), Mainga (2013), and Convey (2014), have demonstrated that teachers’ satisfaction is largely influenced by demographic characteristics. In Conley and You’s (2017) study, demographic variables were significant predictors of teachers’ satisfaction in their job, hence the need to establish head teachers and teachers demographic characteristics.

4.1.3 Head teachers’ and teachers’ school location

The respondents were asked to indicate whether the school was located in urban or rural areas. Figure 4.1 presents the frequency distribution of head teachers and teachers in rural and urban schools.
Figure 4.1: Frequency distribution of head teachers and teachers in rural and urban schools

The study established that out of 31 head teachers, 67.7% were from urban schools, while 32.3% head teachers were from rural schools. On the other hand, out of 248 teachers 62.9% were from urban schools while (37.1%) of the teachers indicated that their schools were in rural areas. In focus group discussion teachers said that they were more comfortable teaching in urban school, asked to expound one teacher noted:

Some of us do not come from the school locality; therefore we have to find accommodation near the school. It is easy to find decent accommodation in urban areas than in rural areas.

The findings of the current study that Catholic private schools were located in both urban and rural areas adheres to the recommendations of the Catholic education policy (2000) that learning institutions be established in all areas to address educational needs of children and youth in such places. Jakuback, (2017) observes that Second Vatican Council of 1965, gave the church the right to establish schools in as many areas as possible in order to enhance education and evangelization. Although the Catholic private schools were in both urban and rural areas, the location for the establishment of
such schools were dependent on the population, hence the concentration of more Catholic private schools in urban areas, Njeru (2009). Hinic, Grubor and Brulic (2017) and Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) were in agreement that the school location had significant implications on leadership practices adopted by the school principal. In the study, Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) established that school from rural setting were more inclined to adapt participative leadership which was anchored on distributed leadership.

4.1.4 Head teachers’ and teachers’ gender

The study sought to establish head teachers’ and teachers’ gender. The results are presented in Figure 4.2
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**Figure 4.2: Head teachers’ and teachers’ gender**

Figure 4.2 shows that a majority 58.1% of the head teachers were female while male head teachers were 41.9%. Among the teachers, 50.8% were female and 49.2% were male. This shows that the gender of sampled teachers had a relatively balanced representation. Nevertheless, there were more female than male head teachers. The
findings are in line with Yakavets (2017) study in Kazakhstan which found that majority of school heads, deputys and teachers were predominantly female and a few male. Similarly, Masuku (2011) found that following a government policy in Zimbabwe on women empowerment, female head teachers were a majority. An earlier study by Njeru (2009) in Meru Catholic sponsored schools also found that female teachers were a majority. Research has shown that gender has a bearing on leadership practice used by head Teachers. In Kazakhstan, where two thirds of head teachers were women, Yakavets (2017) study found that supportive leadership was overwhelmingly used by head teachers. Hinic, Grubor and Brulic’s (2017) study reported that male teachers who were fewer than female teachers, took a more participative approach to leadership while women relied on both directive and achievement oriented leadership practices.

4.1.5 Head teachers’ and teachers’ professional experience

The head teachers and teachers were asked to indicate their professional experience. The results are presented in Table 4.1

**Table 4.1: Head teachers’ and teachers’ professional experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Professional experience as Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers professional experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The head teachers’ and teachers’ professional experience ranged from less than two years’ experience to over 20 years of professional experience. Majority 48.4% of the head teachers had between 2–5 years professional experience. Only 3.2% head teachers had between 16 – 20 years of professional experience. Cumulatively, majority 21(67.8%) of the head teachers had between 2-10 years in leadership. The head teachers with 11 years and above experience were only (19.4%). During the interviews, head teachers with more than 20 years professional experience explained that they had retired from public service after attaining the mandatory retirement age. However, due to their vast experience, they were employed by the Catholic private schools to either spearhead the establishment of new schools, or strengthen the management of those schools. This is in line with Hinic et al (2017) study which found that some head teachers in Serbia would opt to re-commit to work in a later period in life, after retirement. Asked for the reasons of re-committing themselves to work after retirement one head teacher observed:

…the school management was looking for an experienced person to lead this school since the school was just being started; although I had already retired, I was offered the job because of my experience as a head teacher.

Head teachers with few years of experience explained that they had recently been employed in the schools. A majority 95 (38.3%) of teachers had between 2-5 years professional experience. The teachers with 6-10 years professional experience were 81 (32.7%). Few 4 (1.6%) teachers had between 16-20 years professional experience. Teachers with a professional experience of 20 years and above were also 4 (1.6%). Cumulatively, Majority 180 (71%) of the teachers had a professional experience ranging from 2 to10 years, the number of teachers with more than ten years professional
experience reduced significantly with only 8 (3.2%) reporting to have had more than 16 years professional experience.

Further inquiry revealed that teachers with more than 16 years of professional experience had either taken early retirement from Teachers Service Commission or had retired after attaining the mandatory retirement age. In response to further probing on the reasons some teachers took early retirement some said that they were enticed by special responsibilities and attractive allowances offered to them. A teacher who had taken early retirement in order to join a Catholic private school explained that:

When I was employed by the Teachers service commission, I was simply a classroom teacher. However, when I learnt that the management of this school was looking for an experienced teacher to be the deputy head teacher, and the remuneration was much better than I could ever get in public service, I chose to come here. I resigned from Teachers Service Commission. I am now comfortable here.

The findings in the current study that most head teachers and teachers had few years of experience concurs with observation made in Njeru (2009) study who found that school principals in Catholic Diocese of Meru had little experience as heads of the institutions. In contrast, Makokha’s (2014) study in Nairobi public schools found that most head teachers had more than 15 years professional experience. Similarly, Yakavets (2017) study in Kazakhstan found most school principals had many years of experience. Those head teachers with long years of service had better understanding of the teachers hence the adoption of more supportive approaches which was an antidote for teachers’ satisfaction with their jobs.
4.1.6 Head teachers’ and teachers’ working duration at their current schools

The respondents (Head teachers and teachers) were asked to indicate the duration they had served at their current schools. The results are presented in Table 4.2

Table 4.2: Head teachers’ and teachers’ working duration at the current school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Head teachers working duration at current schools</th>
<th>Teachers working duration at current schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4.2, 19 (61.3%) head teachers had been at the current schools for 2-5 years. A significant number 107(43.1%) of the teachers had served at the current schools for less than two years. The head teachers who indicated that they had been in the school for 11 – 15 years were 2 (6.5%). Among the teachers, 5 (2.0%) said that they had been in the schools for between 11-15 years. None of the respondents had an experience of more than 15 years at their current schools.

In response to further probing during an interview with some head teachers on the reason many head teachers had been at the current school for few years, some head teachers cited frustration with the school administrators, who in most cases had no educational administration background. Therefore, the school administrators did not understand how schools are managed. Asked to expound one head teacher clarified:
…It’s hard to be in these schools for a long period; It is tough to manage the school when you have to answer to a senior (Parish priest) who has no idea of how a school should be managed. It frustrates. Schools can never be managed like a church.

Further probing in focus group discussion with the teachers on the reason few teachers had more than five years working experience at the current schools revealed that, teachers had left the private institutions for employment with the Teachers Service Commission. The teachers explained that the government, through the Teachers Service Commission employed primary school teachers who had been registered with the TSC for more than five years. During an interview with some head teachers, it emerged that while some teachers were discontinued for dismal performance of their duties, others left for greener pastures in other schools or sectors. Explaining how teachers left the school for green pastures, one head teacher gave the following experience:

One year a nearby school was being established. The school administrator wanted good and experienced teachers. Our teachers were enticed to join the school with promises of very good salaries and allowances….., which we could not offer. Many of the teachers left for the new school. The school was offering salaries that we could not afford.

Teachers reported that some of their colleagues who left their school were dissatisfied with working conditions and the way teachers were treated at the schools. In response to further probing in focus group discussion on how teachers were treated one teacher observed:

Sometimes the head teacher is very harsh, very harsh; it’s very hard to make the head teacher bend the rules, some of us are on the lookout for any opportunity to leave.

The findings of the current study differs with the Masuku (2011) study which found that most head teachers and teachers had more than 10 years working at the same school. Yakavets (2017) study found that teachers had served at the same school for long
duration. However, most head teachers had worked at the schools for a short duration. Further, the study found that head teachers with long duration at a school understood teachers better and were more supportive. The Hinic et al. (2017) study concurred with Yakavets (2017) and added that teachers with short working duration were under pressure to prove themselves, hence relied heavily on directive leadership.

4.1.7 Teachers working duration with their current head teacher

The teachers were required to indicate their duration of working with their current head teacher. The results are presented in Figure 4.3
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According to figure 4.3, a majority, 153 (61.7%) of the teachers said that they had worked with the current head teacher for less than 2 years. The teachers who had worked with the head teacher for more than ten years were 2 (0.8%). A total of 20 (8.1%) reported that they had worked with their current head teachers for between 6 and 10 years. The findings that a majority of teachers had short working experience with their current head teacher differs with Sancar (2014) study which found that teachers in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus had long working experience with their school.
heads. The long working duration with a head teacher allowed teachers to decipher accurately the head teachers’ behaviour and actions. Similarly, the Hinic et al (2017) study found that teachers’ job satisfaction changed progressively with increase in teachers’ experience on the job or working with a leader.

4.2 **Head teachers’ leadership practices**

Leadership approaches developed by Robert House (1971) in Path Goal Theory formed the leadership practices. The leadership practices were directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented. A directive leader provides a clear structure of job performance by making the followers aware of what is expected of them (Robin, 2012). The leader also removes role ambiguity by providing clear rules, regulations and standards of job performance. In addition, the leader gives clear timelines for job completion. (Northhouse, 2016). In directive leadership the leader provides the followers with specific directions on performance of the required tasks (Robin, 2012).

In supportive leadership, the leader is friendly and appreciative of the followers’ efforts. Participative leadership is characterized by a leader consulting the followers/subordinate when making decisions which affect them. An achievement oriented leader sets challenging goals and shows confidence in the followers’ ability to attain these goals. The leader thus defines the tasks to be performed, puts structures in place, plans, organizes and monitors the achievement of the set goals (Luthans, 2011).

4.2.1 **Head teachers’ directive leadership practices and its influence on teachers job satisfaction**

In determining head teachers’ perception of their directive leadership practices, the head teachers were required to indicate the frequency in which they executed ten (10)
directive leadership practices. The responses were determined on a 5-point Likert rating scale as follows: 5- Always 4- Often 3- Undecided, 2- Rarely, and 1- Never. The results are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Head teachers’ perception of their directive leadership practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The head teachers' directive leadership</th>
<th>Always n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Often n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Undecided n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rarely n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Never n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides teachers feedback on their performance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains teachers the expected levels of performance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminds teachers to follow set rules and regulations</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows teachers how to perform difficult tasks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides teachers with clear performance standards</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to inform me issues hindering performance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively monitors teacher's performance of their duties</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives teachers clear deadlines of completing allocated tasks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educates teachers on methods of improving performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward teachers who achieve set targets</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.3, most 25 (80.6%) head teachers indicated that they always reminded teachers to follow set rules and regulations. In response to further probing
during an interview with some head teachers on why it was important to frequently remind teachers to follow set rules and regulations, one head teacher explained:

… I want to achieve set targets, therefore, the only way of ensuring I achieve them is to frequently remind teachers the school rules and regulations, which facilitate the achievement of these targets. I also give them specific timelines of finishing allocated tasks. This ensures teachers complete their tasks on time.

Another head teacher noted:

As a head teacher I have to follow and ensure that duties are performed accordingly. I am committed to always remind teachers the set rules and regulations. I found that failure to remind them leads to activities not being executed as expected.

The head teachers’ sentiments concurred with Masuku (2011) findings that teachers tended to relax if the head teacher relaxed in reminding teachers the school expectations. The findings were also in line with Butcher (2014) study which found that in addition to verbally reminding teachers the rules and regulations, head teachers’ in Arkansas schools gave teachers procedural manuals on structure and order of when and how various activities within the school are performed. A total of 25 (80.6%) indicated that they always, gave teachers clear deadlines for completing allocated tasks. Asked when they were likely to give teachers deadlines of completing allocated tasks during the interviews one head teacher said:

I tell teachers the expected deadlines for completing allocated tasks as soon as I allocate them. Telling them the expected deadlines enables teachers to plan work accordingly in order to beat the deadline.

The study found that 21 (67.7%) head teachers always encouraged teachers to inform them on issues hindering their performance. In response to further probing on how head teachers encouraged teachers to inform them on the hindrances to their performance, one head teacher pointed out:
I always inform the teachers of my availability to listen to them anytime they have an issue that would hinder their performance. … When a teacher comes with any concern that would deter his or her performance I act on it without delay.

The head teacher comments concurred with Northouse (2016) observation that in path goal theory, a leader should be able to understand and remove obstacles that hinder the attainment of set targets. The head teachers who said that they always provided teachers with clear performance standards were 20 (64.5%). The findings were in line with Butcher’s (2014) study which reported that teachers were given performance standards and the disciplinary measures for persistent non-compliance. During the interviews, head teachers were asked to elaborate on ways in which they provided teachers with performance standards. One head teacher explained:

I give teachers the expected performance standards at the beginning of each school term. To ensure that they (teachers) do not forget, I post them on teachers’ notice boards in the staffroom to act as a constant reminder.

The head teachers 17 (54.8%), said that they often educated teachers on methods of improving their performance. These findings were in accord with Yakavets (2017) study which found that head teachers were enthusiastic to share with the teachers any new knowledge and skills that would improve their performance. A total of 8 (25.8%) head teachers acknowledged that they rarely showed teachers how to perform difficult tasks. In response to further probing on the reasons for not showing teachers how to perform difficult tasks during the interview, one head teacher explained:

I let teachers discover how to perform any difficult tasks. Furthermore, I can’t claim to know all things and I don’t fear to admit when I do not know how to perform some tasks, even when I expect teachers to perform them.
The response to further probing during interviews on how rewards were offered to teachers revealed that not all teachers were rewarded for achieving set targets. The interviewed head teachers anonymously agreed that it was not possible to reward all teachers who achieved set targets. Asked for clarification on teachers who were likely to be rewarded for achieving set targets one head teacher said:

Because of the high competition among schools, there is the need to motivate class eight teachers to work harder. Therefore, teachers in class eight are rewarded a lot more. However, each teacher gets something little at the end of the year.

Another head teacher commented:

Only teachers with a subject in class eight are rewarded on meeting the agreed upon targets. There is a tradition in this school to reward class eight teachers with an agreed upon amount of money for each grade ‘A’ the teacher gets.

In a school where the head teacher acknowledged to rarely offering material reward to teachers who achieved their set targets observed that:

It’s not possible to offer material rewards whenever a teacher achieved set targets, I sometimes commend the teacher for the good work and encourage the teacher to exceed set target.

To obtain the most and the least common directive leadership practice, the frequency of head teachers who indicated always and often and those who indicated rarely and never was combined. The study found that a common head teachers’ leadership practice was giving teachers clear deadlines for completing allocated tasks, a task identified in the path gal theory as a major characteristics of directive leadership (Robin, 2012). The findings concurred with Masuku (2011) study which found that apart from informing teachers verbally on deadlines for various activities, the school heads in the Midlands Province of Zimbabwe high schools gave teachers a calendar of events showing
deadlines of various activities within the school term. Another common leadership practice was providing teachers with feedback on their performance, a task which in Sancar (2014) study in Turkish republic of Northern Cyprus was found to be frequently practiced in order to give teachers a clear sense of direction. Explanation of the expected levels of performance was found to be a common head teachers’ leadership practice. The findings were therefore in congruence with Masuku (2011) study which found that head teachers frequently explained to teachers the expected levels of performance by establishing well-defined procedures with clear performance expectations.

Unlike in Butcher (2014) study which found that teachers in Arkansas were rewarded for achieving set targets, the current study identified the rewarding of teachers who achieved set targets as the least common directive leadership practice. In schools where some form of reward was in place, head teachers concurred with Masuku (2011) study that there were inconsistencies in rewarding teachers who achieved set targets. With a preference being teachers in national examination classes. In contrast to Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) study in which head teachers took the responsibility of showing teachers how to perform difficult tasks, in the current study, showing teachers the methods of performing difficult tasks was a least common directive leadership practice.

Further, the study sought to establish teachers’ perception on their head teachers’ directive leadership practices. The teachers were required to indicate the frequency their head teachers executed ten (10) directive leadership practices. The responses were determined on a 5-point Likert rating scale as follows: 5- Always, 4- Often, 3- Undecided, 2- Rarely, and 1- Never. The results are presented in Table 4.4
Table 4.4: Teachers’ perception of their head teachers’ directive leadership
(n = 248)

| The head teachers directive leadership | Always (n | %) | Often (n | %) | Undecided (n | %) | Rarely (n | %) | Never (n | %) |
|----------------------------------------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|-----|
| Provides teachers feedback on their performance | 93 37.5 | 107 43.1 | 9 3.6 | 31 12.5 | 8 3.2 |
| Explains teachers the expected levels of performance | 143 57.7 | 76 30.6 | 4 1.6 | 21 8.5 | 4 1.6 |
| Reminds teachers to follow set rules and regulations | 170 68.5 | 66 26.6 | 2 0.8 | 9 3.6 | 1 0.4 |
| Shows teachers how to perform difficult tasks | 34 13.7 | 89 35.9 | 31 12.5 | 63 25.4 | 31 12.5 |
| Provides teachers with clear performance standards | 120 48.4 | 69 27.8 | 25 10.1 | 22 8.9 | 12 4.8 |
| Encourages teachers to report issues hindering performance | 129 52.0 | 59 23.8 | 10 4.0 | 33 13.3 | 17 6.9 |
| Actively monitors teacher’s duty performance | 144 58.1 | 75 30.2 | 14 5.6 | 10 4.0 | 5 2.0 |
| Gives teachers clear deadlines of completing allocated tasks | 159 64.1 | 52 21.0 | 8 3.2 | 11 4.4 | 18 7.3 |
| Educates teachers on methods of improving performance | 60 24.2 | 80 32.3 | 23 9.3 | 50 20.2 | 35 14.1 |
| Rewards teachers who achieve set targets | 50 20.2 | 52 21.0 | 20 8.1 | 56 22.6 | 70 28.2 |

Table 4.4 shows that 170 (68.5%) teachers said that their head teachers always reminded them to follow the set rules and regulations. A total of 159 (64.1%) teachers reported that they were always given clear deadlines for completing allocated tasks. In focus group discussion, the researcher sought a clarification about the deadlines teachers were given. One teacher explained:
We have clear deadlines for completing schemes of work preparation, and even deadlines for handing over our lesson plans every week. Personally I like it because as a human being I would relax and not prepare these professional documents if such reminders were not made regularly.

The teacher’s comment on tendency to relax if frequent reminders were not made concurred with an observation made by a head teacher during an interview. A total of 143 (57.7%) teachers indicated that expected levels of performance were always explained to them. At the focus group discussion, teachers were asked how often their head teachers explained expected performance levels. One teacher commented:

Once the head teacher explains the expected levels of performance, she does not keep repeating, the head teacher has confidence that we will meet the performance targets without being constantly reminded.

Most 144 (58.1%) teachers indicated that their head teachers always actively monitored their duty performance. A total of 107 (43.1%) teachers reported that their head teachers often provided teachers with feedback on their performance, while 93 (37.5%) teachers indicated that such feedback was always provided. This was in line with TSC (2016) directive that teachers be provided with frequent feedback on their performance through performance appraisals. At the focus group discussion teachers were asked to elaborate on the methods that were used in monitoring teachers’ performance and one teacher explained:

The head teacher normally walks around and sometimes comes into the classes. The head teacher also checks lesson plans and students’ books on weekly basis… When not in a position to do it, the deputy head teacher is delegated to monitor.

Unlike in Yakavets (2017) study which found that after attending training on performance improvement, school heads in Kazakhstan organized workshops for inducting teachers on performance improvement, A total of 50 (20.2%) and 35 (14.1%)
teachers said that their head teachers rarely and never respectively, educated teachers on methods of improving performance. In focus group discussion some teachers said that their head teachers did not possess the capacity to educate them on methods of performance improvement. Asked to expound one teacher observed:

The head teacher does not have much experience either as a teacher or head teacher. We cannot assume that being appointed as a leader has transformed the head teacher to be an expert on improving performance. But even if the head teacher had the knowledge on improving performance I would prefer to be taught by a resource person who is not my head teacher.

The teachers observed that they were more comfortable with a resource person since they did not feel intimidated and were freer to seek for clarifications on issues they did not understand. A total of 56 (22.6%) and 70 (28.2%) teachers indicated that head teachers rarely or never respectively, rewarded teachers who achieved set targets. On being probed on the prospect of proposing the implementation of some reward system during the focus group discussion, a teacher expressed apprehension of such a move by saying:

Even suggesting its implementation is seeking for trouble. You start your exit the moment you mention it.

In schools where teachers said that there was a reward system some teachers expressed their frustrations that despite their efforts, only teachers with subjects in national examination classes were rewarded. In focus group discussion a frustrated teacher remarked:

We work as hard as class eight teachers, we actually prepare the learners for class eight, yet the school has never created a system where we are rewarded for our hard work. Without our hard work, the learners would never succeed within that one year of national examination.
A total of 63 (25.4%) and 31 (12.5%) reported that their head teachers rarely or never respectively, showed them how to perform difficult tasks. In focus group discussion some teachers said that it was not necessary for them to be shown how to perform difficult tasks. Asked to expound on why they thought it was not necessary, a teacher explained:

I don’t expect a head teacher to come and show me how to teach a difficult concept. Once you are given a responsibility it is up to you to find out how to do it. The head teacher will not come and show you how to do it. You have been trained.

To obtain the most and the least common directive leadership practice, the frequency of teachers who indicated always and often, and those who indicated rarely and never was combined. Teachers were in agreement with the head teachers being explained the expected levels of performance was a frequent practice. Thus, the findings were in congruence with Butcher (2014) study which found that school head teachers in Arkansas explained teachers the expected levels of performance and held them accountable for their achievement. The study findings also concurred with Sancar (2014) and Wango & Gatere (2012) studies that reminding teachers to follow set rules and regulations was a frequent practice. Vijayaran (2008) observed that reminding teachers to follow rules and regulations was a major characteristic of the path goal theory. Sancar (2014) study found that reminding teachers the set rules and regulations maintained the desired standards. In path goal theory monitoring performance is a key feature of a directive leader (Robin, 2012), however, the study found that monitoring teachers’ performance was a common leadership practice. The findings were in contrast to Reche, Bundi, Riungu & Mbugua (2012) study in which monitoring was least common practice in Maara district schools. The study findings concurred with Sancar
(2014) findings that school heads monitored teachers’ performance through classroom observation, checking of teachers records of work and performance appraisals. In contrast to findings of a study by Lumbasi, K’Aol & Ouma (2016) which established that there is a reward system in place for teachers who attain the given goals, teachers in the current study concurred with head teachers that rewarding teachers who achieved set targets was a least common directive leadership practice. Further, teachers concurred with head teachers that unlike in path goal theory in which the leader provides support in performing difficult tasks (Koontz and Wehrich (2009), showing teachers how to perform difficult tasks was another least common directive leadership practice. The study also sought to determine if head teachers’ directive leadership practices had any significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.05$).

$H_{01}$: Head teachers’ directive leadership practices have no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ directive leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. The independent variable was directive, leadership practices. The dependent variable was teacher job satisfaction. Table 4.5 presents the model fitness on the influence of head teachers’ directive leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction.

Table 4.5: Model Fitness on the influence of head teachers’ directive leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.421$^a$</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>22.88553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in table 4.5 indicates that 17.4% of teachers’ job satisfaction is explained by directive leadership practices. According to Muijis (2004) in Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) an adjusted R of between 0.11 and 0.3 is a modest effect. A total of 82.6% of teachers’ job satisfaction was determined by other factors not included in the model.

Table 4.6: Analysis of Variance on the influence of head teachers’ directive leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>27727.752</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27727.752</td>
<td>52.941</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>128841.857</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>523.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156569.609</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 indicated that the model was statistically significant since F statistic of 52.941 and the reported p value (0.000) was less than 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level, a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers’ directive practices and teachers’ job satisfaction, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teachers directive practices had significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

Table 4.7: Regression of coefficients for directive leadership practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta(β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>10.625</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>7.276</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since P-value was (0.000), which was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding t-
statistic was 7.276 was greater than the critical t statistic ($t_{\text{cal}}[7.276] > t_{\text{crit}}[1.96]$). Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was that directive leadership practices have significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Quantitatively, a unit change in head teachers’ directive leadership practices would result in 0.421 change in teachers’ job satisfaction.

This finding agrees with Wachira (2013) study which reported that by guiding and controlling how teachers conducted their school activities, head teachers’ significantly influenced teachers’ job satisfaction. Similarly, the finding affirm earlier studies by Yilmaz (2007), Riffatun-NisaAwan and Bigger (2008) which reported a positive relationship between principal directive leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction. The studies further established that directive leadership practice motivated teachers to work harder in order to accomplish the institutional objectives. In contrast to the current study which found a statistically significant influence of head teacher’s directive leadership practice on teachers’ job satisfaction, in Bell, Chan and Nel (2014) study directive leadership had no significant impact on organizational culture and teachers’ job satisfaction. Mulwa and Kyalo (2013) study, found that directive leadership had a negative influence on teachers job satisfaction.

4.2.2 Head teachers’ supportive leadership practices and its influence on teachers job satisfaction

The study sought to establish influence of the head teachers’ supportive leadership practice on teachers’ job satisfaction. In supportive leadership, the leader is friendly and appreciative of the followers’ efforts (Luthans, 2011). To determine the extent head teachers perceived their supportive leadership practices. Head teachers were required to
indicate the frequency in which they executed ten (10) supportive leadership practices. The responses were determined on a 5-point Likert rating scale as follows: 5- Always, 4- Often, 3- Undecided, 2- Rarely and 1- Never. The results are reported in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Head teachers’ perception of their supportive leadership practices (n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The supportive leadership</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Careful not to hurt teachers' personal feelings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps teachers solve problems that hinder their performance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains a friendly working relationship with teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does little things to make it pleasant for teachers in school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thoughtful of teacher's personal needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Celebrates teachers’ special occasions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approachable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patient with the teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes teachers' personal achievements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give teachers special treats</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8 showed that 21 (67.7%) head teachers indicated that they always maintained friendly working relationship with the teachers. At an interview with some head teachers they were asked how a friendly working environment was maintained in the schools. One head teacher remarked:

I believe in open communication and cordial interaction with the teachers. I don’t want to cause tension in school. If there is tension teachers won’t work well. My experience has been that open communication and cordial interaction helps to create a friendly working environment.

A total of 15 (48.4%) head teachers reported that they always helped teachers solve problems that hindered their performance and a similar number 15 (48.4%) of the head teachers were positive that they often helped teachers solve problems hindering their performance. In response to further probing on factors that would hinder performance in interviews, head teachers said that hindrances to performance could emanate from the person’s health or family issues, asked how they (head teachers) offered support to such teachers, one head teacher explained:

If a teacher gets unwell we organize and ensure he or she is taken to the hospital by another teacher. The teachers makes certain that the sick colleague is given proper care is taken. I also give permission to teachers to attend to serious family issues, of course not all the time, but, I try to support where I can.

A majority 20 (64.5%) head teachers said that they were always approachable, head teachers observations concurred with Butcher (2014) study in which head teachers reported that they perceived themselves as approachable. During an interview with some head teachers they were asked why they perceived themselves as approachable, one head teacher gave a personal experience saying:

I have tried to create a culture where teachers feel free to approach me anytime with any issue. I try to be non-judgmental and understand their
situation… teachers are more comfortable with me and even tell me when they apply to join the Teachers service Commission.

Another head teacher observed:

One thing I have learnt is don’t boss the teachers. Be at their level. I have found it very good since the teachers are very free to approach me and I can now attest I understand them much better. It’s not always easy but I try my best.

The head teachers struggle to maintain an approachable character concurs with Korb & Akintude (2013) study which found that head teachers’ maintenance of an approachable character was crucial but overwhelming task for them. Although a majority 20 (64.5%) of the head teachers said that they were always careful not to hurt teachers personal feelings, further probing on how they prevented themselves from hurting the teachers’ personal feelings during interviews proved that this was not always the case. The complexity of being careful not to hurt teachers’ feelings was brought out by one head teacher who exclaimed:

Being careful not to hurt teachers feeling! It is not possible all the time….There are times when stern actions must be taken and which of course, hurts teachers’ feelings

The head teacher’s assertion supports a recommendation by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, (2015) which directs school heads to make teachers aware that there are some school directives and working boundaries that are non-negotiable. The directives and working boundaries may not be always pleasant for teachers and may hurt a teacher’s feelings. A total of 18 (58.1%) head teachers said that they were always thoughtful of teachers’ needs. At the interview one head teacher gave the following example:
Realizing that teachers’ payment was not adequate I have tried to get something extra for them like organizing extra activities in school to ensure they get something extra in their pockets.

A total of 20 (64.5%) head teachers reported that they always recognized teachers’ personal achievements. The finding concurred with Butcher (2014) study which reported that school heads not only recognized but also celebrated teachers’ personal achievements. When asked how personal achievement of the teachers were recognized during an interview with some head teachers it emerged that teachers’ personal achievements were recognized when they made learners excel in the subjects they taught. Explaining how recognition of teachers’ achievements in the school was conducted a head teacher said:

Only class eight teachers are recognized for their achievement, it will be impractical to recognize every teacher for each achievement they make, they are many.

A total 16 (51.6%) head teachers reported that they were always patient with teachers. In response to further probing on how they practiced patience with the teachers one head teacher explained:

If a teacher has an issue, let us say in relation to discipline, I don’t jump into conclusion, I restrain myself, and take my time to gather relevant information, listening to all sides of a story, at times issues just get solved by themselves.

The head teacher’s account was consistent with findings of Maxwel and Riley (2017) study in which a head teacher acknowledged the need for exercising constraint irrespective of the situation. A total of 10 (32.3%) head teachers admitted that they rarely celebrate teachers’ special occasions. At the interviews some head teachers who did not celebrate teachers special occasions said that they considered such celebrations as personal events, which should not be integrated into a teachers’ professional life.
Other head teachers differed with those who said that those were private occasions. Their opinion was that recognition and celebration of special occasion like excelling in a school activity made the teachers feel appreciated for their efforts. In addition to celebrating teachers’ special occasions, some head teachers reported that they did little things to make it pleasant for teachers in the schools. Asked to elaborate on the little things they did to make it pleasant for teachers during an interview, one head teacher said:

I surprise teachers with small gifts like sweets, sometimes I buy a cake for their tea. I like seeing the joy in my teachers when I surprise them.

Other head teachers said that they organized special activities for teachers within the school term. One head teacher gave the following illustration:

I have realized it’s very important to organize special social events for teachers, like here, during the first term we have a prayer day (recollection), the second term we go for either team building, or a seminar or a workshop, and at the end of the year, we go for lunch out.

The head teacher’s comments echoed the comments made in Butcher (2014) study, where a head teacher noted that doing little things like writing thank you notes, or a consoling note if a teacher encountered any challenge made teachers feel that they were appreciated.

To obtain the most and the least common supportive leadership practice, the frequency of head teachers who indicated always or often and rarely or never were combined. The study found that maintaining a friendly working relationship with the teachers was a common supportive leadership practice. Similar findings were observed in Masuku (2011) study which reported that the existence cordial working relationship between head teachers and teachers in high schools at the Midlands Province, Zimbabwe created
conducive teaching and learning environment in Zimbabwe. Similar findings were reported in Makokha (2014) study which added that a friendly working relationships between school heads and teachers and reduced stress and tension associated with the school environment. Contrary to a report by the Ministry of education science and Technology (2012) that teachers’ needs were not met, the current study found being thoughtful of teachers’ needs was a common supportive leadership practice. Some of the ways head teachers showed thoughtfulness included supporting in times of need and encouraging teachers to assist each other. Another common supportive leadership practice was head teachers helping teachers solve problems that hindered their performance. The findings on head teachers helping teachers solve problems concurred with Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) study which found that school heads in south-east Queensland Australia helped teachers solve problems that hindered performance by encouraging teachers to mentor one another. Unlike in Butcher (2014) study that found head teachers in Arkansas gave teachers special treats for-example a surprise candy bar, a thank you note or a fun day out, the current study found that giving teachers special treats was a least common supportive leadership practice. Another least supportive leadership practice was celebrating teachers’ special occasions.

Further, the study sought to establish teachers’ perception of the extent their head teacher executed leadership behaviours that characterize supportive leadership. The teachers were required to indicate the frequency their head teachers practiced ten (10) supportive leadership behaviours. The responses were determined on a 5- point Likert rating scale as follows: 5- Always, 4 - Often, 3 - Undecided, 2 - Rarely and 1- Never. The teachers’ perception of their head teacher’s supportive leadership practices are reported in Table 4.9.
### Table 4.9: Teachers’ perception of their head teachers’ supportive leadership practices (n = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The head teachers’ supportive leadership</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Careful not to hurt teachers’ personal feelings</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps teachers solve problems that hinder their performance</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains a friendly working relationship with teachers</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does little things to make it pleasant for teachers in school</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is thoughtful of teacher's personal needs</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Celebrates teacher's special occasions</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is approachable</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is patient with the teachers</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes teachers' achievements</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives teachers special treats</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.9, 175 (70.6%) teachers reported that their head teachers were always approachable. In response to further probing during focus group discussion on why they thought their head teachers were approachable a teacher explained:

The head teacher can go down to your level and joke with you. The head teacher listens a lot. Is very friendly, doesn’t yell to people around. Respects
teachers and would not embarrass a teacher by correcting him or her in front
of the students.

The teacher’s explanation was in accord with Massachusetts Department of Elementary
and Secondary Education, (2015) that being approachable builds a culture of trust
between the head teacher and the teachers. A total 136 (54.8%) teachers reported that
their head teachers always maintained a friendly working relationship with teachers.
Nevertheless, in focus group discussion some teachers expressed their disappointment
that their head teacher created obstacles that hindered a friendly working relation among
teachers. Asked to elaborate, one teacher noted:

We have no time to meet and know each other, I even do not know some of
the teachers especially the new ones. We have no staff room here, so we
remain in our classes and only change from one class to another. Since we
are not many, each teacher has been allocated a class where to work from
during breaks. We eat our meals from the classroom with the students.

According to 124 (50.0%) of teachers, head teachers were always patient with them. In
response to further probing in a focus group discussion on how head teachers
demonstrated patience with teachers, one teacher said:

The head teacher listens a lot. If there is any issue, it is properly investigated
and all sides of an issue are examined before a decision is made. Even when
a disciplinary action is taken, you know you have been given many chances
to tell your story and even given time to improve. The head teacher is in no
hurry to make unpleasant decision.

A similar comment was made in Sancar (2014) study when a teacher reported that their
school head was a very good listener, which made solving teachers’ issues much easier.

In focus group discussion teachers observed that some head teachers were always
thoughtful to teachers’ personal needs. In response to further probing on how the head
teacher showed thoughtfulness to teachers personal needs one teacher noted:
Whenever any one of us has an issue that requires our support, everyone is informed and encouraged to support the teacher. The head teacher keeps reminding us the importance of helping one another.

The teachers who observed that their head teachers always recognized teacher’s achievements were 94 (37.9%). Further probing in focus group discussion on how teachers were recognized brought out the fact that there were inconsistencies in such recognition, one teacher clarified:

The only time a teacher gets recognized in this school is when they perform well in KCPE examinations. Maybe when you win in extra curriculum activities you may be congratulated and nothing else.

Teachers in some schools came out strongly to negate the claim that teachers were recognized for achievement in their school. One teacher commented with finality:

“Nobody is recognized for achievements in this school”. We are expected to achieve set targets and it does not attract any special recognition.

According to 50 (20.2%) and 45 (18.1%) teachers noted that their head teachers rarely or never respectively, celebrated their special occasions. On being probed further during focus group discussions it was established that most head teachers celebrated teachers’ weddings and birth of a baby. However, other personal celebrations like graduations were not celebrated. However, in some schools, head teachers had introduced celebrating each other’s birthdays, this however never lasted. One teacher reported with nostalgia:

Last year the head teacher had introduced celebration of each other’s birthday. It was such an uplifting moment… That was last year, but from this year the celebrations have since stopped.

Teachers who said that their head teachers rarely gave them special treats were 54 (21.8%). A significant number 70 (28.2%) teachers indicated that they were never given special treats. During a focus group discussion some teachers noted that they did not
anticipate any special treats and were okay with that, others reported that lack of being
given special treats was demotivating.

To obtain the most and the least common supportive leadership practice, the frequency
of teachers who indicated always or often, and those who indicated rarely or never was
combined. Teachers were in agreement with their head teachers that a common
supportive leadership practice was being patient with the teachers. Head teachers
patience enabled head teachers to understand teachers’ aspirations and feelings as
advocated for in the path goal theory (Vijayaragan, 2008). The findings concurs with
those of Sancar (2014) study that found head teachers were friendly and approachable
most of the time, which made teachers comfortable to approach and communicate with
their head teachers without hesitation. Explaining the approachable nature of their
school head, teachers in Butcher (2014) study reported that the school had an open door
policy which made teachers meet their head teachers easily without following the
protocol of making prior appointments. The open door policy made it easy for the head
teacher to solve urgent issues.

Unlike in Jakuback (2017) study in which teachers reported dissatisfaction with
unfriendly working environment that made teachers leave teaching in Catholic Diocese
of Louisiana schools, in the current study teachers concurred with their head teachers
that maintaining friendly working relationship was a common supportive leadership
practice. The study established that a least common supportive leadership practice was
giving teachers special treats. Similar findings were found in Butcher (2014) and
Jabukack (2017) studies in which teachers reported to seldom being accorded special
treats. Teachers observed that another least common supportive leadership practice was celebrating their special occasions. Unlike in Sancar (2014) study in which most teachers observed that their head teachers did little things for teachers to make them have a sense of belonging in the school, in the current study, doing little things to make it pleasant for teachers in the school was a least common supportive leadership practice. The second hypothesis of the study sought to determine if head teachers supportive leadership practices had any significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.05$).

$H_02$: Head teachers’ supportive leadership practices have no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ supportive leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction. The independent variable was head teachers supportive, leadership practices. The dependent variable was teacher satisfaction. Table 4.10 presents model fitness for the influence of head teacher’s supportive leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.507a</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>21.73904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.10 presented the model fitness used in explaining supportive leadership practices. The adjusted R square was 25.4%. This shows that head teachers supportive practices explains a modest 25.4% of teachers’ satisfaction. Therefore, 74.6% of teachers’ job satisfaction was determined by other factors not included in the model.
Table 4.11: Analysis of Variance for the influence of head teachers supportive leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>40313.458</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40313.458</td>
<td>85.304</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>116256.151</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>472.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156569.609</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 provided the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 83.304 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level supportive leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teachers supportive practices are a good predictor of teachers’ job satisfaction.

Table 4.12: Regression of Coefficients for supportive leadership practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.729</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive leadership practices</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>9.236</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive leadership practices had a strong positive influence on teachers job satisfaction with (β = 0.507). At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since the P-value (0.000), was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding t-statistic was 9.236 was greater than the critical t statistic t_{crit} [9.236] > t_{crit} [1.96]. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Hence the conclusion was supportive leadership practices have significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.
A unit change in head teachers’ supportive leadership practices would lead to a 0.507 units change in teachers’ job satisfaction.

These finding were consistent with Giessner, Dawson and West (2013) study which established that supportive leadership was associated with increase in followers’ satisfaction. Khalid (2012) also found that supportive leadership improved job stress, employee performance and job satisfaction. The findings were also in agreement with Adeyemi (2010), Mwangi, (2013), who found that supportive leadership was widely practiced in schools which led to willingness of teachers to work overtime.

4.2.3 Head teachers’ participative leadership practices and its influence on teachers’ job satisfaction

The study sought to establish influence of the head teachers’ participative leadership practice on teachers’ job satisfaction. Participative leadership is characterized by a leader consulting the followers/subordinate when making decisions which affect them. The leader allows followers participation in decision making. The leader values the ideas and contributions of the followers (Luthans, 2011). To establish the head teacher participative leadership practices. The head teachers were required to indicate the frequency they executed ten (10) participative leadership practices. The responses were determined on a 5- point Likert rating scale as follows: 5- Always, 4- Often, 3- Undecided, 2- Rarely and 1- Never The results are reported in Table 4.13.
Table 4.13: Head teachers’ perception of their participative leadership practices

(n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers participative leadership practices</th>
<th>Always n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Often n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Undecided n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rarely n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Never n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holds meetings to identify teachers problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens receptively to teacher's ideas and suggestions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks teachers’ opinion before making decisions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks teachers’ views on tasks to be performed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask teachers’ for suggestions on how to perform identified tasks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in informal discussions with teachers during breaks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures teachers are comfortable with their teaching schedules</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates time to meet each teacher to get their views</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves teachers in planning school events</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives assurance to teachers of competencies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 4.13, most 20 (64.5%) head teachers indicated that they always sought teachers’ suggestions on how to perform identified tasks. Further probing in an interview with some head teachers on when a head teacher was likely to seek teachers’ suggestions on how to perform identified tasks revealed that, head teachers with less
than two years’ working experience at a school were more inclined to seek teachers suggestions on how to perform identified tasks as one head teacher noted:

Since I am new in this school, I don’t know how things are done, therefore, I seek teachers’ suggestion on how to perform some activities. I usually consult the deputy head teacher and the heads of departments

The head teacher’s assertion was in congruent with Grootenboers and Hardy (2017) study that found head teachers remained calm and sought to learn about the school by seeking teachers views on school traditions from their deputies or heads of departments who had longer experience at the schools. The head teachers reported that remaining calm and seeking teachers’ views in unfamiliar circumstances made it easier for them to execute earmarked school activities. During an interview a head teacher elaborated:

When I was new to this school, I often sought teachers’ suggestions on how to perform identified tasks. But today, unless I am doing something I have not done before I rarely seek teachers’ views on how to perform the tasks

Other head teachers said that they sought teachers’ views to get the general idea of the tasks to be performed from all teachers. Asked how often head teachers sought teachers’ suggestions on how to perform identified tasks a head teacher said:

You see every morning I pray with the teachers in the staffroom, after prayers I make teachers aware of any important activities of the day, sometimes I ask them for their suggestions on how to perform those activities.

The head teachers who said that they often held meetings to identify the problems teachers faced, were 20 (64.5%). Further probing revealed that in most schools staff meetings were held at least twice in a term. It was during such meetings that teachers’ problems and possible solutions were discussed. Most 18 (58.1%) head teachers indicated that they always involved teachers in planning school events. Asked how teachers were involved one head teacher noted:
After informing the teachers the pre-arranged school events for the term during school opening staff meeting, I guide the teachers to form committees that steer the planning of these events.

Another head teacher observed:

I want teachers to own the events and take active part in their implementation. Therefore, once I earmark the events to be performed I involve teachers’ in planning for them right from the beginning.

The head teachers who reported that they always sought teachers’ views on tasks to be performed were 17 (54.8%). An interview with some head teachers clarified that views on tasks to be performed in the school were not sought from all teachers. Head teachers said that they consulted the deputy head teacher or heads of departments to identify priority activities to be performed during a school term. The head teachers who said that they sought teachers’ views before making decisions were also 17 (54.8%). The findings were consisted with Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) and Masuku (2011) studies which reported that teacher opinion and views were frequently sought before decisions that affect them were made. Seeking teachers views enabled the head teachers to take cognizant of everyone’s needs in making the decisions. On further probing on how teachers’ views were sought one head teacher clarified:

… from experience I realized that in order to have everyone on board as I make school decisions, and especially on issues concerning teaching and learning, I consult teachers beforehand. This allows me to accommodate everyone’s views as much as possible.

Further, the head teachers noted that seeking teachers’ opinion before making decisions helped teachers embrace the final decision and take personal responsibility of the resolutions made. In illustrating on how seeking teachers’ opinion before making decision helped solve a perennial discipline issues among the teachers, a head teacher explained:
...When I realized that we had issues with teacher discipline that kept recurring, I called teachers for a brainstorming meeting on the issue. After brief brainstorming teachers requested that they be allowed to develop guidelines for resolving such problems in the future. Once they were through, they gave me a copy of proposed guidelines which I made a copy for each teacher. Teachers owning the resolutions has helped to address the discipline issue.

An inquiry into whether teachers’ opinion were sought when making all decisions established that in sensitive decisions for example, on their pay and increments teachers opinions were not sought. A majority 16 (51.6%) head teachers indicated that they always listened receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions. The findings were in congruence with Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) study in which school heads reported that they listening receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions, made teachers have a sense of being understood and their ideas appreciated. A total of 11 (35.5%) head teachers acknowledged that they rarely created time to meet individual teachers to get their views. When the head teachers were probed on why they failed to create time for meeting individual teachers, one head teacher explained:

…. Unless a teacher has a problem there is no need of meeting each teacher individually. However, when a teacher has a problem either personal or work related, I always create time to meet the teacher.

The head teachers clarified that they delegated the duty of meeting individual teachers on a regular basis to the deputy head teachers. They said that the only time they met individual teachers was when the teacher had issues that could not have been handled by the deputy head teacher. Further, 10 (32.3%) head teachers said that they rarely participated in informal discussions with the teachers during breaks. In response to further probing on their lack of participation in informal discussion with the teachers one head teacher observed:
… Teachers need some time by themselves and this is only possible during break. I do not join them during break time because I want them to interact with each other freely.

The head teachers observed that they were very busy in the office and had no time to mingle with teachers during breaks. The study sought to establish the most and the least common participative leadership practice in the schools by combining the frequency of head teachers who indicated always or often and rarely or never. The findings indicated a common participative leadership practice was seeking teachers’ opinions before making decisions, which concurs with path goal theory that a participative leader involves the followers in making decisions (Vijayaragan, 2008). Other common participative leadership practices were listening receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions, seeking teachers’ views on tasks to be performed. These findings were consistent with Sancar (2014) study in which head teachers in Turkish republic of Northern Cyprus which reported that head teachers frequently created time to listen to the teachers. The head teachers noted that listening to teachers either individually or during staff meetings helped them to identify and solve teachers’ issues and problems.

Similar findings were reported in Masuku (2014) and Wachira (2017) studies which reported that head teachers held monthly meetings to listen to teachers views, seek clarifications, review teachers progress in achieving set targets and identify obstacles hindering performance for the purposes of finding solutions. Unlike in Butcher (2014) study which reported that the school heads found time to meet individual teachers, in the current study, head teachers creation of time to meet individual teachers was a least common participative leadership practice. Other least participative leadership practices were head teachers interaction with teachers informally and holding informal discussion
with the teachers during breaks. Further, the study sought to establish teachers’
perception on head teachers’ participative leadership practices. The teachers were
required to indicate the frequency their head teachers executed ten (10) participative
leadership practices. The responses were determined on a 5-point Likert rating scale as
follows: 5- Always, 4- Often, 3- Undecided, 2- Rarely and 1- Never. The results are
reported in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: Teachers’ perception of head teachers’ participative leadership
practices

\( (n = 248) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers’ participative leadership practices</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Holds meetings to identify problems teachers’ face</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listens receptively to teacher's ideas and suggestions</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks teachers’ opinion before making decisions</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks teachers’ views on tasks to be performed</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asks for suggestions on how to perform identified tasks</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participates in informal discussions with teachers during breaks</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures teachers are comfortable with their teaching schedules</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates time to meet each teacher to get their views</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involves teachers in planning school events</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives assurance to teachers of their competencies</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14 shows that majority 131 (52.8%) teachers reported that their head teachers always involved them in planning school events. In response to further probing on how teachers were involved in planning school activities during a focus group interview, one teacher explained:

We always meet with the head teacher to plan for upcoming school events. During such meetings we are given a chance to give our views on how to organize them. Most of our views are incorporated. We even go ahead and allocate ourselves duties with the guidance of the head teacher.

Some teachers revealed that their head teachers had pre-determined school activities and events. Further probing sought to establish the level of teacher involvement in schools where the head teacher had pre-determined activities, a teacher clarified:

...once the head teachers identifies what is to be done, we are given a chance to give our views on how to perform the identified tasks or, if the task is already being implemented we are asked to provide suggestions on how to enhance and fast track its implementation.

The teachers 106 (42.7%) and 79 (31.9%) teachers indicated that their head teachers always or often respectively, sought teachers’ views on tasks to be performed. In a focus group discussion some teachers agreed that their views were sought while others were categorical that their head teachers did not seek their views on tasks to be performed. Justifying head teachers’ failure to seek teachers’ views on tasks to be performed one teacher noted:

The head teacher does not need to seek our views. Anything that the head teacher wants us do, we should be instructed to do it without much consultation; that includes work or duties allocation.

The teacher's assertion contrasted Sancar (2014) findings that to ensure that each teacher was comfortable, head teachers allocated all duties in consultation with the
teachers. The teachers who said that their head teachers asked for suggestions on how to perform identified tasks were 106 (42.7%). In response to further probing in a focus group discussion on whether suggestions on how to perform identified tasks were asked from everyone, one teacher explained:

Individually no! In most cases the head teacher consults the deputy head teacher or heads of subject panels or departments on how to perform certain tasks. Nevertheless, Sometimes the head teacher asks for suggestions on how to perform certain activities during staff meetings.

Similar observations were made in Somech and Wenderow (2006) study that found school heads did not involve all teachers in every decision, instead when making decisions on some issues they consulted a few teacher representatives. A total of 103 (41.5%) teachers concurred with Sancar (2014) that head teachers always listened receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions. In a focus group discussion, some teachers expressed their concern that their head teacher was too busy to attend to them. If they had an issue they were directed to the deputy head teacher. In some schools however, teachers were pleased that their head teacher had time to listen receptively to them, one teacher noted:

The head teacher listens a lot. When I talk I feel I am understood, I feel I am not judged. It makes me happy to be a teacher here.

A significant number 100 (40.3%) teachers reported that their head teachers always held meetings to identify challenges teachers face. Further probing in a focus group discussion revealed that the head teachers not only identified challenges faced by teachers but also facilitated the search for most amicable solutions to the challenges.

Unlike in Butcher (2014) study which reported that head teachers found time to meet individual teachers and get their views. A total of 62 (25%) and 69 (27.8%) teachers
indicated that their head teachers rarely or never respectively, created time to meet each individual teacher. In focus group discussion teachers said that they were more satisfied with the head teachers who rarely or never created time to meet each individual teacher. Asked to clarify, one teacher pointed out:

I don’t think it is necessary for head teacher to meet each individual teacher… unless the teacher has issues which can only be handled by the head teacher.

In contrast to Sancar (2014) study in which teachers reported that their head teachers found time to interact with teachers informally, 55 (22.2%) of the teachers said that their head teachers rarely participated in informal discussions with the teachers during break, while 61 (24.6%) indicated that their head teachers never participated in informal discussions with the teachers. Asked how they felt about their head teacher failure to participate in informal discussions, one teacher observed:

I am more comfortable when head teacher does not join in our informal discussions. Without the head teacher we crack lots of jokes which would not be possible with the head teacher in our midst.

In focus group discussion teachers further revealed that although their head teachers rarely met individual teachers or participated in informal discussions with the teachers during breaks, they recognized the teachers’ competencies. Asked to explain how recognition of teachers’ competencies was affirmed, one teacher explained:

When the head teacher allocates me a task for-example making me a class teacher or in charge of a subject panel, it gives me confidence that I have leadership competencies.

The teacher’s response concurred with Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) findings that teachers felt appreciated when they were given opportunities to take lead of school activities. Teachers perceived that being trusted with a school responsibility was an
assurance of their competencies recognition. It a noted that the teachers who said that their head teachers did not recognize their competencies had not been given any additional responsibilities at school. Unlike in Bas and Mustafa (2010), Masuku (2011) and Sancar (2014) studies which found that the teachers were consulted when making teaching and learning schedules and timetables to ensure teachers were comfortable, in focus group discussions, some teachers observed that they were not consulted in making teaching schedules or time tables. A teacher who disagreed with the notion that their head teachers ensured they were comfortable with their teaching schedules noted:

No! The head teacher does not seek our views on whether we are comfortable with teaching schedules. Work load is mostly allocated depending with the number of teachers for that subject in the school.

To establish the most and the least common participative leadership practice the frequency of teachers who indicated always or often and rarely or never was combined. Teachers supported their head teachers’ perception that the most common participative leadership practice was listening receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions. The findings were in congruence with Sancar (2014) study that found head teachers created time to listen to teachers in order to understand their perspective. In line with the current study, Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) study which reported that in order to have a clear focus when planning activities, school heads sought to utilize teachers’ knowledge by seeking their views. Another common participative leadership practice was seeking for teachers suggestions on how to perform identified tasks. Seeking to learn unfamiliar practices was identified in (Hajisoteriou 2014) study among Greek-Cypriot head teachers as an important leadership practice.
Unlike in Masuku (2011) study that found head teachers used informal communication to improve on their leadership practice. Teachers in the current study concurred with their head teachers that head teachers’ participation in informal discussions with teachers during breaks was a least common participative leadership practice. There was also consensus between teachers and head teachers that creation of time to meet individual teachers to get their views, a practice identified in Sancar (2014) and Masusku (2011) as an avenue for identifying current professional issues and providing necessary assistance, was a least common participative leadership practice in the current study. The third hypothesis of the study determined if head teachers participative leadership practices had a significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.05$).

**H03: Head teachers’ participative leadership practices have no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.**

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ participative leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction. The independent variable was head teachers’ participative leadership practices. The dependent variable was teachers’ job satisfaction. Table 4.15 presents model fitness for the influence of head teacher’s supportive leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.486$^a$</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>22.05432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.15 presented model fitness used in explaining the influence of leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. The adjusted R square of 23.3% shows
that head teachers’ participative practices explains a modest 23.3% of teachers’ job satisfaction. Other factors not included in the model explains 76.7% of teachers’ job satisfaction.

**Table 4.16: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the influence of head teachers’ participative leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>36916.976</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36916.976</td>
<td>75.900</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>119652.633</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>486.393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156569.609</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on table 4.16 indicates that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 75.900 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers supportive leadership practices and teachers job satisfaction, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teachers’ participative leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction.

**Table 4.17: Regression of Coefficients for participative leadership practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta(β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.967</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participative leadership practices</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>8.712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent variable, participative leadership practices had a strong positive influence on teachers satisfaction with (β = 0.486). At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since the P-value (0.000) was less than 0.05 level.
of significance. The corresponding t-statistic 8.712 was greater than the critical t statistic ($t_{\text{cal}}[8.712] > t_{\text{crit}}[1.96]$). Thus the null hypothesis was rejected. The conclusion was participative leadership practices have a significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Quantitatively, a unit change in head teachers’ participative leadership practices would lead to a 0.486 units change in teachers’ job satisfaction.

This finding concurred with Sagie, Zaidman, Amichai-Hamburger and Schwartz (2012) study which established that when team leaders solicited different ideas from the team members, there was improved team outcomes and high levels of job satisfaction. Similarly, Sinani (2016) established that participative leadership had a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction. According to Namaei (2012) an employee's motivation, job satisfaction and innovation was higher when participative leadership was used. In his study, Onah (2011) established that participative leadership had positive influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers were satisfied with participative leadership because their opinions, comments and suggestions were considered in decision-making. Wanjiru (2016) established that when head teachers remained accommodative of teachers’ opinions, through participative leadership, they also encouraged good interpersonal relationship which enhanced teachers were satisfied with their work. Iqbal (2010) study on the impact of principals’ job satisfaction of teachers the province of teachers in Punjab, Pakistan established that participative leadership led to teachers’ job satisfaction compared to other leadership approaches. Nevertheless, in the current study, while concurring with the positive influence of participative leadership on job satisfaction, it was noted that teachers desired greater involvement in decision making than currently provided.
4.2.4 Head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practice and its influence on teachers’ job satisfaction

The study sought to establish influence of the head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practice on teachers’ job satisfaction. An achievement oriented leader sets challenging goals and shows confidence in the followers’ ability to attain these goals. The leader thus defines the tasks to be performed, puts structures in place, plans, organizes and monitors the achievement of the set goals (Luthans, 2011). The head teachers were required to indicate the frequency in which they practiced ten (10) achievement oriented leadership practices. The responses were determined on a 5-point Likert rating scale as follows: 5- Always, 4- Often, 3- Undecided, 2- Rarely and 1- Never. The results are reported in Table 4.18
Table 4.18: Head teachers’ perception of their achievement oriented leadership practices

(n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers achievement oriented leadership practices</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage teachers' continual improvement of performance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates teachers preparation of detailed work plans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show confidence in a teachers' ability to achieve set goals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets challenging goals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs teachers’ on the highest performance expectations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to set challenging goals for themselves</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges teachers’ to exceed their set goals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews teachers’ progress in achieving set performance targets</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes teachers’ into work groups to improve performance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teachers’ to work without much supervision</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 shows that most 21 (67.7%) head teachers indicated that they always encouraged teachers’ continual improvement of performance. When asked to clarify the ways they encouraged teachers’ continual improvement of performance during an interview with some head teachers, some head teachers noted that they encouraged teachers to improvise ways of making students understand better. One head teacher explained:
I do not settle for one performance per excellence, I challenge teachers to go an extra mile and have teaching and learning aids to make students’ understanding easier. I want lessons to be more practical.

Other head teachers said that they encouraged continual improvement of performance by fast tracking syllabus coverage. Asked how fast tracking was done, a head teacher explained:

…. I facilitate the coverage of the syllabus through preparation of a common detailed schemes of work. When I came to this school, I instructed the subject panels to come up with common schemes of work for each subject for different levels. I keep a soft copy of the schemes of work, which is updated at the beginning of each school term, once it’s complete, each teacher gets a copy.

From the interviews, it was conspicuous that none of the head teachers said that they encouraged teachers to attend workshops, seminars or other training for improving their pedagogical skills. The revelation from interviews differed with Yakavets (2017) findings which reported that head teachers sought training opportunities for teachers to improve their pedagogical skills both locally and internationally.

A total of 17 (54.8%) head teachers observed that they always showed confidence in their teachers’ ability to achieve set targets. From the interviews it emerged that although many head teachers said that they showed confidence in their teachers’ ability to achieve set targets, some head teachers did not have full confidence in their teachers as noted by one head teacher who said:

I have confidence that the teachers have the ability to achieve set targets and that is why I recommended most of the teachers to be hired. Nevertheless, I don’t take chances, I monitor their target achievement regularly.
In congruent with Yakavets (2017) study which found that head teachers made teachers aware of the high performance expectations, a total of 16 (51.6%) of the head teachers indicated that they always informed teachers of the highest performance expectations. In response to a question on how teachers were informed on the high performance expectation during interviews, some head teachers said that reminders were done whenever there was a staff meeting. An inquiry into how often such meetings were held during an interview with some head teachers revealed that, brief regular staff meetings were conducted at least once a week, while longer staff meetings were held once a term, or whenever there were serious issues needing elaborate or length discussions.

A majority 17 (54.8%) head teachers reported that they always facilitated teachers’ preparation of detailed work plans. Further probing during an interview with some head teachers revealed that the work plans were prepared at the beginning of the term. These work plans were used for the purposes of performance appraisals at the end of each term. Further, head teachers said they assisted teachers to make detailed work plans by notifying the teachers of all activities for the term. Further, 16 (51.6%) head teachers concurred with Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) study that found head teachers challenged teachers to exceed their set goals. Asked for elaboration on how they challenged teachers to exceed their targets, one head teacher observed:

Targets are what actually drives us. I always challenge the teachers to exceed targets for-example, if you are given a target of 80%, aim higher and surpass the mark, I tell the teachers not to limit themselves, to work hard to exceed that given target. When a class is weak, I sometimes give the teachers higher class targets to motivate them to work hard.
Although 16 (51.6%) head teachers said that they often set challenging goals for the teachers, a significant number 7 (22.6%) of head teachers observed that they rarely set challenging goals for the teachers. Further inquiry into the reasons for some head teachers failing to set challenging goals for the teachers revealed that some head teachers thought that teaching was a well prescribed routine job. One head teacher observed:

There is nothing challenging about a teacher’s job at school, all that a teacher does while in school is part and parcel of what being a teacher is all about. It is laid down in the school curriculum.

Unlike in Sancar (2014) study that established supervision of performance was constantly executed, 16 (51.6%) head teachers reported that they often allowed teachers to work with minimal supervision. In response to the question on why it was necessary to have teachers work without much supervision, a head teacher remarked:

I believe in allowing teachers perform their duties without much supervision. I don’t have to follow them to prepare teaching records, or ensure they are punctual in classes. I believe a good teacher should work without being followed.

The head teachers who said that they always organized teachers into work groups were 11 (35.5%). In further probing on how head teachers organized teachers into such work groups during the interviews, some head teachers admitted that even though such groups existed in their schools they were not involved directly in organizing them. One head teacher clarified:

I have delegated to the deputy head teacher the duty of organizing teachers into panels. I however assist the deputy head teacher in identifying each teachers’ subjects and grouping teachers into subject panels accordingly.
All teachers in this school are in a particular panel, for-example, Mathematics, English, among others.

To establish the most and the least common achievement oriented leadership practice, the frequency of head teachers who indicated always or often and rarely or never was combined. The findings showed that a common achievement leadership practice was showing teachers’ confidence in their ability to achieve set targets, which according to path goal theory is a characteristics of an achievement oriented leader (Northouse, 2016). The findings were in line with Korb and Akintude (2013) and Conley and You (2017) studies that found head teachers not only set targets but also showed confidence in their teachers’ ability to achieve the set targets, and in their ability to select and execute appropriate pedagogical approaches.

Another common achievement oriented leadership practice was facilitating teachers’ preparation of detailed work plans. The findings concurred with Murat (2010) study which found that head teachers facilitated detailed work plans by redesigning work contexts to match teachers’ expectations and ability. Head teachers were in accord with the findings of Yakavets (2017) study that it was a common leadership practice to encourage teachers to explore ways of improving their performance. Although several studies Bas (2012), Rew (2013) and Grootenboer and Hardy (2017) have shown that organizing teachers to work in collaboration improved their performance, a least common achievement leadership practice was organizing teachers into work groups to improve performance. Unlike the path goal theory which advocated that an achievement leader give the followers challenging goals (Northouse, 2016), setting challenging goals was a least common achievement leadership. The current findings contrasts an earlier
research by Butcher (2014) which found that head teachers motivated their teachers by setting challenging goals for them. Further, the study sought to establish teachers’ perception of the extent their head teachers executed achievement oriented leadership. The teachers were required to indicate the frequency in which their head teachers executed ten (10) achievement oriented leadership practices. The responses were determined on a 5- point Likert rating scale as follows: 5- Always, 4- Often, 3- Undecided, 2- Rarely and 1- Never. The results are reported in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19: Teachers’ perception of their head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices

(n = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices</th>
<th>Always n</th>
<th>Always %</th>
<th>Often n</th>
<th>Often %</th>
<th>Undecided n</th>
<th>Undecided %</th>
<th>Rarely n</th>
<th>Rarely %</th>
<th>Never n</th>
<th>Never %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers’ continual improvement of performance</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives teachers detailed work plans for achieving set targets</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows confidence in a teachers’ ability to achieve set goals</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets challenging goals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs teachers’ on the highest performance expectations</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to set challenging goals for themselves</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges teachers’ to exceed their set goals</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review teachers’ progress in achieving set performance targets</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes teachers’ into work groups to improve performance</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teachers’ to work without much supervision</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in table 4.19, most 152 (61.3%) teachers said that their head teachers always encouraged their continual improvement of their performance. In response to further probing during an interview with some teachers on how head teachers encouraged continual improvement of performance, a teacher explained:

The head teacher has set targets for each level. In lower class, we have the target of 90%, while in upper primary the target is 75%. That target is what drives us because the targets are usually higher than what the class gets.

Another teacher expounded further:

…. In subject panels, we deliberate and set the targets. The targets emanates from the panels and are taken to the department and the head teacher. We are encouraged to continually set higher target than we had previously.

Some teachers however, expressed their disappointment that despite their hard work aimed at improving the performance, head teachers still demanded more improvement without appreciation of the already improved performance. A total of 134 (54.0%) teachers indicated that their head teachers always informed them on the highest performance expectations. In response to the question on how frequently head teachers informed teachers on the highest performance expectations one teacher observed:

One aspect that the head teacher never forgets to remind us to surpass our targets whenever we have a staff meeting … at least twice a term we are reminded not to settle at our set targets but aim higher.

Majority 130 (52.4%) teachers indicated that their head teachers always showed confidence in their ability to achieve set targets. The findings were in congruent with Masuku (2011) who observed that head teachers seldom interfered with teachers’ decisions regarding teaching and learning processes, a sign of confidence in teachers’ abilities to organize and make right decisions. Rew (2013) in his study found that
having confidence in teachers empowered them to believe in their effectiveness. Asked to expound on how the head teacher demonstrated confidence in teachers ability during the focus group discussion one teacher noted:

First, the head teacher has confidence that we will achieve set targets. Even when we seem to lag behind in achieving the targets, the head teacher does not harass us. He knows by the end of the term, all we had set to achieve will be done.

Further inquiry into how (the teachers) felt about their head teacher confidence in their abilities revealed that teachers were elated. In contrast to Sancar (2014) study which established that school heads conducted frequent supervision of the teaching and learning process, 118 (47.6%) teachers said that their head teachers always allowed them to work without much supervision. In response to a question during focus group discussion on how teachers felt about being allowed to work without much supervision, a teacher noted:

….there is that feeling of being set free to work, even when you are given a subject there is that freedom to work without being followed daily.

Another teacher observed:

Being trusted to achieve my targets with minimal supervision gives me an inner drive to perform to my best capacity. The head teacher does not need to closely monitor my performance.

Teachers who said that their head teachers rarely set challenging goals were 49 (19.8%), while 48 (17.7%) teachers indicated that teachers never set challenging goals. During focus group discussion, teachers noted that although head teachers seldom set challenging goals they were satisfied. Asked to expound, one teacher noted:

The head teacher does not have to set a challenging goals. The achievement of the goals is dictated by the disposition of the learners. As much as there
is a need to exceed given set goal, learners may not have the capacity to understand.

The teachers who reported that their head teachers never organized them in work groups to improve performance were 58 (23.4%). In focus group discussion with the teachers, it was established that in some schools, subject panels or work groups never existed. In response to a question on how they (teachers) felt about not being organized into work groups, some teachers observed that it was not necessary since they were already experts in their subjects. Among the teachers who said that their head teachers organized them into work groups (subject panels) further probing revealed that the head teacher initiated the formation of such groups and delegated to the deputy head teacher the duty of allocating teachers into their panels. To explain how work groups were organized one teacher said:

We have panels for different subjects. Despite the fact primary school teachers can teach most subjects, with the help of the deputy head teacher we identify the subject a teacher is good at and group each teacher accordingly.

To obtain the most and the least common achievement oriented leadership practice, the frequency of teachers who indicated always or often, and those who indicated rarely or never was combined. In consistence with path goal theory which observes that an achievement oriented leader seeks continuous improvement of performance (Northouse 2016), teachers concurred with their head teachers that encouraging continual improvement of performance was a common achievement oriented leadership practice. The findings resonates with Marshall (2014) report that head teachers encouragement of teachers’ continual improvement of performance was a major characteristic of high performing school heads. In line with Butcher (2014) study teachers supported their
head teachers’ views that being made aware of the high performance expectations was also a common achievement oriented leadership practice. Although path goal theory proposes that an achievement oriented leader should constantly monitor and supervise goal attainment, the current study found that supervision of teachers was not a common leadership practice.

The finding were differed with Sancar (2014) study that reported rigorous supervision of instruction in Turkish Republic. Further, the findings indicated that the teachers being shown confidence in their ability to achieve set targets was common leadership practice, a function reported by Butcher (2014) as one of pillars of successful school heads in Arkansas. Teachers in these schools reported that owing to the confidence their school head had on them, they worked hard to avoid disappointing them. The findings concurred with Lumbasi, K’Aol, & Ouma (2016) that achievement oriented leaders not only set challenging goals but frequently reviewed work progress of set performance targets. Unlike in Butcher (2014) findings that teachers were frequently organized them into work group, in the current study teachers concurred with their head teachers that teachers being organized into work groups to improve performance was a least common leadership practice. The results of the current study also differs with Yakavet (2017) study which found that head teachers in Kazakhstan frequently set challenging goals for teachers, a function which the current study found to have been a least common practice. The fourth hypothesis of the study determined if head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices had a significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.05$).

**H04: Head teachers achievement oriented leadership practices have no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.**
Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction. The independent variable was head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was teachers’ job satisfaction. Table 4.20 presents model fitness for the influence of head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction.

**Table 4.20: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.467a</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>22.30731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.20 presented model fitness model used in explaining the influence of achievement oriented leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. The adjusted R square was 21.5%. This shows that head teachers achievement oriented leadership practices explains 21.5 % of teachers’ satisfaction. Other factors not included in the model explained 78.5 % of teachers’ job satisfaction.

**Table 4.21: Analysis of Variance of the influence (ANOVA) of head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices influence on teachers’ job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>34156.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34156.094</td>
<td>68.639</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>497.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>497.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results in table 4.21 indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 68.639 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers achievement oriented leadership practices and teachers satisfaction, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction.

**Table 4.22: Regression of Coefficients for achievement oriented leadership Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta(β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>11.880</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>8.285</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent variable, achievement oriented leadership practices had a strong positive influence on teachers satisfaction with (β = 0.467). At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since the P-value (0.000) was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding calculated t-statistic was 8.285 was also greater than the critical t statistic of 1.96. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was that achievement oriented leadership practices have significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Quantitatively, a unit change in head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices would lead to 0.467 units change in teachers’ job satisfaction. Thus, the more the head teacher practiced achievement oriented leadership the more satisfied teachers were.
This finding in the current study concurred with Yukl (2012) study that found task-related behaviors ensure that people, equipment, and other resources are efficiently used in order to accomplish objectives. The study also established that use of achievement oriented leadership enhances member skills, job satisfaction and commitment to the mission of the organization. These findings are in accord with Gatere (1998), Obina (2012) and Njeri (2011) studies that found a significant positive relationship existed between the level of teacher job satisfaction and achievement leadership behaviours. In his study, Negron (2008) noted that achievement-oriented leadership style was most suited for unclear tasks and where teachers needed a morale booster to increase their confidence in accomplishment of given tasks. Similarly, achievement oriented leadership was found to be effective in changing teachers’ attitudes towards their work and motivated them to seek continuous improvement (Obina, 2012). Lussier & Achua (2010) found that achievement oriented leadership was appropriate when followers are open to autocratic leadership, had external locus of control, and where the work was complex and the environment uncertain because it increased teachers’ self-confidence to attain the set goals.

4.2.5 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers job satisfaction

Multiple regression analysis was used to test if there was a significant influence of a combination of the four head teachers’ leadership practices namely: directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented on teachers’ job satisfaction. Amin, Shah & Tatlah (2013) states that a multiple regression analysis is most appropriate when determining the influence of between more than one independent variables and one dependent variable. In this study there were four independent (predictor) variables:
directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent (criterion) variable was teachers’ job satisfaction. The alpha level was set at 0.05. An overall Job satisfaction was calculated based on job satisfaction subscales proposed by Spector (1994). In determination of the influence, Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) and Muijs (2004) in Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) observed that an adjusted R of 0.1 and below presents a poor influence, between 0.11 and 0.3 is a modest influence, 0.31 to 0.5 is a moderate influence, while above 0.5 presents a strong influence.

Hypothesis determined if head teachers’ leadership practices had any significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.05$).

**H05: Head teachers’ leadership practices have no significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.**

Table 4.23 presents the model fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction.

**Table 4.23: Model Fitness for total influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.533*</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>21.48244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.23 presented the model fitness used in explaining the influence of directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square was 27.2%. This shows that a combination of head teachers’ leadership practices explained 27.2% of teachers’
satisfaction. Other factors not included in the model explained 72.8% of the teachers’ job satisfaction.

Table 4.24: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta(β)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>82.297</td>
<td>10.786</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Practices</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-.637</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Practices</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Practices</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented Practices</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4.24 leadership practices had a significant influence on teachers job satisfaction (P = 0.000), which was above 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding calculated t-statistic was 10.786 was greater than the critical t statistic of 1.96. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was that leadership practices have significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. In relation to each other, Supportive leadership practices had a positive and significant influence on teachers job satisfaction (β = 0.297) and p value of 0.005 which was less than 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the more the head teacher practiced supportive leadership the more teachers were satisfied. Participative and achievement leadership practices had a positive but insignificant influence on teachers job satisfaction (P = 0.130 and P = 0.064) respectively. The p values were above 0.05 level of significance. Directive leadership practices had a negative and insignificant influence on teachers job satisfaction (β = -0.063) and p value of 0.524 which was above 0.05 level of significance.
4.2.6 Multicollinearity test

A multicollinearity test was conducted using tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor. The results are represented in table 4.25.

Table 4.25: Multicollinearity Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta(β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.786</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Practices</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-637</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Practices</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Practices</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented Practices</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The insignificant variables with the with lowest tolerance and highest Variance Inflation Factor were excluded in the final model for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. Multicollinearity results showed that directive leadership practices and participative leadership practices had the highest Variance Inflation Factor, hence were excluded in the final model.

4.2.7 Final Regression Model

Table 4.26: Model Fitness for the influence of supportive and achievement oriented leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.526a</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>21.50478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive leadership practices and achievement oriented leadership practices were found to be satisfactory in explaining teachers’ job satisfaction. This was supported by coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square of 27.0%. This shows that supportive leadership practices and achievement oriented leadership practices explain 27% of teachers’ job satisfaction.

Table 4.27: Analysis of Variance of the influence (ANOVA) of head teachers’ supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices influence on teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>43268.019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21634.010</td>
<td>46.781</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>113301.589</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>462.455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156569.609</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 4.27 indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 46.781 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at 99.5% confidence level, head teachers supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction, P < 0.05. The results implied that Supportive leadership and achievement oriented leadership practices were a good predictor of teachers’ job satisfaction.
Table 4.28: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta(β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>79.273</td>
<td>11.685</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>4.439</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive leadership practices</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>4.439</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>2.528</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in table 4.28 showed that, at the 99.5% confidence level, The P-value (0.000), was less than 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, head teachers’ supportive leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. In addition, Supportive leadership ($\beta = 0.357$) which implied that a unit change in supportive leadership practices would lead to a 0.357 units change in teachers job satisfaction. Similarly, at the 99.5% confidence level achievement oriented leadership practices had a significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction, with P-value (0.012). The influence was also positive ($\beta = 0.203$). Thus, the more the head teachers practiced supportive and achievement leadership the more teachers were satisfied with their jobs.

The final regression model shows that **Teachers job satisfaction = 79.723 + 0.357 Supportive practices + 0.203 achievement oriented practices + e.**

These findings concurs with Giessner, Dawson and West (2013) study which established that supportive leadership was associated with increase in work force satisfaction. Khalid (2012) also found that supportive leadership was positively related to reduction in job stress, employee performance and job satisfaction. The findings further corresponds with Lumbasi (2016) study which who found that achievement
oriented leadership was positively and significantly related with employee performance and job satisfaction. Although in this study supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices were found to have significant influence on teachers job satisfaction, Sinani (2016) and Ibrahim, (2014) studies found that participative leadership has a positive and significant influence on employee job satisfaction. Moreover, in Wachira (2013) study, directive leadership was found to have a higher influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

4.3 Teachers’ job satisfaction levels

The second objective of the study sought to establish the teachers’ job satisfaction levels. Data was gathered with a standard job satisfaction tool ‘the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)’ developed by Spector (1994) and revised in 2007. Teachers responded to the nine subscales of job satisfaction namely Pay, Promotion opportunities, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Working conditions, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication.

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) questionnaire uses a 6 point Likert scale rating scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Spector, 2007). The Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS is made up of 36 items which are further subdivided onto nine sub scales, which assess the employee attitudes about certain aspects of the job. Each job subscale is assessed with four items. To get the overall job satisfaction the total score is computed from all 36 items (Spector, 1994). In a 36-itemscale, total scores ranged from 36 to 216. The satisfaction levels were measured using Spector (1994) tool which recommends that scores be grouped as follows; From 36 to 108 is dissatisfaction; above 108 to 144
ambivalent and above 144 to 216 satisfaction. Teachers’ levels of job satisfaction are presented in Table 4.29

Table 4.29: Teachers’ levels of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction sub-scales</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study established that most 226 (91.1%) teachers were satisfied with the nature of their work. In the response to further probing on the satisfying aspects of their work during focus group discussions, teachers provided a range of factors that made them feel satisfied. One teacher explained:

I love being able to teach, to mold the young children. The fact that I am given the responsibility of molding the future of the young ones gives me satisfaction.
Another teacher observed:

The feeling that you have your dignity as a teacher is very satisfying. Whenever I go and my former students appreciate the fact that I contributed in shaping their lives is simply satisfying.

Majority 221 (89.1%) of the teachers indicated that they were satisfied with their co-workers. In focus group discussions, teachers noted that they were satisfied with the fact that whenever any one of them had an issue they all joined together and supported that teacher. Describing their relationship with each other a teacher said:

...our relationship is good. It’s really good ... We are friends! We form a strong support group. Whenever one of us has an issue, joyous like graduation, wedding, birth of a baby, or sad for example sickness and death we join together, contribute money and visit.

A section of the teachers were however not satisfied. They noted that there was no feeling of unity among teachers. The dissatisfied teachers noted that their school rules did not provide a chance for interaction. The school rules demanded that teachers remain in their classes at all times. They even took their meals from their class rooms. The teachers clarified that the school did not provide a common room for meeting during breaks. In a school where such rules were applied one teacher explained:

I don’t know some of my colleagues (teachers) especially those who were employed recently. We have no chance of meeting during breaks. A teacher comes, enters the classroom and that is the end. Once the day is over they go home without ever meeting all teachers except the ones they meet on their way out.

Most teachers 197 (79%) were consistent with Younes (2012) findings that teachers were satisfied with supervision in their schools. In focus group discussions teachers observed that various methods of supervision were used by the head teachers. Asked for examples of these methods one teacher noted:
The head teacher normally walks around the classes and sometimes goes into the classes and observes a lesson being taught.

Another teacher added:

Our lesson plans are checked for at least once in a week. Students’ books are also checked once in a while to ascertain that teaching took place.

Further probing on teachers’ feelings about supervision revealed that although it was unpleasant to have a supervisor seated in classes assessing how one was teaching, supervision was an important activity of ensuring that work was being done. Justifying the necessity of supervision of teaching and learning one teacher explained:

I would say that I am happy with supervision, however, you know everyone wants to be in charge of themselves, so when somebody comes around to check on you, it feels uncomfortable, but it has to be done, because if the head teacher does not do it, human beings have a tendency of relaxing, making teaching less effective.

A total of 159 (64.1%) teachers said they were satisfied with communication in their schools. Further probing in focus group discussion on the methods of communication within the schools revealed that, the most commonly used method of communication was verbal communication. Other methods of communication were memos which were either served to individual teachers or pinned on teachers’ notice boards and personal letters. In focus group discussion some teachers noted that they were dissatisfied with communication in their schools. The dissatisfied teachers said that teachers were unhappy with being corrected in public, which embarrassed them. Other teachers said that they did not mind public corrections as long as their names were not mentioned. One teacher noted:

…… when a correction is done in public and there is no finger pointing, it’s good because it actually deters anyone who would have committed the same mistake. Furthermore, no one else knows who the offender was except the head teacher and the concerned teacher.
Moreover, teachers who expressed dissatisfaction with communication in their schools disliked the idea of important information not being passed to all members of staff. Asked to elaborate one teacher observed:

> It is dissatisfying when you find something has happened and you have no idea because it’s not communicated to all teachers. It makes me feel as if I am not part of this school.

Giving an example of dissatisfaction with communication in the school, another teacher reported:

> In this school, there is no proper communication. Sometimes we may have a staff meeting, and you only know when you see the head teacher and deputy coming to the staffroom with files.

Unlike in Makokha (2014) study which found that teachers were satisfied with their salary and felt that they received a fair amount for the work they did, in this study only 69 (27.8%) indicated that their pay was satisfying. A total of 119 (48%) teachers said that they were dissatisfied with their pay. Another 60 (24.2%) of the teachers observed that they were ambivalent. Cumulatively, 179 (72.2%) of the teachers were either ambivalent or dissatisfied with their pay. In focus group discussion, teachers were in agreement that pay was inadequate. While acknowledging that there was no time money will be enough, they observed that the amount they were earning was not enough to meet the basic needs of a person. One teacher gave the following illustration:

> …You know the uchumi (economy) is bad, take for-example you pay Kshs 4,000 or Kshs 5,000 for utilities and meals, then you have to commute every day, a two way travel is Kshs 60. For a whole week multiply that by 5 days, its Kshs 300, a decent housing here is between Kshs 6,000 and Kshs 8,000 thousand, and then there are other emergencies. You see at the end of the month you can’t spare anything when you are paid between Kshs 10,000 and Kshs 15 thousand. The money is not even enough to meet all the basic needs.
In contrast with Younes (2012) study in which a majority of the respondents were satisfied with fringe benefits provided in their schools, the current study found that a total of 93 (37.5%) and 75 (30.2%) teachers were either dissatisfied or ambivalent respectively, with provision of fringe benefits. Explaining how some fringe benefits provided were inadequate during the focus group discussion one teacher said:

I agree we are given some house allowance but the amount is so little … The amount we are given cannot afford a relatively comfortable house. There is a need for review of the allowances we get.

Further, 95 (38.3%) of the teachers indicated that they were dissatisfied with Contingent rewards, while 79 (31.9%) indicated that they were ambivalent on contingent rewards in the schools. A majority 174 (70.2%) teachers concurred with Younes (2012) that majority of the teachers were either Ambivalent or dissatisfied with contingent rewards. The teachers who said that they were satisfied with the appreciation, recognition and rewards for good work they received were 74 (29.8%).

According to current study, most 113 (45.6%) were satisfied with chances of promotion in their school, while 93 (37.5%) and 42 (16.9%) of the teachers were either ambivalent or dissatisfied, respectively, with promotion opportunities at the schools. Further probing on promotion opportunities in the schools during focus group discussion revealed that the only probabilities of one being promoted was to be appointed as class teacher or head of a subject panel. While some teachers acknowledged that promotion chances were important, they reiterated that being accorded contingency rewards overrode promotion aspirations. Probed to elaborate one teacher observed:

…You know promotion is not a big issue, compared to recognition. You see as human beings we consider promotion as being raised to a certain rank, but you can remain where you are, and are recognized. Recognition gives a teacher the feeling of being valued and gives a sense of self worthy.
Another teacher observed that recognition and appreciation are intangible rewards which far surpassed material rewards. The teacher simply said:

It’s satisfying to be recognized even without that promotion. I can work under any situation as long as what I do is recognized and appreciated.

Out of the nine job satisfaction facets, teachers were satisfied with four job satisfaction subscales, these were: the nature of work, their co-workers, supervision and communication within the school. Teachers expressed dissatisfaction with five job satisfaction subscales, namely: pay, promotion opportunities, fringe benefits, contingency rewards, and the working conditions. For the overall job satisfaction, the study indicated that 111 (44.8%) teachers were satisfied with their job, and a similar number 111 (44.8%) were ambivalent, meaning they could not make up their mind as to whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied. Teachers who indicated that they were dissatisfied with their jobs were 26 (10.8%).

The findings of the current study were consistent with Makokha (2014) study that found teachers were satisfied with the nature of the work they performed. The teachers associated their satisfaction with its challenging nature since it requires constant upgrading and it’s not repetitive and dull, every year one teaches new students. The job also enabled teachers to achieve short and long term goals. The findings were also in line with those of Butcher (2014) and Makokha (2014) that found teachers were satisfied with their coworkers. The satisfaction with each other was perpetuated by friendly and supportive collaboration among themselves. Further, the study concurred with Marshall (2014) and Gitaka (2014) findings that teachers were satisfied with communication channels in their schools. The teachers appreciated that many methods including verbal and non-verbal methods were used to communicate with the teachers.
Although in Pope Francis (2015, March 14) message to Catholic schools raised the need for teachers to be paid a fair living wage, the current study concurred with many studies Younes (2014), Masuku (2011), Jakuback (2017) and Sancar (2014) that teachers in the Catholic private schools were still dissatisfied with their salaries. In addition, the findings of the current study were consistent with Jakuback (2017) findings that fringe benefits like medical allowance, house allowance among others were not adequately provided.

4.4 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices (directive, supportive, participate and achievement oriented) on teachers’ job satisfaction components

The third objective of the study sought to establish the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented practices) on specific teachers’ job satisfaction components. The subscales developed by Spector (1994) and revised in 2007 formed the job satisfaction components. These were pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, working conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. The hypothesis of the sought to determine if there were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented) on each of the teachers’ job satisfaction components ($\alpha = 0.05$).

**H06: There is no significant difference in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on different components of teachers’ job satisfaction**
4.4.1 Influence head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with pay

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with pay. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was the pay and pay rises. Table 4.30 presents model fitness for the influence of head teacher’s leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with pay.

Table 4.30: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.294a</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>5.19764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.30 shows that 7.1% of teachers’ satisfaction with pay and pay rise is influenced by head teachers directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) the influence of 0 to 0.20 is a weak influence. Thus, there is a weak but significant influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with pay.

Table 4.31: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of leadership practices on pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>621.140</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>155.285</td>
<td>5.748</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6564.759</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>27.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7185.899</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 5.748 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers achievement oriented leadership practices and teachers satisfaction, P < 0.05.

Table 4.32: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.418</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative practices</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence of all the leadership practices on teacher’s satisfaction with pay and pay rise was statistically insignificant at 99.5% confidence with p-values of 0.442, 0.525, 0.735 & 0.263 respectively which were all above 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the conclusion there are no significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with pay, P < 0.05. Compared to the other, achievement oriented leadership practices had a stronger positive influence on teachers’ satisfaction with pay and pay rise (β = 0.123) directive, supportive and participative leadership also had a positive influence on teacher satisfaction with pay and pay increases (β = 0.086, 0.075 & 0.039) respectively.
4.4.2 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher satisfaction with promotion opportunities. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was promotion opportunities. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.33

Table 4.33: Model Fitness for the influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.280a</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>4.81329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.33 presented the model fitness used in explaining directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities. This was supported by coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square of 6.3 %. This implies that 6.3% of teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities was explained by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices while 93.7% of teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a weak influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities.
Table 4.34: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>477.076</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>119.269</td>
<td>5.148</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5629.763</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>23.168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6106.839</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.34 provided the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 71.427 and the reported p value (0.01) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level head teachers’ leadership practices has a statistically significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities, \( P < 0.05 \). Thus, head teacher’s directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities.

Table 4.35: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.188</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.437</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>2.486</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in table 4.35 shows that participative leadership practices had the highest and significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities with
Directive, supportive and achievement has insignificant influence on teachers satisfaction with promotion opportunities (p=0.663, p=0.962 and p=0.788) respectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion there are were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion. A unit change in participative leadership practices would lead a 0.287 unit change in teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities. Thus, the more the head teacher practiced participative leadership, the more the teachers were satisfied with promotion opportunities. Supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices had a positive but insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities (β = 0.006, p=0.962 and β = 0.030, p=0.788) respectively. This means that the more head teachers practiced supportive and achievement oriented leadership, it did not significantly influence the teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities. Head teachers directive leadership practices were found to have a negative and insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities (β = -0.049, p=0.663).

### 4.4.3 Influence of head teacher’s leadership practices on teacher satisfaction with supervision

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teacher’s leadership practices on teacher satisfaction with supervision. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was supervision. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.36.
Table 4.36: Model Fitness for the influence of head teacher’s leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.735a</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>3.10346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.36 presented the model fitness used in explaining directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices influence on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision. This was supported by coefficient of determination that is, the adjusted R square of 53.3 %. This shows that head teachers directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices explains 53.3% of teachers’ satisfaction with supervision. This implies that a strong 53.3% of teachers’ satisfaction with supervision is determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices while 46.7% of teachers’ satisfaction with supervision is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a strong influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision.

Table 4.37: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2751.794</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>687.949</td>
<td>71.427</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>9.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5092.242</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.37 provided the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F
statistic of 71.427 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level, head teachers’ leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision, P < 0.05. Hence, head teacher’s directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with supervision.

**Table 4.38: Regression of Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>6.655</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>7.243</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative practices</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>3.172</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-1.331</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.38 shows that at 99.5% confidence level, supportive and participative leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision (p=0.000 and 0.002) respectively. Directive and achievement oriented leadership practices had insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion there are were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision. Supportive leadership practices had the strongest positive influence on teachers satisfaction with supervision (β = .605). A unit change in supportive leadership would lead to a 0.605 change in teachers’ satisfaction
with supervision. Participative leadership practices also had a positive influence on teachers’ job satisfaction with supervision ($\beta = 0.259$). This implied that the more head teachers used supportive and participative leadership practices, the more the teachers were satisfied with supervision in the schools. Directive leadership practices and achievement oriented leadership practices had a statistically insignificant negative influence on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision ($\beta = -0.022, p= 0.784$ and $\beta = -0.103, p= 0.184$) respectively. This implies that the more head teacher used directive and achievement oriented leadership practices the more the teachers were dissatisfied with supervision. However, the influence was insignificant.

### 4.4.4 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teacher's leadership practices on teacher satisfaction with fringe benefits. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was fringe benefits. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.39.

**Table 4.39: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.331*</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>4.66673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.39 presented the model fitness used in explaining directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices influence on
teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits. This was supported by coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square of 9.5 %. This implies that 9.5% of teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits is determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices while 90.5% of teachers satisfaction with supervision is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a weak influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits.

Table 4.40: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>652.398</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>163.099</td>
<td>7.489</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5292.147</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>21.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5944.544</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.40 provided the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 7.1489 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers’ leadership practices and teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits, $P < 0.05$. The results implied that head teachers’ directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits.
Table 4.41: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.374</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-1.003</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative practices</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in table 4.41 shows that achievement oriented leadership practices had the highest and significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities with (p=0.004). Directive, supportive and participative leadership practices has insignificant influence on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits (p=0.986, p=0.317 and p=0.226) respectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion there are were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion. A unit change in achievement oriented would lead to a 0.303 units change in teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits. Consequently, the more the head teacher practiced achievement oriented leadership, the more the teachers were satisfied with fringe benefits. Directive and participative leadership practices also had a positive influence on teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits (β = 0.002 and β = 0.138) respectively. Supportive leadership practices was found to have a negative influence on teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits (β = -0.117) and the p value of 0.317 at 99.5% confidence level, the influence was insignificant. Thus, teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits was only influenced by head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices.
4.4.5 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was contingent rewards. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.42.

Table 4.42: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.526a</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>4.34356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.42 presented the model fitness used in explaining directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices influence on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards. This was supported by coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square of 26.5 %. This implies that 26.5% of teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards was determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices, while 73.5% of teachers satisfaction with contingent rewards is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a moderately strong influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards.
Table 4.43: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1754.503</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>438.626</td>
<td>23.249</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4584.557</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>18.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6339.060</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.43 provided the results of the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 23.249 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers leadership practices and teachers satisfaction with contingent rewards, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teachers’ directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards.

Table 4.44: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative practices</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.44 shows that supportive leadership practices had the highest and significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards. The p-value was 0.01.
Directive, participative and achievement leadership practices had insignificant influence on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits (p=0.785, p=0.479 and p=0.088) respectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion there are were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards. A unit change in supportive leadership would lead to a 0.347 change in teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits. Consequently, the more the head teacher practiced supportive leadership, the more the teachers were satisfied with contingent rewards. Participative and achievement oriented leadership practices were found to have a positive influence on teachers’ satisfaction with contingency rewards (β = 0.073 and β = 0.167) respectively. However, the p values of 0.479 and 0.088 respectively at 99.5% confidence level indicated that the influence was statistically insignificant. Directive leadership practices was found to have a negative influence on teachers satisfaction with contingency rewards (β = -0.027) and the p value of 0.785 at 99.5% confidence level indicated that the influence was insignificant. Thus teachers’ satisfaction with contingency rewards was only influenced by the supportive leadership practices.

4.4.6 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was working conditions. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.45
Table 4.45: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.249a</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>3.79259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.45 presented the model fitness used in explaining the influence of directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions. This was supported by coefficient of determination that is the adjusted R square of 4.6 %. Therefore, 4.6% of teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions was determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices while 95.4% of teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a weak influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions.

Table 4.46: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>229.815</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.454</td>
<td>3.994</td>
<td>.004b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3480.857</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>14.384</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3710.672</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.46 provided the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 3.994 and the reported p value (0.004) which was less than the conventional
probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers leadership practices and teachers satisfaction with working conditions, \( P < 0.05 \). The results implied that head teacher’s directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions.

**Table 4.47: Regression of Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>10.199</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-1.956</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative practices</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-1.150</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.47 shows that supportive leadership practices had the highest and significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with working. The \( p \)-value was 0.00. Directive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices has insignificant influence on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits (\( p=0.052 \), \( p=0.251 \) and \( p=0.680 \) respectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion there are were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions. A unit change in supportive leadership would lead to a 0.433 change in teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions. Consequently, the more the head teacher practiced supportive leadership, the more teachers were satisfied with working conditions. Although achievement oriented leadership practices had positive (\( \beta = 0.046 \)) influence on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions, the influence was insignificant. This is because the \( t \)-test statistics
was 0.413 with associated p-value (0.680 > 0.05) level of significance. Directive and participative leadership practices had negative influence on teachers’ satisfaction with working conditions (β = -0.222 and -0.135), respectively. Thus working conditions was only influenced significantly by supportive leadership practices.

4.4.7 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with Co-workers

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with co-workers. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was co-workers. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.48

Table 4.48: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with co-workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.221a</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>3.41618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.48 indicates that a weak 3.3% of teachers’ satisfaction with co-workers was determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices while 96.7% of teachers’ satisfaction with coworkers is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a weak influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with coworkers.
Table 4.49: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with co-workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>145.986</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.496</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2835.885</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>11.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2981.871</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 3.127 and the reported p value (0.016) which was less than 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers leadership practices and teachers satisfaction with coworkers, $P < 0.05$. The results implied that head teacher’s directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with coworkers.

Table 4.50: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>13.530</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative practices</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.909</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.50 indicates that the influence of all the leadership practices on teacher’s satisfaction with co-workers rise were statistically insignificant at 99.5% confidence
with p-values of 0.601, 0.130, 0.364 & 0.439 respectively, which were all above 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the conclusion there were no significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with co-workers, P < 0.05. Compared with the other, supportive leadership practices had a stronger positive influence on teachers’ satisfaction with co-workers rise ($\beta = 0.182$) directive and achievement oriented leadership practices also had a positive influence on teacher satisfaction with co-workers ($\beta = 0.060$ & 0.087) respectively.

4.4.8 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with the nature of work. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was the nature of work. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.51

Table 4.51: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.282a</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>3.21403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.51 indicates that directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices were found to be satisfactory in explaining teacher’s satisfaction
with nature of work. This was supported by determination as a coefficient, that is, the adjusted R square of 6.4 %. Therefore, 6.4% of teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work is determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices while 93.6 % of teachers’ satisfaction with coworkers is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a weak influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work.

Table 4.52: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with the nature of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>216.913</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54.228</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2510.180</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>10.330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2727.093</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.52 provided the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 5.250 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers leadership practices and teachers satisfaction with nature of work, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teachers’ directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work.
Table 4.53: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.961</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative practices</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.53 indicates that the influence of all the leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with co-workers was statistically insignificant at 99.5% confidence with p-values of 262, 0.748, 0.074 & 0.043 respectively, which were all above 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the conclusion there are no significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work, P < 0.05. Compared with the other, achievement oriented leadership practices had a stronger positive influence on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work ($\beta = 0.223$). Although participative leadership practices had a positive influence ($\beta = 0.207$) on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work, the influence was statistically insignificant. Directive and supportive leadership practices had negative influence on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work ($\beta = -0.126$ and -0.038) respectively. The results of this study therefore imply that teacher satisfaction with the nature of work was only influenced by head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices.
### 4.4.9 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with communication

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with communication within the school. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was communication. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.54.

**Table 4.54: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with communication within the school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.367a</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>3.24142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.54, presents the model fitness used in explaining the influence of directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with communication. The coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square was 12.1%. This implies that 12.1% of teachers’ satisfaction with communication was determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices, while 93.6% of teachers’ satisfaction with communication was determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a weak influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with communication.
Table 4.55: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers satisfaction with co-workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>398.444</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99.611</td>
<td>9.481</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2553.152</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>10.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2951.597</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 9.481 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers leadership practices and teachers satisfaction with communication, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teacher’s directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices was a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction with communication.

Table 4.56: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.104</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>-1.194</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Practices</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.56 indicates that the influence of all the leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with communication were statistically insignificant at 99.5% confidence with p-values of 233, 0.057, 0.389 & 0.071 respectively, which were all above 0.05
level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the conclusion there was no significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with communication, P < 0.05. Compared with the others, supportive leadership practices had a stronger positive influence on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work (β = 0.219). The results also showed that directive leadership practices had an insignificant negative influence on teacher’s satisfaction with coworkers (β = -0.130). The results of this study therefore imply that teacher satisfaction with communication within the school was not influenced by head teachers’ leadership practices namely, directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented.

The study findings that head teachers had insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with pay differs with Nyenyembe, Maslowski, Nimrod and Peter, (2016) study which found that teachers were more satisfied with their job when their school heads solicited for an annual salary increment from the board of directors. Similarly, Ibrahim (2014) found that teachers in Mandera County were not satisfied with the pay that they received. The current study revealed that only participative leadership influenced teachers’ job satisfaction with promotion opportunities which agrees with the finding of Namaei (2012) who found that the level of employee's motivation, job satisfaction and innovation is higher when participative leadership used. In their study in Somalia, Ali and Dahie (2015) found that teachers were more satisfied with promotion opportunities in schools where the principals were supportive and gave teachers more responsibilities through promotions.
The findings of the current study that teachers were more satisfied when teachers were more supportive and encouraged participation in their supervisory processes differs with Wachira (2013) study which found that teachers satisfaction with supervision was promoted through head teachers’ directive leadership which involved directing and controlling how teachers carried out school activities. Similarly, Ampaire (2015) Study in Meru secondary schools, found that when principals provided teachers with clear performance standards and maintained a friendly working relationship, teachers were comfortable with the supervisory procedures. The study concurs with Wangai (2016) study which found that directive leadership had a positive influence on teachers job satisfaction with contingent rewards. The finding that only supportive leadership had significant influence on teachers satisfaction with working conditions differs with Ali and Davie (2015) who found that all the path goal leadership practices had significant and positive impact on teacher satisfaction with the working conditions.

The results of the current study indicated that teacher satisfaction with the co-workers was not influenced by head teachers’ leadership practices namely, directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented. This finding disagree with that of Malik, Hassan and Aziz (2011) findings that there was a significant relationship between participative, supportive and achievement-oriented leadership behavior and employee’s relationship with coworkers. Similarly, Kochhar (2011) and Bellibas and Yan Liu (2016) found that head teachers’ emphasis on sharing and participative leadership encouraged collegial relationship among teachers thus enhancing their satisfaction with each other.
Although the results of this study imply that teacher satisfaction with the nature of work was only influenced by head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices. Several studies have revealed that teachers’ satisfaction with the nature of work is largely influenced by supportive leadership Rafferty & Griffin (2014), Mwangi (2013) and Xie & Li (2011). Boyd, Crossman, Lankford & Wyckoff (2009) found that both participative leadership and supportive leadership encouraged teachers' satisfaction with their work. Jakuback (2017) study in Catholic diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana parochial established that teachers’ dissatisfaction with the nature of their work emanated from their head teachers failure to adopt supportive leadership which would have facilitated collaborative support among the teachers. Similarly, Korb & Akintude, (2013) study concluded that head teachers’ supportive leadership was a major contributor to teachers’ satisfaction with the nature of work. Contrary to current study, in Boggler (2011) study, teachers reported that satisfaction in communication was evidenced when the principal maintained an open communication policy and constantly shared information as pertains their work and school processes. However, the findings that none of the leadership practices had a significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with communication compliments an earlier study by Adegbesan (2013) in Nigeria which found that the administrative styles adopted were inadequate for effective school administration. The styles adopted elicited teachers dissatisfaction with communication within the schools. Further, a study by Nobile (2014) in Australian primary schools found that excessive directive communication poses potential problems for school climate, teachers’ morale and satisfaction.
4.4.10 Influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers job satisfaction in urban and rural Schools

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with in urban and rural schools. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was teachers’ job satisfaction.

H₀₆: There are no significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in urban and urban schools

The model fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices in urban schools is presented in table 4.57

Table 4.57: Model Fitness for the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in urban schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.497ᵃ</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>22.92291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings, head teachers directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices explains a modest 22.8% of teachers’ job satisfaction in urban catholic primary schools. This was supported by coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square of 22.8%. This implies that 22.8% of teachers’ satisfaction within the school was determined by head teachers’ directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices while 77.2% of teachers’ satisfaction in urban schools is determined by other factors not included in the model.
Table 4.58: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in urban schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>26092.514</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6523.128</td>
<td>12.414</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>79344.409</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>525.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105436.923</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.58 indicated that at 99.5% confidence level, head teachers leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. The P-value < 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, head teacher’s directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices were a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction in urban catholic primary schools.

Table 4.59: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.258</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>3.326</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Participative Practices</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.59 shows that at 99.5% confidence level, supportive leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in urban schools. (p=0.001). Directive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices had
insignificant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was there were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in urban schools. Supportive leadership practices had the highest positive ($\beta = 0.437$) and significant influence on teacher’s job satisfaction in urban primary schools. Participative and achievement oriented leadership practices had also a positive but insignificant influence teacher’s job satisfaction in urban primary schools ($\beta = 0.106$, $p=0.431$ and $\beta = 0.100$, $p=0.435$) respectively. This implies that a change in participative and achievement oriented leadership practices did not have significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in the urban Catholic primary schools. The results of this study therefore indicate that teacher satisfaction in urban primary schools was only influenced by head teachers’ supportive leadership practices.

Regression analysis examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in rural catholic primary schools. The independent variables were directive, supportive, and participative and achievement oriented leadership practices. The dependent variable was teachers’ job satisfaction. The model fitness analysis is presented in table 4.60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.661a</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>18.12688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results in Table 4.60 present the model fitness used in explaining the influence of leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in rural Catholic primary schools. The coefficient of determination, that is, the adjusted R square of 41.1 %. This shows that head teachers directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices explains 41.1 % of teachers’ job satisfaction in rural Catholic primary schools, while 58.9 % of teachers’ satisfaction in rural Catholic primary schools is determined by other factors not included in the model. Thus, there is a moderately strong influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in rural Catholic primary schools.

Table 4.61: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in rural Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>22140.126</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5535.032</td>
<td>16.845</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>28586.776</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>328.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50726.902</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 16.845 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant influence existed between head teachers’ leadership practices and teachers’ satisfaction in rural Catholic primary schools, P < 0.05. The results implied that head teachers’ directive, participative, and supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices are a good predictor of teachers’ satisfaction in rural Catholic primary schools.
Table 4.62: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.017</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive practices</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive practices</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.595</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Practices</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented practices</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>2.735</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.62 shows that at 99.5% confidence level, achievement oriented leadership practices had a statistically significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in urban schools. (p=0.008). Directive, supportive and participative leadership practices had insignificant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was that there were significant differences in the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in rural Catholic private primary schools. Achievement oriented leadership practices had the highest positive (β = 0.437) and significant influence on teacher’s job satisfaction in rural primary schools. The findings also showed that head teachers’ directive and participative leadership practices had a positive but insignificant influence on teacher’s job satisfaction in urban primary schools (β = 0.138, p=0.371 and β = 0.298, p=0.057) respectively.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The purpose of the study was to establish the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private primary schools. This chapter summarizes the findings, makes conclusions and recommendations for policy decisions and further research.

5.2 Summary of the findings
The study was guided by objectives of the study. The study revealed that most head teachers and teachers had between two and five years professional experience. A few had a professional experience of more than eleven years. Most of the teachers had worked with their current head teacher for between two and five years, an indication that they had sufficient experience of working with the head teacher to provide objective views of head teachers’ leadership practices.

The first objective sought to determine the influence of head teachers’ directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private schools. To achieve this objective, the study first examined head teachers’ and teachers’ perception of the leadership practices on each of the leadership practices, determined the influence of each leadership practice on teachers’ job satisfaction and examined the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on different job satisfaction components.
**Directive leadership practices**

The study examined both head teachers’ and teachers’ perception of head teachers’ leadership directive practices. Head teachers and teachers were in agreement that the most frequent directive leadership practices were explaining teachers’ expected levels of performance and providing clear deadlines for competing allocated tasks. While head teachers’ perceived themselves as frequently providing teachers with feedback on their performance, teachers viewed their head teachers as frequently monitoring their performance and reminding them to follow set rules and regulations. In focus group discussion teachers pointed out that they were satisfied with the way head teachers frequently reminded them of the school rules, regulations and completion deadlines. Teachers appreciated that such reminders made them work harder to achieve set targets.

Head teachers and teachers were in agreement that the least executed directive leadership practice was rewarding teachers who achieved set targets. Interviews with head teachers revealed that rewards were accorded to teachers who achieved set targets in external examinations, while those who achieved targets in internal examinations were not rewarded. In focus group discussion with the teachers, they expressed dissatisfaction with the discriminative nature of awarding rewards. The study also found that head teachers seldom showed teachers how to perform difficult tasks. In focus group discussions, teachers pointed out that they did not expect the head teachers to show them how to perform difficult tasks especially in their teaching subjects.

At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since P-value was (0.000), which was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding t-statistic was 7.276 which was greater than the critical t-statistic ($t_{cal}[7.276] > t_{crit}[1.96]$).
Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was that directive leadership practices has significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Further, the study found that the more the head teacher practiced directive leadership the teachers were satisfied. With a beta being 0.421, a unit change in head teachers’ directive leadership practices would lead to 0.421 units change in teachers’ job satisfaction.

**Supportive leadership practices**

The study found that head teachers and teachers were in congruent that being thoughtful of teachers’ needs was a common supportive leadership practice. Interviews with head teachers and focus group discussion with teachers revealed that head teachers showed thoughtfulness of teachers needs by organizing fundraising for teachers in case of emergencies. Head teachers also sought ways of supplementing teachers’ salaries by offering monetary rewards for other activities teachers perform in school for example when teachers took learners for extra curricula activities. Head teachers and teachers were in consensus that head teachers frequently helped teachers solve problems that hindered their performance. Teachers concurred with their head teachers that the head teachers were approachable and patient with teachers. Although the teachers and head teachers quantitative data revealed that head teachers maintained friendly working relations with the teachers, in focus group with teachers it was established that some school rules strained teachers working relations. Some rules like forbidding teachers social interactions denied them a chance to know each other and did not have time to create healthy working relations.
The least supportive leadership practice was celebrating teachers’ special occasions. Focus group discussions revealed that a few head teachers who had tried introducing celebrating each other’s special occasions like birthdays did not last for a long period. Other least executed supported leadership practices were doing little things to make it pleasant for teachers in school and giving teachers special treats. Examples of special treats that head teachers accorded to the teachers was arranging for teachers’ tours and special prayer camps. Although head teachers perceived themselves as frequently recognizing teachers’ personal achievements, teachers were of contrary opinion. The study found that head teachers supportive practices explained 25.4% of teachers’ job satisfaction. Supportive leadership practices had a strong positive influence on teachers job satisfaction with ($\beta = 0.507$). Therefore a unit change in head teachers’ supportive leadership practices would lead to a 0.507 units change in teachers’ job satisfaction. At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since the P-value (0.000), was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding $t$-statistic was 9.236 which was greater than the critical $t$ statistic ($t_{cal} [9.236] > t_{crit} [1.96]$). Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and conclusion was that supportive leadership practices has significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

**Participative leadership practices**

The study revealed that most frequent participative leadership practices were seeking teachers’ suggestions on how to perform identified tasks and seeking their views on tasks to be performed. Interviews with some head teachers revealed that newly employed head teachers were more likely to seek for suggestions and views on tasks to be performed and how to perform the identified tasks. Head teachers and teachers were
in agreement that such suggestions were often sought from teachers with senior positions in the school. Other frequent participative leadership practices were listening receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions, holding meetings to identify problems faced by teachers, seeking teachers’ opinion before making decisions that affected them, and involving teachers in planning school events.

Least frequent participative leadership practices were head teachers’ participation in informal discussions with teachers during breaks and creating time to meet individual teachers. At the Interviews, head teachers observed that teachers needed time to interact among themselves freely during their free time, usually during breaks, an assertion that was supported by teachers. The head teachers and teachers did not also deem it necessary for head teachers to meet individual teachers unless they had an issue.

Head teachers’ participative practices explains a modest 23.3% of teachers’ job satisfaction. At 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since the P-value of (0.000) was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding t-statistic 8.712, was greater than the critical t statistic (t_{cal}[8.712] > t_{crit}[1.96]). Thus the null hypothesis was rejected. The conclusion was that participative leadership practices have significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Further, participative leadership practices had a positive influence on teachers job satisfaction with (β = 0.486). Thus, the more the head teacher practiced participative leadership the more teachers were satisfied with their jobs. Additionally, a unit change in head teachers’ participative leadership practices would lead to a 0.486 units change in teachers’ job satisfaction.
**Achievement leadership practices**

Frequent achievement oriented leadership practices were seeking teachers’ continual improvement of performance, informing them the highest performance expectations and showing confidence in their ability to achieve set targets. The study established that the head teachers challenged teachers to set higher targets and to exceed their set targets. Interviews with head teachers revealed that they were apprehensive about leaving teachers unsupervised for long periods. Nevertheless, there was a consensus between teachers and head teachers that teachers were allowed to work without much supervision. Focus group discussions revealed that working with less supervision made teachers take personal responsibility of their duty performance and made them work harder. Further, head teachers and teachers were in agreement that head teachers frequently reviewed teachers’ progress in achieving set targets. Head teachers and teachers concurred that the least achievement oriented leadership practices were setting challenging goals for the teachers and organizing them into work groups.

Interviews and focus group discussions revealed that the practice of organizing teachers into work groups was delegated to the deputy head teachers. At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant influence since the P-value (0.000) was less than 0.05 level of significance. In addition, calculated t-statistic (8.285) was greater than the critical t statistic of 1.96. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. The conclusion was that achievement oriented leadership practices have significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Achievement oriented leadership practices had positive influence on teachers satisfaction with (β = 0.467). Therefore the more the head teacher practiced achievement oriented leadership the more were satisfied teachers. Further, a
unit change in head teachers’ achievement oriented leadership practices would lead to a 0.467 units change in teachers’ job satisfaction.

The second objective sought to establish the levels of teachers’ job satisfaction in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private primary schools. The study found that the components of job satisfaction in which most teachers were satisfied with were; the nature of work, their co-workers and communication. Further discussion in focus group discussion revealed that teachers’ satisfaction with these job components did not depend on head teachers practices. For example in their satisfaction with the nature of work, teachers’ satisfaction emanated from the respect and appreciation they got from their former students. Further, in satisfaction with co-workers, most teachers noted that they shared a strong bond with each other in and out of school. They worked as friends who supported each other especially in times of need. Some teachers who were dissatisfied with their co-workers said that their head teachers’ practices created barriers for their interactions. Several channels of formal and non-formal communication enhanced teachers’ satisfaction. Most teachers expressed satisfaction with supervision in their schools. The study revealed that most teachers were dissatisfied with pay and fringe benefit provided by the schools. Teachers noted that their pay package and other benefits were not enough to enable them live relatively decent lives. Further, the study found that teachers were dissatisfied with contingent rewards. A majority of the teachers said that they felt unappreciated and unrecognized for their achievement of set targets.

The third objective sought to establish the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on different job satisfaction components. The study found that the influence
of all the leadership practices on teacher’s satisfaction with pay was statistically insignificant. The p-values (0.442, 0.525, 0.735 & 0.263) were all above 0.05 level of significant. Compared to the other three leadership practices achievement oriented leadership practices had higher positive significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with pay (β = 0.123). Compared with other leadership practices, participative leadership practices had the highest significant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion opportunities (β = 0.287, p=0.014). There was a strong influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with supervision. A total of 53.3% of teachers’ satisfaction with supervision was explained by teachers’ leadership practices. Supportive leadership practices compared to directive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices had the strongest positive and statistically significant influence on teachers satisfaction with supervision (β = 0.605), and (p=0.000). Participative leadership practices had also a positive and statistically significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction with supervision (β = 0.259) and the p-value (0.002).

The results indicated the influence of leadership practices on teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits was statistically significant. Achievement oriented leadership practices had the strongest positive and significant influence on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits (β = 0.303), and the p-value (0.006). The other leadership practices had insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with fringe benefits. The results indicated that 26.5% of teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards was explained by head teachers’ leadership practices. The influence was statistically significant at 0.05 level of significant. Supportive leadership practices had the highest and significant
influence on teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards. The influence of the other leadership practices were statistically insignificant.

Supportive leadership had a positive and statistically significant influence on teacher satisfaction with working conditions ($\beta = 0.433$), p-value ($0.000 < 0.05$). Directive leadership practices had a negative and statistically significant influence on teacher satisfaction with working conditions. Therefore, the more a head teacher practiced directive leadership the less teachers were satisfied with working conditions. The study found that head teacher leadership practices had insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with coworkers.

Achievement oriented leadership practices had a statistically significant positive influence on teachers’ satisfaction with nature of work ($\beta = 0.223$), p-value ($0.043 < 0.05$). Directive, supportive and participative leadership practices had insignificant influence on teachers’ satisfaction with the nature of work. Although the study showed that supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices had a positive influence on teachers satisfaction with communication ($\beta = 0.219$, 0.097 and 0.193) respectively, the influence was statistically insignificant. Similarly, directive leadership practices had an insignificant negative influence on teachers’ satisfaction with communication.
5.3 Conclusions

The study conclusions were based on the objectives of the study, these were: influence of head teachers’ directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction, the levels of teachers job satisfaction, and the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on job satisfaction components. The study made the following conclusions:

1. The frequent directive leadership practices were related to task performance for example explaining teachers’ expected levels of performance and providing clear deadlines for competing allocated tasks. However, the directive leadership practices that provide an affirmation and recognition of teachers hard work for example rewarding teachers for their achievements were relegated.

2. Head teachers frequently practiced supportive leadership practices that were concerned with assisting teachers in difficult situations, however, head teachers rarely offered supportive leadership to teachers who achieved important milestones and during their pleasant occasions. Participative leadership practices that required the head teachers’ initiative were readily practiced. Nevertheless, the practices that did not require formal facilitation for example participation in informal discussions were relegated.

3. Supportive leadership practices had the highest influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Directive leadership practices had the lowest influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

4. Teachers’ job satisfaction is a function of head teachers supportive and achievement oriented leadership practices. Thus, this study concluded that Teachers job
satisfaction = 79.723 + 0.357 Supportive practices + 0.203 achievement oriented practices + e

5. The highest levels of teachers’ job satisfaction were with the nature of work, co-workers and communication. These job satisfaction components were largely influenced by teachers’ self-efficacy and other informal connections among themselves. It is the conclusion of this study that teachers’ job satisfaction is not solely dependent on head teachers’ leadership practices. Other personal and school dynamics contribute to the total teachers’ job satisfaction.

6. The job satisfaction component which was highly influenced by the head teachers’ leadership practices was supervision. Teachers were satisfied when head teachers exercised supportive leadership during supervision process.

7. Supportive leadership practices influence teachers’ satisfaction with contingent rewards while achievement oriented leadership had the strongest influence on teachers satisfaction with fringe benefits.

8. Participative leadership practices had higher influence on teachers’ satisfaction with promotion.

9. The practice of directive leadership had no significant influence on any job satisfaction component.

5.4 Recommendations for Catholic education policy makers

To enable teachers make deliberate efforts to adopt leadership practices that have significant and positive influence on teachers job satisfaction the study recommends that:

1. Formulate by-laws to regulate school internal processes like teachers’ pay, promotions, and provision of fringe benefits
2. Facilitate the formulation of in-service or pre-service leadership programs that are tailored to offer knowledge and skills on discernment of leadership practices to be adopted at different times, places and encourage all head teachers to attend.

3. All newly recruited head teachers in Catholic private schools to attend an induction course to familiarize themselves with leadership practices and how they are applied to different situations.

4. Formulate a policy for Catholic private schools to guide the recruitment and deployment of head teachers in the private schools, implementation of recommended salaries, fringe benefits and promotions among others

5. Practice periodic review of teachers’ salaries and fringe benefits to enable teachers meet their basic needs.

6. Realign teachers’ salaries and other remunerations with the national guidelines on remuneration and benefits for teachers

5.4.1 Recommendations for head teachers in Catholic private schools

To enable head teachers adopt leadership practices that have the highest and significant influence on teachers’ job satisfaction the study further recommends that head teachers;

1. Attend leadership training programs to enhance leadership competencies and increase awareness on how to apply various leadership practices to different situations

2. Adopt leadership practices that recognize and appreciate teachers knowledge, abilities, expertise and experiences in different fields

3. Practice to integrate supportive leadership aspects in the execution of other leadership practices (directive, participative and achievement oriented), since the
study revealed that supportive leadership has the highest positive influence on teachers’ job satisfaction

4. Make a deliberate effort to practice supportive and achievement leadership practices as much as possible.

5. Create caring and positive environment based on supportive relationships.

6. Facilitate the attainment of school goals and targets by adopting a more achievement-oriented leadership and minimizing directive leadership.

7. Structure the school schedule to accommodate frequent interactions and collaboration between the school administration and the teachers.

8. Give teachers an opportunity to strengthen relationships among themselves in order to satisfy their emotional and professional needs.

5.5 Suggestions for further study

1. The study concentrated on Catholic private primary schools in two Catholic Dioceses, there is a need to establish the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction in more Catholic private primary and secondary schools.

2. There is a need to establish influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in Catholic private tertiary institutions in Kenya.

3. The study found out that the head teachers’ decisions and actions are sanctioned by the school manager. There is therefore need to establish the influence of the school managers on teachers’ job satisfaction in Catholic private institutions.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Teachers’ questionnaire on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction

PURPOSE
This questionnaire is aimed at soliciting information on the influence of head teacher’s leadership on teacher job satisfaction. It will specifically identify head teacher’s performance of school leadership practices, measure teachers’ satisfaction levels and examine the influence of head teacher’s leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. The study is being conducted in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private primary schools.

INSTRUCTIONS
The researcher kindly requests you to respond to all the questions asked. You are assured that the responses given will be kept in confidence and used for research purposes only. You are reminded not to indicate your name anywhere in this questionnaire. In section A tick (✓) the responses that you find suitable in the spaces provided. In section B, circle (○) the performance level of your head teachers’ leadership practices. Section C requires circling (○) your level of agreement with the statement provided.

SECTION A
1. Location of the school  Urban ( )   Rural ( )
2. Gender  Male ( )   Female ( )
3. How many years have you worked as a teacher?
   Less than 2 years ( )   2-5 years ( )   6-10 years ( )
   11-15 years ( )   16 – 20 years ( )   Above 20 years ( )
4. How many years have you worked under the current head teacher?
   Less than 2 years ( )   2-5 years ( )   6-10 years ( )
   11-15 years ( )   16 – 20 years ( )   Above 20 years ( )
5. How many years have you been at current school
   Less than 2 years ( )   2-5 years ( )   6-10 years ( )
   11-15 years ( )   16 – 20 years ( )   Above 20 years ( )
Section B: Head teachers’ performance of leadership practices

The following statements are head teachers leadership practices. Read carefully each statement and indicate by circling “(O)” the level of your head teachers performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers practices</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides teachers regular feedback on their performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains to teachers the expected levels of performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is careful not to hurt teachers’ personal feelings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps teachers solve problems that hinder their performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminds teachers to follow set rules and regulations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds meetings to identify problems teachers face.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers’ continual improvement of performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows teachers how to perform difficult tasks allocated.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides teachers with clear performance standards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains a friendly working relationship with teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does little things to make it pleasant for teachers in school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks teachers’ opinion before making decision that affect them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is thoughtful of teachers’ personal needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrates teacher’s special occasions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to inform him/her when there is an issue hindering performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively monitors teachers performance of their duties</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is approachable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is patient with the teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers practices</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives teachers clear deadlines of completing allocated tasks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates detailed work plans for achieving set targets.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educates teachers on methods of improving performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows confidence in teachers ability to achieve set goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks teachers’ views on tasks to be performed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks teachers for suggestions on how to perform identified tasks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes teachers’ personal achievements.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives special treats to teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in informal discussions with teachers during breaks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consults to ensure teachers are comfortable with their teaching schedules</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets challenging goals for the teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs teachers on the highest performance expectations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates time to meet each teacher to get their views.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves teacher in planning school events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to set challenging goals for themselves.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives assurance to teachers who are uncertain of their competencies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges teachers to exceed their set goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews teachers progress in achieving set performance targets</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes teachers into work groups to improve their work performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teachers to work without much supervision</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards teachers who achieve set targets</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: Teacher job satisfaction levels

The statements below indicate items on job satisfaction. The ratings of the statements indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Read carefully and circle ‘o’ the number that indicates your agreement level with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do in this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My head teacher is quite competent in doing his or her job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition that I should receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures in this school make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I sometimes feel my job as a teacher is meaningless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communications seem good within this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Salary increases are too few and far between.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My head teacher is unfair to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree very much</td>
<td>Disagree moderately</td>
<td>Disagree slightly</td>
<td>Agree slightly</td>
<td>Agree moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The benefits I receive are as good as most other schools offer.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by excessive bureaucracy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I like the things I do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The goals of this school are not clear to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the school when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>In this school people get promoted as fast as other places.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My head teacher shows too little interest in the feelings of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I enjoy my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE STATEMENT.</td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I like my head teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My job as a teacher is enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you
Appendix 2: Focus group discussion guide on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction

This focus group discussion is aimed at soliciting information on the influence of the head teacher’s leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction. It will specifically identify teachers’ perception on important school leadership practices, gauge teachers’ satisfaction levels and finally examine the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. The study is being conducted in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private primary schools.

Location ................................................................................................................................................
Recorder ................................................................................................................................................
Gender: Total No. of Male     Total No. of Female
1. How many teachers are in the school at any one given time..............................................
2. How many teachers have left the school in the past one year..............................................
3. In your opinion which leadership practices does the head teacher perform in the school? Probe for leadership practices association with the following leadership approaches:

- Directive leadership: (feedback on performance levels, reminding to follow rules and regulations, show how to perform difficult tasks, giving deadlines. Performance standard)
- Participative leadership: (hold meetings to identify problems, listening receptively, seek opinion before making decisions, seek views on tasks to be performed, ask suggestions on how to performs tasks, participate in informal discussions)
- Supportive leadership: (maintain friendly working environment, thoughtful of personal needs, celebrating special occasions, careful not to hurt personal feelings, helps solve problems hindering performance)
- Achievement oriented leadership: (encourage continual improvement of performance, show confidence in ability to achieve targets, challenging exceeding of set targets, reward achievement of targets, allowance to work without supervision)
4. How are you satisfied in your pay? **Probe for**
   - Satisfaction with pay levels
   - Contingency awards
   - Rewards
   - Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied and dissatisfied with, in regard to pay and allowances

5. How are you satisfied in your promotion chances in this school? **Probe for**
   - Criteria for promotion
   - Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied and dissatisfied with, in regard promotion procedures in the school

6. How are you satisfied in your teacher supervision in this school? **Probe for**:
   - Methods used for supervision
   - Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied and dissatisfied with regard teacher supervision in the school

7. How would you describe your working conditions? **Probe for**
   - Relationships with each teaching staff
   - Relationships with non-teaching staff
   - Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied and dissatisfied with regard building relationships in the school

8. What are you supposed to do at school? **Probe for**:
   - The nature of work
   - Conditions of work
   - Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied and dissatisfied with in regard to promoting teachers work.

9. How would you describe communication in this school? **Probe for**:
   - Probe the communication channels used for communication.
   - Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied and dissatisfied with regard to communication in the school.
Appendix 3: Head teachers’ questionnaire on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction

PURPOSE

This questionnaire is aimed at soliciting information on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction. It will specifically identify the head teachers’ performance of leadership practices and examine the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction. The data is being collected in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private schools.

INSTRUCTIONS

The researcher kindly requests you to respond to all the questions asked. You are assured that the responses given will be kept in confidence and used for research purposes only. You are reminded not to indicate your name anywhere in this questionnaire. In section A tick (√) the responses that you find suitable in the spaces provided. In section B, tick (√) the performance level of your leadership practices

SECTION A

1. Location of the school Urban ( ) Rural ( )
2. Gender Male ( ) Female ( )
3. How many years have you been a head teacher?
   Less than 2 years ( ) 2-5 years ( ) 6-10 years ( )
   11-15 years ( ) 16 – 20 years ( ) Above 20 years ( )
4. How many years have you been a head teacher at current school
   Less than 2 years ( ) 2-5 years ( ) 6-10 years ( )
   11-15 years ( ) 16 – 20 years ( ) Above 20 years ( )
Section B: Head teachers’ performance of leadership practices

The following statements are head teachers leadership practices. Read carefully each statement and indicate by ticking (√) the level of your performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers leadership practices</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide teachers regular feedback on their performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain to teachers the expected levels of performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am careful not to hurt teachers’ personal feelings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teachers solve problems that hinder their performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remind teachers to follow set rules and regulations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold meetings to identify problems teachers face.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage teachers’ continual improvement of performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show teachers how to perform difficult tasks allocated.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide teachers with clear performance standards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a friendly working relationship with teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do little things to make it pleasant for teachers in school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen receptively to teachers’ ideas and suggestions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek teachers’ opinion before making decision that affect them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am thoughtful of teachers’ personal needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate teacher’s special occasions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage teachers to inform me when there is an issue hindering performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively monitor teacher’s performance of their duties.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am approachable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am patient with the teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give teachers clear deadlines of completing allocated tasks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create detailed work plans for achieving set targets</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate teachers on methods of improving performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers leadership practices</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Show confidence in a teachers’ ability to achieve set goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Seek teachers’ views on tasks to be performed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ask teachers for suggestions on how to perform identified tasks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Recognize teachers’ personal achievements.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Give special treats to teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Participate in informal discussions with teachers during breaks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Consults to ensure teachers are comfortable with their teaching schedules</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Set challenging goals for the teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Inform teachers on the highest performance expectations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Create time to meet each teacher to get their views.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Involve teachers in planning school events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Encourage teachers to set challenging goals for themselves.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Give assurance to teachers who are uncertain of their competencies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Challenge teachers to exceed their set goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Review teachers progress in achieving set performance targets</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Organize teachers into work groups to improve performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Allow teachers to work without much supervision</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Reward teachers who achieve set targets</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you
Appendix 4: Head teachers’ interview guide on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teachers’ job satisfaction

This interview guide is aimed at soliciting information on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction. It will specifically identify head teachers’ perception on important school leadership practices, and examine the influence of head teacher’s leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction. The study is being conducted in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private primary schools.

Location ........................................................................................................................................
Recorder ........................................................................................................................................
Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )
1. How many years have you been at the current school? .................................................
2. How many teachers are in the school at any one given time ........................................
3. How many teachers have left the school in the past one year ........................................
4. In your opinion which leadership practices do you perform in your school? **Probe**
   for the leadership practices associated with:
   - **Directive leadership:** *(feedback on performance levels, reminding to follow rules and regulations, show how to perform difficult tasks, giving deadlines. Performance standard)*
   - **Participative leadership:** *(hold meetings to identify problems, listening receptively, seek opinion before making decisions, seek views on tasks to be performed, ask suggestions on how to performs tasks, participate in informal discussions)*
   - **Supportive leadership:** *(maintain friendly working environment, thoughtful of personal needs, celebrating special occasions, careful not to hurt personal feelings, helps solve problems hindering performance)*
   - **Achievement oriented leadership:** *(encourage continual improvement of performance, show confidence in ability to achieve targets, challenging exceeding of set targets, reward achievement of targets, allowance to work without supervision)*
5. Do you think teachers are satisfied in their pay? **Probe for**
   - **Satisfaction with pay levels**
• Chances for increment
• Leadership practices that makes teachers satisfied or dissatisfied with, in regard to pay practices

6. Do you think teachers are satisfied with other benefits/fridge benefits? **Probe for**
• Monetary benefits offered
• Non-monetary benefits offered
• Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied or dissatisfied with, in regard to fridge benefit allocations

7. Do you think teachers are satisfied with non-monetary (contingency) rewards? **Probe for**
• Recognition/appreciation/rewards for good work performance
• Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied or dissatisfied with, in regard to non-monetary rewards

8. Do you think teachers are satisfied with promotion chances in this school? **Probe for**
• Promotion opportunities
• Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied or dissatisfied with, in regard promotion procedures in the school

9. Do you think teachers are satisfied with supervision in this school? **Probe for:**
• Methods used for supervision
• Head teachers competence
• Leadership practices that teachers are satisfied or dissatisfied with regard teacher supervision practices in the school

10. How would you describe working conditions in this school? **Probe for**
• The teacher workload
• Rules and procedures
• Leadership practices on working conditions that teachers are satisfied or dissatisfied with

11. How would you describe teachers’ relationship with the school? **Probe for**
• Relationship with one another in school
Leadership practices that facilitate teachers satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their colleagues

12. In your opinion, what is a teacher supposed to do? **Probe for:**
   - Tasks allocated
   - Enjoyment of the work
   - Leadership practices that teachers make teachers satisfied and dissatisfied with their work.

13. How would you describe communication in this school? **Probe for:**
   - Communication practices in the school
   - Clarity of communication within the school
   - Leadership practices the teachers are satisfied or dissatisfied with regard to communication in the school.
Appendix 5: Letter of Consent for Interview

Dear..................................................................

You are being invited to participate in a research study on the influence of head teachers’ leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction in Nairobi and Nakuru Catholic private schools.

This interview will take approximately one hour of your valuable time. The interview will be conducted at your preferable time. There are no anticipated risks associated with this interview.

Several steps will be taken to protect your identity. While the interview will be recorded, it will be deleted once the content has been typed. The typed interview will not have your name and any information revealing your identity. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you will be free to withdraw anytime you feel like.

The results of the study will be presented to you once the study has been completed. Please call the researcher on this number, 0722331937. If you have any questions regarding your right as a participant in this research you may contact Kenyatta University Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Curriculum studies. The department can be reached through the following contact:

Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies,
School of Education,
Kenyatta University,
P.O Box 43844-00100, Nairobi.
Telephone: +254 208703782

I have read the above information regarding this research and I consent to participate in the study.

Name………………………………………………………………………
Date………………………………………………………………………
Signature…………………………………………………………………

[Signature]
Appendix 6: Letter of consent to use JSS questionnaire

Susan mutune <srmutune@gmail.com> May 21

to Prof. Spector,

Dear Prof. Spector,

I am a Doctorate student at Kenyatta University in Kenya. my research in on the influence of head teachers' leadership practices on teacher job satisfaction in Catholic private schools. This is purely for academic purposes and I agree to share the results with you using the template provided. I however would like permission to change some terminologies like supervisor to head teacher, organization to school for the respondents to understand the meaning since in Kenyan schools there are many supervisors and i need to be specific, and the refer to educational institutions to schools instead of organizations.

Thanking you in Advance

Susan
Appendix 7: Consent to use JSS questionnaire

Spector, Paul <pspector@usf.edu>

to me

Dear Susan:
You have my permission for noncommercial research/teaching use of the JSS. You can find copies of the scale in the original English and several other languages, as well as details about the scale's development and norms. I allow free use for noncommercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included, "Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved." Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation).
You also have permission to translate the JSS into another language under the same conditions in addition to sharing a copy of the translation with me. Be sure to include the copyright statement, as well as credit the person who did the translation with the year.

Thank you for your interest in the JSS, and good luck with your research.
Best,
Paul Spector, Distinguished Professor
Department of Psychology
PCD 4118
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620
813-974-0357
pspector [at symbol] usf.edu
http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~spector
Appendix 8: Research authorization from NACOSTI

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:

MS. SUSAN MWEMI MUTUNGE
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 0-100 Nairobi, has been permitted to conduct research in Nairobi, Nakuru, Counties on the topic: INFLUENCE OF HEAD TEACHERS' LEADERSHIP PRACTICES ON TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION IN CATHOLIC PRIVATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN NAKURU AND NAIROBI DIOCESES, KENYA for the period ending: 6th September, 2017

Applicant's Signature

Permit No: NACOSTI/P/16/48911/13441
Date Of Issue: 7th September, 2016
Fee Received: Ksh 2000

[Stamp]

Director General
National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation
Appendix 9: Research authorization from Nairobi Catholic Diocese

ARCHDIOCESE OF NAIROBI
Office of the Education Secretary

Your Ref: 
Our Ref: 

Mobile: 0721 491853
Direct line: 020 4950824
Email: education@archdioceseofnairobi.org

Monday April 4, 2016

To:

Director/Head teacher

Primary School

REF: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN CATHOLIC PRIVATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF NAIROBI.

This is to introduce Sr. Susan Mutune of Little Sisters of St. Francis Congregation. She is pursuing her PhD in Educational Management at Kenyatta University. The Education Office has allowed her to conduct research in Private Schools in the Archdiocese.

Kindly accord her the support that she needs.

Note that the findings of the research are purely for Academic purpose.

Yours in Christ,

Rev. Fr. Francis Kiarie
EDUCATION SECRETARY

P.O. Box 20053 – 00200 City Square Nairobi, Kenya, Cardinal Ohungo Plaza, 7th and 8th Floor, Kanda Street. 
Phone: +254 020 4950000  Cellphone: 0721 491853 Website: www.archdioceseofnairobi.org.
Appendix 10: Research authorization from Nakuru Catholic Diocese

CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF NAKURU

EDUCATION OFFICE

P. O. Box 938 - 20100
Nakuru - Kenya.

28th August 2017

Our RCDN/EDU/127/013/2016

The Head teachers
Catholic Private Primary Schools
CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF NAKURU

RE: SR. SUSAN M. MUTUNE

Sr. Susan M. Mutune is a Doctorate student at Kenyatta University. She is doing her research on “Influence of Head teachers Leadership Practices on Teacher Job Satisfaction in Catholic Private Primary Schools in Nakuru and Nairobi Dioceses – Kenya”

Kindly accord her with the necessary support.

Yours sincerely,

Very Rev. Fr. Stephen Nyamweya
EPISCOPAL VICAR/EDUCATION SECRETARY