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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of head teachers' leadership styles on teachers' job satisfaction in public primary schools in Kajiado North District. Four research objectives were formulated to guide the study which was; to determine the extent to which Autocratic, Democratic, Laissez faire and Transformational leadership styles of head teachers influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. The study was based on Fredrick Herzberg’s Two Factor theory. The study employed the descriptive survey research design. The study targeted 86 head teachers and 844 teachers in the 86 public primary schools. Simple random sampling technique was used to get 26 head teachers and 169 teachers. Two questionnaire sets were used to collect the required information from the head teachers and teachers. A pilot study was conducted to pre-test the reliability and validity of the instrument. Quantitative data was entered into the computer for analysis using the SPSS software (Statistical Package for Social Science). This processed the frequencies, means and percentages which were used to discuss the findings while the qualitative data was analyzed through the use of content analysis. The analyzed data was presented using tables, pie charts and bar graphs. The study revealed that the democratic leadership style is the most used style in primary schools and that head teachers’ autocratic leadership style negatively influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. The study also revealed that head teachers’ democratic leadership style positively influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. The study established that head teachers’ laissez faire leadership style on primary school moderately influenced teachers’ levels of job satisfaction and that the head teachers’ transformational leadership styles positively influences primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. The main recommendations of this study are: School head teachers should avoid the use of autocratic style of leadership in the management of schools as it does not allow teachers to give off their best. Adoption of leadership strategies by the schools' heads such as participative style of leadership that creates conducive environment which will help in improving primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. The study also recommends that school managers, avoid the laissez-faire leadership style which permits total delegation of responsibility to teachers. Specialized management and leadership training course be designed for those aspiring to become head teachers, current serving heads should undertake courses on the modern rudiments of leadership styles. A mentoring program is recommended for newly appointed and underperforming serving head teachers thus promote and encourage the use of transformation leadership in the school systems. In conclusion; further comparable studies in public primary schools should be carried out in other parts of the county to find out whether the findings can be generalized to the entire county. Further research on effects of school’s leadership styles on the performance of KCPE in Kajiado North district should also be undertaken.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Educational institutions are critical places where the next generation is educated and school leaders bear a heavy burden of responsibility for their institutions. Although there are many definitions of leadership made from different aspects, most of them point at leading followers to reach a specific achievement. Northouse (2004) defined leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of other individuals to achieve a common goal”. Miller, Walker and Drummond (2002) view leadership style as the pattern of interactions between leaders and subordinates. Koontz and O’Donnell (1959) explain that leadership is a way of influencing people to follow achieving of a common goal. Crosby and Bryson (1999) further expound that leadership is the inspiration and mobilization of others to undertake collective action in pursuit of a common goal. It includes controlling, directing, indeed all techniques and methods used by leaders to motivate subordinates to follow their instructions. It is a procedure to influence the people in order to achieve the desired result.

Ezeuwa (2005) states that leadership is the key to the progress and survival of any organization whether it is an enterprise or institution. It is the act of influencing people so that they strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the accomplishment of goals. Kasinga (2010) says effective leadership is essential in
all organization. He further states that, success of an organization largely depends on the quality of its leadership. It is an admitted fact that deficiency in dedicated leadership prevails all over the world. Hence different countries have different leadership styles on the basis of their cultural associations (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Societal values and beliefs of a specific region and country play a significant role. The suitability and effectiveness of a leadership style depend on the operating situation in which a leader matches his/ her leadership style with the task of their followers (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2001).

Among determinants of job satisfaction, leadership is viewed as an important predictor and plays a central role. Employee job satisfaction depends upon the leadership style of managers (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Mosadeghrad (2003) defined job satisfaction as an employee’s affective reaction to a job, based on a comparison between actual outcomes and desired outcomes. Job satisfaction is the totality of employees’ social and psychological well-being relative to job performance (Omeke & Onah 2011). It leads to satisfactory interpersonal relations, fringe benefits, financial rewards, decision-making, free channels of communication, staff development among others. This influences employees to work hard for optimum productivity.
Job satisfaction is critical to retaining and attracting well-qualified personnel: this is especially an issue in learning institutions such as schools where specialist training and retention are highly important. Basically, such achievements in schools are dependent on four identifiable leadership styles namely; autocratic, democratic, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 1991). While the autocratic leadership style appears generally self-centered and allows minimum participation of the subordinates in decision making, the democratic style is rather people oriented and counts on the participatory contribution of the subordinates (Mgbodile, 2004). Autocratic leadership behaviors have prevailed in Mexico and Taiwan, while in South Korea and United States the dominant leading style is democratic.

Only democratic leadership style had a direct and significant affiliation with performance in United States (Dickson, Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003). Transformational leadership style pays particular attention to the subordinates’ needs for growth and achievement and thus leaders who use this style are proactive (“hands on”) leaders (Bass, 1990). Weasmer (2002) stated that transformational leadership led to greater job satisfaction while as a study by Carpenter (2004) contradicted this. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership styles refer to the style which allows free contributions of ideas or opinions without interference by the leader.
Wathika (2011) established that in Tetu District, the laissez-faire and democratic leadership styles were the most used styles used by head teachers in the district. On the whole, head teachers are therefore assessed by their staff for credible performance based on application of these leadership styles. Different styles are needed for different situations and each leader needed to know when to exhibit a particular approach (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Lesomo (2013) revealed that school managers did not restrict themselves to one management style. No one leadership style is ideal for every situation, since a leader may have knowledge and skills to act effectively in one situation but may not emerge as effectively in a different situation.

A major concern of all modern organizations is goal attainment. There is therefore informed growing interest to determine which of these styles is capable of ensuring organizational goal’s attainment and employee job satisfaction. In Kajiado North District, teachers appear to be less satisfied with their jobs as evidenced by occasional truancy, indiscipline and drifting away from the teaching profession (Kajiado North DEO’s office, 2011). It has become necessary that relationship between leadership styles applied by head teachers on one hand and job satisfaction of primary school teachers on the other hand be investigated.
1.2 Statement of the problem

Nationally there has been marked increase in capacity building for head teachers with the establishment of the Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) whose legal mandate was to develop the management capacity of all personnel involve in education management and training. Legal Notice 19/2010 of the Education Act legally mandates KEMI to undertake capacity building activities in the education sector. (www.kemi.ac.ke). The rationale of training head teachers is aimed at improving leadership in our learning institutions. Studies by Ngumi (2003) and Mbugua (1998) on job satisfaction of the teachers in secondary schools found that teachers had low job satisfaction regardless of the subjects they taught.

Kashu (2012) study on the influence of principals’ leadership styles on students’ performance revealed that the three styles studied did not promote improvement in national examinations performance and it thus recommended that principals make their personal review of their use of the three leadership styles with a view of improving performance.

Information obtained from Kajiado North district indicates that there was high turnover of teachers in public primary schools. For example in 2013, 2 teachers resigned while in the same year, 39 letters were received in the DEO’s office from teachers seeking transfer to other districts within the county and also to other
counties (Kajiado North DEO’s office Annual report ,2013). Kajiado North District is also understaffed by about 23 teachers with schools in the interior areas being the most affected. Leadership of head teachers in the schools might have an influence on this. This study therefore aimed at examining the influence of head teachers’ leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in public primary schools in Kajiado North District.

1.3 Purpose of the study
The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of head teachers’ leadership styles on public primary school teachers’ job satisfaction in Kajiado North District, Kajiado County.

1.4 Objectives of the study
The study was guided by the following objectives:

i. To establish the influence of headteachers’ autocratic leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District.

ii. To determine the influence of headteachers’ democratic leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District.
iii. To examine the influence of headteachers’ laissez faire leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District.

iv. To analyse the influence of headteachers’ transformational leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District.

1.5 Research questions

The study sought to answer the following questions:

i. To what extent do headteachers’ autocratic leadership styles influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District?

ii. To what extent do headteachers’ democratic leadership styles influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District?

iii. To what extent do headteachers’ laissez faire leadership styles influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District?

iv. To what extent do headteachers’ transformational leadership styles influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction in Kajiado North District?
1.6 Significance of the study

This study may be useful to headteachers who will be equipped with knowledge on how to enhance job satisfaction of teachers. Headteacher may re-examine and appraise their own leadership style and hence make adjustment where necessary. The County Director, TSC may use the information in determining strategies of enhancing job satisfaction among primary school teachers. He may know how to make and enforce policies and terms of service which are human, friendly and satisfying to teachers.

KEMI may use the findings of this study to identify intervention measures to undertake in preparing management courses for school administrators with the view of enhancing the teachers’ job satisfaction. They might use these findings as reference point in identifying areas for further training of school managers. The outcome of the study might also help stakeholders in the education sector such as parents, the surrounding communities among others; understand the effects of leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction among public primary schools in Kajiado county. The study findings may also influence further research by other students and scholars who may be interested in the field of leadership styles and job satisfaction.
1.7 Limitations of the study

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a limitation is an aspect of a research that may negatively affect the results but over which the researcher has no control. The study depended on the co-operation of respondents. To ensure that this did not affect the study, the researcher appealed to them to be frank with an assurance that their identities would not be disclosed and their responses were treated confidentially and was only used for the purpose of the study.

1.8 Delimitation of the study

According to Orodho (2005), delimitations of the study refer to the boundaries of the study. The study was carried out among teachers and head teachers in public primary schools in Kajiado North District. The findings were based on employees from one employer Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) and from a small region. This was not enough to make a generalization to other employers and employees. However, the findings gave an insight into further research in other organization and other parts of the country.

1.9 Basic assumptions of the study

Basic assumptions of the study refer to guiding philosophy of the study and the givens that the study holds if it is going to be carried out successfully. It was assumed that each headteacher in a public primary school applied a particular leadership style. Instruments that were used to measure the job satisfaction among
teachers was valid and reliable to produce the credible information. Also it was assumed that the respondents will give honest and accurate responses.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were taken to mean as defined below:

**Attitude** refers to the teacher’s positive or negative evaluation with regard to one’s thinking, feeling, perceiving and behaving in a certain way towards the head teachers’ leadership style.

**Autocratic leadership style** refers to the head teacher’s leadership style that tends to centralize power and decision making upon his/her teachers.

**Democratic leadership style** refers to a head teacher’s leadership style whereby power and authority are derived from his/her subordinates.

**Head teacher** refers to a trained teacher who has been appointed by the TSC to manage a public primary school.

**Influence** refers to the manner, capacity or power of the head teacher to be a compelling force on or produce effects on the actions, opinions and behavior impacts on the teacher’s job satisfaction.

**Job satisfaction** refers to whether or not teachers like their job or facets of jobs, such as nature of work or supervision..

**Laissez-faire leadership style** refers to a head teacher’s leadership style whereby the subordinates under him/her do what they want.
Leadership refers to the process used by the head teacher in inspiring the teachers to give off their best in the pursuit of the desired results.

Leadership style refers to the head teacher’s manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans and motivating the teachers under their headship. Various styles can be employed such as autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire and transformational.

Transformational leadership style refers to a head teacher’s leadership style that inspires and motivates the staff under them to achieve a given goal.

1.11 Organization of the study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one consists of introduction, background of the study, statement of problems, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, basic assumptions, definition of significant terms and organization of the study. Chapter two deals with the literature review where the subtopics covered are: introduction, head teachers and leadership styles, factors affecting job satisfaction, leadership styles and job satisfaction, summary of literature review, theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Chapter three focuses on research methodology and comprises of research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instrument, instrument validity and instrument reliability. It also includes data collection procedure and data analysis techniques. Chapter four deals with data analysis, interpretation and discussion of
the findings while chapter five comprises the summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of relevant literature to explain the research objectives. It is reviewed under the following sub-topics: head teachers and leadership styles, teachers’ job satisfaction in relation to the different leadership styles, the summary of the reviewed literature and finally the theoretical and conceptual frameworks. The review focuses on leadership styles of public primary school head teachers and their influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

2.2 Head teachers and leadership styles

School leadership plays a key role in improving school’s outcomes by influencing the motivation and capacities of teachers as well as the school climate and environment (Bush, 2005). The head teacher must employ inclusive kind of leadership where they will involve other people as a team. This team gets a deliberate opportunity to contribute to the vision, culture and climate of the school and thus the head teacher has a duty to create the opportunities to make this happen and teachers partly determine the leadership styles of the head teacher (Mutula, 2006). As a leader, the head teacher has the power to influence job satisfaction among the teachers under them.
It’s worthwhile to note that leadership has been one of the most popular research topics in organizational behavior since the days of Greek philosophers (McShane & Glinow, 2004). The importance of leadership was first researched in the 1920s with studies using surveys reporting that favorable attitudes toward supervision helped to achieve employee job satisfaction (Bass, 1990). Several studies were conducted during the 1950s and 1960s to investigate how managers could use their leadership behaviors to increase employees’ level of job satisfaction (Northouse, 2004). These studies confirmed the significance of leadership in making differences in employees’ job satisfaction (Bass, 1990).

Furthermore, Yousef (2000) showed that leadership behavior was positively related to job satisfaction and therefore managers needed to adopt appropriate leadership behavior in order to improve it. Leadership style affects a range of factors such as job satisfaction, performance, turnover intention, and stress (Chen & Silverthorne, 2005) and so contribute to organizational success (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Yousef (2000) argued that theories developed and tested in Western organizations are still valid for non-Western countries. Hence, the significant impact of leadership style on job satisfaction does not differ between west and east and can be considered an important factor in the success or failure of any organization.

In recent times, the topic of leadership has been the object of extensive study. Every organization and department is structured in groups of subordinates acting
under the control and guidance of leaders (Tsourvakas, Zotos, & Dekoulou, 2007). Effective leadership must filter through in the organization, not exist in one or two superstars at the top (Bateman & Snell, 2002). Leadership styles have a powerful influence on individual and group behavior (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995).

Leadership can be taught and learned (Bateman & Snell, 2002). According to Bennis and Nanus (1985) leadership seems to be marshaling of skills possessed by a majority but used by minority. It is something that can be learned by anyone, taught to everyone and denied to no one. Isaac, Zerbe, and Pitt (2001) and also Pearce and Conger (2003) corroborates this view when they stated that any member of the organization may become a leader, it is not the property of the executives. The leaders in successful situations work and share their wisdom with others to stimulate and create conditions which support efforts of their subordinates. The supervisors with an ideal leadership style significantly affect employees’ job satisfaction with respect to self esteem, opportunities, and expectations with job, self respect, fair dealing, and participation (McKee, 1991).

Being social institutions schools are linked closely with patterns of power in historical and social sense. As leadership is the combination of influence and power, the concept of school change studies may be disturbed seriously if we neglect it. So its analysis is needed to be investigated with its allied concepts of legitimacy and authority (Fleisch & Christie, 2004). The leaders who are effective
and committed motivate their teachers and learners, and retain professional academic environment in their institutions (Barker 2001; Fernandez 2000). Leadership effectiveness is assessed by employees’ commitment to leader, group cohesiveness, leader’s ability to advance, and subordinates’ development (Sweeney & McFarlin, 2002).

It has been observed that leadership is a personal quality and willingness of people to follow a person as leader. It exists only with followers. It is meaningless without adherents. Leadership involves readiness to accept complete responsibility in all situations. Leadership styles may change under different circumstances. Leaders stimulate the followers to strive willingly for attainment of organizational objectives.

According to Sahni (2004), a leader must have the ability to sway the behavior, attitude, and belief of his/ her subordinates. The success of a leader depends on the acceptance of his leadership by the followers (Khanka, 2007). A leader gives orders and instructions by formulating objectives for his group; he takes important decisions, listens to subordinates, and responds to their needs. A leader is careful to inspire and motivate all members of his group and represent them to the outside world.

It is obvious that leadership is the appropriate use of power. There are two common types of power; position and personal power. The capacity to affect the
behavior of people is called power (Bartol, Tein, Matthews, & Martin, 2003). Sometimes power comes from person’s position in the organization, while other sources of power are based on personal characteristics. So leader’s power exists in the forms of position and personal (Daft, 2005).

Leadership styles or traits are the characteristic way in which a leader uses power, makes decision, and interacts with others. Leadership style is an inbuilt, relatively enduring attribute of our personality which provides us motivation and determines our general orientation when exercising leadership Kunwar (2001). The leadership style of a leader is the combination of behaviors as task and relationship. It is important to note that leadership behavior refers to particular acts which one could perform or not perform if one has knowledge and skills.

Good leadership is about action and not position. The two must never be confused. If someone wants to become a good leader, he must stress on actions rather than talking. People are interested in one’s actions rather skills. The theories about leadership have direct implication for what the style leader uses in managing employees (Kunwar, 2001). The term style is almost comparable to the manner where the leader influences subordinates (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). The ways in which leaders influence their subordinates are called styles of leadership.
Every organization and institution likes to promote the satisfaction and effectiveness of its employees. Societal values and beliefs of a specific region and country play a significant role. The appropriateness and effectiveness of leadership style depend on the operating situation in which a leader matches his/her leadership style with the task of their followers (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2001). It has been stated elsewhere by De Nobile and McCormick (2005) that the priority of school leadership team is to keep teachers satisfied on their job.

Headteachers’ leadership capacities in urban settings are significantly higher than in sub-urban and in rural settings. Schools in urban settings have advantages in terms of funding, cultural and physical environment, teacher and student quality and community support systems. Headteachers in urban settings enjoy better professional development opportunities, higher salaries and comfortable living status than their sub-urban and rural counterparts (Hannum, 2003; Luo, 2004).

According to Evans (1998), head teachers with a consultative and collaborative leadership styles were more successful in achieving greater job satisfaction and morale from teaching staff. Directive style of leadership is suitable in the situation in which the leader is more competent than followers. If the followers are more competent and knowledgeable, then participative style of leadership is favourite (Murphy & Fiedler, 1992; Peterson, 1997; Somech & Wenderow, 2006). The
head teacher is expected to be the prime agent articulating, embodying, and implementing the school's mission and ethics (Sullivan, 1999).

The selection of leadership styles is motivated by the reality that these leadership styles influence subordinate’s satisfaction as well as performance. Heads of schools constitute dynamic leaders who influence classroom teachers who are their immediate subordinates in the school management system. Okafor (1991) noted that in Nigeria most of the successes or failures in secondary school administration or other institutions depend largely on the influence of the leaders that had on their subordinates.

In the world that we live in today, school leaders’ roles have changed from practising teachers with added responsibilities to full-time professional managers of human, financial and other resources accountable for their results (Bolam, McMahon, Pocklington & Weindling 2000). This has meant that more and more tasks have been added to the job description: instructional leadership, staff evaluation, budget management, performance assessment, accountability, and community relations, to name some of the most prominent ones. In this environment, the range of knowledge and skills that effective school leaders need today is daunting: curricular, pedagogical, student learning in addition to managerial and financial skills, abilities in group dynamics, interpersonal relations and communications. Recent evidence suggest that emotional intelligence displayed, for example, through a leader’s personal attention to an
employee and through the utilization of employees capacities, increases the employee’s enthusiasm and optimism, reduces frustration, transmits a sense of mission and indirectly increases performance (Hanuscheck & Raymond, 2004).

One way of accomplishing organizational goals is for the head teacher to satisfy members’ needs. Teachers’ expectations of their boss is to recognize them, give them current information and opportunity for growth and development, effective supervision and treat them as human beings (Mutula, 2006). A head teacher should thus demonstrate friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in their relationship with their teachers in order to gain their commitment and cooperation. The head teachers’ leadership styles do impact on teachers’ job satisfaction (Ngumi, 2003). Studies have proven that effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling.

2.3 Factors affecting job satisfaction

The study of job satisfaction is a topic of wide interest to both people who work in organizations and people who study them. Researchers have attempted to identify the various components of job satisfaction, measure the relative importance of each component of job satisfaction and examine what effects these components have on employees’ productivity.

Job satisfaction is how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs (Spector, 1997). Armstrong (2003) defined job satisfaction as the feelings
and attitudes of people toward their job. He mentioned that if people have favorable and positive attitudes towards their job, this means job satisfaction, but if they have unfavorable and negative attitudes towards their job, this means job dissatisfaction.

Strauus and Sayles (1960) explain that job satisfaction is a positive optimum feeling derived after a completion of a task in lieu to achieving the target of the organization. Thereby benefits the organization and in return the worker is rewarded in cash or in kind. This definition gives importance to the commitment between the job satisfaction and the benefits of the work. But Smith (1964) defines that it is related with the individual need and job satisfaction can be classified as per the needs of the individual. It is the feeling associated with the mind and the environment the individual lives in. Similarly Vroom (1967) defines job satisfaction as the response of the individual towards the role played at work. This definition is supported by Smith (2000) who also asserts that it is the degree of satisfaction or gratification experienced by workers with their profession.

A study by Smith (2000) stated that “the principal is expected to be an instructional leader who can support, inspire, and develop students and teachers, as well as communicate effectively with all publics within the educational environment”. Hallinger and Heck (1998) found that a school leader’s leadership style is the main factor that greatly influences school effectiveness and should be
underscored. In addition to a school leader’s leadership style, teacher job satisfaction is another critical factor affecting school effectiveness.

Schulz and Teddlie (1989) believed that “a teachers’ job satisfaction may serve to influence their morale, motivation and general willingness to maximize their teaching potential”. Teachers who are not satisfied with their jobs may result in bad teaching or learning process, and school effectiveness will consequently be negatively impacted. As to the relationship between a school leader’s leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, the two basic factors influencing school effectiveness, Chieffo (1991) recognized that the school leader’s leadership style significantly influences teacher job satisfaction, consequently, it will be helpful, for reaching the goals of the school and increasing school effectiveness, to clearly comprehend the relationship between these two important factors.

Studies on job satisfaction dated from the beginning of the twentieth century when scientific management theory was prevailing and improving production efficiency was paid much attention. In this period, psychological and sociological variables were ignored (Hoy & Miskel, 1996), and workers and production equipment were thought of as parts of the process of production, so studies focused on extrinsic factors such as salaries and materials. The intrinsic factors, human relations, were not attached importance until the 1920’s in the Hawthorne Studies that established that work efficiency could be enhanced by not only
improving the physical conditions of work, but also improving intrinsic factors such as work attitudes.

According to Mullins (2002), the level of job satisfaction is affected by social, personal, cultural, environmental and organizational factors. Moreover, Armstrong (2003) suggested a classification into extrinsic factors, intrinsic factors, social relationships in work place, individuals’ abilities to do their work, and the quality of supervision. Job satisfaction is in regard to one’s feeling or state of mind regarding the nature of the work.

Overall, job satisfaction is a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The intrinsic factors are associated with job itself and extrinsic factors related to work environment where it is performed (Bogler, 2001). Intrinsic satisfaction refers to when workers consider only the kind of work they do, the tasks that make up the job while extrinsic satisfaction has to do with when the workers consider the conditions of work for example pay.

Savery (1994) established that democratic leadership style related positively to employees’ job satisfaction and commitment in federal organizations in Western Australian, while in contrast, Rad and Yarmohammadian (2006) found no relationship between leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction in Isfahan University Hospitals in Iran, where a participative leadership style was prevalent. Furthermore, Erkutlu and Chafra (2006) cited that laissez-faire
leadership style in a boutique hotel led to negative results in organizational performance such as low satisfaction, high stress, and low commitment by followers.

Mbugua (1998) noted that some of the factors influencing job satisfaction levels among teachers include the subjects taught, school type, sex, age and professional qualifications. He also found out that 32% of teachers were ready to quit their jobs due to low salaries and that only 33% wished to stay on. Karuga (2004) found that 53.7% of science teachers were satisfied with their jobs while 39% were willing to change employers. Tuiyot (1995) established that it was only when job satisfaction is created by meeting teacher’s needs that teachers turnover was going to reduce. Mutie (1993) agreed that the reason teachers stayed in the profession was because of supportive administrators and inter personnel relationships among other reasons. These findings clearly underline the principal’s role in boosting the teachers’ job satisfaction.

In another study done by Kadinya (1995), it was discovered that older teachers who had taught more than fifteen years were more satisfied than young teachers. Sogomo (1993) further asserted that meeting the teachers’ needs boosted their job satisfaction which resulted to favorable attitude towards their job. All the above past studies have not dealt with job satisfaction of primary schools teachers as influenced by the head teacher’s leadership styles specifically in Kajiado County.
The study thus examined the results of the interaction of these two variables and thus endeavored to address the gap left by earlier studies.

2.4 Autocratic leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction

Autocratic leadership is also known as, directive, coercive, dictatorial or authoritarian leadership. It places emphasis on force. It does not derive its legitimacy from those who are governed but it is leadership imposed upon the organization. This leadership style centralizes power, authority and decision making (Okumbe, 1998). It involves issuing detailed instructions and close supervision of subordinates’ work. A research by Iqbal (2010) on comparative study of the impact of principals’ leadership styles on job satisfaction of teachers in Pakistan revealed that teachers working under an autocratic style of leadership were less satisfied than teachers working under a democratic style of leadership.

Omeke and Onah (2011) researched on the influence of the leadership styles of principals on teachers’ job satisfaction in Nsukka education zone, Enugu state, Nigeria. It was concluded from the study that autocratic leadership style had the highest rating. Nsubuga (2008) conducted a study which sought to analyze the leadership styles of head teachers and school performance of secondary schools in Uganda where it was revealed that the greater the use of autocratic principles, the poorer the learners’ academic performance. The coercive style leader often creates a reign of terror, bullying and demeaning his subordinates, roaring with
displeasure at the slightest problem. Subordinates get intimidated and stop bringing bad news or any news in fear of getting bashed or blamed for it, and the morale of the workers plummets. Nthuni (2012) research on how the head teachers' leadership styles influenced motivation of teachers in public schools confirmed this assertion. Kariuki (1998) study on teachers’ perception of the leadership style behavior of women head teachers of secondary schools found that female head teachers were perceived to be autocratic.

2.5 Democratic (Participative) leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction

Democratic leadership style is a style where a leader uses one or more employees in the decision making process and it is consultative in nature. The style decentralizes power and authority (Okumbe, 1998). Ingersoll (2001) maintained that teachers were more satisfied when they were part of the school decision making and when they had control over their classrooms. Iqbal (2010) revealed that teachers working under a democratic style of leadership were more satisfied than teachers working under other styles of leadership. Omeke and Onah (2011) established that democratic leadership style exerts positive influence on teachers’ job satisfaction. Employees are satisfied with democratic leadership because their opinions, comments and suggestions are needed for decision-making (Obi, 2003). Nsubuga (2008) revealed that most school manages used the democratic style of leadership. The school head uses the democratic leadership style to build trust, respect and commitment because the style allows people to have a say in
decisions that affect their goals and how they do their work. Mutuku (2005) noted that a democratic system is an integrated approach to management.

Nakola (2011) established that Principals who were perceived to be exhibiting democratic style had a considerably highly motivated staff as they consulted with them on the proposed actions, decision and encouraged participation from them. Kasinga (2010) indicated that the democratic style of leadership was the most applied one by Principals in secondary schools in Nairobi province while a study by Okoth (2000) on the effects of leadership styles on performance in KCSE in the same province revealed that democratic headteachers produced higher mean score grades as compared to autocratic head teachers. The democratic dimension of leadership style is therefore a better predict of teachers’ job satisfaction and school achievement.

2.6 Laissez faire leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction

In laissez faire leadership style, the leader tends to avoid power, authority and depends largely on the group to establish goals and means for achieving progress and success (Okumbe, 1998). The laissez-faire leadership style involves a non-interference policy, allows complete freedom to all workers and has no particular way of attaining goals. Here the leader allows the employees to make decisions although the leader is still responsible for the decisions made. The style is not the best to use in the school’s organization because complete delegation without follow-up mechanisms may create performance problems, which are likely to
affect the school’s effectiveness. This is in agreement with MacDonald’s (2007) study of laissez-faire leadership which indicated that it is associated with the highest rates of truancy and delinquency and with the slowest modifications in performance which lead to unproductive attitudes and disempowerment of subordinates.

Nsubuga (2008) study revealed negative correlation between the laissez-faire leadership style and the school performance in secondary schools. It established that head teachers who use the leadership style tend to fail to follow up on those they have delegated tasks to and consequently performance declines. Nthuni (2012) study revealed that teachers who were led by head teachers who practiced laissez faire style of leadership were demotivated to a large extent based on leadership factors singled out by the researcher. The laissez faire style of leadership was the least applied by the schools’ heads (Kasinga, 2010).

2.7 Transformational leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction

Transformational leaders are proactive, raise awareness levels of followers and help the followers to achieve high performance outcomes (Bass, 1990). Transformational leaders pay particular attention to each individual’s needs for achievement and growth. Hamidifar (2009) found that employees are more satisfied with transformational leadership than any other style. He also revealed that this type of leadership was not being exercised by the managers. The study concluded that transformational leadership led to better satisfied employees.
Nguni, Sleegers, and Denessen (2006) also studied the effects of transformational and transactional leadership on teachers’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship in schools in Tanzania. They observed that the two leadership styles were distinguished by the different ways leaders motivate their followers and appeal to the emotions and values of their followers. The teachers rated their headteachers particularly high on the transformational leadership traits of charismatic leadership, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

A study by Nthuni (2012) on leadership style factors that influence motivation of pre-school teachers in public pre-schools in Embu North District, revealed that there was need to adopt a transformational leadership style in order to enhance motivation of pre-school teachers in public pre-schools and improve their working environment by involving them in decision making and in policy formulation in their schools. Kibue (2008) study on transformational leadership style on public secondary schools in Kirinyaga County revealed that majority of principals and teachers did not understand nor use the transformational leadership style in schools. This style is still a new concept to many. The researcher concluded that there was need for teachers to be trained and properly inducted on leadership in order to properly manage both human and material resources.
2.8 Summary of literature review

The literature review has reviewed the influence of head teachers’ leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction. For example, Kasinga (2010) found that democratic leadership style was the most applied and laissez faire was the least applied. Nsubuga (2008) concurred with this finding while in Lesomo (2013) the study revealed that the school managers did not restrict themselves to one management style. In Nthuni (2012), the study findings indicated that pre-school teachers led by head teachers who practice authoritarian and laissez faire style of leadership are demotivated to a large extent based on leadership factors singled out by the researcher. Okoth (2000) established that democratic head teachers produced higher mean score as a result of good motivation compared to autocratic head teachers whereas. Due to the above inconsistencies in research findings, there is need to carry out this research with a view of identifying the influence of leadership styles on job satisfaction.

2.9 Theoretical framework

This study was based on Fredrick Herzberg’s Two Factor or Dual Factor Theory. He classified job factors into two categories, motivators and hygienes. The theory postulates that motivation has two independent factors i.e. maintenance (hygiene) factors example salary, fringe benefits, types of supervision, working environment and conditions, administration policies and motivational factors for instance achievement, recognition for accomplishment, challenging work, increased
responsibility, growth and development. The content theories of motivation can be seen as more related to satisfaction than to motivation. For example, Herzberg’s theory is considered as a theory of job satisfaction related to motivation at work (Mullins, 2002).

The content theories suggest unsatisfied needs lead to an unstable situation and state of tension. Herzberg’s (1959) theory argued that hygiene factors include working conditions, interpersonal relations, supervision, job security, benefits, company policies and management, and salary. When the level of these factors is unacceptable for employees, job dissatisfaction occurs, but an acceptable level does not lead automatically to job satisfaction and but simply prevents dissatisfaction and poor performance. Motivating factors which included recognition, advancement, achievement, autonomy, work itself and responsibility lead to job satisfaction. The theory argues that satisfaction factors and dissatisfaction factors are distinct and separate.

Herzberg (1959) also called the maintenance factors dissatisfiers and the motivational factors satisfiers. The same factors contribute to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. From the study, he found that the motivational factors (satisfiers) increased job satisfaction beyond the neutral point when present. When absent, they only led to minimal dissatisfaction of the worker. On the other hand, dissatisfiers when absent led to dissatisfaction however gratification of the maintenance factors only led to minimal job satisfaction (Mbiti, 2007). Herzberg
theory is applicable to this study due to the critical role played by the head teachers’ leadership styles in teachers’ work. It will help establish how head teachers with different leadership styles satisfy teachers. According to Okumbe (1998), Herzberg’s theory can lead to teachers’ job satisfaction through change in the nature of the job as well as through job enrichment and management allowing teachers maximum control over mechanisms of task performance. Head teachers should delegate more responsibilities to teachers so as to enhance participation, joint responsibilities and results. Job description should also be redesigned to ensure that human resources and potentials are developed to the fullest.

2.10 Conceptual framework

Figure 2.1: Head teachers’ leadership styles and teachers’ job satisfaction

![Conceptual Framework Diagram](image-url)
The conceptual framework advances that the leadership employed by the head teachers is the independent variable which has an influence on the teachers’ job satisfaction (dependent variable). There are variables that come into play that influence teachers’ job satisfaction in school. There are also intervening variables such as intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that influence teachers’ job satisfaction. However, the researcher is of the opinions that no matter the situation, the leadership style adopted by the head teacher have an impact on the teachers’ job satisfaction. The framework shows that the different leadership’s styles influence teachers’ job satisfaction.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the procedures that were used in conducting the study. It focuses on the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, instruments validity and reliability, data collection procedure and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research design

This study employed descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allowed the researchers to gather information about people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any other characteristics of a particular individual, group, summarize it, present and interpret the data collected for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2009).

This design was ideal because the study sought to explore the cause and effect of the relationship between the head teachers’ leadership style as an independent variable and teachers’ job satisfaction as dependent variable. In this study, the design also assisted in analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative data since the researcher used semi-structured questionnaires to collect data.
3.3 Target population

Orodho (2005) defines population as all the items or people under consideration. For this study, the target population consisted of 86 public primary schools in Kajiado North District. The district comprises of five zones namely; Ewaso, Ngong, Kisamis, Ongata Rongai and Magadi. The schools have a total of 86 head teachers and 844 teachers (DEO’s office, Kajiado North, 2013). The head teachers and the teachers should have worked in the same working station for a period of two year. Two years was seen as minimum period for a head teacher to be established in a school to make it possible for teachers to form an opinion about their leadership styles.

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedure

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define a sample as a group obtained from the accessible population. This sub group is carefully selected so as to be representative of the whole population. Orodho (2005) also defines sampling as the process of selecting a sub-set of cases in order to draw conclusions about the entire set. Sampling is essential because one can learn something about a large group by studying a few of the members.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) say a sample of between 10-30% is suitable for descriptive survey. To sample the respondents, the researcher used 30 % for headteachers giving a total of 26 headteachers. As for the teachers, the researcher used 20 % giving a total of 169 teachers .The simple random technique was used
where the entire individual in the defined population had an equal and independent chance of being selected as members of the sample. Table 3.1 presents the sampling frame.

Table 3.1. Sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Teachers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Research instruments

The study used questionnaire as the instrument of data collection. A questionnaire is a research instrument that gathers data over large sample (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). The researcher used the questionnaire because it was easy to administer, give the respondent ample time to answer the questions, give the respondents freedom to express their views or opinions and also make suggestions (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

Two questionnaires were used for the two different categories that is head teachers and teachers. The questionnaires comprised of both closed and open-ended questions formulated by the researcher. The questionnaires contained three sections. Section one was designed to gather background information about the
respondents, section two had questions related to job satisfaction while section three showed the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership styles. The sample questionnaires are attached to this study as appendix II and III.

3.6 Instrument validity

According to Borg and Gall (1989) validity is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) also define validity as the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study. It therefore has to do with how accurately the data obtained in the study represents the variables of the study.

Content validity is defined as the degree to which the sample of an instrument item represents the content that the instruments is designed to measure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). To enhance validity of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted in two selected schools. This involved the head teacher and three teachers from each school. This population was not used in the final research. The reason behind pilot study was to assess the clarity and relevance of the instrument items so that those found inadequate were either discarded or modified to improve the quality of the research instruments thus increasing the validity. The researcher also sought the supervisors’ guidance in order to improve validity of the instrument.
3.7 Instrument reliability

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). A pilot study was conducted using the Test-Retest technique of assessing reliability of data which involves administering the same instrument twice to the same group of subjects at two separate times with a time lapse between the first and second test. The researcher used Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient formula to determine the correlation coefficient (r) between the two sets of scores.

\[
r = \frac{n \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[n \sum (x)^2 - (\sum x)^2][n \sum (y)^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}
\]

Where

- \( x \) = first set of scores;
- \( y \) = the second set of scores;
- \( n \) = the total number of respondents;
- \( \sum x \) = the sum of the first set of scores;
- \( \sum y \) = the sum of the second set of scores;
- \( \sum x^2 \) = the sum squared of the first set of scores;
- \( \sum y^2 \) = the sum squared of the second set of scores and
- \( \sum xy \) = the sum of the cross product of \( x, y \).

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a reliability coefficient of above + 0.60 is deemed satisfactory. The correlation coefficient attained from the head teachers questionnaire was 0.864 while that of teachers was 0.825 indicating
that the both the questionnaire were also reliable hence the instruments were
deeded reliable enough by the researcher to be used in the study.

3.6 Data collection procedure

The researcher sought a research permit from the National Commission for
Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) before embarking on the study.
Thereafter, the researcher made courtesy calls to the County Commissioner (CC),
Kajiado county and DEO Kajiado North District and discussed the research visits
to the schools before the study commenced. A visit was also made to the sampled
schools to book appointments with the head teachers on when to administer the
instruments. Data collection was done through questionnaires and was
disseminated personally by the researcher to the respective schools. The
researcher through the head teachers created a good rapport with the teachers
before asking them to filled in the questionnaires. The respondents were assured
of strict confidentiality when dealing with their identities. The completed
questionnaires were collected after two days.

3.7 Data analysis techniques

According to Cohen and Manion (1994), after data has been collected, editing
should be done to identify and eliminate errors made by respondents’. This checks
the completeness if all questions have been answered accurately and also if the
respondents interpreted instructions and questions uniformly.
Quantitative data was entered into the computer for analysis using the SPSS. This processed the frequencies and percentages which were used to discuss the findings. Tables, pie charts and bar graphs were used to present the data. Whilst qualitative data was categorized according to themes from the objectives and where applicable presented in the form of frequency tables.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results of the study based on the data collected from the field. The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of head teachers’ leadership styles on public primary school teachers’ job satisfaction in Kajiado North District in Kajiado County. The presentations were done based on the research questions and analysis of significant relationship between variables selected for the study. Results of the data analysis provided information that formed the basis for discussion, conclusion and interpretation of the findings and recommendations of the study.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate
From a sample size of 195 respondents, 184 responses were successfully completed. This gave a questionnaire return rate of 184/195 X 100 or 94.4%. The findings of this study are based on these responses. Table 4.1 below shows the questionnaire return rate of the respondents.
Table 4.1 Questionnaire return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent category</th>
<th>No. in the Sample</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Response by Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a response rate of 50 per cent is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60 per cent is good and a response rate of 70 per cent and over is excellent. This response rate was satisfactory to make conclusions for the study. The response rate was representative. Based on the assertion, the response rate was considered to be excellent.

4.3 Demographic information of the respondents

The demographic data of the respondents focused on their gender, academic qualifications, age and duration of service in the teaching profession. The data obtained were to help analyse the relationship between head teachers’ leadership styles and teachers’ job satisfaction.

4.3.1 Respondents’ distribution by gender

The study sought to determine the gender of the respondents. The researcher included the gender of the respondents in order to establish the magnitude to
which each of the sexes influences leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction. In order to establish the gender of the respondents, they were asked to indicate their gender and their responses are presented in table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Distribution of the respondents by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above findings, the study established that majority of the head teachers were male (62.5%) while 37.5 per cent were female. This shows gender imbalance in appointment to leadership positions suggesting that primary school leadership is male dominated in the district. This may suggest that the male are given priority in appointment for headship postions due to harsh working conditions in some parts of Kajiado North District. This could also imply that female teachers to don’t apply for this postions while others seek jobs in urban areas as most of primary schools in Kajiado North District are located in hardship areas. This findings concurs with that of Nakola (2011). There are gender disparities in the use of leadership styles. In Nsubug(2008), it emerged that
females administrators employ more participative methods of leadership including counseling and guidance of teachers and students than male head teachers.

The gender distribution for the teachers indicated that majority of the teaching staff in Kajiado North District are female suggesting that female teachers are given priority in posting due to the close proximity of the district to Nairobi.

4.3.2 Distribution of the respondents by age

The researcher was further interested in ascertaining the age composition of the respondents and they were therefore asked to indicate the same. The head teachers’ responses are presented in figure 4.1 while as those for the teachers are presented in figure 4.2 below.

**Figure 4.1: Distribution of headteachers by age**
Data presented in figure 4.1 above revealed that most of the head teachers were aged between 31 to 40 years (41.7%) followed by those aged between 41 and 50 years (29.2%). The data showed that most of the head teachers were relatively middle aged and generally balanced their leadership styles because their rich experience has taught them that the situation around their school affects the leadership style of the head teacher hence may have experience that is likely to influence their leadership styles. The high level of experience and maturity of many head teachers was vital in adding value to the trend of the findings for this study.

Figure 4.2: Distribution of teachers by age

The data presented above on the age distribution of teachers revealed that majority of the teachers who participated in the study were in the age bracket of 31 and 40 year followed by those aged between 41 to 50 years The older the teachers are the
more satisfied they would be expected to be with their jobs since as age goes by, they tend to settle into one’s job for security purposes as opposed to young teachers. It also evident that most teachers in the district are both mature and energetic as they are at their prime age in the teaching profession. Due to the current TSC recruitment policy, teachers are staying out after graduation before they are recruited by the TSC and as such when they are finally hired, they are mature age wise.

4.3.3 Professional qualifications of the respondents

The study sought to establish the highest professional qualifications of the respondents. Their responses are presented in table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3: Professional qualifications of the respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of qualification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on the analysis revealed varied qualifications for head teachers and teachers. Majority of the head teachers as presented above indicated that 63 per cent of
them were diploma holders, 25 per cent were university degree holders, whereas 12 per cent of the respondents indicated their highest academic qualification as P1 graduates. These results imply that majority of the head teachers had basic professional qualifications desirable for primary school teaching and should be encouraged to further their studies to enrich their professionalism, competence and acquire new approaches and skills pertaining to new educational trends in the country. Headteachers who are well educated and trained are likely to adopt leadership styles that foster teachers’ job satisfaction. At a glance, teachers in the district are also highly academically qualified and this is an indication that the respondents were well trained and educated as teachers and would therefore be expected to be more satisfied with their jobs since they are well equipped with the knowledge they need to perform their duties effectively and efficiently

4.3.4 Duration of service as a headteacher

The study further sought to establish the duration that head teacher had served as a head teacher and their responses are presented in table 4.4 below.
Table 4.4: Duration of service as a headteacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service as a headteacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the administrative experience of head teachers, it was revealed that a majority of the head teachers had between 11 to 15 years of administrative experience (45.8%) with 25 per cent having an experience of between 6 to 10 years. This is an indication that a significant number of headteachers had headed schools for a considerable period of time implying that they clearly understood issues pertaining to institutions leadership, able to articulate the issues affecting job satisfaction and thus their knowledge could be relied upon in this study.

4.3.5 Teaching experience of the respondents

The study requested the respondents to indicate the period of time each had served in the teaching profession. Their responses are presented in table 4.5.
Table 4.5: Teaching experience of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26 years</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis on the head teachers’ duration of service in the teaching profession revealed that 19 of them representing 79.1 per cent had taught for a period of between 11 to 25 years with only 1 respondent ( 4%) having taught for a period of between 6 to 10 years. This is an indication that that majority of the respondents had served for a considerable time, showing they had adequate experience to dispense their duties. In addition, they had a chance to work in various schools and have experienced different ways of doing things. The different challenges they have faced at the end of the day have enabled them mature in judgement also. A research conducted by Ward (1997) among elementary head teachers in Virginia, USA indicated that head teachers who had six years or more of service...
had a stronger feeling regarding inter-personal relationship with teachers than head teachers who had five or fewer years of experience.

The analysis above also revealed that majority of the teachers (39.4%) had 6 to 10 years of teaching experience, 28.2 per cent who had a teaching experience of between 11 to 20 years followed by 21.3 per cent who had less than 5 years experience suggesting that a number of teachers had been employed recently by the government. However, it was discovered that most of the teachers felt that the greater the experience the less need to use autocratic style of leadership and the greater the use of democratic style of leadership. This is because teachers who had taught for more than 10 years and longer detested the use of strict methods of leadership. They felt that head teachers needed to involve them in the decision making because they also possess some leadership experience. The way the teachers perceived and appreciated the head teachers’ leadership styles varied on the basis on the number of years of service. This was an indication that majority of respondents had served for a considerable period of time and their vast knowledge could be relied upon in this study.

4.3.6 Respondents’ length of service in their current school

The respondents were lastly asked to indicate the period they had served and taught in their current school as head teachers and teachers respectively. Their responses are presented in table 4.6.
Table 4.6: Respondents’ length of service in their current school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service in the current school</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 26 years</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information in table 4.6 above shows that 50 per cent of the head teachers had served for a period of between 1 to 5 years as heads in their current schools while 25 per cent of them had served for a period of between 6 to 10 years. This is an indication that majority of the head teachers had headed their current school for quite some time and thus they were in a position to give credible information about their teachers’ levels of job satisfaction and how they relate with them. The data as presented above also indicated that 66.9 per cent of the teachers had taught in their current school of deployment for a period of between 6 to 15 years, 16.3 per cent for a period of between 16 to 20 years. This indicates that majority of teachers had taught in their current school for a much longer period and thus they were in a better position to give credible information pertaining to the leadership
styles of their head teachers and how their leadership styles influenced their job satisfaction.

4.3.7 Management course/seminar attended by headteachers

Head teachers were also asked if they had ever taken any course/seminars or workshop on education or educational management. Their responses to this question are presented in table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Management course/seminar attended by headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data obtained above, the study established that all of the respondents as shown by 100 per cent response rate had attended courses or seminars on educational management. This implies that all school head teachers had attended education management course. Head teachers are well trained as teachers but not as school managers as most of head teachers leave their classrooms to become head teachers. This view is supported by the fact that majority of the head teachers confirmed to the researcher that they had neither attended any induction management training course upon being appointed as school heads’ nor undertaken any training during their tenure of service as head of schools and thus could have influenced their style of leadership in schools that they headed.
4.4 Job satisfaction and leadership information by headteachers

Table 4.8: Statements relating to leadership behaviour by headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Let the group members know what is expected of them</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the teachers a high degree of initiative and creativity in their work</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am concerned with the interest and welfare of the teachers while making decisions</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the ideas/suggestions of teachers while making a decision</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit the members to use their own judgements</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try my ideas in the group</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage interpersonal relationship</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the teachers to go about their work the way they want</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign a task, then let the members handle it</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise for my staff to attend workshops and seminars</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am accommodative of other teachers’ opinions</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give advance notice of changes</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule the work to be done</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am willing to make changes</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant to explain my actions</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act without consulting the group</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urge the group to beat its past target</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the group to set its own pace</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to determine the extent to which respondents complied to the above practices, from the findings, the study established that majority of headtechers often allowed their staff to know what is expected of them as shown by mean of 4.79, they also allowed teachers a high degree of initiative and creativity in their work as shown by mean of 4.67, tried their own ideas in the group as show by a mean of 4.29, Gave advance notice of changes, assiged tasks and gave members chance to handle it as shown by mean of 4.25. Also the,head teachers were concerned with the interest and welfare of the teachers while making decisions, as shown by mean 4.21, they also allowed the teachers to go about their work the way they want.

Majority of the head teaches oftenly decided what shall be done and how it shall be done as shown by a mean of 4.17 in each case, majority of head teachers oftenly allowed the group to set its own pace as shown by mean of 4.14,
scheduled the work to be done and remained accommodative of other teachers’ opinions as shown by a mean of 4.13 in each case. They also encouraged interpersonal relationship, urged the group to beat its past target, were willing to make changes and at the same time organised workshops and seminars for their staff as shown by mean of 4.08.

The study further established that majority of respondents oftenly considered the ideas or suggestions of teachers while making a decision as shown by a mean of 4.04, the research also established that a significant number of head teachers did let some group members to have authority that they should keep as shown by mean of 3.92. The study also further revealed that majority of the respondents rarely permitted their members to use their own judgements as shown by mean of 2.21, they rarely acted without consulting the group as shown by mean 1.92, and that majority of the school head teachers were never reluctant to explain their actions as shown by mean of 1.04.

From the above findings a number of the head teachers perceive themselves as democratic while others as autocratic in their style of leadership. Decentralization of authority, participatory planning, mutual communication and the heads sharing in the decision making with their teachers are some of the main features of democratic leadership. A number of them also adopted the autocratic style of leadership as evidenced by a mean of 4.17 whereby most of them decided for
their staff what was to be done and how it was to be undertaken. As was pointed out in Oyetunyi (2006) the major focus of a democratic style of leadership is sharing whereby the manager shares the decision making with subordinates. This type of leadership is viewed as an important aspect of empowerment, teamwork and collaboration. However, the leader who adopts this style of leadership maintains the final decision making authority as unlike the laissez faire style of leadership which permits total delegation of responsibility to teachers. The problem with laissez faire leaders they tend to neglect their duty of overseeing things and seem to over trust subordinates; this should only be cases where the subordinates like work, are trustworthy and professionals.

**Figure 4.3: Head teachers general consideration on teachers satisfaction with their jobs**

The study sought to establish the head teachers general consideration on teachers satisfaction with their jobs and therefore requested them to indicate accordingly. The data is presented in figure 4.3 below.
The study findings as illustrated by figure 4.3 established that majority of the respondents as shown by 63 per cent were of the opinion that, the group of teachers they lead were not fully satisfied with their jobs whereas 37 per cent indicated that the groups they led were satisfied with their teaching job.

4.5 Job satisfaction and leadership styles information by teachers

The objectives of the study were to establish the relationship between leadership styles of school headteachers and teachers’ job satisfaction in terms of the extent to which their leadership styles influenced teachers’ job satisfaction in public primary schools in Kajiado North District. Data collected from the respondents, dwelt on the leadership styles of headteachers, the effect on the styles of leadership and also teachers’ job satisfaction. Data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation.
The researcher sought to determine the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with the above statements relating to job satisfaction of teachers. From the study findings it was established that; majority of the head teachers made
teachers work easier and more pleasant as shown by a mean of 4.91, teachers also agreed that they were comfortable working in their current school as shown by a mean of 4.84. Majority of the teachers were satisfied with the school administration and also the teaching job gave them a feeling of success to doing their job, The teaching profession gave them the prestige they desired as shown by a mean of 4.81 in all cases. Further the study established that majority of school head teachers understood and recognised good teaching practice as shown by a mean of 4.78 and that teachers enjoyed no incentive for their work as shown by a mean of 4.75, Timely promotion enhanced interest in teaching as shown by a mean of 4.72, Teaching profession gave teachers mental satisfaction as shown by a mean of 4.63, the study also revealed that majority of the respondents felt that they were a vital part of the school system as shown by a mean of 4.56, and that the feeling of going to school, gave teachers immense pleasure. It is thus fair to conclude that the majority of the teachers in primary schools in Kajiado North District were intrinsically motivated by the responsibilities they performed in the school that gave them a sense of satisfaction. According to Cameron Deci, Koestner & Ryan (2001) intrinsic motivation is derived from within the person or from the activity itself and, positively affects behavior, performance, and well being.
Table 4.10: Level of agreement on statements relating to leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have no enough freedom to make their own decision within the given</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are various channels of communication in our school</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The head teacher promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in my school</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in the planning process in our school</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to determine the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with the above statements relating to leadership style. From the study findings, majority of the respondents agreed that: there are various channels of communication in their school and that the head teacher promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in the school as shown by mean of 4.14 in each case. Teachers are involved in the planning process in the school as shown by mean of 4.11. The study also established that majority teachers have no enough freedom to make their own decision within the given responsibility as shown by mean of 1.86. All the cases were supported by a low standard mean of deviation which implies that majority of the respondents were of the same opinion. From the above finding it was clear that most of the headteachers embraced the democratic
style of leadership with a few adopting the autocratic style of leadership as they
do not give their teachers the freedom to make their own decisions. Teachers do
not want commanding authority since such authority make them lose morale and
may neglect their duty.

Table 4.11: Statement relating to effect of leadership style on teacher
motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are not free to express their views</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My head teacher does not guide as a friend but as a dictator</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in my school get promotion on the basis of their seniority and not on their capabilities</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomes questioning by the staff in matters related to school affairs</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My head teacher invites teachers to participate in the decision-making process</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My head teacher makes affective use of teachers individual capacity and talent</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My head teacher delegates some of his responsibilities to his teachers</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My head teacher acts without consulting the staff</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My head teacher permits staff to use their own judgement in solving problems</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers take their own initiatives</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers get adequate chance to give suggestions on policy matters</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with the head teacher</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to determine the extent to which respondents agreed with the above statements, from the study findings the study established that majority of the respondents agreed that; their head teachers made affective use of teachers individual capacity and talent as shown by mean of 4.29, majority of the school head teachers normally delegates some of the responsibilities to the junior teachers as shown by mean of 4.09, Delegation is the process of relinquishing decisions and tasks to others. It is one of the dimensions of democratic leadership, which includes distributing responsibility among members of the school organization, empowering these members, and aiding their participation (Ward & Wilcox, 1999).
The data analysis also reveals that majority of the school head teachers made follow ups on work already delegated to the junior staff. as shown by mean of 3.93. It is important to note that complete delegation without follow-up mechanisms creates performance problem and thus it is evident that very few headteachers use the laissez-faire style of leadership and that majority of the them invited junior teachers to participate in the decision-making process as shown by mean of 3.88 This indicates that majority of the head teachers use participative leadership where the leader allows subordinates to participate in decisions that affect their work. This seems to support the fact that teachers’ involvement in decision-making leads to more job satisfaction and work commitment as observed by Murphy and Beck, (2006).

When teachers in a school are involved in decision-making, they will own the decisions and therefore the policies in the school. Majority of the teachers, never hesitated to discuss any school problem with the head teacher as shown by a mean of 3.81, most teachers had autonomy to take their own initiatives as shown by a mean of 3.73, Teachers in the school get promotion on the basis of their seniority and not on their capabilities as shown by mean of 3.69.

The data analysis also established that majority of the respondents disagreed that teachers are not free to express their views as shown by mean of 1.94, Teachers get adequate chance to give suggestions on policy matters as shown by a mean
of 1.97, majority of the school head teacher do not guide as a friend but as a dictator as shown by 2.04, the head teacher permits staff to use their own judgement in solving problems as shown by mean in of 2.08, and that respondents disagreed that most of the head teacher acts without consulting the staff as shown by a mean of 2.24.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the study, the key findings of the study, conclusion drawn from the findings highlighted, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

5.2 Summary of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of head teachers’ leadership styles on public primary school teachers’ job satisfaction in Kajiado North District, Kajiado County. Four research objectives were developed. The first objective was to establish the influence of headteachers’ autocratic leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction; the second objective was to determine the influence of headteachers’ democratic leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. The third objective was to examine the influence of headteachers’ laissez faire leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction while the last objective was to analyse the influence of headteachers’ transformational leadership style on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction.

This study employed a descriptive survey design. Data was gathered by use of questionnaires. The total sample size had 24 headteachers and 169 teachers giving
a total of 169 respondents. With varying education levels, the majority of the respondents had been working for over 2 years in the schools studied. This implies that teachers were already conversant with their headteachers’ leadership styles in their respective schools and were therefore expected to assess how such leadership styles had affected their job satisfaction at work. Accordingly, some of the study findings agree with the conceptual framework that was developed to guide the study while others do not.

5.3 Summary of the study findings

The study established that more than half of the teachers who participated in the study were below 40 years of age. This had implications on the leadership styles employed by the school head teachers. The younger the teachers the more authoritarian the head teachers tended to be. On the contrary, more mature teachers appeared to be comfortable with more democratic leadership approaches and they could even perform well under a laissez-faire style of leadership. The perceptions of the leadership styles of the head teacher by the young teachers differed from that of the older ones.

It was also noted that the young teachers, because of over ambition, tended to be more aggressive which led to the head teachers adopting an autocratic leadership style. The age of the head teachers, however, was not found to be a critical factor in influencing the leadership style employed. However, because most of the head teachers, who participated in the study were aged between 31 to 40 year, it could
be inferred that head teachers probably become more democratic with professional training and experience rather than with age or gender.

The study’s findings also revealed that most of the teachers felt that the greater the experience the less need to use the autocratic style of leadership and the greater the use of democratic style of leadership. They felt that the headteachers needed to involve them in the decision making process as they also possess some leadership experience. Many of the teachers who had taught for more than 10 years detested the use of strict methods of leadership. The way the teachers perceived and appreciated the head teachers’ leadership styles varied on the basis of the number of service.

From the analysis the study revealed that majority of the school head teachers had attended education management course. It is important to note that head teachers were well trained as teachers, but not as school managers. It was established that the nature of the head teachers’ training contributed to either poor or good leadership. Indeed in many African countries, Kenya included head teachers are not formally trained for leadership roles. Majority of them had been deputy head teachers before, so they might have acquired some leadership skills in case they might had served under knowledgeable head teachers (Nsubuga, 2008).
The training given to head teachers when training as teachers is inadequate to prepare them for leadership roles. Schools today are faced with many challenges that emphasize the demand for effective leadership.

In 2002, NARC government implemented the Free Primary Education (FPE) policy, which was a campaign pledge to the voters. The FPE initiative focused on attaining Education For All (EFA) and in particular, Universal Primary Education (UPE). As the country struggles to meet its commitments in the implementation of the EFA goals and the MDGs and also the implementation and sustaining of FPE policy which was characterized by increased enrollment of pupils. The demand for head teachers with good leadership skills is very essential so as to direct the school to operate as successful entities. Such head teachers do not just require training in general education administration, but specialized training which is capable of imparting the necessary management and leadership skills.

The study also revealed that majority of head teachers often allowed their group members to know what is expected of them. A significant number of head teachers allowed the teachers a high degree of initiative and creativity in their work. Majority of them also tried their own ideas and gave advance notice of changes, they delegated tasks and gave members fair chance to handle delegated work. Most of head teachers also showed great concern with the interest/welfare of the
teachers while making decisions and they allowed the teachers to go about their work the way they wanted.

Majority of the head teachers oftenly decided what shall be done and how it shall be done, they oftenly allowed the group to set its own pace and scheduled the work to be done. Head teachers normally delegate some of their responsibilities to their junior. This study established that head teachers who use the laissez faire leadership style tend to fail to follow up on those they have delegated tasks to; they leave everything to the mercy of their subordinates, some of whom may lack the necessary skills and competence to execute the work. Others may simply not like to do the work unless they are supervised. Laissez-faire leadership is not the best leadership style to use in the school’s organization because complete delegation without follow-up mechanisms may create truancy and performance problems, which are likely to affect the school’s effectiveness.

Democratic leadership is associated with leaders showing confidence and trust in their subordinate staff. The study revealed also that head teachers remained accomodative of other teachers’ opinions, they also encouraged interpersonal relationship, urged the group to beat its past target, were willing to make changes and at the same time organised workshops and seminars for their staff. The study futher established that majority of respondents oftenly considered the ideas/suggestions of teachers while making a decision. They let some group
members to have authority that they should keep, the study also further revealed that minority of the respondents rarely permitted their members to use their own judgements, they rarely acted without consulting the group. Head teachers were of perception that their junior teachers were not satisfied with their teaching jobs.

The study further established that most of the head teachers made teachers’ work easier and more pleasant, teachers were comfortable working in their current school of deployment. Majority of the teachers were satisfied with the school administration and the teaching job gave them a feeling of success and prestige. Further the study established that majority of school head teachers understood and recognised good teaching practice. It was also revealed that teachers enjoyed no incentive for their work and that timely promotion enhanced interest in teaching,

The study also revealed that teachers considered themselves to be an important organ in the school administration system, and that the feeling of going to school, gave teachers an immense pleasure.

The study found that there existed various channels of communication in most of the schools. Most head teachers promoted a sense of belonging among the teachers in the school and that teachers are involved in the planning process in the school. This study also established that there is a strong relationship between democratic leadership style of head teachers and teacher leadership. This is where
teacher leadership is seen as a collective form of leadership in which the teacher develops expertise by working collaboratively. One of the dimensions of teacher leadership is that it focuses upon participative leadership where all teachers feel part of the change process and have a sense of ownership (Mujis & Harris, 2003). So they work together with colleagues to shape school improvement efforts and thus positively influence job satisfaction of the teachers involved.

Research findings also revealed that most head teachers made effective use of teachers’ individual capacity and talent and that they invited junior teachers to participate in the decision-making process. Majority of the teachers never hesitated to discuss any school problem with the head teacher, they also had autonomy to take their own initiatives. It is worthwhile to note that in a bid to improve the performance of head teachers, a mentoring program is strongly recommended for newly appointed and underperforming serving head teachers. Teachers in the schools get promotion on the basis of their seniority and not on their capabilities. Mentoring is not only beneficial to the mentee, but it also benefits the mentor: they are both afforded the opportunities for both professional and personal growth. The mentee acquires technical managerial and leadership skills while as the mentor gains professional satisfaction, improved communication skills and heightened motivation which leads to improved job satisfaction for the subordinates under the mentor.
The study also established that teachers are not free to express their views, teachers did not get adequate chance to give suggestions on policy matters, a number of the school heads guide not as a friend but as a dictator, thus not permitting their staff to use their own judgement in solving problems even though some teachers disagreed that most of the head teachers’ acted without consulting them.

5.4 Conclusions

It was therefore concluded that the autocratic leadership style of school head teachers was found to have a negatively influence on primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. Further, head teachers’ democratic leadership style positively influence primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. Head teachers’ laissez faire leadership style moderately influences primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction whilst transformational leadership style positively influences primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction.

5.5 Recommendations of the study

Basing on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

- School head teachers should avoid the use of autocratic style of leadership in the management of schools as it does not allow teachers to give off their best.
• Need for school managers to share their vision with other stakeholders in the school as this improve primary teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. They should be able to communicate the vision to the staff of what their schools should become.

• Adoption of leadership strategies by the schools’ heads such as participative style of leadership that creates conducive environment which will help in improving primary school teachers’ levels of job satisfaction,

• While one can delegate duties, one cannot delegate responsibilities. One remains accountable. It is therefore recommended that school managers, avoid the laissez-faire leadership style which permits total delegation of responsibility to teachers. The school heads should know that they are accountable for every action and thus the need to monitor school progress and performance.

• A specialized management and leadership training course be designed for those aspiring to become head teachers in primary schools and also the current serving heads should undergo in-service and refresher courses on the modern rudiments of leadership styles

• A mentoring program is strongly recommended for newly appointed and underperforming serving head teachers. Such programs may identify mentors from experienced and knowledgeable serving head teachers with a proven track record of success and thus promote and encourage the use of transformation leadership in the school systems
5.6 Suggestions for further research

The study suggests that further studies be carried in the following related areas:

- Comparable studies in other public primary schools should be carried out in other parts of the county to find out whether the findings can be generalized to the entire county.

- The effects of school’s leadership styles on the performance of KCPE in Kajiado North district.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I : LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

University of Nairobi,
Department of Educational Administration & Planning,
P.O.BOX 92 0902,
KIKUYU.

Date ……………………

The Head teacher,
…………………………Primary School.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A RESEARCH IN YOUR SCHOOL.

I am a postgraduate student pursuing a Master of Education degree in Educational Administration at University of Nairobi. I am conducting a research on the “Influence of headteachers’ leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in Kajiado North District”. I will be grateful if you allow me to involve you and some of your teachers in this study. The information obtained will be used for the purpose of the research and the identities of the respondents will be kept confidential. Your co-operation will be highly appreciated.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Jane W. Gitaka.
Leadership Behaviour Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ)

This questionnaire is divided into three sections A, B and C. Please complete each section according to the instructions. Do not write your name or your school’s name to ensure complete confidentiality. Please respond to all the questions. Tick (✓) where applicable.

Section A: Demographic variables

1. What is your gender?  
   a) Male [ ]  
   b) Female [ ]

3. How old are you?  
   a) 20 - 30 Years [ ]  
   b) 31 - 40 Years [ ]  
   c) 40 - 50 Years [ ]  
   d) Above 51 Years [ ]

4. What is your highest qualifications?  
   a) P1 [ ]  
   b) Diploma [ ]  
   c) Graduate [ ]  
   d) Others [ ]

5. For how long have you been in the teaching profession?  
   a) 1 – 5 years [ ]  
   b) 6 – 10 years [ ]  
   c) 11 - 15 years [ ]  
   d) 16 – 20 years [ ]  
   e) 21 - 25 years [ ]  
   f) Over 26 years [ ]

6. For how long have you been a headteacher?  
   a) 1 – 5 years [ ]  
   b) 6 – 10 years [ ]  
   c) 11 - 15 years [ ]  
   d) 16 – 20 years [ ]  
   e) 21 - 25 years [ ]  
   f) Over 26 years [ ]

7. For how long have you been a headteacher in your current school?  
   a) 1 – 5 years [ ]  
   b) 6 – 10 years [ ]  
   c) 11 - 15 years [ ]  
   d) 16 – 20 years [ ]  
   e) 21 - 25 years [ ]  
   f) Over 26 years [ ]
8. Have you ever attended any course, seminar or workshop on education or educational management?

Yes [   ]  No [   ]

**Section B : Profile of own behaviour**

Please indicate to what extent you feel the following statements correspond with your leadership behaviour. Please tick the appropriate response.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. As a headteacher, I</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Let the group members know what is expected of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Allow the teachers a high degree of initiative and creativity in their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Am concerned with the interest and welfare of the teachers while making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Consider the ideas/suggestions of teachers while making a decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Permit the members to use their own judgements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Try my ideas in the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Encourage interpersonal relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Allow the teachers to go about their work the way they want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a headteacher, I

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x)</td>
<td>Assign a task, then let the members handle it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi)</td>
<td>Organise for my staff to attend workshops and seminars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii)</td>
<td>Am accomodative of other teachers’ opinions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii)</td>
<td>Give advance notice of changes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv)</td>
<td>Let some group members to have authority that they should keep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv)</td>
<td>Schedule the work to be done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi)</td>
<td>Am willing to make changes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii)</td>
<td>Reluctant to explain my actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii)</td>
<td>Act without consulting the group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix)</td>
<td>Urge the group to beat its past target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx)</td>
<td>Allow the group to set its own pace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C

10. Would you please indicate ONE way that you use to satisfy your teachers

………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Would you please state ONE factor outside you that pose challenges to you as you seek to satisfy teachers

………………………………………………………………………………………………

12. Will you generally consider your teachers as satisfied with their jobs?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Thank you very much for your co-operation and assistance.
APPENDIX III : QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

This questionnaire is divided into two sections A and B. Please complete each section according to the instructions. Do not write your name or your school’s name to ensure complete confidentiality. Please respond to all the questions. Tick (√) where applicable.

Section A: Personal data

1. What is your gender?  a) Male [    ]  b) Female [    ]

2. What is your age?  a) 20 - 30 years [    ]  b) 31 - 40 years [    ]
   c) 41 - 50 years [    ]  d) Above 51 years [    ]

3. What is your professional qualification?  a) P 1 [    ]  b) Diploma [    ]
   c) Graduate [    ]  d) Others [    ]

4. For how long have you been a teacher?
   a) 1 - 5 years [    ]  b) 6 - 10 years [    ]  c) 11 - 15 years [    ]
   d) 16 - 20 years [    ]  e) 21 - 25 years [    ]  f) Above 26 years [    ]

5. For how long have you been a teacher in the current school?
   a) 1 - 5 years [    ]  b) 6 - 10 years [    ]  c) 11 - 15 years [    ]
   d) Above 16 years [    ]

Section B: Job satisfaction and leadership information

Please read each statement carefully and honestly and give your opinion to it in any one of the alternatives given against each statement. Please tick (√) to show the most appropriate response

<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><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching gives me mental satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The feeling of going to school gives me immense pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching gives me the prestige I desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Timely promotion will enhance my interest in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers enjoy no incentive for their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My head teacher understands and recognises good teaching practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My teaching job gives me a feeling of success to doing my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My head teacher makes my work easier and more pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel I am a vital part of the school system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel comfortable working in this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Am satisfied with the school administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers have enough freedom to make their own decision within the given responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There are various channels of communication in our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The head teacher promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teachers are involved in the planning process in our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers are not free to express their views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My head teacher does not guide as a friend but as a dictator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers in my school get promotion on the basis of their seniority and not on their capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Welcomes questioning by the staff in matters related to school affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My head teacher invites teachers to participate in the decision-making process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My head teacher makes affective use of teachers individual capacity and talent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My head teacher delegates some of his responsibilities to his teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My head teacher makes follow ups on work he/she has delegated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My head teacher acts without consulting the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My head teacher permits staff to use their own judgement in solving problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Teachers take their own initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teachers get adequate chance to give suggestions on policy matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with the head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your co-operation and assistance
APPENDIX IV: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Ref: No.

NACOSTI/P/14/6705/792

Jane Wangithi Gitaka
University of Nairobi
P.O.Box 30197-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Influence of headteachers leadership styles on teachers job satisfaction in public primary schools in Kajiado North District, Kajiado County, Kenya,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Kajiado County for a period ending 31st December, 2014.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Kajiado County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. M. K. RUGUTU, PhD, HSC.
FOR: SECRETARY/CEO

Copy to:

\checkmark The County Commissioner
The County Director of Education
Kajiado County.
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