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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of secondary school principals’ leadership styles on Kenya certificate of secondary education performance in Nairobi. The study was guided by five research objectives. The objectives sought to determine the extent to which headteachers use of autocratic leadership style, democratic leadership style, situational leadership style and Laissez-fair leadership style influenced students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education. The study also sought to seek suggestions on how leadership styles could be improved. The study used descriptive survey research design. The target population comprised of 78 headteachers and 989 teachers. The sample size was therefore 24 headteachers and 99 teachers totalling to 108 respondents. Data were collected by use of questionnaires. Data were analysed by use of descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings revealed that headteachers who had adopted autocratic leadership styles had their schools KCSE mean score of between 4.1- 6.0 points. On the other hand, schools whose head had adopted democratic leadership style had relatively higher mean scores of between 6.1 - 9.0. Headteachers who used situational leadership had mixed results; whereby, some schools reported low mean scores while majority reported mean scores of 4.1 – 9.0 points. Based on the findings it was concluded that public secondary schools had adopted situational leadership style. Schools which had adopted situational leadership style had mixed results in the KCSE; findings show that most had achieved mean scores of six points; however, there are also those who performed well while other performed poorly. The study also concluded that democratic leadership style is the second most adopted leadership style among public secondary schools in Nairobi County. Democratic leaders achieved high score in the KCSE; with some achieving means scores of as high as nine points and above. Schools with heads who adopted autocratic leadership style performed poorly. The regression analysis shows a negative but significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and students performance. The study recommended that head teachers should use the most appropriate leadership style that facilitates collective responsibility and consultative decision making with all stakeholders in the schools. The headteachers should also involve the teachers in school administration which would enhance participative leadership and hence better performance. The government should facilitate the head teacher leadership styles through empowerment and training since they have a direct relationship with the student’s academic performance. The study proposed that leadership styles in public schools could be improved through encouragement of free expression of feelings including criticism among the teachers and staff in general. The study suggested that study on the influences of parental involvement on the pupil’s performance should be conducted. Lastly a study on the teachers’
perception of headteachers leadership styles and their motivation to work should be conducted.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Globally, educating a nation remains the most vital strategy for the development of the society throughout the developing world (Aikman & Unterhalter, 2005). Many studies on human capital development concur that it is the human resource of a nation and not its natural resources that ultimately determine the pace of its economic and social development (Cohen & Soto, 2007; Barro & Lee, 2010). Formal education is the principle institutional mechanism for developing human capital (Nsubuga, 2003). According to a study done by Rhodes, Nevill and Allan, (2004) education is an investment hence; there is a positive correlation between education and economic development.

For many years now, researchers in the area of educational leadership have attempted to identify links between educational leadership and school effectiveness research. This phenomenon is mainly due to the perception that educational leaders, especially school principals, affect school effectiveness (Pashiardis, 1998; Pashiardis, 2004). There are contradictory findings concerning effects of leadership on students’ achievement. Some studies found no influence whereas others identified some effects (Johnson, 1993). Okoth (2010) also found
that the head teachers’ leadership styles seemed not to have been the major contributing factor towards the fairly low student academic achievement.

Today, the position of the principal is far more sophisticated and the job is far more complex than in previous decades. This complexity can best be seen in the incredible number of functions that principals are expected to perform daily and often simultaneously. The maintenance of quality and standards in education depend largely on the extent to which principals effectively carry out their leadership responsibilities (Ibukun, Oyewole & Abe, 2011).

Principals have the power to influence the teacher morale in their school by the actions or daily practices they exhibit (Rhodes, Nevill, & Allan, 2004). Often teachers feel they are not treated as professionals, are not appreciated, or are overworked, thus causing low teacher morale. On the other hand, some teachers with a high morale level may say their principal is very supportive or that they are able to teach instead of having to perform an abundance of clerical tasks. Teacher morale is an important aspect of academic achievement. Thus, through their leadership style, principals must also understand they have a tremendous influence on the morale of the teachers.

In Uganda poor academic performance is associated with the inability of the head teachers to apply the appropriate leadership styles in their everyday leadership activities. A study done on the same established that effective school performance
requires visionary leadership amongst others, and that there is a strong relationship between visionary leadership and transformational leadership which is recommended for educational leaders (Nsubuga, 2010).

In Kenya, it is noted that most head teachers acquire their leadership position through service transition that is promotion from a classroom teacher to the leadership position without prior training. In this case most of them are only equipped with classroom methodology and not leadership skills that can enable them to be effective in their leadership roles (MoE, 2005). The head teacher’s effectiveness determines the quality of performance and the co-operation among subordinates. Effective leadership style in a school does not only reflect good performance but quality production from all the members within the organization (ibid, 2005).

Effective leadership styles in schools have been noted as factors that differentiate between performers and non-performers in educational achievement. Campbell, Bridges, and Nystrand, 1993) reviewed leading ninety seven (97) studies of successful schools and interviewed leading researchers as well as writers on urban education about the factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Leadership style emerged as a crucial factor in determining schools’ success. Head teachers are directly involved in influencing the activities of the school towards goal setting and goal attainment.
Responsibility is placed on the hands of head teachers to ensure that students perform well in their examinations. Olembo and Karugu, (1998) pointed out that the head teacher had overall responsibility over the operation of the school. Luthans (2002), stresses that dramatic changes noted in a work environment resulted to visionary leader who encourages and persuades rather than commands followers towards common goals. Bush and Bell (2003), emphasize that head teachers were directly involved in influencing the activities of the school towards goal setting and goal attainment. Low achievements have been observed in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in public secondary schools in Nairobi County over the last four years.

Public secondary schools in Nairobi County have been performing poorly. For instance in KCSE results 2012, only two schools managed to be in top 10 nationally. Nairobi County was not even among the top 10 counties that performed well. According to Kenya National examination council (2012) on overall the counties did well in the 2012 KCSE exams included, Samburu, West Pokot, Elgeyo Marakwet, Siaya, Embu, Transnzoia, Bomet, Nandi, Uasin Gishu and Kisumu. Districts such as Kasarani, Kamukunji, Dagoretti and Embakassi Districts of Nairobi County have continually performed poorly.
1.2 Statement of the problem

The quality of education and good students’ performance depicted in any school reflected the quality of leadership styles applied by the institution. Effective leadership style is a source of motivation that drives all stakeholders to work towards the goals of the institution. The outcome is always good students’ performance. It is the obligation of an institution leader to influence the subordinates to strive to achieve institutional goals through application of appropriate leadership skills (Ibukun, Oyewole & Abe, 2011). The poor performance displayed by public secondary schools in Nairobi County is an indication that there is a glaring gap in administration of these public institutions in spite efforts being made the government to ensure that there is adequate instructional materials and teaching staff.

Despite the government’s efforts to make education free and accessible to all through the provision of instructional materials and by meeting most of the subsidiary cost in the system with an intention of improving and increasing the participation rate and performance in secondary schools, public secondary schools in Nairobi County have been performing below average. According to Ministry of Education (2005), poor examination performance is an indication that all is not well with the administration and learning system in public secondary schools in
Nairobi, County, hence this study intended to investigate the effect of leadership styles on students’ performance in the area under study.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of secondary school principals’ leadership styles on Kenya certificate of secondary education performance in Nairobi.

1.4 Research objectives

The study aimed at achieving the following objectives:

i. To determine the extent to which principals autocratic leadership style influence students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education.

ii. To analyse the influence of democratic leadership style on students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education.

iii. To determine the extent to which secondary school principals’ situational leadership style influence students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education.

iv. To analyse the influence of principals’ Laissez-fair leadership style on students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education.

v. To seek suggestions on how leadership styles in secondary schools can be improved.
1.5 Research questions

This study was guided by the following research questions.

i. To what extent do principals’ autocratic leadership styles influence students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education?

ii. What is the influence of principals’ democratic leadership style on students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education?

iii. To what extent do principals’ situational leadership styles influence students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education?

iv. What is the effect of principals’ Laissez-fair leadership style on students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education?

v. In what ways can leadership styles in secondary schools be improved?

1.6 Significance of the study

It was expected that every head teacher would apply the leadership style or a combination of styles that are suitable at that particular time. The study could be a reference point for principals on possible relationships between leadership styles and achievement. The study would be a source of reference material for future researchers on other related topics; it would also help other academicians who undertake the same topic in their studies. The study can be a resource for KEMI in management training.
1.7 Limitations of the study

The researcher expected to encounter challenges of honesty from the respondents; whereby the respondents would not give the true information or facts on their leadership fearing competition this was highly on the top performing schools. This was be countered by assuring the respondents that their identity was confidential. The researcher was not able to control the attitudes of respondents which would result to unobstructive measures hence affecting the research findings. The results should however be generalized to other counties and schools with caution.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

The study was delimited to public secondary school in Nairobi County due to the low performance as compared to schools in other Counties. Private schools were left out because they had different management procedures.

1.9 Assumptions of the study

This study was based on the following assumptions:

i. The teachers were capable of describing the head teachers’ leadership behaviour.

ii. That the KCSE results were valid and reliable measure of school performance.

iii. That the respondents involved in the study were co-operative and provided reliable information.
1.10 Definition of significant terms

Autocratic leader refers to a leader who does not involve subordinates in decision making and in policy formulation in an organization.

Democratic Leadership style refers to a leader who consults his/her subordinates before making decisions.

Laissez-Faire Leadership refers to a non-authoritarian leadership style where leaders try to give the least possible guidance to subordinates, and try to achieve control through less obvious means.

Leadership refers to the ability to influence people to willingly follow guidance and perform group tasks.

Leadership style refers to patterns of behaviour by a leader through which he influences members of the group. The way the leader will be behaving towards the group members.

Principal refers to an administrative head of a secondary school appointed by Teachers Service Commission.

Public schools refer to schools that are funded by the public and teachers employed by government corporate body or Teachers Service Commission. The public (State) owns the institutions.

Situational leadership refers to a leadership style employed by secondary schools that varies based on situational demands.
**Student’s performance** refers to Students’ grades in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education as rated by the Kenya National Examinations Council from the lowest grade of “E” to the best grade of “A”.

1.11 **Organization of the study**

The study was structured in five chapters; chapter one is the introduction, which explored the background of the study and the spelt the research gap, the objective of the study, delimitation, limitations and definition of terms. In chapter two, is the literature review which reviewed the past literature on the effect of principals’ autocratic leadership style, situational leadership style, democratic leadership style and Laissez-fair leadership style on students’ academic performance. It also discussed the theory that guides the study and lastly presents the conceptual framework. Chapter three, is the research methodology which explained the research design to be adopted, target population, data collection methods and procedures and data analysis techniques that were used in achieving the objectives of the study. Chapter four, is data presentation, analysis and interpretation. This was followed by an in depth discussion of research findings. Finally, chapter five comprised the summary of the research findings, conclusion and recommendation that emerged from the study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter of the study focuses on literature review on leadership styles, effects of leadership styles on students’ performance in National Examinations, effects of leadership styles on evaluation and assessment of students’ performance. Lastly, there is a summary of the literature reviewed, theoretical framework and conceptual framework.

2.2 Leadership styles

Leadership is central to the effective management of educational institutions. Education administration, as Lussier (2008) notes is indeed the guiding platform within which human resources and students are able to integrate objectively in achieving better results. Studies have shown that good leadership styles in any institution is evidenced by improved performance while inadequate leadership styles leads to poor examination performance in any given institution.

Duening and Ivancevich (2003), adds that initiating structure refers to task-oriented behaviour in which leaders organizes and defines the relationships in the group, establishes patterns and channels of communications and directs the work methods. The behaviours of head teachers who emphasize initiating structure fall into a consistent pattern. They tend to insist that subordinates follow rigid
structures in work methods, they insist on being informed, they push their subordinates for greater effort, they decide in detail what shall be done and how it should be done.

Considerate leaders express appreciation for jobs well done, stress the importance of high morale, treat everyone as equal and are friendly and approachable. Effectiveness of leadership styles can be measured by student’s academic performance. Edmonds (1979), found that strong leadership and a climate of high expectation led to higher achievement. He also observed that strong administrative leadership by the principal is the key variable that ties together all the elements identified as characteristics of effective’s school. However, the researcher feels that this study did not address other factors that lead to effective leadership in institutions such as the need to embrace the modern technology and application of modern management skills in ensuring smooth operation of the school.

Leadership is regarded as the single most important factor in the success or failure of institutions such as schools (Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Markley, 1996). In contemporary affairs, governments or companies that prosper are said to enjoy good leadership; whereas in those that fail, the leaders are to blame (Campbell, et al. 1993). Getting the job done and done well require good leadership and good
management (Ubben & Hughes, 1992). Different experts have identified different leadership styles have distinctive characteristics.

2.3 Autocratic leadership style and students’ academic performance

Autocratic leadership is “power-centered.” Group members are allowed little or no voice in the decision-making process. An autocratic leader uses rewards and punishments to “persuade” people to function. When the ratio of punishments to rewards becomes too unequal, the autocratic leader may end up looking for another line of work. Such a person relies on the power of the position to get things done. The leader makes all of the decisions and retains the right to set goals. Group members are seen as workers whose primary responsibility is to carry out instructions from the leader. An autocratic leader zealously shields himself from criticism about personal abilities and has an ego-driven need to control other people. If the workers are willing - that is to say, submissive - work can get done, perhaps not too willingly. Fear is often used as a tactic by an autocratic leader. The power to confer privilege on some, or withdraw it from others, serves as a powerful tool in the hand of an unscrupulous leader (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 2003).

Autocratic leaders, also known as authoritarian leaders, provide clear expectations for what needs to be done, when it should be done, and how it should be done. There is also a clear division between the leader and the followers. Authoritarian
leaders make decisions independently with little or no input from the rest of the group. Researchers found that decision-making was less creative under authoritarian leadership. Lewin also found that it is more difficult to move from an authoritarian style to a democratic style than vice versa. Abuse of this style is usually viewed as controlling, bossy, and dictatorial. Authoritarian leadership is best applied to situations where there is little time for group decision-making or where the leader is the most knowledgeable member of the group.

2.4 Democratic (participative) leadership style and students’ academic performance

This involves sharing authority, responsibility and decision making. Individual opinions are welcomed as valuable inputs into the decision making process. A participative leader must be an excellent communicator, one who listens to the concerns and ideas of the group’s members. They are encouraged to assume responsibility for their own actions and to use their creativity in helping the group achieve objectives. He makes a decision that the team accepts; questions from the team are encouraged, and the process of taking action is a continuing, fluid process of input between the leader and the team. An atmosphere of enthusiasm is kindled and each team member is stimulated to perform well, find fulfillment and self-respect, and play an integral role in achieving group goals (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 2003).
Lewin’s study found that participative leadership, also known as democratic leadership, is generally the most effective leadership style. Democratic leaders offer guidance to group members, but they also participate in the group and allow input from other group members. In Lewin’s study, children in this group were less productive than the members of the authoritarian group, but their contributions were of a much higher quality. Participative leaders encourage group members to participate, but retain the final say over the decision-making process. Group members feel engaged in the process and are more motivated and creative.

Okoth (2000), carried out a study on the effects of leadership styles on students’ performance in K.C.S.E. in Nairobi Province, Kenya, and found out that head teachers rated as being democratic had high mean performance index than autocratic head teachers. The findings contradict Njuguna (1998) who found that there is no significant relationship between leadership styles and students’ K.C.S.E. performance. Huka (2003), brings a point of contrast by noting that head teachers who are rated most democratic had the lowest mean scores, while autocratic head teachers had higher mean scores. The same findings feature in Muli (2005), and Wangui (2007).

Njuguna (1998), contrary to Ndegwa (2002), notes that head teachers of day schools practice a low-consideration structure while those in boarding schools
practice a high-consideration structure. This contradicts Okoth (2000), who notes that in day schools, head teachers were found to be democratic than in boarding or mixed. Okoth (2000) further found out that head teachers in girls schools are slightly democratic compared to boys’ and mixed schools.

2.5 Laissez-fair leadership style and students’ academic performance

Researchers found that children under delegative leadership, also known as laissez-fair leadership, were the least productive of all three groups. The children in this group also made more demands on the leader, showed little cooperation and were unable to work independently. Delegative leaders offer little or no guidance to group members and leave decision-making up to group members. While this style can be effective in situations where group members are highly qualified in an area of expertise, it often leads to poorly defined roles and a lack of motivation (Northouse, 2001).

Situational leadership theory has seen an increased use in organizations over the years (Northouse, 2001). However, the situational model does not clearly address the role of group leadership, nor have time-based issues been adequately addressed within the model. In terms of group performance, research shows that effective groups generally display relatively higher levels of group efficacy than those who are less effective at a given task (Gibson et al., 2000; Gully et al., 2002; Hoyt, Murphy, Halverson, & Watson, 2003).
2.6 Situational leadership style and students’ academic performance

Situational leadership style links the effectiveness of a leader's style to the current work environment is referred to as situational leadership. Situational leadership allows the school heads to change their leadership style as conditions warrant. It stresses the need of adapting the leadership styles based on the developmental level of the institution, teachers or students; hence its expected to have an effect on students performance.

Avolio and Bass (2002), presented full range leadership theory according to which three leadership styles known as transactional, transformational, laissez-fair were identified. Douglas (1996), claimed that decisions by leaders depends on these three leadership styles which are democratic, autocratic and laissez-fair. A democratic style is characterized by co-ordination, co-operation and by collaboration. (Yulk, 2005), discovered that autocratic leadership style allows no participation inn decision and laissez-fair which is also known as free-rein leadership style empowers subordinate to work with freedom and free-will. The research done by Sammons et al; (2011) found that leadership effects directly and indirectly on a range of school and classroom processes and effects indirectly on improvements in schools’ academic results.
2.7 Head teachers’ professional experience and academic achievement

The principal has always been looked up as a leader. Complex organizations such as schools need principals with leadership characteristics to play an active role in steering the organization towards excellence. According to Beare, et al. (1989), outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of outstanding schools. There is no doubt that those seeking quality in education must ensure its presence and the development of potential leaders must be given high priority (Abrar et al., 2010). According to Crum & Sherman (2008), the principals provide valuable insights into their daily practices that foster an environment which is supportive of high-student achievement.

Research done by Jaafar (2004) found that there were significant differences within the execution behavior of principal instructional leadership, teachers’ commitment (Ahmad, 2012), and job satisfaction in effective and less effective schools. Moreover, there is a significant correlation between instructional leadership styles of principal within teachers’ job satisfaction and commitment in effective schools. The principals had practiced and implemented eleven job functions of instructional leadership. Monitoring student progress was the most dominant function implemented, followed by framing school goals, maintaining high visibility, developing and enforcing academic standards (Hatta, 2009).
Kythreotis, et al. (2010) found that students’ achievement gains were found to be related with five factors at the school level: the principals’ human resource leadership style and four dimensions of organizational culture. Principal as a leader should be able to implement the most suitable leadership styles that suit his school most. It is important for the principal to possess the ability and capacity in balancing the relationship between productivity and educational objectives along with coping with the stress (Yusof, 2012). The school principal must develop his or her leadership capacity in developing the styles of leadership and management techniques in order to ensure job satisfaction and effective teaching instructions among teachers (Ibrahim, 2003).

It has been recognized that principals cannot lead alone because of complexity and the array of leadership skills necessary to perform the task of leadership cannot successfully be achieved by a single individual. High levels of student achievement are possible when schools and districts perform as coordinated units of change. Principals have a difficult time with leading alone and school leadership teams are an essential part to the school improvement process (Chrispeels, Burke, Johnson, & Daly, 2008).

Njuguna (1998), found out that there is a relationship between head teachers leadership styles and professional experience. Head teachers with professional experience of 16 years and above are rated higher on consideration behaviour.
This concurs with Okoth (2000), that head teachers with an administration experience of 11-15 years are rated as being democratic than those with less administrative experience. This also concurs with Wangui (2007), but contradicts Kimacia (2007), who found that there is no relationship between professional experiences of teachers in rating leadership styles of head teachers.

Ndegwa (2002), in his study on teachers’ perceptions of leadership styles of male and female head teachers in public secondary schools in Maragwa District, Kenya, found that female head teachers in district and provincial schools practice a high-consideration structure compared to those in provincial schools while male head teachers practice a high-initiating structure. Both male and female head teachers in day, partly boarding secondary schools practice a high-consideration structure more so than their counterparts in boarding schools.

Mumbe (1995) argues that, head teachers in their leadership styles must incorporate their subjects from the lower levels in creating harmony and satisfaction to their work. Most head teachers as Mumbe stated, acknowledged that teachers possess important skills that can help improve their Students’ performance. Mumbe refers to motivation as a “magic” that head teachers must use in fostering better performance. Though head teachers actually understand many of the issues that affect their teachers and students, consulting with lower level human resources creates a sense of trust and further diversifies the
alternatives that could be used in addressing them. The publication calls head teachers not to see consultation as a point of belittling themselves, but a pillar within which they enrich their models of addressing existing problems at all levels of their schools’ performance.

Kwakwa (1973), brings out the importance of evaluation and assessment in fostering improvement. Every school leader should establish essential targets for their teachers and school in general. While most schools appear to have this type of objectivity, Kwakwa (1973) asks the question, why the large disparity in performance? As a result, he brings out the fact that most of the head teachers develop their objectives and targets without adequate involvement of their subjects. As a result, they are turned into managers, not leaders, who only adhere to outlaid procedures with minimal flexibility. Successful head teachers therefore, as Kwakwa (1973) found, should establish a creative way of bringing their subjects in developing these objectives and targets. Kwakwa’s (1973) findings concur with Mumbe’s (1995) argument that by incorporating the juniors, the overall vision of the school, teachers and students becomes harmonic. With a common objective, Kwakwa’s argument is further supported by Ndegwa (2002) who called head teachers to create visions for their schools and sell them widely to their human resources to implement.
Vera (2004) appears to take Kwakwa’s view ahead by developing a model that seeks to allow school leaders to effectively evaluate themselves and their schools. She calls these leaders to set up short win-win goals which are easy to implement and guide the main objectives. The role of short win-win situation is bringing the leader closer to their subjects and creating points of intersection for analyzing short term successes. Participative leadership allows teachers to continuously upgrade their teaching methods in improving their short term goals towards the main school objective. As head teachers assume this model of assessment and operation, every result whether positive or negative is considered to have important room for improvement. When head teachers employ participative leadership, Vera likens it to putting their schools on wheels and setting it in motion. As a result, they will always adopt new teaching skills and facilitate better performance with minimal resistance.

2.8 Summary of the literature review

The reviewed literature shows different and contradicting findings on the relationship that principals’ leadership styles have on education performance of students. For instance, Okoth (2000), found out that head teachers rated as being democratic had high mean performance index than autocratic head teachers; this in line with Kimacia (2007), findings as well as Mwalala (2008). However, there are contradicting findings for instance Njuguna (1998) who found that there is no significant relationship between leadership styles and students’ K.C.S.E.
performance. Huka (2003) also found that most democratic head teachers had the lowest mean scores, while autocratic head teachers had higher mean scores.

Hence there was need for more investigations amidst these contradictions. In addition, the various studies cited failed to give an explanation as to why different leaders used particular leadership styles even though they have been indicated to lead to poor students’ KCSE performance.

2.9 Theoretical framework

This study is based on the normative decision theory by Vroom & Yettom (1973), which is a decision tree model that enables leaders to identify among the five leadership styles provided, a leadership style that is appropriate to use depending on the situation on the ground. This theory attempted to bridge the gap between leadership theory and managerial practice using empirical research into management decision making process.

According to Gordon (1987), normative theory of leadership focused on decision-making by managers with a defined group of subordinates and consisted of procedures for determining the extent to which leaders should involve subordinates in the process. According to normative theory, the manager could choose one of the five basic processes for involving subordinates in the decision-making. This theory proposed that if the head teachers do not involve their subordinates in decision making process the outcome would be poor achievement
of pupils in national examinations which trickles down to poor out-puts from the school.

According to this theory, five leadership styles were identified, each with independent effect on the subordinates and organizations’ performance: Autocratic I (AI): The leader makes the decision alone using available information; Autocratic II (AII): The leader gets information from subordinates but makes the decision alone. Subordinates may or may not be told what the problem was. They are not asked for input into the decision; Consultative I (CI): The leader meets individually with subordinates, explains the situation and gets information and ideas on how to solve the problem. The leader makes the final decision alone. The leader may or may not use the subordinates’ input; Consultative II (CII): The leader meets with subordinates as a group, explains the situation and gets information and ideas on how to solve the problem. The leader makes the decision alone after the meeting. Leaders may or may not use the subordinates’ input; Group II (GII): The leader meets with the subordinates as a group, explains the situation and allows the group to make the decision.

This theory is applicable in this study because it outlined some of the leadership styles that a head teacher could choose to apply in order to influence the subordinates to achieve the set goals and objectives. The theory gives the head teachers an opportunity to manipulate different leadership styles depending on the situation on the ground. This model would enable head teachers to be flexible in
their administrative duties. This would foster effective school management which would led to improved KCPE performance.

**2.10 Conceptual framework**

This section presents the conceptual framework which is a diagram representation that seeks to show the relationship between the study dependent variable (Students’ Academic Performance) and the independent variables. The conceptual framework of the study is presented in Figure 2.1.

**Figure 2.2: Relationship between variables in leadership styles and academic performance**

![Diagram showing the relationship between leadership styles and academic performance.](image)

The conceptual framework presented in figure 2.1 shows the relationship between variables in the leadership styles and students academic performance. The figure
shows that the various head teacher’s leadership style have impact direct influence of students academic performance. In autocratic leadership, there is individual control over all decisions and little input from group members. Some institutions require strong leadership in order to get things accomplished quickly and efficiently. The democratic head teacher is kind, caring and warm, but also firm. Democratic leaders develop students’ self esteem by involving them in the decision-making process, requiring them to take responsibility for their own actions, and encouraging them when they take risks and make mistakes. Students are motivated from within rather than from teacher demands. The democratic classroom atmosphere is one of openness, friendly communication, and independence, with a resultant high level of productivity and performance. Situational leadership style links the effectiveness of a leader's style to the current work environment is referred to as situational leadership. Situational leadership allows the school heads to change their leadership style as conditions warrant. It stresses the need of adapting the leadership styles based on the developmental level of the institution, teachers or students; hence its expected to have an effect on students performance. Lastly, Laissez-faire leader is completely permissive, is the opposite of autocratic leadership. Students are allowed to behave however they want, which generally leads to classroom chaos. This causes student frustration, a high level of stress, and a feeling of being totally overwhelmed and lost. The teacher cannot teach because the students aren’t ready to learn. Students’
achievement and self-esteem suffer. The result of the interaction style is often characterized by centralized decision making and group members are obliged to respond.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the procedures that will be used in conducting the study. The section focuses on research design, target population, sample and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity of the instruments, reliability of the instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis.

3.2 Research design

In this study the researcher used descriptive survey research design. This design was suitable for this study because the study involved broad categories of respondents and a wide area of the population. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a descriptive research is a process of collecting data in order to answer questions concerning the current status of the subjects in the study. The researcher has chosen this research design because the study aims at collecting information from respondents on their attitudes and opinions. Descriptive design also gather information from relatively, large cases of samples hence cutting down costs. Descriptive research design was therefore be appropriate and suitable for this study as this information was collected from the respondents using questionnaires.
3.3 Target population

Target population in statistics is the specific population about which information is desired. According to Kothari (2004), a population is a well defined or set of people, services, elements, events, group of things or households that are being investigated. The population of this study was teachers and head teachers in the 78 public secondary schools in Nairobi County. The breakdown is as shown: Boys Boarding (7), Boys Day (8), Girls Boarding (12), Girls Day (10), Mixed Boarding (2) and Mixed Day (39) which total to 78.

Table 3.1 Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>No. of Schools (HeadTeachers)</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Boarding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Day</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Boarding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Day</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day and Boarding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Day</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>989</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedures

According to Chandran (2003) a sample is a small proportion of an entire population; a selection from the population. To draw a representative sample for
the Head teachers the study adopted probability sampling. This ensured each participant has an equal chance of being selected. To ensure efficiency, the selection of students was done using stratified random sampling with proportions. This sampling technique involved dividing the population into different stratum by some characteristics. The study took a 30% population from each stratum to get a representative sample size.

On the Sampling of teachers, the study took a 10% from each strata; the principles of probability sampling was adopted to ensure the study have a representative sample. The sample size was therefore be 24 head teachers and 99 teachers totalling to 108 respondents as shown below:

Table 3.2 Schools sampling schools/ head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sampling (Head teachers)</th>
<th>Sample Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Sampling (Teachers)</th>
<th>Sample Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Boarding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Day</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Boarding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Day</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day and Boarding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Day</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>989</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Research instruments

Primary data collection instrument for the study through was the questionnaire for teachers and an interview guide for the head teachers. The reason for choosing questionnaire as the data collection instrument was primarily due to its practicability, applicability to the research problem and the size of the population. It is also because of their cost effectiveness. The questionnaires to collect data from both teachers and head teachers was divided into five parts; the first section gathered the background information of the respondents, section two to section five sought to answer the study objectives, that is, determine the relationship between autocratic leadership style, democratic leadership, situational leadership style and Laissez-fair leadership style with students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education.

3.6 Instrument validity

Validity involves how accurately the data obtained represents the variables of the study. Validity of the instrument was established by the research supervisor reviewing the items. The study carried out content validity to establish whether the content on the questionnaire will achieve the objectives of the study. A random sample of 10 respondents- five head teachers and five teachers; the population will be selected from the listed schools and given the questionnaire to fill in the presence of the researcher. This aided the researcher in clearing any
ambiguities and in ensuring that the questions posed measure what it is intended to measure.

### 3.7 Instrument reliability

To ensure reliability, the questionnaires were pre-tested on a pilot scale through selected respondents outside the study area. A pilot study was carried out from a random sample of 5 head teachers and 5 teachers. The objectives of pre-testing were to allow for modification of various questions in order to rephrase, clarify and or clear up any shortcomings in the questionnaires before administering them to the actual respondents.

Cronbach’s alpha was computed to establish whether there was internal consistency on the likert scale questions. Cronbach alpha was computed with the help of the SPSS software. Where the Cronbach alpha was higher than 0.7, the instrument was considered as reliable. There is no rule to suggest that a Cronbach’s alpha greater than 0.70 indicates a good instrument (Comer & Kelly 1982). However, it is commonly agreed among researchers that an alpha greater or equal to 0.7 shows that an instrument is reliable in measuring what it was intended to measure. From the results, the necessary amendments were made on the questionnaire to ensure that it collects the intended information.
3.8 Data collection procedures

The researcher obtained an introductory letter from University of Nairobi. Permission to collect data will be obtained from the relevant authorities such as Ministry of Education, and the sampled school management. The researcher visited the sampled schools to book appointments. The researcher personally administered the questionnaire to the respondents but where it proved difficult due to the respondents schedules, the researcher adopted a drop and pick method.

3.9 Data analysis techniques

When the questionnaires were received, they were checked if they were duly filled in and complete questionnaires were coded. Data analysis was conducted using descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the findings from the raw data. These included measures of central tendency (the mean), measures of variability (standard deviation) and measures of relative frequencies and the use of percentages. The findings were presented in tables’ charts and graphs. The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine if any significant differences exist in the headteachers leadership styles and KCSE performance in public Secondary schools in Nairobi County.

The study also employed multiple regressions to generate models for the various independent variables. The process of generating a model, the researcher identified several independent variables correlated all identified variables against the dependent
variable (KCSE performance) to determine how strongly the variables related. Correlation coefficients have a value between -1 and +1. A positive coefficient means that x and y values increases and decrease in the same direction. A negative correlation means that as x and y move in opposite directions where one increases as the other decreases. Coefficient of 0 means x and y are associated randomly. The researcher then used the variables that had significant relationships to perform multiple regressions. Multiple regressions were performed to show the cumulative effect of the regression results. In regression analysis the R value is the slope of the linear regression model, such that if the R value is close to 0 the change in y (dependent) over relative to the change in x (predictor/ independent variable) is very small, the larger this value is, the less random the values are.
4.1 Introduction

This chapter presented the findings of the study. The responses from the subjects were compiled into frequencies and converted into percentages and presented in tabular form. This was to facilitate easy analysis and understanding of leadership styles used by headteachers and their effects on students’ performance. The analysis was done based on the research objectives.

4.2 Response rate

Return rate is the proportion of the questionnaires that are returned after administration to the respondents. In this study, out of 99 questionnaires issued to the teachers, 78 questionnaires were successfully filled and returned. Out of 24 questionnaires issued to the head teachers 18 were successfully filled and returned. This gave a response rate of 79 percent on teachers’ questionnaire and a response rate of 75 percent on head teachers questionnaire. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a 50 percent response rate is adequate, 60 percent good and above 70 percent rated very well. The response rate was fair enough for the researcher to proceed on.
4.3 Background Information of the headteachers and teachers

This section presents the background information of the headteachers and teachers in the study. The background information focussed on gender, education level and teaching experience of both the teachers and head teachers’ respondents to the study. This information was significant to the study as it gave the characteristics of the respondents who took part in the study. The demographic information would also facilitate a further research on whether demographic factors have an effect on leadership styles.

4.3.1 Gender of headteachers and teachers

In this section the study sought to establish the gender of the respondents who took part in the study. It was important to establish the respondents’ gender as it would also help in establishing whether there is any relationship between gender and the leadership styles applied in the secondary schools.

Table 4.1 Distribution of headteachers and teachers by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study shows that the number of female teachers in public secondary schools in Nairobi is higher than that of their male counterpart. The findings show that majority of the teachers were female while majority of the head teachers. The high female teachers’ presence in secondary schools in Nairobi may be attributed to the fact that, teaching is seen as a female dominated field while others have joined their partners/ husband who are working in Nairobi. The next sub-section looks at the academic qualifications of the respondents.

4.3.2 Distribution of headteachers’ and teachers’ by academic qualification

The study sought to establish the highest academic qualifications of the headteachers and teachers in the study. Table 4.2 below shows the highest academic qualifications reached by the teachers and the head teachers who were respondents to the study.

**Table 4.2 Teachers’ and head teachers’ academic qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M. Ed</th>
<th>B. Ed</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that majority 52 (66.7%) of the teachers had done Bachelors of education as their highest qualification as well as majority of the head teachers.
This shows that the teaching fraternity in public secondary schools in Nairobi County were highly educated; this may be as a result of availability of a variety of learning facilities (colleges, universities) and also due to competitiveness among the teaching fraternity among schools in Nairobi. The following sub section looks at the teaching experience of the teachers and the head teachers.

### 4.3.3 Distribution of teachers’ by teaching experience

The study also sought to establish the duration which the headteachers and teachers had taught. Table 4.3 was used to capture both the teachers and head teachers teaching experience.

**Table 4.3 Distribution of teachers’ teachers by teaching experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11-20 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and above</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table 4.3 shows that majority 43 (55.1%) of the secondary school teachers in Nairobi County had extensive teaching experience and had accrued more skills; this is believed also to have an effect on the leadership styles the teachers adopt when promoted to the level of school heads. Results show that
majority of the teachers had teaching experience of between 11-20 years and with
a number having teaching experience of above 20 years.

Asked to indicate the headteachers teaching experience, the headteachers
responded as indicated in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Head teachers’ experience as teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 2-10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10-20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years and over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study further shows that majority 10 (55.6%) of the head teachers had gained
extensive experience in the teaching fraternity which would have an impact on the
leadership styles that they adopt. From the results, it can be seen that majority of
the head teachers also had an accumulated teaching experience of over 20 years.
The following table presents the distribution of headteachers by teaching
experience.
The study results show that half the number of the head teachers 9 (50%) had teaching experience of between 5-10 years. This shows that majority of the head teachers had more experience as teachers; the experience is expected to have an influence on head teachers leadership style adopted. This is in line with Njuguna (1998), who found out that there is a relationship between head teachers leadership styles and professional experience. Head teachers with professional experience of 16 years and above are rated higher on consideration behaviour. This concurs with Okoth (2000), that head teachers with an administration experience of 11-15 years are rated as being democratic than those with less administrative experience. This also concurs with Wangui (2007), but contradicts Kimacia (2007), who found that there is no relationship between professional experiences of teachers in rating leadership styles of head teachers. The next sub section focuses on the various leadership styles adopted by the school headteachers and their effect on students’ performance.
4.4 Influence of leadership style and students performance

This section captures the objectives of the study; it sought to establish the leadership styles adopted by the various head teachers in the secondary schools in Nairobi County. The results are as shown below in Figure 4.3.

Table 4.6 Leadership style adopted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic styles</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic styles</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational styles</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-fair leadership style</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that most 35 (44.9%) of the public secondary schools heads in Nairobi County had adopted situational leadership style; this is to mean that the school heads hanged their leadership style as conditions warranted; that is, they adapted the leadership styles based on the developmental level of the institution, teachers or students.

Moreover, a number of head teachers 26 (33.3%) further revealed that they had adopted democratic leadership style and autocratic leadership style; this shows that various head teachers had adopted diversified leadership styles; this may be
depending to their environment or their back ground. The next sub section focuses on the effect of situational leadership style and students performance.

4.5 Situational leadership style and students’ performance

In this section, the study sought to establish the effect of situational leadership style on students’ performance in the KCSE. A likert scale was used to analyse the findings using a scale of 1-4 whereby a scale of 0-1.9 represented ‘always’, 2.0-2.9 represented ‘sometimes’, 3.0-3.9 represented ‘rarely’ while 4.0-4.9 represented ‘never’ in the findings. Table 4.7 shows the relationship between situational leadership style and students’ performance.

Table 4.7 Situational leadership style and students’ performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills’ enhance students performance on KCSE</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates power of responsibility to teachers and support staff</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates and directs goals for staff to support and accomplish</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages performance standard as mutual agreement to all</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates ideas and abilities of teachers and staff</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative in decision making</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares success and failure with other stakeholders</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teachers and support staff to function freely as they wish</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study findings showed that the head teachers sometimes appreciated ideas and abilities of staff as shown by a mean score of 2.78. On the other hand, head teachers sometimes were consultative in decision-making as shown by a mean score of 2.90 while 2.54 showed that the head teachers sometimes delegated power of responsibility to teachers and support staff. According to Northouse (2001), students under delegative leadership were the least productive; delegative leaders offer little or no guidance to group members and leave decision-making up to group members.

Further, the head teachers sometimes initiated and directed goals for staff to support and accomplish as shown by a mean score of 2.68. However, a mean score of 3.13 indicated that head teachers rarely allowed teachers and support staff to function freely as they wished. The head teachers sometimes shared success and failure with other stakeholders as shown by a mean score of 2.92 while 2.68 indicated that the head teachers sometimes encouraged performance standard as a mutual agreement to all stakeholders. Lastly, the teachers indicated that sometimes the head teachers’ leadership skills enhanced students’ performance on KCSE.

According to Lussier (2008), leadership is central to the effective management of educational institutions. He narrates that education administration, is indeed the guiding platform within which human resources and students are able to integrate objectively in achieving better results. Edmonds (1979), also found that strong
leadership and a climate of high expectation led to higher achievement. He also observed that strong administrative leadership by the principal is the key variable that ties together all the elements identified as characteristics of effective school. The next sub section focuses on the effect of autocratic leadership style and students performance.

4.6 **Autocratic leadership style and students performance**

To establish the effects of Autocratic leadership style and students performance, a likert scale was used to analyse the findings whereby a scale of 0-1.9 represented ‘always’, 2.0-2.9 represented ‘sometimes’, 3.0-3.9 represented ‘rarely’ while 4.0-4.9 represented ‘never’ in the findings. The study established that a mean score of 2.0 indicated that head teachers leadership styles sometimes encouraged free expression of feelings. Table 4.8 presents the data.
Table 4.8 Autocratic leadership style and students performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influences school stakeholders</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express confidence in staff members</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience/academic qualification</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage free expression of feelings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation in decision making</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages standard performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage staff development and welfare</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of power</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that head teachers’ leadership styles sometimes allowed consultation in decision making. The data further shows that head teachers sometimes delegated power. However it was established that head teachers leadership styles always expressed confidence in staff members while they further indicated that head teachers leadership styles sometimes encouraged standard performance and staff development and welfare. Lastly head teachers leadership styles always influenced school stakeholders and teaching experience/ academic qualification.
4.7 Democratic Leadership Styles and Students Performance

To demonstrate the influence of democratic leadership styles and students performance, a likert scale of 1-5 was used to analyse the findings whereby where 1-2.5 represented great extent, 2.6-3.5 represented moderate extent, and 3.6-5.0 represented no extent. Table 4.9 shows teachers perceptions on the headteachers leadership styles.

Table 4.9 Democratic Leadership Styles and Students Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers with higher qualifications are more democratic than those with less qualification</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate male head teachers are more democratic while their female counterparts are more autocratic due to inferiority complex while dealing with their subordinates and students</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers in girls schools are slightly democratic compared to boys’ and mixed schools</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that head teachers with higher qualifications are more democratic than those with less qualification affected head teachers leadership and performance to a moderate extent. Further graduate male head teachers are more democratic while their female counterparts are more autocratic due to inferiority
complex while dealing with their subordinates and students affected leadership and performance to a moderate extent. The respondents also indicated that head teachers in girls schools were slightly democratic compared to boys and mixed schools affected leadership and performance to a moderate extent. This contradicts Njuguna (1998), notes that head teachers of day schools practice a low-consideration structure while those in boarding schools practice a high-consideration structure; but is in line with Okoth (2000), who notes that in day schools, head teachers were found to be democratic than in boarding or mixed. Okoth (2000) further found out that head teachers in girls schools are slightly democratic compared to boys’ and mixed schools.

Table 4.10 presents teachers opinions concerning their headteachers leadership traits.
Table 4.10 Leadership Styles and Students Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female head teachers in district and provincial schools practice a high-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration structure compared to those in provincial schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate male teachers rate higher than female head teachers in</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration dimension than their male counterparts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and professional qualifications do not affect teachers’</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceptions of male and female head teachers in their management styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers of day schools practice a low-consideration structure</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while those in boarding schools practice a high-consideration structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was also established that academic and professional qualifications do not affect teachers perceptions of male and female head teachers in their management styles was affected leadership and performance to no extent. The teachers felt that the graduate male teacher rate was higher than female head teachers in consideration dimension than their male counterparts affected head teacher leadership and performance to a moderate extent. Female head teachers in district and provincial schools practiced a high-consideration structure compared to those in provincial schools affected leadership and performance to a moderate extent. According to
Ndegwa (2002) who did study on teachers’ perceptions of leadership styles of male and female head teachers in public secondary schools in Maragwa District, Kenya, found that female head teachers in district and provincial schools practice a high-consideration structure compared to those in provincial schools while male head teachers practice a high-initiating structure.

4.8 Analysis of leadership style adopted and the students’ performance

To analyse the influence of leadership styles on students’ academic performance, a cross-tabulation was conducted to make comparisons between the specific leadership style adopted and the students’ performance. Table 4.11 presents the data.

Table 4.11 Cross-tabulations of leadership styles and students’ performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>4.0 and Below</th>
<th>4.1-6.0</th>
<th>6.1-9.0</th>
<th>9.1 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leadership style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic leadership style</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational leadership style</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table 4.11 shows that headteachers who had adopted autocratic leadership styles had their schools KCSE mean score of between 4.1-6.0 points. On the other hand, schools whose head had adopted democratic leadership style had a
relatively higher mean scores of between 6.1-9.0. Headteachers who used situational leadership had mixed results; whereby, some schools reported low mean scores while majority reported mean scores of 4.1 – 9.0 points.

4.9 Regression analysis

A multiple regression model was applied to determine the relative influence of each school headteachers’ leadership styles with respect to students’ performance in the Kenya certificate of secondary education. The regression model was as follows:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \epsilon \]

**Where:**

- \( Y \) = Students’ performance in KCSE
- \( \beta_0 \) = Constant Term
- \( \beta_1 \) = Beta coefficients
- \( \chi_1 \) = Autocratic leadership style
- \( \chi_2 \) = Democratic leadership style
- \( \chi_3 \) = Situational leadership style
Table 4.12 Model Summary

<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>0.845(a)</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic leadership style, Democratic leadership style, Situational leadership style

The R² is called the coefficient of determination and tells us how each and every leadership style (autocratic leadership style, democratic leadership style and situational leadership style) varied with students’ performance in the in Kenya certificate of secondary education. From the table above, the value of R² is 0.714. This implies that, there was a variation of 71.4 percent of students’ performance with the four variables; that is; autocratic leadership style, democratic leadership style and situational leadership style, at a confidence level of 95%. Table 4.13 presents the ANOVA results.

Table 4.13 ANOVA Results

<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>11.718</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.930</td>
<td>44.231</td>
<td>0.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4.818</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.421</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a Predictors: (Constant Autocratic leadership style, Democratic leadership style, Situational leadership style

b Dependent Variable: Students’ performance in KCSE

The study used ANOVA to establish the significance of the regression model from which an f-significance value of $p<0.001$ was established. This shows that the regression model has a less than 0.001 likelihood (probability) of giving a wrong prediction. Table 4.14 presents the coefficients Results between leadership styles and academic performance.
Table 4.14 Coefficients results for different variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic leadership style</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>8.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leadership style</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>-3.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational leadership style</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Students’ performance in KCSE

The regression analysis shows that there is a positive relationship between students’ performance in KCSE with democratic leadership style and situational leadership style. From the above regression model, holding autocratic leadership style, democratic leadership style, situational leadership style constant, students’ performance in KCSE would be at 0.116.

The study though shows a significant relationship between students’ performance in KCSE and democratic leadership style (p= 000<0.05). This is with line with Okoth (2000) who carried out a study on the effects of leadership styles on
students’ performance in K.C.S.E. in Nairobi Province, Kenya, and found out that head teachers rated as being democratic had high mean performance index than autocratic head teachers. Lewin’s study also found that participative leadership, also known as democratic leadership, is generally the most effective leadership style. Democratic leaders offer guidance to group members, but they also participate in the group and allow input from other group members. The findings however contradict Njuguna (1998) who found that there is no significant relationship between leadership styles and students’ K.C.S.E. performance. Huka (2003), brings a point of contrast by noting that head teachers who are rated most democratic had the lowest mean scores, while autocratic head teachers had higher mean scores. Autocratic leadership style was also found to have a significant relationship with performance as shown by p= 000<0.05). This is in line with Huka (2003), who revealed that head teachers who were autocratic head teachers had higher mean scores.

4.10 Suggestions for improving leadership styles in secondary schools

The headteachers were asked to give their suggestions on what the government should do to improve school leadership. They suggested that head teachers had to apply new ideas to improve service delivery and have better training. On the other hand, the teachers felt that the head teachers should consult in decision making. Others felt that the students should be offered guidance and counselling to
improve their performance. On the other hand the teachers felt that mentorship, motivation and provision of adequate text books in schools would improve the performance of students. Lastly all the stakeholders should be involved in bettering the school performance. The head teachers indicated that good leadership raises morale of teachers and promotes good performance in KSCE. They further felt that members should be encouraged to improve performance through appreciation and motivated so as to motivate the students.

They were also asked what the government should do to improve head teachers’ leadership styles for better KCSE performance in secondary schools. The teachers indicated that the government should increase its funding to schools for better performance in KSCE while other felt that the government should offer better training through offering in service courses for head teachers and teachers. Moreover offer the head teachers and teachers leadership courses which should be implemented, monitored and supervised to better the performance in KSCE.

The head teachers indicated that the government should conduct in-service courses for administrators expose head teachers to management skills to improve performance. Teachers also to be exposed to training and refresher Courses. Secondly the government should select the best to head public secondary schools and award them to increase competition therefore better KCSE performance. The government should increase funding for facilities and labor to enable better
performance. The head teachers felt that they should harness efforts of all staff members and parents to produce good results. Secondly improve all other areas in the team and install sense of responsibility on all stakeholders. Further increase number of teachers to reduce workload hence better services and offer effective leadership.

The teachers were asked which stages their schools went through before decisions are implemented. The teachers indicated that in decision making all departments were involved and there was consultation in all stages through staff meetings. However some felt that no stages were involved in decision making rather they imposed directives from the higher authorities.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of key data findings, conclusion drawn from the findings and recommendation made. The conclusions and recommendations drawn focus on addressing the influence of secondary school headteachers’ leadership styles on students’ performance in KCSE.

5.2 Summary of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of secondary school headteachers leadership styles on Kenya certificate of secondary education performance in Nairobi. The study was guided by four research objectives. Research objective one sought to determine the extent to which headteachers autocratic leadership style influence students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education; research objective two aimed at analysing the influence of democratic leadership style on students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education, research objective three sought to determine the extent to which secondary school headteachers’ situational leadership style influence students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education while research objective four sought to analyse the influence of headteachers’ Laissez-fair
leadership style on students’ performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education. The study used descriptive survey research design. The target population comprised of 78 headteachers and 989 teachers. The sample size was therefore be 24 head teachers and 99 teachers totalling to 108 respondents. Data were collected by use of questionnaires. Data were analysed by use of descriptive and inferential statistics.

The following were the findings of the study. In regard to demographic information, gender is used to show that the schools exercise gender equality while academic qualification shows the extent that the respondents have embraced teaching experience regardless of their age bracket. The study shows that most 35 (44.9%) of the public secondary schools heads in Nairobi County had adopted situational leadership style; this is to mean that the school heads hanged their leadership style as conditions warrants; that is, they adapted the leadership styles based on the developmental level of the institution, teachers or students. Moreover, a number of head teachers further revealed that they had adopted democratic leadership style and autocratic leadership style.

Findings revealed that head teachers sometimes appreciated ideas and abilities of staff. On the other hand head teachers sometimes were consultative in decision making (with a mean of 2.90 and delegated power of responsibility to teachers and support staff (with a mean of 2.54). Further the head teachers sometimes
initiated and directed goals for staff to support and accomplish. However, findings show that that head teachers rarely allowed teachers and support staff to function freely as they wished (with a mean of 3.13). The head teachers sometimes shared success and failure with other stakeholders (with a mean of 2.92) while on the other hand it was found out that the head teachers sometimes encouraged performance standard as a mutual agreement to all stakeholders. Lastly the teachers indicated that the sometimes the head teachers leadership skills enhanced students performance on KCSE as shown by a mean score of 2.12.

It was also revealed that head teachers leadership styles sometimes allowed consultation in decision making (with a mean of 2.06); and they sometimes delegated power to the teachers (with a mean of 2.61). However the head teachers’ leadership styles always expressed confidence in staff members (with a mean of 1.56). Findings show that the head teachers’ leadership styles sometimes encouraged standard performance and staff development and welfare (with a mean of 2.06). Lastly head teachers leadership styles always influenced school stakeholders and teaching experience/ academic qualification (with a mean of 1.78).

The study further revealed that head teachers with higher qualifications are more democratic than those with less qualification affected head teachers leadership and performance to a moderate extent (with a mean of 3.04). The teachers felt that
the graduate male teacher rate was higher than female head teachers in consideration dimension than their male counter parts affected head teacher leadership and performance to a moderate extent (with a mean of 3.04). Further graduate male head teachers are more democratic while their female counterparts are more autocratic due to inferiority complex while dealing with their subordinates and students affected leadership and performance to a moderate extent (with a mean of 3.04); while Female head teachers in district and provincial schools practice a high-consideration structure compared to those in provincial schools affected leadership and performance to a moderate extent (with a mean of 2.76). Findings further show that head teachers of day schools practice a low consideration structure while those in boarding schools practice a high consideration structure affected leadership and performance to no extent. Lastly they that head teachers in girls’ schools were slightly democratic compared to boys and mixed schools affected leadership and performance to a moderate extent (with a mean of 3.35).

A cross-tabulations of leadership styles and students’ performance revealed that headteachers who had adopted autocratic leadership styles had their schools KCSE mean score of between 4.1- 6.0 points. On the other hand, schools whose head had adopted democratic leadership style had a relatively higher mean scores of between 6.1-9.0. Headteachers who used situational leadership had mixed
results; whereby, some schools reported low mean scores while majority reported mean scores of 4.1 – 9.0 points.

5.3 Conclusions

Based on the findings it was concluded that majority of public secondary schools had adopted situational leadership style. Schools which had adopted situational leadership style had mixed results in the KCSE; findings show that most had achieved mean scores of six points; however, there are also those who performed well while other performed poorly. The study also concluded that democratic leadership style is the second most adopted leadership style among public secondary schools in Nairobi County. Democratic leaders achieved high score in the KCSE; with some achieving means scores of as high as nine points and above. Democratic leadership style also has a significant relationship with students’ academic performance. Autocratic leadership style is the least adopted style among public secondary schools in Nairobi County. Schools with heads who adopted autocratic leadership style performed poorly.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

1. The study recommends that the head teachers should use the most appropriate leadership style that facilitates collective responsibility and consultative
decision making with all stakeholders in the schools. They should also involve the teachers in their administration which would enhance participative leadership and hence better performance. The government should facilitate the head teacher leadership styles through empowerment and training since they have a direct relationship with the student’s academic performance.

2. The head teachers should be provided with in-service courses on quality leadership which is a prerequisite for successful academic performance. The head teachers should collaborate with the stakeholders and parents to ensure that the management offers conducive teaching and learning environment for both the teachers and students for successful academic performance.

3. The study proposes that leadership styles in public schools could be improved through encouragement of free expression of feelings including criticism among the teachers and staff in general.

4. There should be delegation of power and responsibilities to teachers and support staff. Improved leadership styles should encourage standard performance of all stakeholders as a mutual agreement towards improved academic achievement. They would consequently influence school stakeholders to focus on improving KCSE performance. On the other hand adequate consultation by head to all stakeholders and frequent consultation will yield to better performance among the public schools.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

The following areas were suggested for further research

i. A study on the influences of parental involvement on the pupil’s performance.

ii. A study on teacher’s perception of the head teachers’ leadership styles and its effect on their job performance.

iii. A study on teachers’ perception of headteachers leadership styles and their motivation to work.

iv. Relationship between school environment and students academic performance

v. A study on effect of teachers’ and students characteristics on students’ performance on KCSE performance.
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Appendix I: Letter of introduction

JOY NKIROTE
P.O. BOX 25598-00100
NAIROBI.

TO THE PRINCIPAL,

……………… SECONDARY SCHOOL,

P.O. BOX ………………,

NAIROBI.

Dear Respondents,

Re: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

I am a post graduate student at University of Nairobi pursuing a Masters degree. My area of specialization is education. Am conducting a research on the influence of secondary school principals’ leadership styles on students’ performance in the Kenya certificate of secondary education in Nairobi. I humble my request for your valuable time in assisting to complete the attached questionnaire. Your response will be treated with strict confidentiality. Your cooperation will be highly appreciated. Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Joy Nkirote
Appendix II: Questionnaire for teachers

Introduction

Please indicate your answer in each question by choosing/ticking the appropriate choice.

The questionnaire is designed in two parts, A and B

Part A: Personal data

Kindly, select by inserting a tick (✓) in the appropriate box provided.

1. what is your gender:  Female  Male

2. Kindly indicate your highest academic/professional qualification.
   M.Ed  B.Ed  Diploma

b). If any other specify .................................................................

3. How many years have you served as a teacher ................. years.

Part B: Leadership styles: Please indicate by ticking (✓) statement that applies.

4. Which leadership styles have your head teacher adopted?
   Autocratic ( )  Democratic ( )  Situational ( )  Laissez-fair leadership ( )

5. To what extent do you feel your head teacher’s leadership style corresponds with? Key: 1 – Always  2 – Sometimes  3- Rarely  4 – Never
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates ideas and abilities of teachers and support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates power of responsibility to teachers and support staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates and directs goals for the staff to support and accomplish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teachers and support staff to function freely as they wish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares success and failures with other school stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages performance standard as a mutual agreement to all stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills enhance students’ performance on KCSE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What do you think the head teacher should be doing to enhance Students’ performance in KCSE in your school?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7. What do you think the government should do to improve head teachers’ leadership styles for better KCSE performance in secondary schools?__________
8. In your school before decisions are implemented which stages does it have to go through?

Part D: Leadership styles and students performance

9. To what extent is your level of agreement with the following statements in regards to head teacher leadership and performance? Use a scale of 1-5 where: 5-Very great extent, 4-Great extent, 3-Moderate extent, 2-Little extent and 1-No extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers who had higher professional qualifications were more democratic than those with less qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and professional qualifications do not affect teachers’ perceptions of male and female head teachers in their management styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate male teachers rate higher than female head teachers in consideration dimension than their male counterparts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate male head teachers are more democratic while their female counterparts are more autocratic due to inferiority complex while dealing with their subordinates and students.

Female head teachers in district and provincial schools practice a high-consideration structure compared to those in provincial schools.

Head teachers of day schools practice a low-consideration structure while those in boarding schools practice a high-consideration structure.

Head teachers in girls schools are slightly democratic compared to boys’ and mixed schools.

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION**
Appendix III: Questionnaire for head teachers

Instructions:

Please indicate your response to each question by choosing/ticking the appropriate choice. The questionnaire is designed in two parts, A and B.

PART A: Personal data

Kindly, indicate correct option by ticking (√) in the appropriate box.

1. What is your Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐

2. Kindly indicate your highest academic/professional qualification.
   - M.Ed ☐ B.Ed ☐ Diploma ☐
   If any other specify ………………………………………………………………………………….

3. What is your teaching experience?
   i. As a teacher?
      - 2 – 10 years ☐ 10-20 years ☐ 6 – 10 years ☐
      - 11 – 15 years ☐ 16 – 20 years ☐ 20 years and over ☐
   ii. As a head teacher: 2 – 5 years ☐ – 10 years ☐
      - 11 – 15 years ☐ 20 years and above ☐

4. (i) What is your staff establishment, Male ……… Female ………
    Total…………
Please indicate the KCSE Performance of your school for the years indicated below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>DEVIATION+</th>
<th>DEVIATION-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B: Head Teachers’ Leadership Style

5. To what extent do you feel the following corresponds with your leadership styles?

Key: 1 – Always 2 – Sometimes 3- Rarely 4 – Never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages free expression of feelings including criticisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative in decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate power of responsibilities to teachers and/ or support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses confidence in staff members for proper delivery of</td>
<td>Encourages standard performance of all stakeholders as a mutual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duties as a measure to achieve good KCSE performance</td>
<td>agreement towards improved academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage staff development and minds about their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influences school stakeholders to focus on improving KCSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching experience and academic qualification?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. State how leadership styles affect KCSE performance in your school.

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

8. What should the head teachers be doing to improve KCSE performance in their school?

____________________________________________________________________________
9. What should the government do to improve quality of leadership styles in public primary schools?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix IV: List of schools

Boys Boarding:

1. MOI FORCES ACADEMY
2. STAREHE BOYS CENTRE
3. PUMWANI BOYS
4. DAGORETTI HIGH SCHOOL
5. UPPER HILL SCHOOL
6. MUHURI MUCHIRI BOYS HIGH SCHOOL
7. NAIROBI SCHOOL
8. LENANA SCHOOL

Boys Day:

1. HIGHWAY SECONDARY SCHOOL
2. ST. TERESA’S BOYS SECONDARY SCHOOL
3. EASTLEIGH SECONDARY SCHOOL
4. UHURU SECONDARY SCHOOL
5. DANDORA SECONDARY SCHOOL
6. RUAI BOYS
7. AQUINAS HIGH SCHOOL
8. OFAFA JERICHO HIGH SCHOOL
9. JAMUHURI HIGH
10. NAIROBI MILIMANI SECONDARY
Girls Boarding:

1. BURUBURU GIRLS SECONDARY SCHOOL
2. NGARA GIRLS’ HIGH SCHOOL
3. MOI GIRLS’ SCHOOL NAIROBI
4. PRECIOUS BLOOD RIRUTA
5. NEMBU GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL
6. PARKLANDS ARYA GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL
7. STATEHOUSE GIRLS H. SCH
8. ST. GEORGE’S GIRLS’ SECONDARY SCHOOL
9. EMBAKASI GIRLS SECONDARY SCHOOL
10. STAREHE GIRLS CENTRE
11. THE KENYA HIGH
12. PANGANI GIRLS

Girls Day:

1. O.L.M SHAURI MOYO GIRLS SEC. SCHOOL
2. RUAI GIRLS SECONDARY
3. KARIOBANGI NORTH GIRLS
4. HURUMA GIRLS
5. OUR LADY OF MERCY
6. NILE ROAD SECONDARY
7. ST TERESA’S GIRLS SECONDARY SCHOOL
8. PUMWANI GIRLS SECONDARY SCHOOL
9. RUTHIMITU GIRLS SEC SCHOOL
10. ST. ANNE’S GIRLS (JOGOO ROAD)

**Mixed Day:**

1. BABA DOGO SECONDARY SCHOOL
2. BETH MUGO SEC. SCHOOL
3. C.G.H.U SECONDARY SCHOOL
4. DAGORETTI MIXED SEC SCHOOL
5. DR. MWENJE SECONDARY SCHOOL
6. DRUMVALE SECONDARY SCHOOL
7. EMBAKASI GARRISON SEC.
8. HIGHRIDGE SECONDARY SCHOOL
9. JEHOVA JIREH SECONDARY SCHOOL
10. KAHAWA GARRISON SECONDARY SCHOOL
11. KAMITI SECONDARY SCHOOL
12. KAMUKUNJI SECONDARY SCHOOL
13. KAREN ‘C ‘SECONDARY SCHOOL.
14. KAYOLE SOUTH (BONDENI) SECONDARY SCHOOL
15. KOMAROCK
16. LANG’ATA HIGH SCHOOL
17. LANGATA BARRACKS SEC. SCHOOL
18. LAVINGTON SECONDARY SCHOOL
19. MAINA WANJIGI SECONDARY SCHOOL
20. MAKONGENI SECONDARY SCHOOL
21. MIHANG’O SECONDARY
22. MURANG’A ROAD MIXED DAY SECONDARY SCHOOL
23. MUTUINI SEC. SCHOOL
24. MWANGAZA SECONDARY
25. NDURURUNO SECONDARY SCHOOL
26. OLYMPIC SEC. SCHOOL
27. OUR LADY OF FATIMA SECONDARY SCHOOL
28. PETER KIBUKOSYA SECONDARY SCHOOL
29. RAILA EDUCATIONAL CENTRE
30. RUARAKA SECONDARY
31. RUTHIMITU MIXED
32. SHADRACK KIMALEL
33. ST. GEORGE ATHI SECONDARY SCHOOL
34. ST. PATRICKS
35. USHIRIKA SECONDARY SCHOOL
36. UTAWALA SCHOOL
Day & Boarding:

1. PARKLANDS BOYS

2. KANGEMI SECONDARY
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