



# **Participation in Decision Making and Leadership Style as Determinants of Teachers Productivity in Mission Secondary Schools in Delta State**

<sup>1</sup>Raphael Aruoture Ayoro & <sup>2</sup>Victoria C. Onyeike (Ph.D.)

**Department of Educational Management,  
Faculty of Education  
University of Port Harcourt,  
Rivers State, Nigeria  
<sup>1</sup>08032989383; <sup>2</sup>08033418420**

## **ABSTRACT**

This study investigated participation in decision making and leadership style as determinants of teacher's productivity in Mission Secondary Schools in Delta State. Two objectives, two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. Correlational design was adopted in the study while the population of the study consisted of all the 1,188 school personnel which included 114 vice principals and 1,073 teachers in the 40 mission schools in Delta State. The sample size of the study was 668 school personnel which included 114 vice principals and 549 teachers who were selected for the study through stratified random sampling technique. The instrument used for data collection was questionnaire which was titled Decision Making and Leadership Styles Scale, (DMLSS)" and Teachers' Productivity Scale (TPS) which were face and content validated by Measurement and evaluation experts in the University of Port Harcourt. The reliability of the instrument was determined through split-half reliability test and coefficients of Decision Making and Leadership Styles Scale and Teachers' Productivity Scale were 0.75 and 0.72 respectively. Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics was used to answer the research questions while regression analysis of variance was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. It was found out in the findings of the study that participation in decision as well as leadership styles have a low positive and high positive relationship of  $r=0.09$  and  $r=0.90$  respectively with teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State. Based on this finding, it was recommended that principals should learn to delegate responsibilities based on specialization to promote teacher's productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State.

**Keywords:** Decision Making, Leadership Styles, Teachers Productivity, Mission Secondary Schools, Delta State

## **INTRODUCTION**

Job productivity of employees remains an issue of incredible concern to numerous organizations such as school. According to Doneely (2012), job productivity is concerned with the general adequacy and effectiveness of completing things. It gives an indication of how an organization is fairing. The idea of job productivity can be seen from numerous points of view like financial, industry and administration. According to Nwachukwu (2016), job productivity is the output, resulting from a given resources input at a given time. Mali (2015) described job productivity as achieving the top of productivity with minimal use of assets. Job productivity in this manner is a basic element in financial advancement as it legitimizes immense use by the association and has numerous other helpful impacts. So, it can be concluded that job productivity involves accomplishing more with less assets, making more from what you have preferably more smart than harder, it is basic to look at the different method for empowering job productivity in our prompt society.

Decision-making is the process of identifying and choosing between alternatives based on values and preferences. Nobert (2006) believes that the control of a system is through the use of feedback from the environment. He defined a system as a means of appreciating how organization parts interact with their environment. Decisions made affect all parts in a system. In a system, planning is very important, as it helps to simplify decision-making process and also provides guidelines for goals to be achieved. For effective decisions to be made, every role player in the system needs to participate at one level or the other (Omobude and Igbudu, 2012).

Involvement of teachers in decision-making is very imperative as they are the life wire of teaching and learning in secondary schools, missionary schools inclusive. Unimplemented decisions are very irritating and may lead to lack of teachers' job productivity. It is therefore very important to determine whether teachers are involved in decision-making and if decisions reached are adequately implemented. Butter (2012) noted that teachers are being marginalized when compared with those in other professions when it comes to decision-making. It appears that teachers are not involved in decision-making or their decisions are not adequately implemented hence they are not satisfied with their jobs. Mark (2011) has noted that principals take decisions all alone without involving the teachers. Perry (2012) remarked that decision-making is the process of choosing from two or more options that best suit a particular situation requiring altered action.

Tanfox (2010) is of the view that starting with the teacher can approach the curriculum improvement function of supervisor of a school, it is surprising that these wonderful teachers are mere technicians who only need to heed to the construction of programmed materials, and professional decisions are made without involving the teachers who carry out the implementation. The consequence is poor performance of the teachers and observable falling standard of education in the system. It appears that teachers are not involved in decision making in their schools. Ako (2011) opined that lack of involvement of teachers in decision-making leads to resistance of orders and poor performance of teachers. Ako also noted that teachers are not involved in decision-making in the area of the study.

There are lots of tensions and conflicts in secondary schools today possibly as a result of lack of involvement of teachers in decision-making in schools or those who would help to implement the decisions are not given any thought. Okunamiri and Uba-Mbibi (2011) highlights that; the problem with Nigerian educational system is not on decision-making formulation but in the implementation of decisions. According to Perry (2012) there are cases of school principals either taking decisions alone or handpicking teachers whom they consider as their favourites to assist them in taking decisions. This invariably means that involving teachers in matters concerning teachers' matters (welfare) are not encouraged.

School leadership is the process of enlisting and guiding the talents and energies of teachers, students and parents towards achieving common educational aims. The term school leadership came into currency in the 20<sup>th</sup> century for several reasons (Aacha, 2010). Demands were made on schools for higher level of pupil's achievements, and schools were expected to improve and reform. These expectations were accompanied by calls for accountability at the school level. Maintenance and status quo was no longer considered acceptable. Administration and management are terms that connect stability through the exercise of control and supervision. Hoadley (2007) adds that the principal or school head is commonly thought to be the school leader, however school leadership may include other persons such as members of a formal leadership team and other persons who contribute towards the aims of the school.

Teachers' job performances are the duties performed by a teacher at a particular period in the school system in achieving organizational goals. Principals can therefore encourage effective performance of their teachers by identifying their needs and trying to satisfy or meet them. How effective the principal is in performing these roles has been a matter of concern to many educationists (Aghenta, 2010). Research shows that many principals do not consider their leadership styles as crucial in the teachers' job productivity. Hence some of them seem to find it difficult to effectively administer their schools (Adeyemi, 2010). It is argued that effective leadership has a positive influence on the teachers' productivity (Charlton, 2010). However, some principals are not effective in their leadership styles because they do not involve the teachers in major decision-making. In highly performing schools, which

have reversed the trend of poor performance and declining achievement, the head teacher sets the pace leading and motivating pupils and staff to perform to their highest potential (Bush and Oduro, 2006).

In the United States of America for example, school leadership or educational leadership has become a popular replacement for educational administration. In recent years, leadership arguably represents only a partial picture of the work of the school, division or district and ministerial or state education agency personnel (Goldman, 2008). Anglo-American schools are led by principals. In addition, school leadership includes level-specific principals (pre-primary, primary, lower and upper secondary classes), assistant or vice-principals dealing with various school specific duties and head teachers in charge of subject departments. Also, in South Africa, schools vary enormously, with some being extremely well resourced and in others there is a total breakdown in the culture of teaching and learning.

Nsubuga (2008) found that in Uganda the training teachers and head teachers undergo does not prepare them adequately for leadership roles; the head teachers lacked management and leadership skills; there was no relationship between the head teachers number of years in service and school performance; there is a disjointed relationship between the training received by head teachers from the universities and teacher training colleges, and the performance requirements in the schools. Most of the schools did not have strategic plans with clearly articulated vision and mission statements. For the few schools, which had visions, mission and strategic plans, the teachers and other key stakeholders were not involved in the process of developing them; the study established that there is a strong positive relationship between the leadership style and school performance.

Citing Kenya, Kimeu, (2010) stated that supervision of primary school teachers is the duty of the Head teacher. The ministry of Education instructs that head teachers have a role to supervise teachers by ensuring that: lessons are planned early; lessons are structured with an interesting beginning; revision of previous knowledge and teachers' use of voice variation and summary of major points at the end; teachers use backups/teaching aids properly; teachers have a good relationship with their students and teachers follow up the curriculum strictly. Education stakeholders in Kenya have very high expectations of public secondary school principals because they believe that the success of a school is measured in terms of good performance in national examinations and the person responsible for this is the principal (Kingori, 2013).

Mwangi (2013) states that school leadership has become more complex as curricular demands have grown. Parental, governmental expectations and demand for greater school effectiveness have been raised. Appointment to school leadership in Kenya has undergone several phases. Initially principals were appointed on recommendation by the stakeholders. Later their appointment was based on seniority and currently it is based on merit where they have to be interviewed before appointment. Mwangi (2013) explains further that after graduation from colleges with diplomas or degrees in education, teachers are posted to various public secondary schools in the country by the Teachers Service Commission. Their promotion to leadership depends on their seniority and performance.

School principals may adopt different leadership styles such as directive, supportive, participative and democratic leadership which suit a particular situation. According to Bunmi (2007) directive leadership involves a leader who gives subordinates task instructions including what is expected of them, how the task is to be done, time for task completion and that the leader sets clear standards of performance, makes rules and regulations clear to subordinates. It is more like autocratic leadership style. Autocratic leadership leaders alone determine policy and make plans. They tell their subordinates what to do and how to do them. Power is centralized only to the leader, workers under the leader have little freedom, and he shows greater concern for work than for his/her worker. In fostering this, Bunmi (2007) pointed out that autocratic leaders were very directive and do not allow participation in decision-makings. They structured the complete work situation for their subordinates. The autocratic leader directs group members on the way things should be done. The leader does not maintain clear channel of communication between him/her and the subordinates. He or she does not delegate authority nor permit subordinates to participate in policy-making (Olaniyan, 2007).

Daresh (2011) opines that there are still many school heads who administer their schools based on the classic management model. He observes that these head teachers practice the autocratic leadership style

with formal procedures, neglecting the teachers' psychological needs. Such leaders suppress the teachers' creativity, overly emphasizing on academic achievement and putting aside their roles as leaders who have to generate quality human capital for the purpose of education development (Chan Yuen Fook, 2009). There are situations which call for directive leadership. It is suitable where there is amongst followers within a group a high degree of task interdependence in which they must co-ordinate their activities with others in order to achieve a high level of performance. Directive leadership is not only used with followers who have an external locus of control but is also used for brief periods of time with those who have an internal locus of control and are in high stress situations such as military exercises or in emergency rooms of hospitals. Secondly, a directive style of leadership is used where there is a need for direct communication between the leader and followers or between followers and a community service being offered.

Furthermore, it works when followers are new at their jobs and need guidance from the leader about effective work methods and the leader is the one who has the expertise. The directive style of leadership is welcome as a means of completing the task where followers have a high need for achievement. Directive leadership is an effective strategy in reducing bureaucracy and stress levels within an organization. Keys (2011) adds that directive leadership increases follower's job satisfaction. This brings structure and direction, which is particularly relevant if the work environment is not highly structured or if the organization is going through transformational change. It clarifies the follower's role. This results in a higher performance and productivity from followers and improved departmental effectiveness. When directive leadership is combined with supportive leadership, it reduces stress and burn-out levels as well as turnover amongst followers. It increases group cohesion, a strong 'we' feeling amongst members. Felt-closeness is often reported amongst group members. Based on clear expectations, followers develop a stronger focus and motivation to achieve the organization's mission and vision.

Supportive leadership style refers to being friendly and approachable as a leader and includes attending to wellbeing and human needs of subordinates using supportive behaviour to make work environment pleasant and treats subordinates as equals and gives them respect for their status (Cheng, 2012). According to Lacoma (2013) the manager is not so interested in giving orders and managing every detail as in giving employees the tools they need to work themselves. While delegation is a vital part of supportive leadership, managers do not simply assign tasks and then receive the results. Instead, they work through the tasks with employees to improve skills and talent until the manager does not need to worry about a task being done correctly and the employee is fully empowered in a particular area.

Participative leadership occurs when a manager seeks to involve company employees, to solicit their ideas and take their suggestions into serious consideration before making decisions (Chen and Tjosvold, 2006). This leadership style is characterized by consultation, empowerment, joint decision-making, democratic leadership, and power sharing (Clark, 2007), and should not be considered a sign of weakness. Participative leadership style involves a leader who invites subordinates to share in the decision-making. According to Liu (2012), a participative leader consults with subordinates, seeks their ideas and opinions and integrates their input into group organizational decisions. This style, is usually one of the most effective and leads to higher productivity, due to better contributions from the group members and increases group morale. Mba (2014) adds that the democratic style of leadership emphasizes group and leader participation in the making of policies. Decisions about organizational matters are arrived after consultation and communication with various people in the organization. The leader, attempts as much as possible, to make each individual feel that he is an important member of the organization. Communication is multidirectional while ideas are exchanged between employees and the leader. In this style of leadership, a high degree of staff morale is always enhanced.

Goldman (2008) observes that leaders using a democratic style of leadership build consensus through participation, but these leaders also expect a higher level of excellence and self-direction; such leaders have time to listen and share ideas with their followers. They also tend to be more flexible and are responsive to one's needs. They are able to motivate teachers to participate in decision-making and are respectful. Dubrin (2008) criticizes democratic leadership style by observing that this leadership style wastes time due to endless meetings and may lead to confusion and lack of direction. He adds that it is not

appropriate for use in times of crisis when the situation demands on-the-spot decision. Seeking advice from an uninformed or incompetent group of subordinates may lead to disaster.

Kuloba (2010) found out that head teachers' involvement of teachers in decision-making process of the school through committees and meetings enhances teacher performance. It was further discovered that teacher performance is enhanced by head teachers' communication to their teaching staff. It was also found out that head teachers' delegation of duties to teachers enhances teacher performance. Kingori (2013) tested whether teachers under a principal who exhibits the transformational leadership styles of initiative, consideration and participative management had higher levels of job satisfaction than those working under principals who did not and discovered that different leadership style factors will have different impacts on employee job satisfaction components. The researcher found out that the dominant leadership style was democratic. Individualized consideration and the need for promotion to higher job groups increase teachers' job satisfaction. Adegbesan (2015) revealed that administrative styles adopted by the principals of secondary schools in Nigeria were found to be inadequate for effective school administration. The personality traits exhibited by the principals appeared somewhat harsh to their subordinates. Teachers in these schools were not adequately motivated and encouraged to carry out their duties.

Hindt (2015) found that principal leadership behaviours do significantly impact teacher morale, and student achievement. Additionally, it was found that positive teacher morale and student achievement in the Initiative Schools influenced positive student behaviours, ultimately reducing student discipline referrals. Marshall (2014) found significant correlations between the dependent variable of teacher satisfaction and principal leadership style as measured by planning, decision-making, communicating, professional support and evaluating. The study also found a significant difference in one of the sub-scales of principal leadership. In the area of delegation there was a significant difference in the way in which male and female teachers perceived principal leadership style. Mwangi (2013) found that teachers who lack enthusiasm are unable to teach effectively, making students not to learn well. It also showed that principals' attitude of not considering teachers' suggestions in decision-making made teachers lose interest in their job.

### **Aim and Objectives of the Study**

The aim of the study was to investigate participation in decision making and leadership style as determinants of teachers productivity in Mission Secondary Schools in Delta State. The specific objectives of the study were to determine:

- i. The relationship between participation in decision-making and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State
- ii. The relationship between leadership styles and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

- i. What is the relationship between participation in decision-making and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State?
- ii. What is the relationship between leadership styles and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State?

### **Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

- i. There is no significant relationship between participation in decision-making and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State.
- ii. There is no significant relationship between leadership styles and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study adopted correlational research design while the population of the study was all the 1,188 school personnel which comprised 114 vice principals and 1,073 teachers in the 40 mission schools in Delta

State. The sample of the study consisted of 668 school personnel which comprised 114 vice principals and 549 teachers who were selected for the study using stratified random sampling technique. was used to arrive at the sample size. The instrument used for collection of data was questionnaire and they were titled Decision Making and Leadership Styles Scale (DMLSS) and Teachers' Productivity Scale (TPS) which were face and content validated by Measurement and evaluation experts in the University of Port Harcourt. The reliability of the questionnaire was determined using split-half reliability test and coefficients of DMLSS and TPS were 0.75 and 0.72 respectively. The research questions were answered using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics while regression analysis of variance was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

## RESULTS

### Research Question One

*What is the relationship between participation in decision-making and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State?*

**Table 1: Pearson r on relationship between Participation in Decision Making and Teachers' Productivity**

Variables	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )	SD	r	r <sup>2</sup>
Participation in Decision Making	18.45	3.50	.009	.000
Teachers' Productivity	44.76	2.25		

Table 1 shows Pearson r on relationship between participation in decision making and teachers productivity. The result of the study revealed mean scores of 18.45, SD=3.50 for participation in decision making and 44.76, SD=2.25 for teachers productivity. The computed  $r=.009$  signified a positive relationship between participation in decision making and teachers productivity. The  $r^2$  value of .000 indicates that participation in decision making influence teachers' productivity by 0.00%. In conclusion, participation in decision making influence teachers productivity positively.

### Hypothesis One

There is no significant relationship between participation in decision-making and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State.

**Table 2: Regression analysis of variance on participation in decision making and teachers' productivity**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
1	Regression	.226	1	.226	.045	.833 <sup>b</sup>	Not Significant
	Residual	3119.879	616	5.065			
	Total	3120.105	617				

Table 2 shows regression analysis of variance (ANOVA). The regression data for the study produced an F (1,616) =.045, sig=.833. With F (1,616) =.045, sig=.833, the relationship between participation in decision making and teachers' productivity was not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between participation in decision making and teachers' productivity in Mission secondary schools was retained.

### Research Question Two

*What is the relationship between leadership styles and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State?*

**Table 3: Pearson r on relationship between Leadership Styles and Teachers' Productivity**

Variables	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )	SD	r	r <sup>2</sup>
Leadership Styles	26.24	5.96	.090	.008
Teachers' Productivity	44.76	2.25		

Table 3 shows Pearson r on relationship between leadership styles and teachers productivity. The result of the study revealed mean scores of 26.24, SD=5.96 for leadership styles and 44.76, SD=2.25 for teachers productivity. The computed  $r=.090$  signified a positive relationship between leadership styles and teachers productivity. The  $r^2$  value of .008 indicates that leadership style influence teachers productivity by 0.8%. In conclusion, leadership styles influence teachers' productivity positively.

**Hypothesis Two**

There is no significant relationship between leadership styles and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State.

**Table 4: Regression analysis of variance on leadership styles and teachers' productivity**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
1	Regression	25.239	1	25.239	5.024	.025 <sup>b</sup>	Significant
	Residual	3094.866	616	5.024			
	Total	3120.105	617				

Table 4 shows regression analysis of variance (ANOVA). The regression data for the study produced an  $F(1,616) = 5.024$ ,  $sig.=.025$ . With  $F(1,616) = 5.024$ ,  $sig.=.025$ , the relationship between leadership style and teachers' productivity was significant. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between leadership style and teachers' productivity in Mission secondary schools was rejected.

**DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

**Participation in Decision Making and Teachers' Productivity**

Finding on hypothesis 3 shows that there is no significant relationship between participation in decision-making and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State. This finding supports Mark (2011) who noted that principals take decisions all alone without involving the teachers. This finding also supports Butter (2012) who noted that teachers are being marginalized when compared with those in other professions when it comes to decision-making. This finding also supports Ako (2011) who revealed that lack of involvement of teachers in decision-making leads to resistance of orders and poor performance of teachers. This finding also supports Perry (2012) who discovered that school principals either taking decisions alone or handpicking teachers whom they consider as their favourites to assist them in taking decisions.

**Leadership Styles and Teachers' Productivity**

Finding on hypothesis 4 shows that there is a significant relationship between leadership styles and teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State. This finding is in line with Nsubuga (2008) who established that there is a strong positive relationship between the leadership style and school performance. Goldman (2008) who observes that leaders using a democratic style of leadership build consensus through participation, but these leaders also expect a higher level of excellence and self-direction; such leaders have time to listen and share ideas with their followers. Charlton, (2010) who argued that effective leadership has a positive influence on the teachers' productivity. Keys (2011) added that directive leadership increases follower's job satisfaction. Marshall (2014) who found significant correlations between the dependent variable of teacher satisfaction and principal leadership style as measured by planning, decision-making, communicating, professional support and evaluating. Hindt (2015) also found that principal leadership behaviours do significantly impact teacher morale, and student achievement.

This finding did not support Adeyemi, (2010) who discovered that many principals do not consider their leadership styles as crucial in the teachers' job productivity. Daresh (2011) observed that these head teachers practice the autocratic leadership style with formal procedures, neglecting the teachers' psychological needs. Such leaders suppress the teachers' creativity, overly emphasizing on academic achievement and putting aside their roles as leaders who have to generate quality human capital for the

who purpose of education development. Lacoma (2013) who revealed that manager is not so interested in giving orders and managing every detail as in giving employees the tools they need to work themselves.

## **CONCLUSION**

It was concluded that participation in decision making does not significantly relate to teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State while leadership styles significantly relates to teachers' productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations were made based on the findings of the study:

1. Principals should ensure that the delegate responsibilities to teachers under careful supervision as this will go a long way to enhance teachers productivity in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State
2. That the embracing and use of the laissez-faire leadership style in Mission Secondary schools in Delta State should be done with caution and care to minimize its possible negative impact on teachers' productivity.

## **REFERENCES**

- Aacha, M. (2010). *Motivation and the performance of primary school teachers in Uganda: A case of Kimaanya-Kyabakuzza Division, Masaka District*. Kampala: Makerere University.
- Adegbesan, S. O. (2015). Effect of principals leadership style on teachers attitude to work in Ogun State secondary schools, Nigeria. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education* 4(1), 17-26
- Adeyemi, T. O. (2010). Principals' leadership styles and teachers' job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria: *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory*, 3(3), 84-92
- Aghenta J. A., (2010) *Educational planning in 21st Century in educational planning and administration in Nigeria in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. National Institute for educational planning and administration
- Ako S. (2011). *Analysis of teacher's job satisfaction in Nigeria*. Kaduna: Shamac
- Bunmi, J. M. (2007). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bush, T, and Oduro, G. K. T., (2006). New principals in Africa: Preparation induction and practice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(4), 359-375
- Butter, K. S., (2012) *Motivation and personality*. New York, Paper Raw
- Chan Yuen Fook (2009). *Evaluating the effectiveness of educational management and leadership programme*. Shah Alam: UPENA, MARA University of Technology Publisher.
- Charlton, G. (2010) *Human habits of highly effective organizations*. Pretorial: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Chen, Y. F., and Tjosvold, D. (2006). Participative leadership by American and Chinese managers in China: The role of relationships. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(8), 1727-1752
- Cheng, Y. C. (2012). *Leadership and strategy*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Clark, D. (2007) *Leadership styles*. Retrieved from <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/leadstl.html>
- Daresh, J. C. (2011). *Leaders helping leaders: A practical guide to administrative mentoring* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Donnelly, J. H. (2012). *Fundamentals of management*. Boston: Irwin Press.
- Dubrin, J. (2008). *Leadership research finding: Practice and skills*. Boston Houghton: Mifflin Company
- Goldman, E. (2008). The significance of leadership style. *Educational Leadership*, 55(7), 20-22.
- Hindt, L. A. (2015). *The effects of principal leadership on teacher morale and student achievement*. USA: University of Houston.
- Hoadley, U. (2007). *Managing curriculum and instruction in South African secondary schools. Kopanong*, Gauteng: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Kimeu, J. M. (2010) *Influence of secondary school Principals Instructional supervision practices on Kenya Certificate for Secondary Education Performance in Kasikeu Division* unpublished M.Ed Project University of Nairobi.



- King'ori, G. M. (2013). *Influence of Secondary School Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Job Satisfaction: A Study of Embu county-Kenya*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Kuloba, N. P. (2010). *Leadership Styles and Teacher Performance in Secondary Schools in Nakaseke District*. Unpublished M. A Thesis, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- Lacoma, T. (2013). *Definition of supportive leadership style*. Chron.com. Retrieved from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/definition-supportive-leadership-style-21835.html>
- Liu, H. (2012). *The impact of leadership style and leadership satisfaction, job satisfaction in view of Chinese cross-strait cultural difference*. Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- Mali, P. (2015). *Improving total productivity*. New York: John Wiley Press
- Mark, L. (2011). *Introduction to teachers' education*. Britain: Taristock.
- Marshall, I. A. (2014). Principal leadership style and teacher satisfaction among a sample of secondary school teachers in Barbados. *Caribbean Educational Research Journal*, 2(2), 105-116
- Mba, J. (2014). *Strategic management centre*. Lagos: Punch Nig. Ltd
- Mwangi, J. W. (2013). *Effects of leadership styles on teachers' job performance and satisfaction: a case of public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Nsubuga, Y. K. K. (2008), *Developing teacher leadership*; A paper presented at the 5th ACP Conference, Kampala, Uganda
- Nwachukwu, C. C. (2016). *Management theory and practice*. Onitsha: Africana Publishers.
- Okunamiri, P. O. & Uba-Mbibi, F. O. (2011). *Perceived influence of job satisfaction on teachers in secondary schools in Umuahia Education Zone of Abia State*. Nigeria: Whytem publishers Nigeria
- Olaniyan, D. A. (2007). Employees job performance as affected by demographic variables in Nigerian: Educational System in Africa, *Journal of Education Management*, 5(2), 38-47
- Omobude M., & Igbudu, U. (2012). Influence of teachers' participation in decision making on their job performance in public and private secondary schools in Oredo Local Government Area of Edo State, Nigeria.
- Perry, U. (2012). *Management of public performance. The way forward*. Britain: Taristock.
- Tanfox, S. (2010). *Applied human relationship*. New York Preaegers Publishers.