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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between Head-teachers’ leadership styles and students’ academic performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County Kenya. The study used the Likert and Likert theory of management and styles of leadership used in public organizations. The survey research design was used as a framework for data collection. The study sought to determine the relationship between leadership styles of the Head teachers and students’ performance at K.C.S.E in public secondary schools in Kericho County. Stratified and simple random sampling techniques were used to select fifty three secondary schools in the County targeted population was two thousand four hundred and ninety nine teachers posted and working in one hundred and nineteen public secondary schools in Kericho County. Out of this target population, one hundred and nineteen were head teachers. Simple random sampling was used to select one thousand and sixty teachers, while stratified sampling was used to select the head teachers from the targeted schools to participate in the study. Validity of the instruments was established by consulting with the supervisors and subject experts in the Department of Education management and policy studies in Moi University. The reliability of the instruments was established by computing a test re-test reliability coefficient. This was done by administering the test twice, but allowing an interval of one month between them. The pre-testing of the instrument was done in ten non-participating schools in Kipkeli on Sub-county. Questionnaires were administered to 10 head-teachers and 100 teachers. Two sets of questionnaires known as the profile of leadership behavior (form LB) and profile of own behavior (form OB) for head teachers and teachers respectively and Interview Schedule were used as the primary tools for data collection. The tools centered on issues of the administrator’s tolerances, motivation of staff, allowing for creativity and teamwork, the data was analyzed thematically with regard to school strata. This research embraced an eclecticism paradigm. The findings revealed that the head teachers’ leadership styles had a strong relationship with the schools’ K.C.S.E results. This study revealed that schools managed by head-teachers who allow maximum consultation performed better in KCSE than schools that were autocratic and more restrictive. Consultation made the staff develop trust, confidence and team work. Better performance was also posted by schools whose heads employed a mixture of autocratic (task-oriented behaviour) and democratic (relationship behavior) leadership. The study recommends that head teachers’ training in school management should be strengthened and supervision of the teachers should be objective. Head teachers should use a balance of autocratic and democratic leadership styles to achieve better K.C.S.E results. This research is vital in its contribution to understanding effective school management in the light of leadership styles and student academic performance.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study.

Leadership is one of the most important human activities in any society. No institution can function effectively without a leader (Dominique 2000). All societies continuously rely on group effort. Many organized groups have become large, and the task of leadership has been increasing in importance and complexity. Leadership is a social process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to achieve the organizational objectives and success (BuckMaster, 2004).

Leadership also concerns the spiritual aspect of work. That is, the followers deeply believe in them and they possess a latent power in the organization. Leaders deal with mundane tasks such as location of roles, tasks and resources needed to achieve organization goals, in addition to the co-ordination of the allocation activities and processes monitoring the everyday operation of the organization. Effective leadership is required during periods of turbulence (Squire, 2001). Lamb and McKee (2004) observe that when people are at peace, happy and satisfied, there is hardly any need for leaders. However when the human condition is at stake, the situation urges someone to step forward, initiate change and develop strategies that are necessary to achieve the desired condition. Dere (2008) argues that leadership means creating and maintaining a sense of vision culture and interpersonal relationships. Okumbe (2001) asserts that leadership is a broader concept than management. Management is sub-skill of leadership in which
achieving organizational goal is of paramount importance. Leadership involves working with and through people so as to accomplish set goals. The trait approach argues that leadership is inborn (Bryman, 1930, Beasson 2000). Leaders become good leaders because of the traits that they posses such as intelligence, appearance, and language ability. Bolman, Crow, Goldring, Slater and Thurston (1994) define leadership as the ability to influence the opinions, attributes and behavior of others. Throughout history, theoretical explanations of leadership have been offered. Up to the late 1940’s, the trait approach claimed that leadership ability is in-born.

From the late 1940’s to the late 1960’s, the behavioral approach became dominant advocating that effectiveness in leadership style has to do with how a leader behaves (Nzuve, 2000). The contingency approach, on the other hand, suggests that effective leadership is dependent upon the situation. The approach became popular in the late 1960’s up to the early 1980’s. Contingency proposes that a particular style of leadership may be appropriate in some situations but not in others. However recent approaches to leadership focus on transactional leadership which emerged in the late 1970’s. The argument for transitional leadership claims that the relationship between managers and employees is based on the act of bargaining whereas transformational leadership supposes that the relationship between the manager and the employees is of mutual trust and characterized by four factors: charisma, inspiration, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation (Squares 2001).
Bolman and Deal (2002) suggest that the essence of effective leadership lies in understanding which frame to apply in a particular situation. When referring to the tasks and functions of school principals, educators use the term administration. The administrator is the pivot around whom all the learning and teaching revolves (Robbin 2006). Head teachers differ in the styles they use to carry out all these tasks. Mazzarella and Smith (1989) believe that some leaders may employ an autocratic leadership style; some use a democratic style, while others use the laissez-faire leadership style.

Griffen (1994) contends that the creation of any school climate starts with the head teacher and it is reflected in the relationships among teachers, between teachers and students, among the students. It is also reflected in the commitment of teachers to the achievement of school goals and objectives, and ethos of the school. In other words, the head teacher is in the position to initiate and maintain the kind of atmosphere he/she wants, through his/her own behaviour. Fondas (1993) affirms this claim by arguing that the head teacher deliberately models a positive climate in school. She explains further that the existence of quality relationships between the head teacher and teachers, among the teachers, and between the teachers and students and among students reflects a positive school climate.

Kindiki (2007) holds that the head teacher is significant in determining the quality of the schools. Hoy& DiPaola, (2007) highlight various types of school climates: a school may have an open climate, an autonomous climate, a controlled climate, a familiar climate, a paternalistic climate or a closed climate. In the light of the above, it can be assumed that
the head teacher’s leadership style principally determines the kind of climate that prevails in the school. Ordinarily, the main task of the head teacher is to help create a healthy working environment in which pupils are happy and prepared to learn and teachers identify with the school’s mission and goals.

Kericho County like other counties in Kenya has had its educational foundation advancement anchored on many factors, such as geographical, historical and infrastructural. Education in Kericho County has been influenced since its inception by factors such as missionary and government activities, roads network and the railway. This is a historical perspective shared by other counties of the country.

The larger Kericho County that includes is home to the Kipsigis people. However other communities have come to settle in the recent past. These included the whites who occupied the white highlands and started the tea plantations in many parts of central Kericho. Other communities such as the Luo, the Abagusii, the Luhya and others later came to work for the white man in the tea plantations. Within the urban area the Indians started businesses and other factories.

So in a nutshell, Kericho County has a composition of many communities living and working there. It is cosmopolitan in composition as well as multi-racial in nature. Several factors have influenced the establishment, development and performance of schools in this county. The Government, as in many other places, was and is a key player in ensuring improvement of human development. In Kericho County, the government
started many of the schools. These include Kabianga high, Kericho High, Cheptenye, Kipsigis Girls, Londiani High, and Kericho Day. Many of the people of Kericho took their children for education to these schools. Such educational luminaries as the late Dr. Taita Towet were educated in Kericho schools. Over the years these government schools have continued to compete with others and performed fairly well. At different times both Kericho High school and Kabianga High school have performed well nationally. Kipsigis Girls and Moi Tea have posted good results between them for girls. So has Kaplong Girls.

Head teachers have played a crucial role in posting of good results. For example during the proper leadership at Kabianga High School between 1986 and 1991 the performance of that school improved. Beside the fully sponsoring schools, the government has also assisted in the expansion of community initiated schools. Harambee schools were started as a partnership between the government and the parents. The effort was popular especially in the 1970s. Several harambee schools were started and helped increase access to education in Kericho County. Some of these schools posted better results than fully sponsored government schools. Whereas many government schools were boarding schools, day schools were also started especially in urban areas like Kericho town. Schools like Kericho Day and Kipchimchim were started to cater for needs of student from the business community in the town.

The other force which has influence the establishment of schools and improved performance in the county are the missionaries. The major players here have been the Catholic and African Gospel churches. The two are the dominant religions which sponsor
the development of schools. However there are other smaller players as well, like the African Inland Church. The Catholic Church has done a lot in advancement of education in Kericho. Kaplong, Sosoit and Chepteny has had the support of Catholic Church for many years. The geographical location of Kericho County has directly influenced education performance.

This influence is two folds. First the County has fertile land with factories and tea plantations that provides for a job market for Graduates. Students have tended to perform better in science oriented subjects. This could be due to the fact that for one to work in the factories he needed a science orientation. However that is subject to debate.

Political influence could have been crucial in the modernization of schools in Kericho County, especially during the regime of president Moi. During Mr. Moi’s administration a number of the old schools in the county were earmarked for modernization. Some schools which were modernized included; Kabianga High school, Chepteny High school and Sosiot Girls. Another political influence which affected education in Kericho County came in the form of post-election violence after 1992, 1997 and later 2007 elections. Kericho County, like other counties in Rift valley had witnessed violence in the region. The violence, overtime, had a negative influence on education in Kericho County. The benefit of being a cosmopolitan County with many communities living and competing together was lost. Many people who moved their children away affected education standards in some ways. Teachers from other communities left in large numbers thereby depriving the schools of the relevant personnel.
As has already been explained leadership is crucial in securing desirable learning outcomes. In 2005 the leadership of Kericho Boys was changed. The long serving principal was transferred. The mean grade of Kericho Boys improved from 6 points which is a C grade, to 7 points which is a C plus grade. This was sustained for several years thereafter.

A similar case was Kipsigis Girls following the change in leadership. But leadership changes in schools do not always produce positive results. Some schools may stagnate while others have even dropped. Such cases have been experienced in Kericho County in the recent past. Other schools where leadership change has witnessed improved or depressed results include among others, Moi Tea, Mercy Girls and Kabianga High schools. However the aspects of leadership that have produced desirable results included the ability to motivate parents, teachers and students. Timely covering of the syllabus, tapping and exploitation of rich history and alumni of the school, and an elaborate system of team work and benchmarking have proved effective.

In Kenya as in other places, examinations have been used as the main basis for judging students’ academic ability as well as a means for educational advancement and for employment, (Eshiwani 1988). A critical examination of Kericho District K.C.S.E results reveals that there is a lot of variation in the performance of students. Many students tend to perform poorly despite the fact that they follow a common national syllabus. There are some schools which are well equipped and admit only bright students but still perform poorly year in and year out (Omolo 2000). Yet others admit average students and
perform decently. It appears that if appropriate measures are not taken, the region will lag behind. Eshiwani (1988) points out clearly that if any region of the country lags behind either in the number of pupils who attend school or in the number of pupils who pass examination, then that region cannot effectively participate in the democratization of education. The socio-economic development of such a region will literally be retarded.

Looking at the academic performance of K.C.S.E in Kericho (1998-2007), it is obvious that it is low as compared to other counties in the country. If appropriate measures are not taken, the county’s socioeconomic advantages may not be appropriately exploited and developed.

The research considered a period of ten years as a baseline for considering school performance in KCSE. Ten years was considered a fair record for the purpose of generalization of performance trends. Table 1.1 below illustrates the trends (1988-2007).

The total average mean-grade score of 5.146 (for the ten years 1988-2007) is quite low compared to the maximum national mean score of 12 in K.C.S.E. Out of 36,757 candidates who sat during those ten years, only 2869 (7.81%) qualified for public university admission. This poor performance in K.C.S.E presented a real problem to all education stakeholders and thus required investigation.
### TABLE 1: K.C.S.E KERICHO DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>Possible University Admission</th>
<th>Entry No of Candidates</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>4.7234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>4.7027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>5.1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>5.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>5.0669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>5.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>5.4240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>4489</td>
<td>5.3880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>4503</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>5102</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source- District Education Office – Kericho

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Employees are the most crucial asset in any organization. All organizations are started and run by people. Leadership is the most important factor in organizational success (Nzuve 2000), Koech (2004). In public secondary schools it is the task of stakeholders, particularly the head teachers to create and sustain a conducive learning environment to improve pupils’ academic and behaviour standards. The head teacher, as an individual occupying the highest official position in the school, determines how the school is run.
His/her expectations, values, beliefs, relationships with teachers and the examples he/she sets for the whole school shape the learning and working climate in the school. The head teacher can promote or inhibit a positive climate through his/her leadership behaviour patterns. Kericho County have had a small portion of its schools performing relatively well, some perform on the average, while the majority are performing poorly. The problem this study sought to investigate therefore is “what role does the head play in influencing students’ performance in KSCE?”

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between leadership styles of the head teachers and the performance of students in K.C.S.E in Kericho County.

1.4 Objectives

The main objective of the study was: To determine the relationship between leadership style of the Head teachers and students’ K.C.S.E performance in Kericho County.

The specific objectives were:

1. To identify the leadership styles used by Head teachers of public secondary schools in Kericho County.

2. To establish the relationship between the head teachers leadership styles and students’ academic performance in Kericho County.

3. To establish the relationship between principals management experience and academic performance in public secondary schools in Kericho in Kericho County.
1.5 Research Questions

To achieve its specific aim, the study sought to answer the following research questions.

(i) What are the leadership styles used by head teachers of secondary school in Kericho County?

(ii) In what ways do the head teachers’ leadership styles impact on students’ academic performance in KCSE in Kericho County?

(iii) How does the principals’ management experience affect the students’ academic performance in Kericho County?

1.6 Research Hypotheses

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between leadership styles and strategies used by Head teachers of public secondary schools in Kericho County, Kenya.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between the Head teachers leadership styles and students’ academic performance in Kericho County, Kenya.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between principal’s management experience and academic performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County, Kenya.

1.7 Justification of the Study

Educators and the general public have expressed concern over poor performance of learners in public secondary schools in KCSE and especially the residents of Kericho County. This is because in Kenya, examinations have long been accepted as important aspects of the education system. These examinations have been used over time as the
main basis for judging students’ academic ability as well as a mean for educational advancement and employment. The issue of management has been cited repeatedly, and several attempts have been made by government to improve school management through INSET and other measures. This study was justified in that it attempts to end speculation as to whether management contributes, and to what extent, to learners’ achievement in KCSE in Kericho County. Schools are bad or good, in a healthy or unhealthy mental, moral and physical condition, as the principal is capable, energetic, of high ideals or the reverse. Schools rise to fame or sink into obscurity according to the principal’s managerial abilities.

1.8 Significance of the Study

This study is significant in that it demonstrates the link between head teachers’ leadership style and learning outcomes. It is hoped that the finding of this study may contribute to the existing body of knowledge on the appropriate leadership styles that can be employed in Kenyan secondary schools. It also provides information teacher educators may use for PRESET and INSET to improve management courses for head teachers. The findings of the study may be useful as reference to head teachers in improving their own leadership styles.

1.9 The scope of the Study

The study was confined to Kericho County in Rift Valley Province. The Study was focused on investigating the effects of Head teachers’ leadership styles on K.C.S.E
results in public secondary school in Kericho County from the year 2000-2009. It examined three types of leadership styles those were: Autocratic, democratic and laisser-Faire. 53 head-teachers and 1060 teacher participated in the study.

1.10 Limitations of the Study

The study was confined to Kericho County in Rift Valley Province. The Study was focused on investigating the effects of Head teachers’ leadership styles on K.C.S.E results in public secondary school in Kericho County from the year 2000-2009. It examined three types of leadership styles those were: Autocratic, democratic and laisser-Faire. 53 Head teachers and 1060 teacher participated in the study.

1.11 Theoretical Framework

The study adopted Likert and Likert (1976) theory on management styles employed by organizations. Likert and Likert believed that there are four systems or styles of leadership. Those being system 1, system 2, system 3 and system 4. System 1 is Exploitative authoritative which is rooted in classical theory. In this system, managers tend to use threats, fear, and punishment to motivate their workers. Managers at the top of the hierarchy make all of the decisions and are usually unaware of the problems faced by those in the lower levels of the organization. Decisions are imposed on subordinates, and motivation is characterized by threats. The orders issued from the top make up the goals for the organization. As a result, workers tend to be hostile toward organizational goals and may engage in behavior that is counter to those goals. System 2 is Benevolent
authoritative. This system is less controlling than the exploitative authoritative system; under this system motivation is based on the potential for punishment and partially on rewards. The decision making area is expanded by allowing lower-level employees to be involved in policy-making but is limited by the framework given to them from upper-level management. Major policy decisions are still left to those at the top, who have some awareness of the problems that occur at lower levels. This creates mainly downward communication from supervisors to employees with little upward communication, causing subordinates to be somewhat suspicious of communication coming from the top. The managers at the top feel more responsibility towards organizational goals than those employees at the bottom, who feel very little responsibility. This contrast in feelings toward responsibility can result in a conflict and negative attitudes with the organization's goals. Subordinates in this system can become hostile towards each other because of the competition that is created between them. Satisfaction among workers is low to moderately-low and productivity is measured at fair to good.

System 3 is Consultative system. The theory of this system is very closely related to the human-relations theory. Motivation of workers is gained through rewards, occasional punishments, and very little involvement in making decisions and goals. Lower-level employees, in this system, have the freedom to make specific decisions that will affect their work. Upper-management still has control over policies and general decisions that affect an organization. Managers will talk to their subordinates about problems and action plans before they set organizational goals. Communication in this system flows both downward and upward, though upward is more limited. This promotes a more positive
effect on employee relationships and allows them to be more cooperative. Lower-level employees are seen as consultants to decisions that were made and are more willing to accept them because of their involvement. Satisfaction in this system improves from benevolent authoritative as doe’s productivity.

System 4 is Participative system. Likert argued that the participative system was the most effective form of management. This system coincides with human-resources theory. This system promotes genuine participation in making decisions and setting goals through free-flowing horizontal communication and tapping into the creativity and skills of workers. Managers are fully aware of the problems that go on in the lower-levels of the organization. All organizational goals are accepted by everyone because they were set through group participation. There is a high level of responsibility and accountability of the organizational goals in all of the employees. Managers motivate employees through a system that produces monetary awards and participation in goal setting. Satisfaction among employees is the highest out of the four systems as is production.

This theoretical framework is paramount to the study as it attempts to show types of leadership style commonly used by head-teachers.

1.12 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework below is derived from the theoretical framework above and schematically summarizes the effect of leadership on learning outcomes as follows: First, democratic leadership style has more positive influence in academic performance. Secondly, in authoritarian leadership, the head-teacher is task-oriented; he takes swift
action even without involving others. While in the Laissez-Faire Style, the Head-teacher avoids the use of power and abides to no code of regulation; he is merely a symbol. There will be many unnecessary committees whose recommendations are never implemented. The best results can be realized when there is a mixture of the first two.

![Diagram of variable interactions]

**Leadership Styles:**
- i. Authoritarian
- ii. Democratic
- iii. Laissez-faire

**Intervening variables:**
- i. Head-teachers’ level of training
- ii. Head-teachers’ Experience
- iii. Type of school
- iv. Learners entry behaviour
- v. Government policy

**Dependent variable:**

- KCSE Performance
  - High means score
  - Average means score
  - Low mean score

**Fig 1.1 Interactions of variables that determine KCSE Performance in secondary schools**

The independent variable is the head teacher’s leadership styles, while KCSE performance is the dependent variable. The intervening variables are head-teachers experience, school culture and learners entry behaviour. The leadership paradigm adopted by the head teacher will invariably influence learners’ outcomes in any assessment of learning, such as in KCSE.
1.13 Operational definition of terms

In this study the following terms were used as defined below:

(i) **Automatic Leadership.** This is the leadership style which is syndromes to dictatorship. The leader makes decision without consolation and stress on task completion. It is characterized by force, positive and dogmatism power is exerted by giving reward and punishment.

(ii) **Democratic leadership:** Leadership style built around the view that power and authority must come from the governed people. It involves consultation, participation, uses power with, rather than over employees.

(iii) **Good academic performance:** refer to schools with an average pass in K.C.S.E and this means being above a mean score of 5.50.

(iv) **Head teacher:** It is used to imply the chief executive of the school either male or female.

(v) **Laissez–Faire:** Leadership style when involves a high amount of independence, whereby employees set their own objectives and decide on how to achieve them.

(vi) **Leader:** An individual in the group who was given the task of directing and coordinating the task relevant to group activity in this case the head teacher.

(vii) **Leadership Style:** Specific mode and manner of administrative performance and conduct. The most common broad categories of such style are autocratic and democratic.
This chapter has provided the background to the proposed study and the theoretical framework within which the study will be based. It has emerged that head-teachers’ leadership style affects students academic performance. Chapter two represents discussion on the literature related to the proposed study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the studies of various researchers so as to provide the general background to the present study. The first part deals with general leadership styles displayed by head teachers. It covers several important aspects of leadership which include a description of what leadership is and popular theories of leadership styles. The leadership styles described are: Behavioral theory, The managerial grid, Fiedler’s contingency model, leader member exchange model, charismatic leadership theory, transitional and transformational approaches. The second part reviews the effects of leadership styles on student’s performance. The third part deals with the effects of gender, age, experience and student’s enrolment on leadership style of the head teacher.

2.2 General Leadership Styles Displayed By Head Teachers

1. Leadership is one of the most relevant aspects of the organization but very challenging to define (Charmers 2002). This is true because several approaches have been employed to provide meaning to the term leadership and effectiveness. Therefore, leadership has been defined from different and some of the definitions are discussed below. The traditional perspectives perceive the concept of leadership as inducing compliance, respect and cooperation.
In other words, the leader exercises power over the followers to obtain their cooperation Zand (1997). In addition to that, the old leadership perspectives are based on leader’s role as formulating goals, and ensuring their efficient accomplishment. Also, Oketch & Rolleston (2007) define leadership as a case of interpersonal influence that get individuals, or groups of people to do what the leader wants to be done. By implication, the leader’s focus is on what he/she wants from people therefore, followers’ input is not encouraged with regard to what it is to be done.

Maxwell (1999) is of different opinion, he argues that the leader’s attention is on what he/she can put into people rather than what he/she can get out of them, so as to build the kind of relationship that promotes and increase productivity in the organization. As the focus shifts from bureaucracy (in which the leader tends to directs others and make decision for others to implement) to non-bureaucracy, the perception of leadership appears to emphasize motivation, inclusion and empowerment of followers. For example, Jaques and Clement (1991) define leadership as a process in which an individual sets direction for other people and carries them along in that direction with competence and full commitment.

Therefore, leadership is a responsibility characterized by commitment and competence; and it takes place in a role relationship within a social structure. In essence, a leader functions by interacting with other people within a social structure. There are other views which differ from the more traditional perspectives, Sergiovanni (1999), for example perceive leadership as a personal thing comprising one’s heart, head and hand. He says
that the heart of leadership deals with one’s beliefs, values and vision. The head of leadership is the experiences one has accumulated over time and the ability to perceive present situations in the light of these experiences. The hand of leadership, according to him, is the actions and decisions that one takes. In essence, leadership is the act of leading, which reflects the leader’s values, vision, experiences, personality and ability to use past experiences to tackle the situation at hand. It may be argued that leadership is a display of a whole person with regard to intelligence, perceptions, ideas, values and knowledge coming into play, causing necessary changes in the organization. In the contemporary context, Dubrin (1998:2) defines leadership as the ability to inspire confidence and support among followers who are expected to achieve organizational goals. This has to do with change, inspiration and motivation. It can be inferred that the leader’s task is to build followers’ confidence in their job so as to be effective on their job. In addition, it is the leader’s responsibility to communicate the picture of what the organization should be, convince followers and channel all activities toward accomplishing it. Sashkin and Sashkin’s (2003) and Hoy and Miskel’s (2001:393) definitions of leadership appear to be a more recent perspective. They define leadership as the art of transforming people and organization with the aim of improving the organization. Leaders in this perspective define the task and explain why the job is being done; they oversee followers’ activities and ensure that followers have what they need in terms of skills and resources to do the job. These kinds of leaders develop a relationship between themselves and their followers; they align, motivate and inspire the followers to foster productivity. This approach’s emphasis is on transformation that brings positive change in the organization, groups, interpersonal relationships and the environment. Both
the old and new concepts of leadership appear to agree on some characteristics of leadership. For example, both agree that leadership does not take place in isolation. Rather, it takes place in the process of two or more people interacting and the leader seeks to influence the behaviour of other people. However, to a large extent, the old concept of leadership is based on exercising power over followers to maintain the status quo, while the new perspective is based on continuous improvement and power sharing with the followers.

The old concept of leadership is based on downward exercise of power and authority while the new seeks to develop respect and concern for the followers and see them as a powerful source of knowledge, creativity and energy for improving the organization. In conclusion, the issue of change and empowerment is the main focus of the new perspective on leadership. The leader is expected to continually generate new ideas for increasing effectiveness and productivity within the organization. His/her is required to:

1. Provide needed strategies for executing the ideas/vision and motivate the employers to accomplish the vision by using their own initiatives to improve their inter-group relations in and the outside school. Fullan’s opinion on the difference between leadership and management and state that leadership deals with guidance of purpose and motivation while management deals with drawing, effecting and accomplishing things within the setting of effective working relations. Similarly, Dunklee (2000) holds that leaders influence while managers implement and administer; leaders motivate while managers facilitate. Leadership and management according to Lussier and Achua (2001:18) and
Bell (1999) are interwoven. Lussier and Achua (2001) believe that successful managers employ democratic form of leadership as they work with people in the organization. In addition to that, Bell (1999) states that management entails formulating a vision for the school according to its values and the aims of education, while leadership incorporates stating clearly this vision and communicating it to others. In essence, an Individual uses both management and leadership skills in a complementary way.

According to Miner (2005), leadership is a process of social influence in which one person can enlist aid and support of another in the accomplishment of a common task. Squire (2001) concurred with the above definition, however observes that leadership is ultimately about creating a way for people to contribute to making something extraordinary happen. Omolo (2000) points out that leadership is an activity of influencing people to co-operate towards same goal which are desirable. The central concept in these definitions are influencing and stimulating others to become followers. The influence might come from different sources, position, reward, expertise, physical strength or organization.

For ages people have been looking for direction, purpose and meaning to guide their collective activities. Leadership is needed to foster purpose, direction, imagination, and passion, especially in times of crisis or rapid change. At such times people look to leaders for hope, inspiration, and a pathway which will lead them to somewhere more desirable (Koech 2004).
As leadership has had a great impact on the culture, history, and civilization of humankind, theoretical explanations for it have been offered throughout history. Although the term leadership is mostly associated with industry and business, it is of great importance to education as well. The trait theory is the oldest theory of leadership (Delunga 1995). The study emerged from the belief that leadership and abilities such as intelligence were inherited. In addition to intelligence other factors such as birth order, status and liberal parents highly correlate with leadership abilities (Carlson, 1996).

This approach dominated the study of leadership up to the 1950’s. It tried to define any distinguishing physical or psychological characteristics of the individual that explains the behavior of leaders (Hoy & Miskel, 1991) Cited in Wango (2010). It claims that leadership ability is in born. As the distinguished philosopher Aristotle in (Hoy & Miskel, 1991) enunciates that “from the hour of birth, some people are marked out for subjection, other for rule”, However, some shortcomings of this approach were identified. Firstly, it is not clarified which of the traits are most important and which are not. Secondly, some traits overlap. For example, tact, judgment and common sense are listed as separate traits but the last one covers the preceding ones. Thirdly, trait studies do not distinguish between traits helping to become a leader and those enabling it to be maintained. Fourthly, most trait studies are descriptive.

There is an assumption that the leaders traits existed prior to leadership and most of them have failed to ‘approach the study of personality as an organized whole. Several studies were conducted to identify leader traits. Mann (1967) later reviews suggested 750
findings about the personality traits of the leaders. However, many of the traits found in one study undermined or were found to be unimportant in other. Gibb in Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer, (1966) Cited in David (2001) argues that failure to outline leadership traits should not be accounted for their absence, but for lack of measurement and comparability of data from different kinds of research. Recent trait studies utilized measurement procedures focusing on managers and administrators. Okumbe (1998) emphasized leader effectiveness rather than leader traits based on the assumption that becoming a leader and becoming an effective leader are different tasks.

The failure of tracing “gold” in the trait “mines” urged researchers to examine and identify what specific leaders exhibited. Behavioral studies of leadership aim to identify behaviors that differentiate leaders from non-leaders (Robbins, 1998). Studies were conducted to identify behaviors adapted by people in formal positions. Behavioral theories of leadership form non-leaders (Elmore, 2000). Behavioral theories of leadership. Leadership style refers to a distinctive behavior adopted by persons in formal positions of leadership (Campbell, et al., 1966) and several studies were conducted to identify them.

The Hawthorne studies were carried out between 1927 and 1932 at the Hawthorne works of the Western Electric Plant in the United States. In one of those studies a group of women workers who were assembling relay switches for telephones were moved to special room and a series of changes were introduced whose impact on productivity were investigated. The researchers concluded that every change increased production.
Employees believed that management cared about them and responded by working harder (Roberts & Hunt, 1991). However, research conducted at the University of Iowa by a group of scientists, came up with three leadership styles to determine their effect on attitudes and productivity of the subordinates.

Authoritarian leaders were found to be very directive and did not allow any participation in the decision-making process (Robbins, 1998). They assume full authority and responsibility from initiation to task completion.

Democratic leaders on the other hand promoted group discussion and decision-making. They encouraged subordinates to express their ideas and make suggestions but Laissez-faire leaders let the group decide on their own and gave them complete freedom. In other words, they do not provide any leadership to their subordinates at all. Some of the implications of the research subordinate preferred democratic style as the best. They also preferred laissez-faire leadership style over the authoritarian one.

Authoritarian leaders receive aggressive or apathetic behavior from their subordinates. Productivity was slightly higher under the authoritarian leader than under the democratic one. However productivity turned out to be the lowest under the laissez-faire leader’s supervision (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996).

On the other hand University of Michigan Studies consider leadership to be over and above mechanical compliance with the routine defectiveness of the organization as an organization consists of human beings in positions of authority and power rather than
computers (Robins, 1998). In terms of the differences between the cognitive orientation and affective styles of the leader, there are two basic dimensions of the leader follower relationship which are task; direction and socio-economic supportiveness.

There are two distinct styles of leadership namely Production-oriented and Employee centered which are at opposite ends of the same continuum. Production-oriented leaders value mission or task accomplishment and technical aspects of the job. Employee-centered leaders delegate decision making and assist followers in satisfying their needs in a supportive work environment (Kihara, 1991).

The study further shows that, In terms of effectiveness, a leader who successfully integrates primary and secondary relationships within the organization is the best. Primary relationship refer to face to face interaction and tend to be person specific such as relationships in the families or among friends whereas secondary relations refer to interpersonal relationship thus a successful leader integrates organizational requirements with the needs of persons; and he does this in ways which are not damaging to the organization, but enhancing it. The leader achieves this through promoting group loyalty and showing care for persons as persons (Ochieng, 2001).

Supporting the Michigan studies the managerial Grid or recently called as the leadership Grid tried to classify leadership styles that focus on a leader’s concern for task accomplishment and people at the same time. Concern for production involves results, the bottom line, performance, mission and profits. Concern for people involves group members and co-workers. Each of these concerns is in varying degrees along a
continuum from 1 to 9. Leaders can integrate their concerns for people with production to be opportunistic or paternalistic/materialistic. The opportunistic leader moves to any Grid style needed to achieve personal gain and self-promotion, but the paternalistic/materialistic adopts the high 9 level of concern from 9, 1 and 1, 9 in order to create a combined style of monitoring parent-like behavior. On the Grid, a9, 9 styles (team management) is desirable in that it results in high productivity, satisfaction, and creativity (Durbin, 1995).

Fiedler’s Contingency Model suggests that if organizational performance is to be improved, one must cope not only with the leader’s style but also with the situational factors which influence the leader. Organizational performance can be improved either by the leader’s fitness to the situation or the situation’s fitness to the leader. Fiedler (1961) cited in Girvin (2005) also states that leadership traits, if exist at all, would be exposed to many outside effects. Therefore, traits are difficult to identify.

Fiedler’s Contingency Model suggests that dealing with leadership effectiveness would be more logical and beneficial on the grounds that the ability to motivate other people may well be dependent upon one or more personality traits. A leader is effective to the extent to which he renders his group more productive. The effectiveness in leadership trait can be termed as consistent and measurable personality attribute which separates effective leaders from ineffective ones. However, the behavior related with these traits will reveal itself only under appropriate conditions.
Leader member Exchange Model (Vertical Dyad Exchange Model) was developed by George Green and his followers’ challenges and the well established assumption that leadership behavior is consistent. It proposes that a leader might be caring and considerate towards a team member yet uncaring and strict toward another (Durbin, 1995). Each of these pairs of relationships must be evaluated in terms of whether the group Member is “in” or “out” with the leader. The leader’s first impression of a group member’s Competency has a strong impact of the group member’s belongingness to the in-group or the out-group. If group members have similar values and attitudes with the leader they are an in-group. However, out-group member do not have much in common with the leader and act in a somewhat detached manner from him.

In-group members can become a part of a smooth functioning team whereas out-group members are unlikely to achieve good team work (Durbin, 1995). Recent Approaches to leadership put aside all the complex and sophisticated explanations about leadership behavior and attempted to examine leadership from the point of view of ordinary and simple people (Robbins, 1998).

According to attribution theory of leadership, people have hidden leadership theories in their minds about what makes a good leader or, in other words, they have a leadership prototype; an image of model leader. These implicit theories or prototypes refer to a mix of specific and more general characteristics. The leader is favorable provided that he/she appeals to the implicit theories of the followers. Leadership is regarded as something to be largely symbolic and in “the eye of the beholder (Squares 2001). One of the most
interesting aspects of this theory is that effective leaders are associated with consistency in the decision making phase (Robbins, 1998).

On the other hand, Sinha (2004) advocates for charismatic leadership style. This style of leadership is based on the leader’s magnetic personality. Owing to the leader’s character, strength and skill, super human qualities are attributed to a leader who saves his followers from a crisis or a catastrophic event and becomes an idol providing direction and inspiration to his followers.

The charismatic leader attaches importance to his vision, speech, capacity to take risks and above all the emotions of his subordinates, House in Durbin, (1995) identified nine effects which charismatic leaders have on their followers namely, as group members trust in the correctness of the leader’s beliefs, congruence between the leaders and the group beliefs, acceptance of the leader, affection for the leader, willing obedience to the leader, identification with and admiration for the leader, emotional involvement of the group member in the mission, challenging goals of the group member and belief in the accomplishment of the mission. Later, these nine effects were statistically clustered into three dimensions.

Reference power refers to the ability of the leader to influence others with the help of his desirable traits and characteristics; expert power refers to the ability of the leader to influence others through his specialized knowledge and skills; job involvement refers to the ability of the leader to encourage group members towards the accomplishment of the Job (Durbin, 1995). Bass (1990) categorized charismatic leaders into four types:
Socialized charismatic: a leader who offers consideration help and support to group members only when it helps to achieve own goals.

Office holder charismatic: a leader who owns respect and recognition through the office or status he holds not because of his personal characteristics.

Personalized charismatic: a leader who exerts influence on others owing to his personal traits and skills but not his status or position.

Divine charismatic: a leader who is believed to be endowed with a gift or divine grace.

Transactional transformational Approaches and on the other hand is epistemologically based on positivist/empiricist foundation on which traditional conceptualizations of leadership have been formulated (Nzuve, 2000). Burns in Deluga, (1995) holds that leadership cannot be separated from followers’ needs and goals. Its essence lies in the interaction between the follower and the leader. Durbin, (1995) states that charismatic and transactional leadership is closely related with each other in literature, but reminds the reader that not all leaders are transformational until they bring about a change in their organizations.

Visionary Leadership style model suggests that the ability to create and express a realistic, attainable and attractive vision of the future for organizations which grow continuously. Visionary leaders should create inspiring and innovative visions for their organizations. This renders them credible in the eyes of the people in the organization. At the same time they have three qualities, which are related to their effectiveness. First, is the ability to explain and articulate the vision to the others? Secondly, is to express the vision not just verbally but through the leader’s behavior. Thirdly, is to communicate the
vision to different leadership contexts. For example, the vision of the organization should appeal to employees in different departments (Jacky, Cary and Petros, 2008).

Structural Leadership is based on a variety of core assumptions. First assumption is that, organizations exist primarily to achieve established goals. For any organization a structural form can be designed and utilized to fit its particular set of circumstances such as goals, strategies, environment, technology and people. Second assumption is that, organizations work most effectively when organizational choices and individual preferences are restricted by norms of rationality. Structure stipulates that people focus on getting the job done rather than doing what they please. Thirdly, specialization entails higher levels of individual expertise and performance. Fourthly, co-ordination and control are of prime importance for organizational effectiveness. Based on the task and environment, coordination may be achieved through authority, rules, policies, standard operating procedures, information systems, meetings or a variety of informal techniques Derel (2007). Lastly, organizational problems typically stem from inappropriate structures or inadequate systems and can be solved through restructuring or devising new systems. There are two main issues in structural design: How to divide the work (differentiation) and how to coordinate the work of different people and units after it has been divided (integration).

2.3 Effects of Leadership Style on Student’s Performance

Leadership is widely regarded as a key factor in accounting for differences in the success with which schools foster the learning of their students. The contribution of effective
leadership is largest when it is needed most; there are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around in the absence of intervention by talented leaders. While other factors within the school also contribute to such turn around, leadership is the Catalyst (Okumbe, 1998).

Astin and Astin (2001) describe leadership as the ability to get all members of the organizations to perform tasks required to achieve the organization’s goals and objectives. Good leadership is essential if schools are to improve. Exemplary leadership creates a sense of excitement about teaching and learning within the school and community by focusing on dreams and expectations of students, parents and the community.

Cuban (1988) refers to leadership as an influence process. Leadership, then refers to people bend the motivations and actions of others to achieve certain goals. It shows that the process of influence is purposeful in that it is intended to lead to specific outcomes. Bass (1990) use the concept of “invitational” leadership to explain how leaders operate in schools. “Leadership is about communicating invitational messages to individuals and groups with whom leaders interact in order to build and act on a shared and evolving vision of enhanced educational experiences for pupils”.

Brook-smith (2003) note that leadership begins with the character of leaders, expressed in terms of personal values, self-awareness and emotional and moral capability. Day, Harris and Hadfield (2001) studied 12 schools in England and Wales which focused on heads who were deemed effective by the Office for Standards in Education. They
conclude that good leaders are informed by and communicate clear sets of personal and educational values which represent their moral purposes for the school. The leaders possess the following qualities: respect for others, fairness and equality, caring for the well being and whole development of students and staff, integrity and honesty. Principals should be able to work with others to implant the vision into the structures and processes of the school. They should be able to communicate the vision to the staff of what their schools should become (Astin and Astin, 2001).

A study by Beirsto (1999) cited in Brooke-smith (2003) for the School Management Task Force illustrates a number of problems about the development and articulation of vision in English and Welsh schools. Their study of 12 “effective schools” shows that most school heads were able to describe “some sort of vision” but “they varied in their capacity to articulate the vision and the visions were more or less sophisticated”. The study casts doubt on the ability of school heads to communicate the vision effectively and to ensure that it is shared by staff. Within the field of educational administration, recognition is developing of the role played by culture in the formulation and exercise of leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996). Culture refers to more than the climate of the school and includes the broader societal culture which the school is located and functions. Hallinger & Leithwood (1996) hypothesized that societal culture exerts a significant influence on administrators beyond that of the specific organization’s culture. Moller and Pankate (2006) recognized a shift in the organizational structure in schools. These included educational leadership shifts in roles, relationships
and responsibilities. Blanchard (2000) contends that, systems that change require a variety of leadership styles at different times in organizational development.

Principals have the central task of building schools that promote teaching and learning for all students (Barber, 1963). Several research studies have identified the critical role of principals. Okumbe (1998) suggests that the areas of principals’ responsibilities have reportedly risen in percentage in the following areas:

1) Marketing / politics, etc, to generate support for school and education.
2) Working with social agencies.
3) Planning / implementing site-based staff development.
4) Development of instructional practices.
5) Curriculum development.
6) Attention to legal issues.

Principals are facing a complex environment and they have to change their roles to meet the Changing external environment. They must coordinate the services offered to their students, and to ensure that these services reach those with the greatest needs; and at the same time to ensure that there is no disruption of the teaching and learning process in school (Goldring & Sullivan, 1996). School principals must serve as change agents of the schools (Donaldson, 2001). They are to lead change in schools to fulfill the requirements that society has largely demanded. Robin Brooke-Smith (2003) identifies five control parameters that determine the state of the system in which change agents function. These are rate of information flow, connectivity, diversity, power differentials and anxiety.
Effective leadership involves the alignment of people within the school. Aligning people means getting people to share the same vision and moving forward in the same direction. Aligning people with the same vision and a set of strategies for school improvements help produce the changes needed to cope with the changing environment (Wango, 2010). Leadership development occurs when individuals become more skilled in getting people to work together as a team and when they have opportunity to develop high-performing work teams. Teams should be the basic unit of performance regardless of the size of the organizations (Koech, 2004). School leaders must learn not to lead from the apex of the organizational pyramid but from the nexus of a web of interpersonal relationships, with people rather than through them (Murphy, 1992). Lunenburg and Oristeinm (1996) also acknowledges that competition in the educational market place results more in innovative marketing than in real innovative improvements in instructional practice.

The survival of many schools depends on their ability to marketing recruit new students and retain existing ones, mobilization of resources, student achievements and on their successes in making their programs attractive. Schools operating in competitive environments tend to incorporate various forms of marketing strategies to recruit prospective students Bennis and Nanus (1985).

Miner (2005) describes the principal as a mover to improve the general feelings of teachers. He observes that it is through transformational leadership and participative behavior that principals motivate the teachers. The influence of transformational leadership is also stressed by Girvin (2005). This study demonstrates the direct effects of transformational leadership on teachers’ commitment to school reform and indirect
effects on teachers’ efforts through teacher motivation. They conclude that the extra commitment and efforts of teachers result in changes in their interactions with students and this have a positive influence on students’ outcomes (Goldhaniner, 1971). Satisfaction is often regarded as an important determinant on the educational outcomes such as students’ achievement (Robert and Hunter 1991). Okumbe (1998) also note that, teacher leaders required a high tolerance for complexity and ambiguity. As the largest group of educators working within the school environment and those closest to their students, teachers are considered critical change agents in building professional communities and working towards school improvement (Miner 2005).

Effective learning requires good communication between teachers and students. Okumbe (1998) also maintains that it was not possible to understand exchanges between students of a classroom without knowledge of the cultural repertoire of the participants. It was not possible for a teacher to address the issues of communication with every student of a multicultural classroom. However, the teacher could be aware of the cultural differences and could make adjustments of his or her communication technique accordingly.

Study by Ochieng (2001) on students’ performance indicated that the more autocratic one becomes, the poorer the performance of the school and the contrary is also true. School leaders who use the authoritarian leadership style lead to poor academic performance, because they adopt harsh leadership styles, which are highly resented by their subordinates. The greater the use of autocratic principles, the poorer the learners’ academic performance will be. 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.

Sagimo (2002) revealed that most school managers used the democratic style of leadership. Schools are composed of intelligent people whose ideas are crucial in the day-to-day running of the same schools. Teachers, students and prefects, for example, have the capacity to advice effectively on academic matters in the school. Their ideas and contributions cannot be ignored.

This approach to management has led many school managers to rely on participatory governance mechanisms or the democratic leadership style. The leader in the school 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. Students in schools need to be involved in the school’s administration and in the implementation of decisions because they affect them directly. School head teachers contended that democracy was the best leadership strategy for school environments because schools are systems with parts that are interrelated.

Ochieng (2001) established that head-teachers who use the laissez faire leadership style tend to fail to follow up on those they have delegated tasks to and consequently performance declines. 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 performance problems, which are likely to affect the school’s effectiveness. This is in agreement with Wango (2010) study of laissez-faire leadership shows 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.

Study by Beare, Cadwell and Milikanet (1994) on the relationship between the students performance of a school and the kind of leadership exhibited that the two were directly related. Kihara (1991) examined the relationship between pupils’ performance in K.C.P.E and the leadership behavior by primary school head teachers in Thika Municipality. His result revealed that good performances were attributed to head teachers who have both taste and relationship oriented behavior.

2.4 Effect of Gender on Leadership Style

According to Fletcher (1994) Sex refers to the basic, biologically given physiological differences between males and females. Gender refers to a culture's social construction of differences between the sexes. These include the different traits, roles, behaviors, attitudes, and aptitudes males and females are expected to display. Gender displays reinforce claims of membership in a sex. Expressions such as "gendered practices," "gendered language," and "gendered jobs" are used to emphasize the tenet that gender
involves a process of social construction, and to make gender a more central explanation of organizational behavior phenomena such as leadership.

Sushila (2004) contend that most teachers in both secondary and primary schools are women, but most heads of Secondary schools are men and the proportion of men who are heads in primary schools is large in comparison to the overall number of women in primary teaching. However, the proportion of women who are head-teachers and deputy head-teachers is growing; for example in 1997, 26 per cent of secondary head-teachers and 35 percent of deputies were women in a teaching force that was 52 per cent women. In 2002, 31 per cent of secondary heads and 39 per cent of deputy heads were women out of a teaching force that was 55 per cent women Yu, Leithwood And Jantzi (2002).

Blanchard (2000) also maintains that Gender plays an important and sometimes unrecognized part in working lives, impacting in particular on women and men who challenge stereotypes. Women who aspire to senior positions, particularly headship are still likely to face gender related barriers as they seek promotion. There is still a common expectation that a head teacher, particularly of a secondary school will be a man, so women head-teachers may also face resistance once in post. Men who work with young children may face difficulties and prejudice when working in areas usually associated with women Rosener (1990). Both men and women seek a balance in their lives between family and work, but family and domestic responsibilities usually impact more on women. Attempting to get a work/life balance can therefore be a particular challenge to women senior leaders and managers. The stereotype that women leaders tend to be soft
and caring and that man tend to be tough and dominant tends to act against women who aspire to be leaders as it may be assumed that they will not be as good at leadership as aspiring men. Women are favoured as heads of all-girls' schools. Becoming a woman head of a boys’ school was comparatively more difficult Miner (2005.).

The human capital theory presaged an argument that emerged in the mid-1980s: that a company's profits could be bolstered by the special qualities women possess—a proclivity for cooperative decision making, ability to share power and communicate well, experience in nurturing the development of others, and comfort with less hierarchical organizations. Increased foreign competition made U.S. companies aware of the failings of the traditional, military, authoritarian leadership style, and thus the utilization of female talent was seen as a possible source of competitive advantage Fenn (1978).

Fondas (1993) argument that females possess a natural leadership advantage over males gained popularity in academic and management circles, some scholars voiced a more critical view. They maintained that the idea of extracting the value of feminine skills and qualities in the global marketplace was exploitative. Such a plan is part of a managerial ideology that dehumanizes and subordinates all workers, not females only. These writers were less concerned with the relationship between gender and leadership per se. Their primary interest was the issue of power, and how the gender categories "male" and "female" are part of a system of power relations that empowers some and exploits others.

Fondas (1993) cited several reasons for the low proportion of women leaders. One is that females' life aspirations are diminished by their early childhood socialization in the
nuclear family. Generally the nuclear family transmits definitions of appropriate gender behavior to children. For girls, this includes submissiveness, passivity, avoidance of aggression and competition, reticence to take risk, and other qualities our culture considers "feminine." Research shows that even when high school boys and girls have the same college and career aspirations, the boys receive significantly more parental encouragement to pursue their goals.

Other reasons women ascend to leadership positions less frequently than men are that women most frequently inhabit managerial positions with little power, little advancement opportunity, or where other women are so rare that their presence is attributed to their sexuality or affirmative action, or it is used as a symbol of the organization's enlightenment Fletcher (1994).

Studies by Fenn (1978) further established the differences between males' and females' task accomplishment styles and interpersonal styles. Males tended to be more task-oriented; females tended to be more relationship-oriented. These differences, however, have been observed only in men and women subjects of laboratory experiments, that is, people asked to speculate how they would behave if they were leaders. Differences disappear in studies where actual managers are compared: most conclude that women do not behave differently from men in the same or similar kind of leadership position. Moreover, experienced women managers show no differences in leadership abilities from experienced male managers. These women, in fact, are likely to more closely resemble their male counterparts in drive, skills, temperament, and competitiveness, than the average woman in the population.
Some difference has been found in males' and females' decision making styles. According to Gary Powell’s comprehensive study, Women and Men in Management, women tend to employ a more democratic, participative style while men tend to take a more autocratic, directive approach. This difference has appeared in both laboratory studies and observations of real leaders. Some scholars thus argue that women's tendency to negotiate, mediate, facilitate, and communicate is the more effective leadership style than men's emphasis on power and control; and because this "feminine" style reduces hierarchy, satisfies subordinates, and achieves results, it should be the norm to which men are compared. There is some evidence that this is occurring: most mainstream writers now urge managers to adopt a caring, cooperative, collaborative, nurturing, connective, servant leadership style.

During the late 1990s medical science found a physical basis for some of these basic differences in leadership qualities. As asserted by Sagan in "Gender Specifics: Why Women Aren't Men," the structure of the female brain affords women several biological and cognitive advantages. This was thought to be in large part due to the connector between the two sides of the brain being larger in women than in men, resulting in a better ability on the female's part to integrate left brain/right brain activities. Women were thought better able to follow several trains of thought at the same time, while men appeared better able to focus on single topics Fagenson (1990).
2.5 Relationship between Leadership and KCSE Performance with regard to Head Teachers’ Age

There exists evidence that head-teachers leadership style and school performance are influenced by age. Drucker (1973) cited in Bolman and Deal (2002), observed that a management group comprised of workers of the same age is a management group headed for crisis. Yet, he also noted that a management group that is uniformly old may be preferable to the one that is uniformly too young. Perhaps a mix is ideal.

On the other hand, in a study carried out by Glasscock (1991), it was discovered that age did not affect principals’ performance of their leadership responsibilities. Omolo (2000) research on primary school head teacher’s performance, however, showed that age tended to affect the head- teachers’ administrative performance. Older head-teachers had generally spent more years on the job, attended more seminars, and participated in relevant professional discussions that exposed them to new techniques of administration. Study investigated the influence of personality characteristics on principal leadership effectiveness in Ekiti State, Nigeria.

The work puts into focus the variables of age, sex, and experience as they relate to the leadership effectiveness of school principals in a traditional local setting in Nigeria. The relationship between age and principals’ leadership effectiveness is not clear either, as empirical results have been mixed. It was found in one study that age did not affect principals’ performance of their leadership responsibilities Kwakwa(1973), but Squires (2001) asserted that age did tend to affect the head teachers’ administrative performance.
However, older head teachers seem to have generally spent more years on the job and have been exposed to different administrative tasks.

Yu, Leithwood and Jantzi (2002) stated that, leaders of age 45 - 55 are more democratic leaders they take great care to involve all members of the team in discussion, and can work with a small but highly motivated team.

2.6 Effect of Students’ Enrollment on Leadership Style

The quantitative expansion in schools enrollment in educational institutions has an impact on schools recurrent expenditure and the head-teachers leadership style. The rapid increase in enrolment led to the employment of many untrained teachers, which prompted in the government to review policy on teacher employment. It recommended the gradual elimination of untrained teachers in the schools, improvement of teachers’ condition of services, the promotion of efficient teachers to the highest professional grades, and reduction in class size to forty pupils for the lower class Omolo (2007).

The World Bank (2007) warns that education in sub-Saharan Africa is in crises today. Rapid population growth rate has resulted in more children than ever seeking places in schools which are already pressed for resources. A lower proportion of children and young people are able to obtain places in educational institution as a result, the quality of education has dropped as classrooms have become crowded and teaching materials increasingly scarce. This makes head-teachers to combine classes or share classes this may lead to teaching classes in turn or neglecting of some subjects.
Asundah (1983) noted that bigger institutions are more complex to lead than simple day schools. Head-teachers of large schools were perceived as very democratic by their teachers as they need support to run the schools. They tend to delegate responsibility to heads of department and subject heads as opposed to heads of small who are perceived to be autocratic as they tend to run the school single handed.

2.7 The Relationship between Leadership Styles and KCSE Performance by Experience.

Eshiwani (1988) ascends that one’s leadership experience can have differential effects on one’s leadership efficiency. Effectiveness is attained when head-teachers are trained, experienced, organized and motivated. It is extremely rare to find all of these qualities in ahead who have not served in substantial period of time. Elmore (2000) argued that the major influence on the type of leader one is today is the result of experience one gains in leading people. In a study by Kihara (1991) on the performances of primary school headmasters, results showed that there was a significant difference in performance between primary school head-teachers with duration of experience ranging from 4 to 11 years and those with 20 years of experience and above. One can thus infer that experience significantly contributes to difference in head-teachers’ performances.

A related study by Ochieng (2001) showed that principals who completed in-service trainings were more effective than those who did not. An important implication of his study is that professionally trained principals perform their roles better than non-professionals. Day (2001) reported that teachers who complete degrees in education are
more professional outputs than those who do not. It is believed that specialized training empowers and motivates such teachers for better performance. For the purpose of this study, only the number of years that the principals have worked shall constitute experience.

On the other hand, Nzuve (2000) disagree that experience prepares one for leadership. Nzuve pervades the business community, experience does not necessarily contribute to leadership effectiveness. In fact, studies of military officers, research and development teams, shop supervisors, post office administrators, and school principals indicate that experienced managers often do not outperform inexperienced managers. The key to these findings is situational variability. While past behavior can predict future behavior, it is critical to consider the relevance of past experience to a new situation. If a person's leadership experience was obtained in a situation similar to the new one, then it can be a reasonably good predictor of future leadership performance. The transferability of knowledge in leaders has important consequences for leadership development and performance. Leaders need to be adaptive and continually learning so as to perform well. In fact, it is the uniqueness and adaptive nature of leadership that has led some scholars to contend that leadership occurs only in the face of adaptive challenges or problems (Okumbe 2000).

Yet surprisingly, in spite of its importance, our understanding of how leaders learn and adapt is still largely theoretical (Day, 2002). Likewise, the adaptive nature of leadership is not high on one's schema of a leader across many cultures – for example, it is not listed
as part of culturally implicit schemas of leadership attributes (English 1992). One therefore would expect that leaders with greater leadership experience (in temporal terms) should be better developed leaders and perform better than leaders with less experience. The question is: better developed how and performs better in what ways? This dissertation operationalised such development and performance to be associated with leadership efficiency, psychological capital, leader self-awareness, and implicit theories of leadership all forms of leadership experiences be they positive ones or negative ones, are in some ways good experiences. It is obvious how positive experiences directly contribute to future performance. For example, positive experiences give rise to higher efficiency beliefs that in turn predict future performance (Durbin 1995). However, it is less clear how negative experiences can be processed in positive ways so that they too become good.

Konchar (1988) states that: Schools are bad or good, in a healthy or unhealthy mental, moral and physical condition, flourishing or perishing, as the principal is capable, energetic of high ideals or the reverse. Schools rise to fame or sink to obscurity as greater or lesser principals have charge of them. It is said that the school is as great as the principal, because everything in the school, the plant, the staff, the curriculum methods and techniques of teaching…human relationships, bear the impress of his or her personality’. Schools do not become great because of magnificent buildings but because of magnificent principals’ goals.
Moller and Pankate (2006), hold that cognitive resources are abilities and a leader is directive or non-directive behavior. Directiveness is most helpful when the leader is competent, relaxed, and supported. When the leader is under stress, experience is more important than ability. There is less leader impact when the group support is low.

2.8 Summary

In conclusion, the above study has review literature related to the study under the following headings: one, leadership styles displayed by head-teachers which were: autocratic, democratic and laisser-faire. Secondly, effects of leadership style on student performance. It reveals that the head-teachers’ leadership style affect school performance. Democratic leadership is more productive. The effect of gender on leadership style was also revived. It contend that most head-teachers are males. It further revealed that female head-teachers are soft and caring while others argue that female heads are more autocratic than men since they lack exposure to administration skills. The study also focused on the relationship between leadership style and age. The review pointed out that the old heads are more democratic as they had spend more years on the job, attended more seminars and participated in relevant discussion related to profession that expose them to new techniques of administration.

On the basis of the effects of student enrollment on leadership style; enrollment has an impact on leadership style. Head-teachers of schools with high enrollment are perceived to be more democratic than those of schools with low enrollment. Lastly, on relationship between leadership styles and experience, the literature review showed that there is a
relationship between head-teacher’s leadership style and his experience. Head-teachers with more experience are more democratic than those with less experience. Literature reviewed has shown that most studies have been done in leadership styles and students performance in various parts of the world Derel (2007). Kihara (1991) also did a research on leadership in primary schools in Thika Sub County and Koech (2004) in Nandi but none has been done in Kericho County. They have also recommended for further research especially on the influence of leadership styles and use of a larger sample, which the current study, has addressed and also used more research tools. The researcher therefore was influenced by this gap.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research design and methodology used in the study. It describes the study area, the study population, sampling techniques, research instruments, validity and reliability of the research instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The study was basically a survey. The design was ex post facto. In such research, the investigator makes inferences concerning relationship among variables “without direct control of the independent variables because the events in question have already occurred (Kerlinger, 1979). The survey design is recommended for use in educational research because most research problems does not lend themselves to experimentation (Kerlinger (1979). This design suited the study since the various causal factors in performance in examination had already occurred and could therefore only be studied retrospectively for their possible effects on KCSE performance.

3.3 The Study Area

The study was conducted in the larger Kericho County of Rift Valley Province of Kenya which comprises Londiani, Chilchila and Kipkelion sub-County. It is bordered by Nandi North Sub-County to the north, Nakuru County to the East, Bureti Sub-County to the South and Nyando Sub-County to the west. It is a cosmopolitan County with its
population made up of almost all the Kenyan ethnic communities. However, the most
dominant community is the Kipsigis sub group of the wider “Kalenjin” speaking peoples.
Kericho has highland sub-tropical climate. Temperatures are much cooler than expected
of a tropical climate because of the high altitude. Day temperatures are cool and pleasant
while the nights become chilly. The region receives rainfall throughout the year. The
annual rainfall totals ranges from 1000mm to1500mm. The long rains are received
between March and May. The short rains between September and December. The
average temperatures range between 17 degrees centigrade and 24 degrees centigrade.
The majority of the people in this district engage in small scale and large scale farming.
They mainly produce maize, beans, tea, coffee and vegetables. They also keep livestock
for milk and meat.

In the rapidly growing Kericho Township, there is a growing population of “petty”
traders dealing in such items as groundnuts, sweets and confectionery, and concentrate
their activities mainly at the bus stage. There are also a significant number of people
involved in metal works in the growing “Jua Kali” informal sector. There is unevenly
distribution of secondary schools in the County. Ainamoi has the highest numbers of
schools (29) while Soin has the least number (10). Other divisions have schools as
follows; Londiani (16), Chilchila (11), Kipkelion (19) Sigowet (13) and Belgut (21) thus
making a total of 119 schools. A map showing Kericho district is provided on appendix
“E”.

3.4 Target Population

Target population is the entire set for which the survey data is to be used to make inferences Kothari (2004). The study target was 2,499 teachers consisting of 119 head-teachers and 2380 teachers working in the 119 public secondary schools (Kericho District Education Office 2011).

3.4.1 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

A mix of sampling techniques was used: Stratified random sampling, simple random sampling and systematic random sampling. All individuals were chosen by chance and had an equal opportunity of being included in the sample. According to Kothari (2004), probability-sampling procedures should be used as it minimizes selection bias, and estimates margins of error and govern the size design of the sample for the desired level of accuracy. Secondary schools in the study area were divided into two categories (strata) Provincial and District secondary schools.

The schools were first classified as Boarding, Day, Girls’ and Boys’. Purposive sampling technique was used to select schools covering: Boarding, Day, Girls and Boys school. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), advocate that this technique is fundamental in selecting typical and useful cases and also saves time and money. Simple random sampling techniques, was used to select the 53(145%) head teachers and 1060 (44.50%) teachers were selected to participate in the study.
3.5 Research Instruments

The researcher used a mix of methods and sources during the study. These included the following:

- Questionnaires
- Interview Schedule
- Documents.

3.5.1 Questionnaires

Questionnaires are very convenient tools where a large numbers of subjects are to be handled. Questionnaires facilitate easy and quick responses (Day 2002). In this study respondents were required to react to the way they view the leadership styles exhibited by the head teacher. Data was collected from public secondary school in Kericho district. The questionnaires known as the profile of leadership behavior (LB) and profile of own behavior (OB) for head teachers and teachers respectively were used. The Questionnaires were divided into two parts:

i) Part one had statements seeking information on the background of the respondents such as their sex, academic qualification, teaching experience and the period of teaching in the school. This information aimed at describing the respondents who took part in the study.

ii) The second part had questions on the head teachers’ leadership styles as perceived by the head teachers and the teachers. The closed ended questions were weighted on Likert scale of 1-5 with questions seeking views on head teachers’ leadership styles.
3.5.2 Interview Schedule

In this study the interview Schedule was organized to collect additional information from the Head teachers.

3.5.3 Documents

The documents analyzed included written speeches, K.C.S.E results summaries, newspapers and policy documents.

3.6 Philosophical foundation of the study

This research embraced an eclecticism paradigm. All research in education based on philosophy which emphasis the essential logical links in research. In research with schools, as in the present study, it is necessary to be eclectic and use mixed methods (Slade 2000 and Yambo, 2014). This is considered significant because eclecticism is conceptual approach that does not hold rigidly to a single paradigm or set of assumption, but instead draws upon multiple theories in particular case. This paradigm has the understanding that no research can be undertaken without background knowledge hence all research requires insight into what is being studied. When documentary evidence exist analytical research is prudent. This research emphasis may change direction as the researcher searches from new ideas or collections evidence to challenge or confirm new ideas even changes from discoveries to verification can occur frequently (Nachmias & Nachmias 2005).
3.6 Validity

Validity is defined as the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure (Kothari, 2004). The validity of an instrument or scale is the success of the scale in measuring what it is set to measure so that differences in individual scores can be taken as representing true difference in characteristics under study (Borg and Gall, 1983). In order to determine content validity and face validity, the supervisors and subject experts in the Department of Education management and policy studies in Moi University were consulted to improve the instrument to be used.

3.7 Reliability

Kothari (2004) observed that the reliability of an instrument is the degree of consistency that an instrument demonstrates i.e. the accuracy of the test scores which are free from errors. The reliability of the instruments was established by computing a test re-test reliability coefficient. This was done by administering the test twice, but allowing an interval of one month between them. The pre-testing of the instrument was done in ten non-participating schools in Kipkelion sub-County. Questionnaires were administered to 10 head-teachers and 100 teachers.

The results were computed and correlated. Pearson product moment correlation formula was used to calculate the co-efficient correlation \( r \). Reliability co-efficient of 0.5 or above, lead to acceptance of the questionnaire as reliable while co-efficient below 0.5 lead to disregarding or improving the instrument (Borg and Gall 1983). The test yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.78 for the head teachers’ questionnaire and 0.72 for the
teachers’ questionnaire. The correlation coefficients were high enough to judge the instruments reliable for use in the study (Kothari, 2004).

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher visited the schools scheduled in the letter of introduction. In each school visited, the researcher paid a courtesy call to the head teacher and explained the purpose of the visit. The head teacher then directed the researcher to the teachers. The teachers were explained that the exercise was not an examination but just a questionnaire to collect honest information from them. The head teachers filled the questionnaire in their offices while teachers filled theirs in the staffroom. Data was collected beginning April and ending in the mid June 2011. Data collection took at three hours in all the sample secondary schools.

3.9 Data Analysis

Data from the questionnaires was presented using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Data got from the questionnaires, was examined and the information coded and fed into the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze the data collected. The descriptive statistics was used to calculate totals, percentages and frequencies while inferential statistics, specifically the chi-square ($X^2$) was used to test relationships between the study variables. Conventional significance level at 0.05 was used. This level of significance of 0.05 is recommended in social science research (John and James 2006).
3.10 Ethical Consideration

Permission to conduct research was sought from the office of the president (OP). In addition, the letter of authority to conduct the research in the County was obtained from the County Commissioner (D.C) and the District Education Office (D.E.O) Kericho County. The Head of the Department of Education Management and policy study prepared letters of introduction to the head teachers of the selected schools. The respondents were guaranteed confidentially of their information.

3.11 Summary of chapter three

This chapter has dealt with the research design which was basically a survey. The study area was Kericho County of Rift Valley Province. The target population was 119 secondary schools in the County. The sampling techniques used in the study included; stratified random sampling, simple random sampling and systematic random sampling. Variables in the study were; independent variable which was head-teacher’s leadership styles and dependant variable which was student’s KCSE performance. The research instruments were mainly a set of questionnaires. Validity and reliability of the instruments were also covered. Data collection procedure as well as research ethics which included getting permission to conduct the research from the office of the president. Data collection instrument were; Interview schedules, library search, document analyses and questionnaires. Data analysis was also coved. In the next chapter data presentation, analysis, interpretation and discussion are covered.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis, interpretation and results discussion. Results presented in this chapter are based on responses from the questionnaires and the interview schedules administered to the head teachers and teachers. The study focused on the relationship between leadership styles and students’ academic performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County of Rift valley Province. Head teachers’ information in this chapter is analyzed presented and discussed as follows; the Demographic information, gender and its effect on effectiveness of leadership, age and its effects on leadership style, students’ population and its effect on head teachers leadership styles. The relationship between the head teachers leadership styles and academic performance in K.C.S.E in Kericho County, various leadership styles displayed by head-teachers of secondary schools in Kericho County. The order of presenting the result of this study in this chapter will be; restatement of the relevant objective, before presenting summary of observations and findings. The summary of the chapter will be done last.

4.2 Demographic Information

The research considered the demographic of the subjects. The information included age of head teacher, sex, duration of stay in school and head–teacher’s highest qualification. This information was intended to enable the researcher to get historical background
information on the head teachers and the schools used in the study, in order to understand the responses and assist in analyzing the results obtained.

4.2.1 School Categories

The study established that eight schools (15.1%) of the sample were Boys Boarding, twenty two (41.5%) were Mixed Day, six (11.3%) were Girls Day, five (9.4%) were Girls Boarding, ten (18.9%) were Mixed Boarding while two (3.8%) were Boys Day. There was more Mixed Day than any other school category in the study. Table 4.1 gives the summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Boarding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Day</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Day</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Boarding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Boarding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of students was ten thousand, two hundred and fifty four. Two thousand and seventy on (20.2%) were in boys boarding, five thousand one hundred and fifty eight
(50.3%) were in mixed day, one hundred and forty four (1.4%) were in girls day school, one thousand and seventy seven (10.5%) were in girls boarding, one thousand four hundred and fifty six (14.2%) were in mixed boarding schools while three hundred and forty eight (3.4%) in boys’ day schools. This is consistent with Wekesa’s (1993) and Sagimo’s (2002) observations that rural areas are dominated by mixed day’s schools. The largest enrolment was noted in mixed day schools. The majority of the schools in the county were dominated by male learners. It was apparent that most parents preferred educating boys to girls and this explains why there is more enrolment in boys than girls in the county.

4.2.2 Sex of the Respondents

An item in the head teachers’ questionnaire sought to establish the sex of the respondents and its effect on leadership style. Table 4.2 shows that there are more male head-teachers (79.2%) than females’ head-teachers (20.8%) who participated in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results also serve to show that a considerable proportion of head-teachers in the county are males. This could imply that there is gender bias in appointment to headship
position in Kericho County. These results concur with those of Koech (2004) which established that 70% of the secondary schools in Nandi County are headed by male head-teachers.

Several reasons are cited for the low proportion of women leaders. One is that females' life aspirations are diminished by their early childhood socialization in the nuclear family. Generally the nuclear family transmits definitions of appropriate gender behavior to children. For girls, this includes submissiveness, passivity, avoidance of aggression and competition, reticence to take risk, and other qualities culture considers "feminine." Wango (2010) shows that even when high school boys and girls have the same college and career aspirations, the boys receive significantly more parental encouragement to pursue their goals. The school categories were also compared with student enrolment and summarized in table 4.3

Table 4.3: School Type and student enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of school</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Student Enrolment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Boarding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Day</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>5158</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Day</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Boarding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Boarding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>10254</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One result of this childhood socialization is the tendency for adult women to be stereotyped as less well-suited than men for leadership roles. Outside their paid jobs, women usually have significant responsibility for the care of their families and home, thereby depleting the energy they might otherwise devote to the pursuit of leadership positions. This greatly affects their leadership style. It would not be incorrect then for one to assume that upward mobility for female teachers was difficult in those circumstances.

In view of this scenario and in order for the system to take advantage of the administrative potential of female teachers, it might have to use some other criteria other than experience and age, in selecting principals.

The study also found out that, gender as a variable have significant influence on the perceptions of the head-teachers leadership styles. These findings are consistent with Ochieng (2000) and John and James (2006) who reported that there is a difference in leadership behavior of male and female head-teachers.

Figure 4.2 revealed that male-teachers were rated higher (64%) than female (24%). The difference could be attributed to the fact that most women leaders tend to struggle to disapprove that women are inferior leaders. In their effort to prove themselves to the society and their superiors, the female head-teacher may end up more autocratic than democratic.
Figure 4.1: Sex of Respondents in percentage
Figure 4.2: Relationship Between Sex and Leadership Style
4.2.3 Age of Head-Teachers

Figure 4.3 shows that forty one point five percent (41.5%) of the head-teachers were between 30-39 years old, also head-teachers aged between 40-49 were forty one point five Percent (41.5%) only seventeen percent (17%) were above 50 years and above. It was established that most teachers especially above 50 years had attained higher grades therefore had been appointed to the Ministry of Education jobs as quality assurance offices or other sectors.

Table 4.4 shows that head-teachers with less than 30 years were perceived to have a more structured style than those with more than forty years, this study contravene that of Koech (2004) which pointed out that subordinates perceived younger principals to be more democratic in their decision-making process, while older principals were seen as more structured. The study further established that age may affect the head teachers’ memory, understanding and adaptability to extrovert instructional and administrative requirements. As retirement approaches a leader has no interest in school’s physical development. For young head teachers, they may be enthusiastic to improve the existing conditions, have the strength to lobby for funds and services for improvement. Also Williams (1972) investigation on whether age affects the head teachers’ leadership found out that older principals seemed to offer less leadership.
Figure 4.3: Age of Head-teachers
Table 4.4: Age of Head-teachers and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>15 (68%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>22(45.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
<td>22(45.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>9(17.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28 (52.83%)</td>
<td>25 (47.17%)</td>
<td>53 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Qualification of Head-teachers and Leadership Styles

The questionnaire item sought to establish whether leadership styles differed according to qualification of the head-teacher. Figure 4.4 shows that majority 43 (81.1%) of the head-teachers in secondary schools in Kericho County had Bachelor of Education qualifications, with a small percentage 3 (5.7%) having masters in education qualifications and Diploma in Education were 5 (9.4%).

It is clear therefore that majority of the head-teachers had studied up to university level. Head-teachers who had Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts had done post graduate
diploma in education. It was observed that the turnover of head-teachers with masters’ degree is very high as they sought employment in other sectors, while others are promoted to higher post. The study further established that head teachers who remained with their Bachelor of Education qualifications continued in schools as head-teachers headship. This finding contravenes those of Covey (2004), who found out that most head-teachers were masters’ holders.

The study further established that, with the introduction of school-based and parallel degree programmes at the public universities and mushrooming of private universities, most teachers and head-teachers who had diploma qualification seemed to have upgraded their academic level of attainment by furthering their education. Table 4.5 reveals that head-teachers who hold masters degree in education (administration) qualification were rated more democratic than autocratic. This may be attributed to the confidence in their management which probably they studied in administration in the university. On the other hand the S1 and diploma holders were reported to be structured. This may be because they normally feel threatened and as a way of proving their leadership ability they tend to be autocratic.
Figure 4.4 Qualification of Head-teachers
Table 4.5: Qualification of Head-teacher and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Leadership style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autocratic (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED/MA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings also tend to agree with the belief that school performance is related to teachers experience on the job Kihara (1991). This finding further established that the performance of the schools could also be affected by other factors that were not related to teaching experience.
4.2.5 Head-teachers’ Experience and School Performance

Table 4.6 shows the experience of head-teachers in relation to performance in their schools. The information shows that head-teachers with over ten years teaching experience had fared well with a mean score of 6.6(55.6%) in KCSE. The study further established that 45(37.8%) of the respondents had teaching experience of 6-10 years while 0-5 years and above 10 years teaching experience had equal number of responses 37 (31.7). The teaching experience was cross-tabulated with performance to establish the nature of relationship. The chi square tests shows that there was a significant relationship between teaching experience and performance. The null hypothesis was stated as:

**H₀:** There is no significant statistical relationship between teaching experience and academic performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County.

### Table 4.6: Chi-Square Test on teaching experience and academic performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>24.368</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>26.718</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>17.889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 53
From the chi-square statistics in table 4.6, it can be observed that the teaching experience in public secondary schools played a significant role in determining academic performance, $\chi^2 (5, N=53) = 24.368$, \( p = .000 \). The study revealed that \( p < .05 \) thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative claim was held true that there was a statistically significant relationship between the teaching experience and academic performance. This prompted the conclusion that the variables teaching experience and the academic performance were statistically related.

The experience of a person in the field does help to improve his/her efficiency at work since ones length of service improves skills in work performance. This is consistent with Griffins, (1994) who observed that the experience of a person in the field does help to improve his/her efficiency at work since ones length of service improves skills in work performance. Head-teachers who have long experience in the profession are believed to be highly productive especially in administration.
Table 4.7: Head-teachers’ Experience and School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' experience and schools' performance</th>
<th>Performance in KCSE</th>
<th>Teachers' experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 5 (%)</td>
<td>6 – 10 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-4.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5-5.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5-6.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 and above</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invariably look for length of stay as a criterion for selection. However, surely not all leaders, especially the more junior leaders, come packaged with the right leadership style.

Head teachers who had stayed between 5-10 years had fairly good results (62.50%) as compared to those who had stayed for 0-5 years whose results were 12.50%. These findings concur with Griffins (1994) who pointed out clearly that frequent transfer of
head-teachers is counterproductive to a school's performance. These findings may suggest that head-teachers should be encouraged to stay in one school for at least four years.

4.2.6 Head-teachers’ Length of Stay in the Same School and School Performance

Table 4.9 reveals the relationship between the head-teachers’ length of stay in the same school and school performance. It indicated that 30.3% of the respondents had stayed in the same station for over 10 years, 52.94% for between 5-10 years while, 16.81 had stayed between 0-5 years. To gain more insight on the relationship between head teachers’ length of stay in the same school and school performance, a null hypothesis was postulated and tested at 5% level of significance. The null hypothesis was stated as:

\[ H_0: \text{There is no significant statistical relationship between head teachers’ length of stay in the same school and school performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County.} \]

Table 4.8 shows the chi-square test results

| Table 4.8: Chi-Square Tests on head teachers’ length of stay in the same school and school performance |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|----------|
| Pearson Chi-Square                              | 14.365\(^a\) | .006     |
| Likelihood Ratio                                | 14.568 | 4        | .006     |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                    | 9.557  | 1        | .002     |
| N of Valid Cases                                 | 53    |          |          |

\(^{a}\) Chi-Square test is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
From the chi-square statistics in table 4.8, it is observed that the percentage of respondents who were of the view that the length of stay of a head teacher in the same school significantly determined school performance differed from school to school, $\chi^2 (4, N=53) = 14.365, p=.006$. Since the study found that the $p < .05$, the null hypothesis was rejected and conclusion made that there was a significant statistical relationship between the head teachers’ length of stay in the same school and school performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County. The implication of this finding is that the length of stay of a head teacher in the same station significantly influences school performance.

The study shows that the length of time a head teacher has stayed in the same school is helpful in enhancing ones efficiency at the station. One identifies problems in the school and obtains their solutions. It is often the case that leaders are called to perform in difficult or novel situations that require them to act wisely or to improvise and adapt from experience. In fact, leadership itself is an adaptive process. Evidently; leaders who act wisely will be highly valued. Since wisdom is one of the little personal strength that increase with the length of stay in one institution rather than decrease this may explain why when selecting for leaders, recruiters.
Table 4.9: Head-teachers’ Length of Stay in the Same School and School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>0-5 years</th>
<th>5-10 years</th>
<th>Above 10 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-4.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5-5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5---6.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These styles were referred to as one, two, three and four. System two and three represent a leaning towards autocracy or some democracy respectively. In this study, head-teachers were mainly seen as either democratic or autocratic depending on their mean scores. However, Likert and Likert continuum of leadership was followed in the establishment of the head-teacher’s degrees of autocratic (task-oriented behavior) or democratic (relationship oriented). In order to find out whether head-teacher was generally
democratic or autocratic, the scores on the (relationship oriented behavior) and task oriented behavior questionnaire were arranged in four different ranges and a midpoint calculated. An explanation of how the scores in forms LB and OB were arrived is given below.

Form LB had 26 items. The lowest score on the leadership continuum is one while the highest is ‘four’ but was increased to ‘five’ because of the addition of the alternative ‘Never’ on the continuum. In order for any completed questionnaire to be used in the study, all the questions had to be answered. Since there were 26 items on Form LB, a score of one throughout gave a total score of twenty-six. A score of two throughout gave a total of fifty-two scores. The first range of scores which represented system one leadership was therefore 26-51. This procedure was followed until the other three ranges were established. The same system was used to find the ranges on Form OB. Table 4.13 shows the range of scores representing the different systems of leadership on Forms LB and OB. The midpoints of these ranges are also shown in Table 4.10.

4.3 Leadership’s Style Used by Head-teachers of Secondary Schools in Kericho County

This section has four items, which required the head-teachers and teachers respondents to provide information which established the head-teachers’ leadership style and its effects on students’ academic performance. The key question is “what are the effects of the various leadership styles displayed by head-teachers of secondary schools in Kericho
County on KCSE performance?” However before the analyses are presented and discussed, the research question is restated.

4.3.1 The Various Leadership Styles Displayed By Head Teachers of Secondary Schools in Kericho County

An item in the questionnaire was designed and administered to establish the leadership styles of head-teacher in public secondary schools in relationship to KCSE performance. In order to establish the leadership’s style displayed by head-teachers of secondary schools in Kericho County, four styles of leadership were arranged in continuum identified from the profile of own behavior and leadership behavior completed by head-teachers and teachers.

Table 4.10: The Ranges and Midpoints of the scores on Forms LB and OB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System of Leadership</th>
<th>Autocratic style (Task–oriented Behaviour)</th>
<th>Democratic style (Relationship-oriented Behaviour)</th>
<th>Midpoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form LB</strong>*</td>
<td>26-51</td>
<td>78-103</td>
<td>104-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form OB</strong></td>
<td>24-47</td>
<td>72-95</td>
<td>96-120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  * LB-Profile of Leader Behaviors.
**OB-Profile of Own Behaviour
4.3.2 Findings

Examination of data reveals that 474 (44.67%) of teachers perceived their head-teachers’ leadership as autocratic, whereas 586 (55.33%) of the teachers perceived their head-teachers’ leadership styles as democratic. The study observed that the prevalent leadership style exhibited by head-teachers in Kericho County was democratic.

The finding further indicated that, there was no significant difference in perception of the head- teachers’ leadership style as rated by both the head-teachers and teachers. The view that no conflict arose may have been because head- teachers were unwilling to rate themselves in any other way other than democratic. This tend to agree with Ochieng (2001) who argues that head- teachers only indicates the right answer to the questionnaire rather than what they actually felt there was their true leadership styles Dou (1972:21) and Ngugi (1982) as quoted by Asundah (1982), also revealed that teachers perceived their head-teachers leadership style as democratic.

This study further shows that a democratic leadership style has been long acknowledged as an essential ingredient in the quest for better schools. In characterizing successful schools, researchers commonly list five school-level factors, which include collaborative planning/colllegial work and parental/community Participation (Sagimo 2002) assert that “high levels of parental involvement and support, collaborative collegial instructional planning, individual school autonomy and the resulting flexibility” are effective school Characteristics that justify the implementation of participatory governance. It should be noted, however, that attempts to involve stakeholders should be geared beyond mere
participation but towards meaningful involvement. Bolman and Deal (2000) confirm that involving teachers in decision-making and implementation yields salutary results.

**Figure 4.5: Teachers' and Head-teachers perception of Head-teachers**

**4.3.3 Students Academic Performance in K.C.S.E and Autocratic Leadership**

The study revealed that out of 1060 respondents, 10.5% rated their head-teachers as autocratic leaders. Their KCSE mean score was 3.808 out of the expected 12.

The comparison of data showing the relationship between students’ academic performance and the head-teachers autocratic leadership is shown on figure 4.6. Examination of data reveals that poor academic performance was attributed to head-teachers who were rated as autocratic leaders.
The finding concur with MC Gregory’s theory as quoted by Okumbe (1999) which posit that employees;

- Are lazy
- Dislike work and like avoiding it.
- Therefore they must be coerced in order to do it.
- Avoid responsibilities and so will seek to be led.
- Are self – centered in that they place security above all other factors?

Hence the only way that management can make employees to achieve high performance is coerce, control and even threaten them. Such head-teachers struggle to be more task-oriented. But they receive a lot of resistance from teachers who have received similar training and academic qualifications. Further still, this lowers their commitment and creativity. Most teachers opposed autocratic style and attribute it to poor KCSE result.
Figure 4.6: Students’ Academic Performance in K.C.S.E and autocratic Leadership
4.3.4 Students’ Academic Performance in K.C.S.E and Democratic Leadership

The comparison of data showing the relationship between students’ academic performance in K.C.S.E and Democratic leadership style (relationship-oriented Behaviour). Gone are the days when the principal unilaterally decides everything: what is to be taught, what is to be tested, who is to be hired, and how the budget is to be spent. Today, teachers seek to be treated with professional respect. They want to be consulted on matters that affect their classroom and the school as a whole, since they too operate under high-stakes accountability (Wango 2010).

The study revealed that a well accepted practice today is to seek the input of those who are closest to the learning process and are most familiar with students and the staff. Effective head-teachers have learned to trust the judgment of the staff. Such a relationship can inspire and motivate. Principals who have not learned to share leadership may find a staff that has lost confidence in their own abilities or act in isolation. Both results are counterproductive to results.

The effect of delegation and school performance is shown in table 4.9. The table shows that 27(40.7%) of the respondent whose head-teachers frequently delegated their work had a mean score of 4.5-5.4, while 6(17.1%), had a mean score of between 5.5-6.4 in K.C.S.E. Only two respondents from schools which had a mean score of between 5.5-6.4, indicated that they were never delegated any duties by their head-teachers. The finding shows that head teachers did delegate but not sufficiently enough to involve all the
teachers. Most head-teachers did occasionally delegated duties as there was a high percent of delegate in all categories. In order to establish the significance of this relationship between the frequency of delegation and performance, a hypothesis was formulated and tested as follows:

**H0: There is no significant statistical relationship between the frequency of delegation of responsibilities by head teachers and school performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County.**

In order to establish the truth of this hypothesis, a chi-square test was run at the .05 level of significance. The results of this finding are presented in table 4.11

**Table 4.11: Chi-Square Test on frequency of delegation and school performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.860$^a$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.714</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>7.864</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N of Valid Cases | 53 |

From the chi-square statistics in table 4.11, it is observed that the percentage of the frequency of delegation of responsibilities by head teachers did not differ significantly on the basis of school categories and school performance, $\chi^2_5 (N=53) = 9.860$, $p=.047$. Since the study results indicate that $p < .05$ the null hypothesis was rejected and a
conclusion made that the variables delegation of responsibilities and the school performance were statistically related. This implies that both men and women had a significant role to play in any phase of project development a distinct discrimination on the basis of gender. This shows that the relationship between frequency of delegation of responsibilities by head teachers and school performance was statistically significant and hence the null hypothesis was rejected. Any disparity as noticed from table 4.11 can be attributed to chance error and the implication of this finding is that the null hypothesis was rejected and therefore a failure to confirm the claim that there is no statistically significant relationship between the frequency of delegation of responsibilities by head teachers and school performance in public secondary schools in Kericho County.

Therefore there is an indication that school performance is significantly depended on whether the head-teacher delegated duty or not as this shows that the head-teacher had a lot of confidence in their teachers. These results concur with those of Moller and Pankate (2006) which established that schools supervision is made more effective when the head-teacher is effectively supported by his staff members.

The result further established that the democratic leaders strive to motivate their workers; this is shown on Table 4.13. The data reveals that only 221 (20.8%) respondents indicated that they were always motivated by their head-teachers; while a total of 582 (54.9%) indicated that they were dissatisfied with their schools motivation. These findings are in agreement with Mbithi (1974) that head-teachers need to realize that their major task include among others is to motivate their staff in order to produce good results.
This can be achieved by providing tea during break and giving subsidized lunch. Staff houses should likewise be availed at subsidized rates, as this will improve teachers’ productivity since they will be available to students. Academic trips, especially in recognition of the teachers’ effort will also lead to improvement in performance.

Motivation in school should not necessarily be through monetary rewards but also involves proper use of verbal praise and other non–monetary reward such as presentation of presents. The study further established that most head-teachers have not realized the importance of motivating teachers, there is therefore need for change of attitude amongst the head-teachers towards teachers’ motivation.

Table 4.12: Frequency of delegation and school Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Performance</th>
<th>3-3.4</th>
<th>3.5-4.04</th>
<th>4.45-5.5</th>
<th>6 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>40.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>82.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13 Motivation of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Offering of presents reward (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 Comparison between Performance in K.C.S.E in Autocratic and Democratic Styles

Examination of the data revealed that good academic performance was attributed to leaders who were rated as using a mixture of Autocratic (task-oriented) and Democratic (relationship-oriented) style of leadership. Out of 1060 teachers, 13.30% rated their head-teachers’ as both exhibiting autocratic (task-oriented) and democratic (relationship oriented) styles of leadership.

The K.C.S.E average mean score (2002-2011) was 6.938. (See table 4.14). These findings are in agreement with Kihara (1992) who found that those schools that held position 1-5 in County KCSE ranking throughout the past five years had their head-teachers scoring high in both initiating structures and consideration dimensions. In
addition Eshiswani (1990) is also supportive of the current study which indicated that effective leader behavior was associated with high performances on both initiating structure and consideration dimension. One may therefore argue that those head-teachers whose schools performed well may have had interacted with members of the community outside school life in different activities hence may have acquired skills in dealing with people.

**Table 4.14 Students’ Academic Performance in K.C.S.E versus A Mixture of Autocratic and Democratic Leadership Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Both Autocratic and Democratic leadership styles</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K.C.S.E Mean Score 2002-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Londian Girls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>7.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabianga Boys</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>7.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kericho High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>7.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kipsigis Girls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>6.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiot Girls</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>6.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>6.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delunga (2000) states that School managers have, through experience, come to terms with the fact that the adoption of a particularly relevant style in a specific situation leads to school effectiveness, rather than relying on a single style of one’s choice. The participants revealed that leadership is dictated by environmental changes within and
outside the School. At one time, students may be so unruly and militant that it requires the head of schools to use strict measures of discipline so as to improve their academic performance. However, in another development students may be so committed and focused that it may require being liberal minded to allow participative leadership to prevail. Of course, this depends on the changes in the situation of the school. This is also corroborated by Koech (2004) who asserts that the relationship between school performance and leadership style is moderated by the situational factors.

4.4 School Enrollment and Head- teachers’ Leadership Styles

In this study small schools are those schools with enrollment of less than hundred students; medium schools are these schools with between one hundred to three hundred students while large schools are those with over three hundred students.

4.4.1 Small Schools and Medium Schools

The comparison between teachers’ perceptions of head-teachers’ leadership styles in small and medium scale school was considered are shown in Table 4.15. A t-test was used to establish whether there was a significant difference in the mean perception of head teachers’ and teachers leadership styles between small and medium schools. In order to be able to carry out this test, a hypothesis was postulated and tested. The hypothesis tested was stated as:

\[ H_0: \text{There is no significant statistical difference in the mean perception of head teachers and teachers’ leadership styles between small and medium schools in public secondary schools in Kericho County.} \]
The T-test model used to test this hypothesis was:

\[ H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

where \( \mu_1 \) and \( \mu_2 \) represent the mean perception of head teachers and teachers leadership styles in small and medium schools respectively.

The results of this analysis are given in Table 4.15.

**Table 4.15: Teachers’ Perceptions of Head-teachers’ Leadership Styles in Medium and Large Scale Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Population Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium-scale schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale schools</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.16: T-test on Mean perception on leadership styles in small and medium schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t \)-critical (df=2,51, \( t \)= 1.96, \( p \leq 0.05 \)); \( t \)-calculated (df=2,51, \( t \)= 0.688 \( p=0.90 \))

The results in Table 4.15 show the \( t \)-test results of \( t \)-critical= 1.96 \( > t \)-calculated=0.437 and \( p \)-value=0.900 which is greater than 0.05 hence the null hypothesis (\( H_0 \)) is accepted. Consequently, the conclusion therefore indicates that the difference in leadership styles perception were not significant. These results suggest that on average of the head teachers leadership styles for small and medium schools as perceived by teachers were near similar for public schools in Kericho County. Examination of the findings revealed no significant difference was found between teachers’ perceptions of head-teachers’ leadership styles in small and medium scale schools. There was no statistical difference
between teachers’ perceptions of head-teachers leadership style in small and medium scale school. These finding are in contrast with Asundah (1983) who found out that head-teachers in small schools were perceived as autocratic by most of their teachers. The discrepancy could be attributed to the fact that head-teachers in such schools were mostly female. One may also argue that head-teachers in small schools knew their entire teaching staff well, hence no conflict arose.

Figure 4.7: Teachers’ Perceptions of Head-teachers Leadership Styles in Small and Medium Scale School.
The difference could be attributed to the large population hence head-teachers in these schools had to delegate responsibilities to most of the teachers further still; those head teachers had enough finance to use to motivate their teachers.
4.4.2 Teachers’ Perception of Head teachers’ Leadership’s Styles in Small and Large Schools

There were no statistically significant differences between teachers’ perceptions of head-teachers’ leadership styles in small and large schools. (See table 4.15). Those findings concur with Ochieng (2001) but differ from Asundah (1983) that head-teachers in medium size schools perceived themselves as very democratic. The discrepancy could be attributed to the fact that head-teachers in these schools do not have to delegate responsibilities as much as those in large schools. Furthermore, there are much more interpersonal interactions between the head teachers and teachers in such schools. One may also argue that head-teachers in their schools knew their teachers well, hence no conflicts is expected.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will focus on findings of the study, conclusions drawn from these finding, and the subsequent recommendations. All these are derived from the data collected using head-teachers’ and teachers’ questionnaire. The adopted approach in this presentation was thematic, where the first objective, and research question are considered, then the findings are presented, followed by the relevant conclusion and the recommendation.

5.2 The Summary of Findings

The head-teacher leadership style of schools is the major determinant of the ability to attain its stated educational goals. The study has established the effect of leadership on academic performance. The statistical data indicated that poor K.C.S.E performance was attributed to autocratic leaders.

This type of leaders believes that the only way that management can make employees to achieve high performance is coerce, control and threaten. Such head-teachers struggle to be more task-oriented. But they receive a lot of resistance from teachers who have received similar training and academic qualifications. This lowers the teachers’ commitment and creativity. Most teachers opposed autocratic style and attribute it to poor KCSE result.
Average performance in KCSE was attributed to head-teachers who were rated as democratic leaders. The researcher established that good performance attributed to combination of both autocratic and democratic leadership style. Kihara (1991) also found out that those primary schools that held position 1-5 throughout the previous seven years had their head-teachers scoring high in both initiating structure and consideration. The head-teacher is expected to take a lead in establishing aims for his school. Most teachers were of the opinion that the head should set the direction of the school. But should also offer their staff a chance to contribute to goal setting and decision-making. The dominant leadership style exhibited by public secondary schools head teachers in Kericho County was democratic. Out of the 1060 teachers 44.67% rated their head teachers leadership style as autocratic, where as 55.33% were for democratic style.

There was statistical significant difference between male and female teachers’ perception of their principals, leadership styles. Male-teachers were rated higher (64%) than female (24%). This difference could be attributed to the fact that most women leaders tend to struggle to disapprove the notion that women are inferior leaders. In their effort to prove themselves to the society and their superiors, the female head-teacher may end up more autocratic than democratic.

There was statistically significant different between teachers aged bellow 30 years and those above 49. Age may affect head-teachers’ memory, understanding and adaptability to extrovert instructional and administrative requirements. As retirement approaches a leader has no interest in school’s physical development. For young head-teachers, they
may be enthusiastic to improve the existing conditions, have the strength to lobby for funds and services for improvement. Also Williams (1972) investigation on whether age affects the head-teachers leadership found out that older principals seemed to offer less leadership. There was no statistically significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of head teachers’ leadership styles in small and medium school. This would be attributed to the fact that head teachers’ in such schools were mostly unqualified and thus temporary employed and poorly paid.

5.3 Conclusion

From the foregoing findings, the research arrived at the following conclusions:

Leadership style affects greatly students’ academic performance. Poor academic performance in K.C.S.E performance was attributed to autocratic leaders. Most teachers viewed autocratic style negatively, it demoralizes their efforts. Average performance in KCSE was attributed to head-teachers who were rated as democratic leaders.

The researcher concluded that good performance was attributed to combination of both autocratic and democratic leadership styles. Those schools that held position One to ten in KCSE performance throughout the past seven years had their head-teachers scoring high in both initiating structure and consideration. It appears from the findings that the dominant leadership style exhibited by public secondary schools in Kericho County was democratic. Gender affects leadership styles of head-teachers in secondary schools. It appears from the study that age affects leadership styles in secondary schools. There were
no statistically significant differences between teachers’ perceptions of head-teachers’ leadership styles in small and large schools.

5.4 Summary of main Conclusions

The following are the main conclusions:

1. The dominant leadership style exhibited by public secondary schools in Kericho County was democratic.

2. Gender and age affects leadership styles in secondary schools.

3. There was no statistically significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of head-teachers’ leadership styles in small and large schools.

4. Leadership style affects greatly students’ academic performance. Poor academic performance in K.C.S.E was attributed to autocratic leaders. Most teachers viewed autocratic style negatively, it demoralizes their efforts.

5. Average performance in KCSE was attributed to head-teachers who were rated as democratic leaders.

6. Good performance was attributed to combination of both autocratic and democratic leadership styles. Those schools that held position One to ten in KCSE performance throughout the past seven years had their head-teachers scoring high in both initiating structure and consideration.
5.5 Recommendation

From the foregoing the research made the following recommendations:

- For good performance a combination of both autocratic and democratic leadership styles should be applied by head-teachers depending on the situation they are faced with.
- Head-teachers need to be assisted in acquiring the modern necessary management skills.
- All Head teachers need to be updated through comprehensive in service courses on leadership in institutions like Kenya Education Staff Institutes.
- The ratio of female head teaches should be increased to achieve gender equity.
- Young teachers who qualify to be appointed as head-teachers should be considered as they are enthusiastic to improve the existing conditions in schools.
- There should be optimum teacher student ratio as this is will ensure effective personal attention to students.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Research

The study makes the following recommendations for further research:

1. A similar study should be carried out in different geographical regions, especially an urban setting, to investigate the actual and preferred leadership styles of head-teachers in both urban and rural setting.
2. A comparative study should be conducted in private schools to provide a comparison between private and public schools.

3. There is need to study other factors not related to school management such as discipline, learners entry behavior and teachers ratio and their impacts on performance.

4. Further research on leadership and factors that influence leadership should be carried out.
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APPENDIX B

HEAD-TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly answer the following questions. There is no right or wrong answers. The researcher would like to assure you that information gathered will be kept confidential and used strictly for the purpose of this research only. However the usefulness of the information to the researcher will solely depend on your honesty. Thanks in advance.

A. Background information

Please tick (√) where appropriate or fill in information as necessary.

Personal data

i) sex: 1. Male ( ) 2. female ( )

ii) Your age: 1. 20-29 ( )
   2. 30-39 ( )
   3. 40-49 ( )
   4. 50 and above ( )

iii) Indicate your highest academic/profession qualification.

1. MED ( )
2. BED ( )
3. DIP IN EDUCATION ( )

4. S1 ( )

IV) For how long have you taught?

1. 0-5 years ( )

2. 6-10 years ( )

3. Above 10 years ( )

v) Type of schools:
1. Boys Boarding ( )
2. Girls Boarding ( )
3. Mixed Day ( )
4. Mixed Boarding ( )
5. Girls Day ( )
6. Boys Day ( )

C. PROFILE OF OWN BEHAVIOUR

Please indicate your answer to each question by ticking (√)

Answer sheet for head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extend do you feel that you:</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Very great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Are friendly and easy to talk to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Listen well to others whether you agree or disagree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Encourage others to express their ideas fully and frankly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expect others to do their very best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Think what you and the members of staff are doing is important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Encourage staff to bring new changes as well as creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are willing to take risks (E.g trying new ideas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accept that you are capable of making mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Allow members of staff to question your views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Use &quot;we&quot; and &quot;our&quot; rather than &quot;I&quot; then or &quot;my&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Give credit and recognition generously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Avoid imposing a decision upon group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>State points of views of others as well disagree, or better than they can ever thought you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encourage others to express their feeling Frankly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Display confidence and trust in others whether or not you agree with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Share information frankly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Expect a high quality job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>Are not defensive when criticized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>Avoid treating others in a condescending (patronizing) manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>Avoid being impatient with the progress being made by the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>Avoid dominating the discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>Encourage members of the staff to work through disagreement by not suppressing Them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>Show no favorites, treat all members equally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>Accepts small blame than may be warranted for any failure or mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>States the points of views of others as well or better than can even though he/she disagrees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>Expect a high quality job from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX C

TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly answer the following questions. There is no right or wrong answers. The researcher would like to assure you that information gathered will be kept confidential and used strictly for the purpose of this research only. However the usefulness of the information to the researcher will solely depend on your honesty. Thanks in advance.

A. background information

Please tick (√) where appropriate or fill in information as necessary.

Personal data

i) Sex: 1. Male ( ) 2. Female ( )

ii) Your age: 1. 20-29 ( )

1. 30-39 ( )

2. 40-49 ( )

3. 50 and above ( )

iii) Indicate your highest academic/profession qualification.

1. MED ( )

2. BED ( )
3. DIP IN EDUCATION

4. S1

iv) For how long have you taught?

1. 0-5 years
2. 6-10 years
3. Above 10 years

v) Type of schools:

1. Boys Boarding
2. Girls Boarding
3. Mixed Day
4. Mixed Boarding
5. Girls Day
6. Boys Day

C. PROFILE OF OWN BEHAVIOUR

Please indicate your answer to each question by ticking (√)

Answer sheet for teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never - Rare - Sometimes - Considerate - Very great</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extend do you feel that your head teacher;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is friendly and easy to talk to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Listen well to others whether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you agree or disagree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Encourage others to express their ideas fully and frankly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expect other to do their very best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Think what you and the members of staff are doing is important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Encourage staff to bring new changes as well as creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are willing to take risks (E.g trying new ideas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accept that you are capable of making mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Allow members of staff to question your views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Use &quot;we&quot; and &quot;our&quot; rather than &quot;I&quot; then or &quot;my&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Give credit and recognition generously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Avoid imposing a decision upon group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>State points of views of others as well or better than they can ever thought you disagree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encourage others to express their feeling Frankly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Display confidence and trust in others whether or not you agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Share information frankly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Expect a high quality job from yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Are not defensive when criticized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Avoid treating others in a condescending (patronizing) manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Avoid being impatient with the progress being made by the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Avoid dominating the discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Encourage members of the staff to work through disagreement by not suppressing Them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Show no favorites, treat all members equally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Accepts small blame than may be warranted for any failure or mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>States the points of views of others as well or better than can even though he/she disagrees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Expect a high quality job from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
HEADTEACHERS INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Please you are requested to give the most appropriate response to the best of your knowledge. The information required of you is intended for this research and shall not be used negatively. Confidentiality is guaranteed

PART 1

Experience in the office as a principal---------

Gender ---------Age----------------

Teaching Experiences------------------

Qualifications--------------------------

Academic-----------------------------

Professions---------------------------

PART II

1. a). Have you attended any Educational Management Courses?

   b). If Yes, what were the main focus in the courses?

2. a) What do you consider to be the main focus mission of your school?

   b). As the head teachers how often do you provide resources to both teachers and learners to meet the school mission?
3. a). Which method of supervision do you use

Own       ( )

Group     ( )

b). If group supervision, which other people do you use apart from yourself?

4. In the school organization, how often do you avoid delays in the provision of teaching learning materials?

5. a) Who sets the performance goals in your school?

b) How does the school strive to achieve these goals?

6. a) Are the school staffs and learners aware of school policies?

b) How often do you conduct staff meetings?

c) Do you often consider the contribution of your teachers for implementations in such meetings?

d) In your opinion that factors contributes to the unsatisfactory performance in KCSE in the district

e) What suggestions can you give to improve performance in KCSE?

7. a) What roles does your BOG/PTA play in the better performance of the school?

b) How effective is the BOG and PTA in committing itself towards improved performance of the school?
8.  a) How do you delegate duties in your school?

   b) In your opinion is the delegation effective?

9.  a) How often do you commit funds for your teachers staff development programs seminars and workshops?

   b) Have all your teachers at least attended such programs?

   c) How do you gauge the performance of your school in KCSE?

      Excellent  (  )

      Very good  (  )

      Good  (  )

      Satisfactory  (  )

      Poor  (  )
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library Nakuru branch</td>
<td>Kenya national Library services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Library/documentation centres
Dear Principals

RE: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

I am a Student Undertaking a Study “An Appraisal Of Head Teachers’ Leadership style on students’ academic Performance” in Moi University. Questionnaires for you and your teachers have been developed for this purpose.

Your school has been identified to take part in this study. It is hoped that the finding will help in improvement KCSE performance. The administration of the of teaching and learning of the Questionnaires may last about one hour

Thanks you in advance for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully

Mbera Peter
## APPENDIX I

### SUMMARY OF FIFTEEN SECONDARY SCHOOL K.C.S.E MEAN SCORE

**2004-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Londiani Girls</td>
<td>6.842</td>
<td>7.793</td>
<td>7.793</td>
<td>7.647</td>
<td>7.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kericho Boys</td>
<td>6.145</td>
<td>7.064</td>
<td>7.841</td>
<td>7.083</td>
<td>7.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Girls</td>
<td>5.262</td>
<td>6.030</td>
<td>6.432</td>
<td>5.989</td>
<td>5.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliat Boys</td>
<td>4.657</td>
<td>5.781</td>
<td>5.531</td>
<td>5.723</td>
<td>5.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taita Towet mixed</td>
<td>4.0375</td>
<td>4.487</td>
<td>4.727</td>
<td>4.732</td>
<td>4.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chepseon mixed</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>4.442</td>
<td>4.553</td>
<td>4.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kericho day</td>
<td>4.136</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>4.559</td>
<td>4.480</td>
<td>4.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi Sitotwet</td>
<td>3.178</td>
<td>3.911</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.227</td>
<td>3.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murao day</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>5.429</td>
<td>4.173</td>
<td>4.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapsigirio</td>
<td>3.476</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>3.190</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>3.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chepsir</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.911</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>3.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barsiele day</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.786</td>
<td>3.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: District education office
## APPENDIX J

### TOTAL SCORES FOR PROFILE OF OWN BEHAVIOUR

**FORM OB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Autocratic leadership style</th>
<th>Democratic leadership style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

**School code**

1. Londian Girls Boarding Secondary School
2. Kabianga Boys Boarding Secondary School
3. Kericho Boys S Boarding secondary School

8. Taita Towett Mixed Boarding Secondary.


20. Kaitui Mixed Day Secondary School


22. Kaborok mixed Day Secondary school

23. Chepsion Complex Mixed Boarding Secondary School

24. Kimasian Day Secondary School

25. Chebigen Mixed Boarding Secondary

26. Musaria mixed Day Secondary School

27. Gettube mixed Day Secondary School

28. Momoniat mixed Day Secondary school

29. Kapcheluch Mixed Boarding Secondary School

30. Kipteris Girl Day Secondary School

31. Kiptere Mixed Boarding Secondary School

32. Kasheen Mixed Boarding Secondary School

33. Chagaik Day Secondary School

34. Kipchimchim Mixed Day Secondary School

35. Lesirwo Mixed Day Secondary School

36. Chepsion Mixed Boarding Secondary School
37. Kericho Day Secondary School

38. Moi Tea Girls Boarding School


42. Kakibei Mixed Boarding Secondary School


44. Anamoi mixed Day Secondary School


46. Kenegut mixed Day Secondary School

47. Kaborok Mixed Boarding Secondary School

48. Kabsoit Mixed Boarding Secondary School

49. Ngenye Kaborok Mixed Boarding Secondary School


51. Poiywek Mixed Day Secondary School

52. Tendeno Mixed Day Secondary School.

53. Barak Day Secondary School

Source: D.E.O Kericho
LIST OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KERICHO DISTRICT

**Provincial Schools**
Kabianga Boys Secondary  
Kericho Boys Secondary  
Moi tea Girls Secondary  
Kipsigis Girls Secondary  
Sosiot Girls Secondary  
Londiani Girls Secondary  
Cheptenye Boys Secondary

**District Schools**
Soliat Boys Secondary  
Chemamul Secondary  
Chagaik Secondary  
Kericho Tea Secondary  
Kericho day Secondary  
Lelu Secondary  
Kipchimchim Secondary  
Taita Towett Mixed Secondary  
Polywek Secondary  
Chilchila Secondary  
Kakibei Secondary  
Chepkosilen Secondary  
Kimasian Secondary
Kunyak Secondary
Moi Sitotwet Secondary
Murao Secondary
Getumbe Secondary
Koiwalelach Girls Secondary
Kenegut Secondary
Kapcheluch Secondary
Kaborok Secondary
Kapmaso Secondary
Barsiele Secondary
Singoronik Secondary
Singor High Secondary
Moi Kipsitet Girls Secondary
Mipsolu Secondary
Moi Sorget Day Secondary
Kipsolu Day Secondary
Moi s Sorget Secondary
Kipsolu Secondary
Kabakyek Secondary

Source: D.E.O Kericho