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ABSTRACT

Leadership seems to be the most operational tool of influencing people so that they strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the accomplishment of goals. Leaders design motivation systems not only to encourage employees to perform in the most effective way but also to draw potential candidates. The key to create a conducive atmosphere in the school is an answer to the question what really enhance teachers’ performance. The main objective of this study is to investigate the influence of leadership styles on teachers’ performance in general secondary schools of Gambella region, Ethiopia. To accomplish this purpose, the study employed a descriptive design. The study was carried in ten general secondary schools of Gambella region. A total of 190 individuals have participated in the study. Among them, 170 teachers were included as a sample through simple random sampling technique especially lottery method. Additionally, 20 general secondary school principals were included through available sampling technique. Questionnaire and interview were the main instruments of data collection. The instrument for the study was a five-point likert type questionnaires. Principal leadership styles and teachers performance were identified as the independent variables and as the dependent variable. The questionnaires on communication, decision-making and delegation of duties were used to describe the principal leadership styles. While lesson plan, assessing students and involve in co-curricular activities were to determine the teachers’ performance within the schools. The analysis of the quantitative data was carried out by using frequency, percentages, mean, standard deviation, one-way ANOVA, Post Hoc Test and Pearson correlation. The finding indicates that there is a positive relationship between leadership styles and teachers’ performance (r=0.980) the relationship is significance (Sign=0.000 at 0.05 level). The findings revealed that the independent variable (democratic was the most practiced leadership styles in general secondary schools of Gambella region. Furthermore, the teachers’ performance was found to be moderate in general secondary schools. In general the findings supposed to conclude, that principals’ leadership style of general secondary schools in Gambella region had significance effects on decision-making, communication and delegation to improve the level of teachers’ performance and thus teachers have not been performing to the expectation. Based on the findings, it is recommended that the principals of general secondary schools should neat a mixture of autocratic and democratic styles of leadership. While teachers’ ideas and taught should be considered in decision-making about the training criteria in their administration in order to enhance better performance amongst teachers.
CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, conceptual framework of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, operational definition of key terms, and organization of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

The issue of leadership styles is a major and basic concern for all organizations and institutions in various countries. Different countries around the world have been attempting to highlight and stress the concept of efficient leadership styles in various ways in their organizational daily activities, programs, and performance, for example, England, Nigeria. In Ethiopia, there is rapid and increasing awareness in various sectors and fields in line with a sharp increase in the number of teachers, including the educational institutions such as universities, colleges, schools and others which are indirectly related to educational domain ESDP III (MoE, 2011).

The Education and Training Policy set aims and objectives, which was to: produce skilled manpower with the necessary quality and quantity to meet the national socio-economic development requirement, to bring up citizens who understand, respect and defend the constitution, a citizen who respects democratic values and human rights moreover with good work culture and ethics” (MOE, 1994).

That is why currently, the government of Ethiopia made the education sector its agenda to ensure the provision of quality education for all citizens, which was launched as a major national wide reform program to improve the quality of general education (MoE, 2010). Thus, in fostering these aims and objectives, the school principal has important roles to play. Among this roles include providing effective leadership in secondary schools, thereby enhancing better job performance among teachers. In supporting this issue (Crum & Sherman, 2008) stated that the principal needed to provide highly valued, insights into their daily styles that foster an environment which is supportive of high teachers’ performance. These roles are categorized in
developing personnel and facilitating leadership responsible delegation and empowering team, recognizing ultimate accountability, communicating and rapport, facilitating instruction, and managing change.

But, the main challenges for the principals are to create and promote the conducive atmosphere for teaching and learning: efforts in undermine teachers in decision making, immutable communication with teachers’ and delegation of duties at schools is considered as the most influential of the employee’s performance within entire school atmosphere that not applying efficient leadership styles (Love 1993, Moore, Cheng and Dainty, 2002 and UNESCO, 2006).

Successful school principal have been taught to be, due to the different styles that are used in their administration process. The principal’s leadership style influences the efficiency and also the effectiveness of the teachers’ performance in school (Alageheband, 1997).

Several researchers have defined leadership style in different countries and contexts. (Chandan, 1987) define leadership style is the ingredient of personality embodied in leaders that causes subordinates to follow them. Okumbe, (1998) on the other hand defines leadership styles is particular behaviors applied by a leader to motivate subordinates to achieve the objectives of the organization. In view of the foregoing, leadership style were defined in various ways. It refers to the underlying needs of the leader that motivate his behavior (Siskin, 1994; Okeniyi, 1995). It is the manifestation of the dominant pattern of behavior of a leader (Olaniyan, 1999; Okurumeh, 2001). It is also a process through which principal influences a teacher or group others in the attainment of educational goals (Akinwumiju and Olaniyan, 1996; Adeyemi, 2006). Therefore, the Leadership style of a principal depends on the leaders’ behaviors. This behavior is the main foundation for choosing efficient leadership style (Douglas, 1996).

Scholar has proposed path goal theory to explain leadership. According to (House, 1968) in the path goal theory, a leader does the following: clarifies and sets goals together with the subordinates and properly communicates to them. Besides, delegates duties to subordinates according to their abilities, skills, knowledge and experience. The leader further helps the subordinates to find the best path for achieving the desired goals. Defines positions and task roles by removing barriers to performance and promotes group cohesiveness and team effort. The leader finally increases personal opportunities for satisfaction and improved work performance by
reducing stress, making external controls and people’s expectations clearer (House, 1968). In supporting this theory, (Ajayi and Ayodele, 2001) the behaviour of the leader is acceptable to the subordinates only if they continue to see the leader as a source of personal opportunities to improve performance and satisfaction. But, some leaders seem to find it difficult to effectively administer their schools (Gronn, 2000).

Therefore, it is imperative that they learn and understand the importance of the styles that enhance positive performance in the schools. As such, leadership style occupies an important position in school administration as the principal who controls schools’ resources used them resulted in positive achievement of educational goals (Adeyemi, 2004). Basically, such achievements in secondary schools are dependent on three identifiable leadership styles namely; autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 1991). Thus, it is no doubt that there is mounting pressure by styles of leadership among principals of secondary schools in Gambella region. It seems however that many principals have not considered their styles of leadership as determinants of teachers’ performance in their schools.

Teachers’ performance is could be described in various ways. (Robert and Tim, 1998) as the act of accomplishing or executing a given tasks. On the other hand (Obilade, 1999) defined teachers performance as the duties performed by a teacher at a particular period in the school system in achieving educational goals. Whereas, (Akinyemi 1993; Okeniyi, 1995) defined it as the ability of teachers to combine relevant inputs for the enhancement of teaching and learning processes. However, (Meindl, 1995) argued that teachers’ performance is determined by the worker’s level of participation in the day to day running of the organization.

Supporting this argument, (Adepoju, 1996) asserted that variables of teachers’ performance such as effective teaching, lesson note preparation, effective use of scheme of work, effective supervision, monitoring of students’ work and disciplinary ability are virtues which teachers should uphold effectively in the school system. In this regard, the teachers’ performance could be measured through annual report of his/her activities in terms of performance in teaching, lesson preparation, and lesson presentation, mastery of subject matter, competence, teachers’ commitment to job and extra-curricular activities. Other areas of assessment include effective leadership, supervision of students’ work; motivation, class control and discipline of the students are the virtues that teachers should uphold effectively in general secondary schools.
As such, (Ibukun, 1997) argued that the main task of the principal is to create a conducive atmosphere for the teachers to be able to achieve desired changes in students. He noted that teachers’ perform effectively under different leadership styles. Due to this, the principal was expected encourage effective performance of their teachers by identifying their needs and trying to satisfying or meeting them. Supporting this argument (Ijaiya, 2000) remarked that teachers in Nigeria express a desire for more participation in decision-making. Therefore, the concern of this study was to describe the principals’ leadership styles in terms of involvement in decision making, communication and delegation of duties to teachers in general secondary schools of Gambella regional State.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

As the NSDC (2002) noted that principals, as instructional leader, focus on helping teachers to improve their classroom performance and make academic instruction as their schools top priority. In one way (MoE, 2010) argued that principals need to have the theoretical knowledge, skill and adequate experiences in school leadership and management and/or should have a profile of possession of various trainings on school leadership and management so as to play active and effective leadership style in school improvement programs.

Therefore, Principals as educational leader play a pivotal role in the success of the school. In build a strong culture of collaboration and creative problem solving, set appropriate curriculum implementation mechanism, and possess an instructional leadership quality that takes responsibility for students achievement, develop and Communicate plans for effective teaching, among all staff members and monitor students learning progress and closely work with parents (MoE; 2005:16). But, (Yenenew, 2012) argued that most preparatory schools of South Wollo Zone are characterized by delay; in the beginning time of the instructional process, problem of curriculum coverage, burden of makeup class around the end of the semester, etc. were noticed. Thus, this could contribute to reduce the level of teachers’ performance. In supporting this, (Weiss, 1993) argued that, the successful implementation of the curriculum it depends to a large extent, on delegation and sharing decision styles of principals that boost teachers’ job opportunities, satisfaction, career commitment and intention to complete the syllabus contents on terms scheduled. In this regard (Nanson, 2010) argued that most principals’ are hardly seen in
their offices executing their duties, they neither delegate duties nor fully communicate to their teachers.

Furthermore, (CfBT, 2008) argued that much of their time was spent on political duties unrelated to the education of students at their school, and requiring much absence from the school site. This seems to reduce the level of performance affecting the teaching and learning process and/or cause undesirable outcome such as failure of student in examination, repetition rate drop out as well as other instructional activities at schools. Hence, the collision of principals’ leadership style and teachers’ performance as has been a subject of disagreement by researchers (Nwadian, 1998; Adeyemi, 2006). The argument was centered on whether or not the principals’ leadership style influences the level of performance among teachers.

It should be noted that despite to the above researches’ effort to research on principal leadership style and teacher performance. Besides, none of these studies was done in the context of general secondary schools of Gambella regional state. This prompted the researcher to undertake the study.

In the past two years the researcher has served in Gambella general secondary school as a teacher and school vice principal. In that period of time the researcher heard complaints about leadership styles that the teachers are not interested in decision made by principal in delegation of duties and responsibilities in different activities of the school. Therefore, the above situation and the ordinary experience in the general secondary school of Gambella prompt the researcher to conduct a study on effects of principals’ leadership styles on teachers’ performance.

The purpose of this study therefore was to investigate the effects of principals’ leadership styles on teachers’ performance in general secondary schools of Gambella regional State. In addressing this problem, the following research questions were raised:

1. What is the significant relationship between the principal’s leadership styles with the teachers’ performance of general secondary schools?
2. Which type of leadership style of school principals’ enhances teachers’ performance?
3. To what extent does school principals’ decision-making influence the level of teachers’ performance in general secondary schools?
4. To what extent does school principals’ communications affect teachers’ performance?

5. To what extent does school principals’ delegation of duties influence teachers’ performance in the general secondary schools?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General objective

The general objective of this study was to investigate the influence of the principals’ leadership styles on the teachers’ performance in General secondary schools of Gambella Nation Nationalities Regional State.

1.3.2 Specific Objective

The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. investigate how principals involve teachers in decision making and the effect it has on theirs’ performance in secondary schools
2. investigate how principals communicate with their teaching staff and the effect it has on teachers’ performance in secondary schools
3. find out how the principals delegate duties to the teachers and the effect it has on teacher performance in selected government secondary schools
4. Determine the leadership style used by principals that enhances teachers’ performance.
5. find the significance relationship between independent and dependent variables

1.4. Significance of the Study

The findings of this research have deep significance for the enhancement of secondary school teachers’ performance and satisfaction by prioritizing inside and outside performance in the study areas. Specifically the result of this research has the following importance for the school principals, teachers, students and others.

- First, it may help the school leaders to be aware of the styles against the level of teacher performance and the practitioners’ principals to exercise efficient leadership styles so as to improve teachers’ performance.
• Second, it may help the school principals to revisit and enrich with new knowledge, theories, methodologies and practical behaviors leaders need in secondary schools and other institutions of learning in general and Gambella general secondary schools in particular for their motivating approach to make the teachers more effective.

• Thirdly, it may give the clear picture of principal leadership style on teachers’ level of performance for decision-maker, higher officials of the regional, zonal education office. Fourth the school principal who is in mount exposure to different pressures both internal and external has to constantly review own leadership style as effective guide in performing his/ her task.

• Lastly it may serve as the reference and may call for further in-depth researchers on the topic, particularly principal leadership style and teachers’ motivation in the secondary schools of Gambella Regional state.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited in both content wise and geographically. The contents were delimited to investigating effect of independent variables on dependent variables based on path goal theory of leadership.

Dependent variables according to McQueen and Knussen (2002) dependent variable represent “the outcome of the study and they provide the quantitative material that allows us to answer the research questions”. As scholars describe dependent variable is the core research questions or hypothesis to be answered at the end of the research. Therefore, teachers’ performance which are the act of scheming, lesson planning, and assessment of students through giving tests, exercises and participation in co-curricular activities of the school is the dependent variable for this study.

Independent variables are the causes supposed to be responsible for bringing about change(s) in a phenomenon or dependent variables (Kumar, 2005). Therefore, the independent variables are conceptualized as the principals’ leadership styles the autocratic, democratic and lazes-fair styles were incorporated to see the existing teachers’ level of performances through communication with teaching staff, involvement of teachers in decision-making and delegation of duties to teachers.
Geographically, the scope of this study was delimited to 10 General secondary schools of Gambella regional state. This means it does not include primary schools found under the study area. Therefore, the finding of this research was generalized for general secondary schools of Gambella Regional state without considering primary one or private secondary schools of nearby.

### 1.6. Limitations of the study

Even though the research has attained its objectives, there were some unpreventable limitations. First, while there are various models of leadership style, due to the limit of time, finance and material resources; this research was not incorporating all models to see teachers’ performance. The investigation is run by focusing on the three leadership styles and teachers performance. Styles, which are prepared based on House (1968) path goal theory of leadership. In addition because of the limits mentioned above, this research was conducted on general secondary school teachers of Gambella region. Therefore, to generalize the result for both primary and secondary school teachers, the study would have involved more participants from both school levels. Furthermore, the lack of similar research works on the issue investigated in the study area impedes/delay the researcher from consulting more findings in the literature as well as in the discussion part.

### 1.7 Operational definition of key Terms

Autocratic style: is a style that leaders communicate irregularly to teaching staff with limited involvement in decision-making and less delegation.

Democratic style: is a style that leaders regularly communicate with teaching staff and to participate them in decision-making for more delegation of duties.

General secondary schools; refers to the school system established to offer four years of general education (grade 9 -12).

Laissez–Faire style: is a style that leaders advocates minimal supervision and moderate involvement in the instructional process.

Leadership style is the patterns of behaviors, which a leader adopts to influence the behaviors of his/her followers.

Principal’s leadership Style: Refers to the pattern or way of doing things by the principal in pursuit of his or her duties. In this study, leadership styles are looked at in
terms of: the way principals involve teachers in decision-making; the way they communicate and the way they delegate duties to teachers. The way the principals behave in line of decision-making, communication and delegation is hypothesized to determine teacher performance in general secondary schools of Gambella region in one-way or the other.

Teachers’ performance: Refers to identification with, and involvement in the teaching occupation. In this study, the teacher performance considered as the act of scheming, lesson planning, and assessment of students through giving tests, exercises and participation in co-curricular activities of the schools.

1.8 Organization of the paper.

The research report has five chapters. Chapter one presents the nature of the problem and its approach through comprising background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, conceptual framework of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, operational definition of key terms and organization of the study. Chapter two discusses the key concepts that were used in the paper to place the problem in a broader perspective of literature or review of related literature. Chapter three concentrates on the research design and methodology specifically which includes research design, research method, study population, sample size and sampling techniques, data collecting instruments, data analysis and interpretation and also ethical considerations. Chapter four deal with the presentation, analyses and interpretation of the research. Finally, chapter five summarizes the main findings, conclusions and gives recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a theoretical knowledge of the phenomenon leadership styles and teachers performance. The chapter is organized in to different sections. Each section has been supposed to release strong necessary power of information to conduct the study effectively as well as to develop smart data collection instruments. For the purposes of this study a wide range of relevant literature was consulted with special reference to literature pertaining to leadership styles models, theories and factors affecting teachers’ performance. Special reference was made to literature relating to management of secondary schools. A variety of sources such as textbooks, journals, official documents, seminar papers and websites were consulted. In addition the literature incorporates, unpublished thesis and various research findings on the issue employees performance and leadership styles which helps the researcher to see various findings conducted in different areas.

2 The Concept of Leadership Styles and Teacher Performance.

According to different writers, the concepts and definition of leadership style and teachers performances viewed in the context of their perspectives and philosophy. However, in this chapter, the researcher reviews the related literature on leadership styles on teachers’ performance. These include theoretical review, conceptual model and literature related to the communication, decision-making and delegation specific objective respectively.

2.1 Leadership Styles

Every leader in every organization performs certain roles/tasks for the smooth running of the organization and improvement of organizational performance. As a result, Ezeuwa (2005) sees it as the act of influencing people so that they strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the accomplishment of goals. In the same manner, Ukeje (1999) observes that leadership means influencing people to work willingly with zeal towards the achievement of the corporate goals. A leader cannot work alone; he must have people to influence, direct, carry along, sensitize and
mobilize towards the achievement of the corporate goal. The manner that leader performs these roles and directs the affairs of the organization is referred to as his/her leadership style. Leadership style therefore is the way a leader leads. Some leaders are more interested in the work to be done than in the people they work with while others pay more attention to their relationship with subordinates than the job. Whether a leader emphasizes the task or human relations is usually considered central to leadership style.

(Chandan, 1987) define leadership style is the ingredient of personality embodied in leader s that causes subordinates to follow them. (Okumbe, 1998) on the other hand defines leadership styles is particular behaviors applied by a leader to motivate subordinates to achieve the objectives of the organization. The school principal is in a unique position as the manager or administrator who controls schools’ resources for the purpose of achievements educational goals and can accelerate the process of schools development or can demolish the progress of education (Oyedeji, 1998 & Adeyemi, 2004). As such, a leadership style occupies an important position in school management.

Leaders express leadership in many roles. These, among others, are: formulating aims and objectives, establishing structures, managing and motivating personnel and providing leadership (Daresh 2002:11). However, Nathan (1996:7-8) asserts providing leadership is a very essential component of a leader’s role. The leadership style leaders choose to perform the above mentioned roles will determine whether they will accomplish the task at hand and long-term organizational goals or not, and whether they will be able to achieve and maintain positive relationships with staff (Mazzarella & Smith 1989:28).

2.1. Types of Leadership Styles

2.1.1 Democratic Leadership Styles
Democratic leadership refers to a situation where there is equal work among leaders and followers. According to Goldman (2002), democratic organizations typically have the following six characteristics: policies are determined by a group of organizations, technical and job performance measures are discussed so they are understood by all, leaders provide advice to members in regards to implementing tasks, members are free to choose with whom they work, the
group determines the distribution of tasks, and leaders try to be objective in giving praise and criticism.

Goldman (2000) states 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. From my own experience I have observed that these 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.

The democratic style of leadership emphasizes group and leader participation in the making of policies. Decisions about organizational matters are arrived at 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 (Heenan and Bennis 1999). In this style of leadership, a high degree of staff morale is always enhanced (Mba, 2004). In other words, consultation, teamwork and participation are the common key characteristics of successful schools. House and Mitchell (as reported in Oyetunyi, 2006) suggest that a leader can behave in different ways in different situations. The following are the four kinds of leaders’ behavior:

2.1.1.1 Directive Style

Directive leadership style is similar to the task-oriented style. The leader who uses this type of leadership style provides teachers with specific guidelines, rules and regulations with regard to planning, organizing and performing activities. This style is deemed to be appropriate when the subordinates’ ability is low and or the task to be performed is complex or ambiguous. Job satisfaction is increased when the leader gives more directives (Hoy & Miskel, 2001:408).

2.1.1.2 Supportive Style

Supportive leadership style is more of a relationship-oriented style. It requires the leader to be approachable and friendly. He/she displays concern for the well being and personal needs of the subordinates. He/she creates an emotionally supportive climate. This style is effective when subordinates lack self-confidence; work on dissatisfying or stressful tasks and when work does not provide job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 2001:408).
2.1.1.3 Participative Style
The leader who employs this style consults with subordinates for ideas and takes their ideas seriously when making decisions. This style is effective when subordinates are well motivated and competent (Lussier & Achua, 2001:175).

2.1.1.4 Consultative Styles
The leader has substantial but not complete confidence and trust in the employees. Although general decisions are made by the leader, he/she seeks the opinions of the employees, but he makes the final decision. The employees have positive attitudes toward the organisation, the manager and their work. When the employees feel that enough consultation has not taken place, they publicly accept orders from the manager, but sometimes covertly resist the order by insubordination, especially when the manager decides on majority rules principle (Owens 1981:207).

Communication flows from and to the hierarchy. The manager consults through relevant channels, with subordinates. They in turn consult with him/her on matters they would like to bring to his/her attention (Brownwell 1985:39-44). Control is mainly at the top. Middle management usually delegates tasks to control subordinates at lower levels. This is done in terms of appraisal, evaluation and supervision. Subordinates perceive control as a way of maintaining the set standard (Ukeje 1992:105-106).

2.1.1.5 Achievement-Oriented Style
In this style, the leader sets challenging but achievable goals for the subordinates. He/she pushes work improvement sets high expectations for subordinates and rewards them when the expectations are met. That is, the leader provides both high directive (structure) and high supportive (consideration) behavior. This style works well with achievement-oriented subordinates (Lussier & Achua, 2001).

2.1.2 Autocratic Leadership Styles
Autocratic leadership refers to a system that gives full empowerment to the leader with minimal participation from the followers. Yukl (1994) found that autocratic leaders tend to have the following five characteristics: they do not consult members of the organization in the decision-making process, the leaders set all policies, the leader predetermines the methods of work, the
leader determines the duties of followers, and the leader specifies technical and performance evaluation standards. Since this style of leadership usually only involves one person deciding, it permits quick decision-making. Although the autocratic style is relatively unpopular, in certain circumstances it can be an effective strategy, especially when the leader is short on time and when followers are not productive.

The autocratic leadership style is also known as the authoritarian style of leadership. Power and decision-making reside in the autocratic leader. The leader directs group members on the way things should be done and does not maintain clear channel of communication between himself or herself and the subordinates. He or she does not delegate authority nor permit subordinates to participate in policy-making (Smylie and Jack, 1990; Hoy and Miskel, 1992; John, 2002).

2.1.3 Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles

Laissez-Faire leadership is when leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make the decisions. With this style, freedoms are fully determined by group goals, techniques, and working methods. Leaders rarely intervene. Laissez-faire style is described by Hackman and Johnson (2009) as the most effective style, especially where followers are mature and highly motivated. Laissez-faire leadership style allows complete freedom to group decision without the leader’s participation. Thus, subordinates are free to do what they like. The role of the leader is just to supply materials. The leader does not interfere with or participate in the course of events determined by the group (Talbert and Milbrey, 1994).

2.2 Theoretical Reviews

Theory adopted in this study is path-goal theory advanced by House (1968). The theory asserts that a good leader should enhance subordinates job performance by clarify and setting goals with the subordinates.

The leader shows the subordinates a clear path to follow and how to remove barriers to the goal achievement. Path-goal theory was explained in figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1: path-goal theory of leadership.

House (1968) stipulates that path-goal approach helps in improving the performance of subordinates (teachers) thus enhancing goal achievement as follows; when subordinates are confused, the leader tells them what to do and shows them a clear path to follow. When the path is shown, the subordinates (teachers) become satisfied and motivated, so they accept leaders behavior thus performing effectively. The leader’s behavior further enhances the subordinates work environment through directing, controlling, supervising, rewarding, proper communication, delegation of duties and joint decision making between principals’ and teachers thus enhancing good performance among the workers. The leader defines role tasks and positions of subordinates thus reducing stress among the employees. By doing these, workers expectations become high, thus their performance is improved. Basing on these, the researcher believes the path-goal theory as advanced by House (1968) help principals involve teachers in decision-making, communicate to teachers and proper delegation of duties to teachers. This help to improve teacher performance in general secondary schools in Gambella Nation Nationalities Regional State.

2.2.1 Conceptual Framework

Consequent to the review of House’s (1968) path-goal theory (Section 2.2.1), a conceptual framework relating the variables in the study as indicated in Figure 2.2.1;

Fig. 2.2.1: Conceptual framework relating leadership styles to teacher performance in general secondary schools of Gambella Nation Nationalities Regional State.

The conceptual model in Figure 2.2.1 suggests that the independent variable is conceptualized as consisting of three leadership styles (democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire) measured in form of; principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making, principals’ communication to teachers and principals’ delegation of duties to teachers while the dependent variable is teacher performance which is conceptualized as lesson preparation, assessment and co-curricular activities.

Figure 2.2.1 further predicted that all leadership styles: democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire, have positive relationship with teacher performance. However, the conception framework indicates that the extraneous variables (teaching experience, teachers’ qualification, teaching load per week and responsibilities and learning environment supervision) were competing with the independent variables (communication, delegation and decision-making) to influence teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella Regional state.

2.2.2. Communication and Teachers Performances

Oxford (2005) defines communication as a process of passing on information from one person to another. Mintzberg (1979) defines communication as a way of passing on information from one level to another. This may be from bottom to top or top to bottom levels of management. Hannagan (2002) defines communication as a way of passing on information about the effectiveness of particular work behaviors and it is thought to perform several functions. For example, it is directive, by clarifying specific behaviors that ought to be performed; it is motivational, as it stimulates greater effort; and it is error correcting, as it provides information about the extent of error being made. However, the importance of communication in institutions of learning has in most cases been undermined especially in general secondary schools in zones of Gambella Regional State.

Pritchard and others (1988) as quoted in Hannagan (2002) indicates that communication by itself can lead to higher level of performance if it is properly used. He further asserts that
communication allows the person to track how well he/she is doing in relation to the goal, so that if necessary, adjustments in effort can be made. He further indicates that communication may be in form of memos, telephone calls, messages, posting notices, writing letters and sending E-mail or fax. Unfortunately, these modes of communication are not properly applied in fields of education more particularly in general secondary schools in these zones of Gambella Regional State.

The concept of communication in leadership is highly internalized by Armstrong and Baron (1998). They endeavored to describe how it is used, operated and thus stressed its importance. They argued that information is usually communicated to employees in form of memos, meetings and telephone calls to enhance their performance. These ideas are supported by Handy (1996) who expressed that for performance to be effective, it is important for employers to communicate on what is to be done and how it is to be done. He added that communication may be presented directly or indirectly to individuals to boost up their performance. However, he emphasized that good counseling and guidance for individual may come as a result of good and open communication provided by heads of human resource departments or heads of institutions like principals. This concept of communication is supported by House (1968) path-goal theory that stipulates that for subordinates to perform well the leader has to guide or direct them through verbal or written communication in form of notices, memos or meetings. The theory further stresses that through communication errors are identified and corrected. It also helps one to know how well or bad he or she is performing a given task. This enhances performance in any organization or institution of learning.

Armstrong (2003) presents the advantages of communication in leadership process as were derived from a survey conducted by the performance management in (1997). The advantages identified include; individuals get broad perspective of how they are perceived by others than previously possible. Communication further increases awareness of and relevance of competencies, gives people a more rounded view of performance and finally it clarifies to employees’ critical performance aspects. This view has a relationship with research conducted by Ashridge management research group in Handy (1996) which identified that one of the reasons why communication is important to support a number of human resource processes such as appraisal, resourcing and succession planning.
Communication therefore becomes more than distributing messages, it becomes an interplay between actors Johansson, (2003). Depending on how communication is conducted, in what circumstances and with what actors, it can deliver different outcomes. The communication quality is dependent on both the actors, such as principals and teachers, and the actual situation and its prerequisites.

This has a bearing to research conducted by Armstrong and Baron (1998) where they found that the 51 organizations covered by the research used communication channels get information about development needs. Armstrong (2003) further notes that communication is often anonymous and may be presented to individuals or managers or both the individual and the manager. However, he noted that some organizations do not arrange for communication to be anonymous; it depended on the organization’s culture. The more open, the culture is, the more open communication is likely to be revealed to the subordinates. One of the reasons why communication is important is that it supports a number of human resource supplies. However, these scholars do not show how principals’ communication to the teaching staff could be used to enhance teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella Region. Thus a gap left for this study to under-take. In a related view, Narayana as cited in Nanson (2010) identified that communication as leadership behavior many a times has been mishandled and has tended to reduce its proper meaning in leadership. Areas in which it has been mishandled include; education managers not being frank and often give wrong communication to teachers. Many times principals’ entrust their information to junior staff who often report wrongly to their colleagues. Though Narayana findings revealed a lot as far as communication and teacher performance in secondary schools were concerned, her main focus was not on the secondary schools in Gambella region.

From the above reviews, it is important to conclude that, the idea of communication is important in leadership; where communication is truly practiced; the leadership tends to be democratic while where it is denied to the subordinates, the leadership style becomes autocratic. On the other hand, some leaders leave communication as a free will. It may or may not be communicated to the subordinates. Such leadership style is laissez-faire Okumbe,( 1998). It is unfortunate, however, that the idea of communication as a leadership behavior had not been fully explored and yet its values if well managed cannot be denied. It should be noted that not all the above studies were positively correlated between leaders' communication with the teaching staff and teacher
performance. This left a research gap for this study to undertake. Besides, none of the studies were carried out in the context of Ethiopia specifically in Gambella Region. To close such gaps, this study considered principal communication with the teaching staff as a factor having a positive influence on teacher performance in secondary schools in these zones.

A variety of variables are interacting which means that communication is created in the actual moment and therefore hard to predict Englund, (2007). Communication within an organization differs in some respect from other communication processes. Organizations have objectives to fulfill and expected results to achieve. How the tasks and meetings are organized are other structural prerequisites that contribute to how communication is conducted. Organizations are dependent on the actors and their history, values and attitudes. Communication in organizations viewed as social systems are often expected to contribute to create a professional and responsive community. Examples of elements in a responsive community that needs support in the communication process is a wholeness that welcome diversity, strong core values, mutual trust and care, teamwork and participation, and affirmation Bredeson,( 2003). Weick argues that schools can be described as loosely coupled systems. Loosely coupled systems, require even more sense making and communication than tightly coupled systems Weick, (1995).

The more people and idea intense an organization gets the more important the communication processes are Hall, (2005); Witherspoon,( 1997). Aspects indicated that research about communication in school settings are warranted Communication is a process of creating and exchanging messages. The process includes several key elements such as network, interdependence, relationship, environment, uncertainty and messages Goldhaber,( 1993). Communication is closely connected to organizational structure and culture. Communication can be used to analyze and reflect as well as affect what is happening in the organization. Communication is here seen as a pervasive role rather than an individual skill (Kowalski, Petersen, & Fusarelli, 2007). In almost all school activities, communication plays an important role. How and what we talk about both construct and form our reality Czarniawska-Joerges, (1993). According to Miller (1998), communication plays a pivotal role in our daily lives. To articulate our ideas, feelings, emotions and skills we communicate not only with verbal but also with non-verbal methods. These are essential in teaching-learning process. Teachers can utilize a variety of verbal and non-verbal skills to aid students’ comprehension of difficult concepts.
As Miller (1998) stated, that the most advanced curriculum and the highest hopes have little chance of success without a supportive physical learning environment. In order to foster productive communication in the classroom, Principals must allow for flexible changes that are beneficial for group interaction. It should be noted, however, the appropriate spatial distances and arrangements are limited by a myriad of variables, including the conversational topic, the nature of the relationship, and the physical constraints present in the leadership style. Miller, (1998) also presented the following guidelines for the improving the teacher’s performance: the teachers should offer a variety of stimuli, the teachers’ should provide a secure, comfortable feeling, the teachers’ should be adopted to fit the activity and the teachers’ should give some privacy and individuality.” Moreover, Woolfolk (2004) stated, "Communication is more than 'teacher talks-student listens'. It is more than the words exchanged between individuals. Communication becomes a way to understand and conduct leadership and actions within the organization. A communicative leadership uses language and communication to motivate different actions (Eriksen, (2001). Weick, (1984) and Gronn,(1983).

To view leadership as a social process makes communication essential both for understanding how the work inside organizations contribute to results and how the individual leader use communication as a tool. Communication is so vivid in our everyday work and lives, we easily forget how much it affects what and how we do things. A traditional way to describe communication is as a process including a sender, a message, channels, a receiver and feedback Dimbleby & Burton,( 1998; Fiske, 1990). Today’s view of communication is therefore much more complex. Communication can have several purposes, to satisfy individual and social needs, to cooperate and understand the world, as well as a way to distribute information and messages Dimbleby & Burton, ( 1998).

2.2.3. Involvement in Decision-Making and Teacher Performance

Involvement in decision-making refers to a practice by which both superiors and subordinates jointly sit together to discuss the way to run the organization Okumbe, (1998). Involvement in decision-making is a typical characteristic of participatory type of leadership. While lack of involvement in decision making portrays autocratic leadership style, laissez-faire is portrayed when leaders may reluctantly involve subordinates in decision making process. Webster (2002)
defines participative leadership style as a way of involving individual participation in decision-making. While Chandan (1987) defines democratic leadership style as one where subordinates are consulted and their feedback is taken into the decision making process. This is in line with House (1968)’s Path-goal theory that stipulates that both leaders (principals’) and subordinates should involve themselves in decision making if an organization is to achieve its goals. He added that when goals are set together, the subordinates (teachers) become committed; self confident and knowledgeable about the set goals thus making them perform well. Thus, this model encourages active participation by subordinates involved, increases creativity and commitment, and develops talents and skills of team members.

UNESCO (2006) identified that teachers performance as being negatively affected by lack of participate in decision. UNESCO, (2006) study in Ethiopia indicated that “There is a strong sense of distance from regional and national-level decisions that are eventually communicated to teachers as immutable decisions, often divorced from their daily situation”. Without adequate communication or consultation, teachers lose morale to perform well and even some feel disenfranchised and more ineffectual in their roles.

Though UNESCO, (2006) findings were good, the study was carried out in the core Regions but not in the peripheral region like Gambella and more specifically general secondary schools. This left contextual gap for this study to fill the gap. On other hand, Ndu and Anogbo (2007) argued that where teachers are not involved in governance, result to teachers behaving as if they are strangers within the school environment. Thus, most teachers do not put in their best to have full sense of commitment and dedication to the school. Teachers who are not satisfied in the workplace are more likely to leave the profession Choy et al., (1993). Udo and Akpa (2007) asserted that where teachers are adequately involved in decision making process, there principal and the realization of school goal will be easy, apathy and opposition within the school will be minimized. But, if teachers can receive support from their principal and from local parents, if they are involved in the decision-making process, and if they work within a positive school climate and culture, they are more likely to succeed and remain in the profession (Lumsden, 1998).

On one hand, Mullins (2005) is of the opinion that many people believed that staff participation in decision making leads to higher performance and which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world. Welfson (1998) reiterated that boredom (dullness) and frustration
(disturbance) at work is often the result of an employee’s lack of involvement in decision making processes with the organization’s goals and a feeling that their ideas are not wanted or listened to. He further expatiated that staff turnover increases as employee’s walkout of the door for more interesting jobs.

Wilkinson (1999) substantiate this fact and saw involvement of employees in decision making as empowerment while a neglect of employees in decision making was seen as an assumption that workers are untapped resources with knowledge and experience and an interest in becoming involved, employers need to provide opportunities and structures for their involvement. He also assumed that participative decision making is likely to lead to job satisfaction and better quality decisions and that gains are available both to employers or increased efficiency and workers or job satisfaction, in short an everyone-wins scenario. Staff cooperation is believed to be an indisputable asset to the school principals while involvement in decision making process by the teachers could ease the principal’s mounting problems as many heads would be put together to intellectually solve problems that could have remained unsolved by the principals alone.

Shaw (1971) shows involvement in decision-making as a function so broad in scope that no one person can or should do. He further said involving teachers in decision-making process is like when two men cooperate to roll a stone that neither could have rolled. Many managers express a belief that involvement of workers in decision-making will improve the quality of workers decision making in the organization (Collins et al., 1989).

In the contrary Awotua-Efebo, (1999) described that, where teachers lack motivation and involvement in decision making, truancy, excessive excuses, abstention and complaints usually emerge leading to general ineffectiveness, inefficiency, low productivity and non-achievement of goals of organization. Regarding to Okoye (1997) in his view said that workers should be involved in decision that concern them like general working conditions, fringe benefits and staff development programs as this adds to the attractiveness of the organization climate.

Short et al. (1991) said openness and risk taking characterize the kind of school climate that encourages involvement in decision-making. This environment encourages teachers to try new ideas and approaches. However, it should be noted that teachers were less willing to participate in decision making if they perceive that their principals sought their opinions but want to make the
final decision rather than allowing teachers that opportunity. Ezeuwa, (2005) support the fact that when people are part of decision making process, there is greater opportunity of the expression of mind, ideas, existing disputes and more occasions for disagreements and agreements. In some establishments, they are gender biased that women are marginalized in decision-making process.

Likewise, a school where staff meetings are held regularly to discuss issues concerning the school, through consultative management style, is an example of a participative organization. Vander Westhuizen, et al (2008) contends that “regular formal contact between the (principals) leaders, subordinates teachers and other members of the organization” schools increases the level of workers’ satisfaction. In such an organization, every person is equal and has the democratic right of expressing opinion freely. Participative management provides an environment that makes employees’ needs known and creates a means of expressing it openly in all areas of the organization Sodhi (, 2009).

Furthermore, Somech et.al (2009) states that “participative management has the potential to balance the involvement of managers and their subordinates in information processing, decision making, or problem-solving Endeavour’s”. Therefore, there are many potential benefits that an organization practicing participative style could use to its advantage in achieving its goals. Consequently, when several people make decisions together, the social commitment to one another is greater, and hence increases their commitment to making better decisions. People say, “Two heads are better than one”. This means that when two or more people sit and try solving a problem together, they are able to make better decisions than one person. In a similar vein, Oduro, (2004) maintains that “problem-solving through consultation is impossible with a single person’s wisdom”. However, Parnell & Crandall (2010) dispute that “participative works in some cases, but in most cases the manager should make the decision based on his or her expertise and information.”

Another dilemma faced in participative management is that it is a time-consuming approach. The more people involved in the decision-making process, the longer it can take to make decisions, because it requires that the participants understand the ideas and afforded opportunities in order to argue or raise their opinions. A related barrier is that participation is associated with meetings and it is, therefore, a time-consuming process. Shennu, (2010) resonates that time is one of the major weaknesses of participative leadership approach. The challenge is that on occasions when there is
an immediate deadline, this approach prevents leaders from taking quick decisions, even in crisis situations. In fact, participative management motivates employees by considering their suggestions, which certainly can have a positive impact on teamwork and employees performance, but not in every situation.

2.2.4 Delegation of Duties and Teachers Performances

Oxford (2005) defines delegation as the process of giving rights, authorities and duties to the people of lower rank. While, Webster (2002) define delegation is the act of investing with authority to act for another. Brech (1969) defines delegation as the “passing on the others of a share in the essential elements of management process”. Chandan (1987) looks at delegation as a process of dividing up total work and giving part of it to subordinates.

Delegation is where a leader transfers power, responsibility, authority and decision making procedures to subordinates working in various departments of any given organization (Hannagan 2002). Blair (2002) defines delegation as a management skill that underpins a style of leadership which allow the staff to use and develop their skills and knowledge to full potential and as a dynamic tool for motivating and training the team to realize their full potential. Maicibi (2005) stated that, delegation is the process of a supervisor/ officer dividing up his total work load and giving part of it to subordinates. He identified that effective delegation is efficient, motivating and developmental towards work performance.

Delegation as a leadership behavior is highly supported by House (1968) path-goal theory that stipulates that for proper performance of the subordinates and goal achievement, the leader has to distribute different tasks to subordinates according to skills, abilities, knowledge, interests, talents and experience. Where the subordinates become confused, the leader has to come and direct them, he further removes barriers to clear the way for better performance. This motivates and satisfies the workers, so they accept the leader’s behavior thus performing well. Basing on the path-goal theory therefore, the leader who does not delegate duties to subordinates is autocratic while one, who makes delegation of duties as part and parcel of the organization, is a democratic leader. On the other hand, the leaders who take delegation as a free will to whoever may like or may not like. Such leadership style is laissez-faire.
Okumu (2006) in his study about delegation and its effects on management of secondary schools in Kampala District found out that effective delegation has positive effects on management of secondary schools in terms of motivation, commitment, satisfaction, discipline and general improvement in teacher performance and management of schools. While Okumu’s (2006) findings were good and educative, his findings do not reveal how delegation of duties can enhance teacher performance in general secondary schools in Gambella region.

Mumbe (1995) in his study “leadership style and teacher satisfaction in primary schools in Busia District” identified that delegation of authority can only be successful when the subordinates have ability, information and knowledgeable about the task and their willingness to perform and supported by the organizational structure where there is a clear line of management and communication without any difficulty as supported by (Max-Weber 1864 – 1920). Much as Cole (2004) tells as how delegation of authority can be successful, he does not bring out clearly how delegation of authority can enhance teacher performance in general secondary schools in the Gambella Region.

Healthfield (2004) found out that for delegation to be successful; the leader has to establish objectives of delegation, specifying the tasks to be accomplished and deciding who is to accomplish them. Though Healthfield (2004) does a good job to mention that successful delegation depends on joint objective formulation, he does not really show how joint objective formulation would help teachers in secondary schools in these zones perform better. Chapman (2005) found out that it is important to ask other people what level of authority they feel comfortable being given. He further discovered that successful delegation depends on the ability, experience and reliability of the subordinates. He, however, discovered that inexperienced or unreliable people will need a lot of close supervision to get a job done to the correct standards. His findings were good and realistic because his study was carried out in the developed world where subordinates are experienced and reliable unlike in Gambella Region where both principals’ and teachers of secondary schools are unreliable on their working stations and therefore need regular supervision by inspectors of schools for work to be done as expected.

McNamara (1999) identified that for the delegated task to be done well, the supervisor and the subordinate must agree on when the job is to be finished or if an on-going duty when are the
review dates when are the reports due and if the task is complex and what help could the supervisor render. McNamara’s (1999) findings are excellent but her focus was mainly between subordinates agreeing on the delegated work. She does not look at how delegation of duties can enhance teacher performance in secondary schools in these zones of Gambella Regional State.

While the above studies had a positive correlation between principals’ delegation of duties and teacher performance, none of them was carried in secondary schools in the context of Gambella region thus a gap was left for this study to research. To cover this gap therefore, this study aimed at getting the information of how principals’ delegation of duties to teachers affect teacher performance in secondary schools in these zones.

Mullins (1993) defines delegation of authority as 'the authorization to undertake activities that would otherwise be carried out by someone in a more senior position. Cole (1996) describes it as a process whereby a manager or a senior officer cedes or entrusts some of his authority to subordinates or team mates to perform certain tasks or duties on his behalf. They however warned that the manager or the senior officer remains accountable for those tasks or duties to his own superior officers.

The school, by its nature, is a complex organization such that delegation of authority is unavoidable; it is therefore imperative for all school managers and administrators at whatever level, primary, secondary or tertiary, to understand the concept of delegation, its importance and how to use it effectively. Therefore, this subtopics sets out to explain the concept of delegation, its place in school management, the possible barriers to effective delegation and ways of ensuring productive delegation.

The above definitions shows that, delegation exists at both organization and individual or personal level. At the organization level, it has to do with location of decision making and it is reflected in the organizational chart, that is, it provides the structure of the organization. It is also influenced by the size of the organization In other words, the larger the organization, the more the need to delegate responsibilities or tasks “to various levels throughout the organization” (Mullins, 1993). At the personal level, delegation involves the passing of one's authority and responsibility to fellow workers to act on one's behalf usually because one is unavoidably absent or busy with something else. Delegation is essentially a two-way power-sharing process. The manager
delegating passes on his responsibility and authority but is still accountable while the one receiving them by implication undertakes to carry them out and be ready for any blame for his mistakes. However, sufficient authority must be given to him/her to hold accountable (Nwachukwu, 1988; Cole, 1996; Mullins, 1993).

In practice, delegation can be found to operate within two ends of a continuum at one end is a loose control but wide freedom while at the other end is a tight control with little freedom. The level of control can fluctuate between the two ends depending on the individuals involved and the situation (Nwachukwu, 1988).

Regarding to Mullins (1993), how much delegation goes on in an organization can be influenced by its size and complexity as well as man's capacity to do only so much within a given period. In addition, associated with delegation are key terms such as authority, responsibility and accountability (Mullins, 1993). Furthermore, it stated that organizations including schools are not supposed to be static. Owners expect growth and development. Schools, certainly experience changes in staffing, student enrolment, curriculum development, societal demands on schools and so on which raise their complexity and mount more pressures on the school principals to delegate more tasks and duties (Nwachukwu, 1988).

Delegation of authority is therefore very important in school management and should be well understood by school principals as well as by the teachers especially its process, benefits and how to make it work to the benefit of the educational system. This is necessary in view of the fact that most school principals and their deputies’ appointment are usually based on experience and 'who you know' (Ayinla, 1999). Most of principals are also deficient in such training. In addition, most problems the educational system nowadays such as, insubordination, truancy, poor academic performance and so on, are probably the result of poor supervision and improper delegation of duties.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This part of the research presents the methodological aspects of the research, which include the research design, research method, study population, sample size and sample techniques, data collecting instruments, data analysis and interpretation and ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Design

In order to investigate the principal leadership style and teachers’ performance, descriptive survey design was employed. This is because it enabled the researcher to collect and describe large variety of data related to the leadership style and teacher performances. As argued by Kumer (1999) descriptive research design is used to describe the nature of the existing conditions. Seyoum and Ayalew (1989) also agreed that “descriptive survey design is the more appropriate to gather several kinds of data in a broad size to achieve the objectives of the study”. In the same line of argument, Best and Kahn (2003) have argued that descriptive design is concerned with conditions or level of performance that exist, opinions that are held, process that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing.

3.2 Research Method

The study employed descriptive survey method by incorporating both quantitative and qualitative approaches with more emphasis on quantitative as the leading method through close-ended questions. Quantitative approach was emphasized because investigating; the principal leadership style on teacher performances of general secondary schools could better be understood by collecting large quantitative data, in a formal, structured and rigid manner. Furthermore, the qualitative approach was incorporated in the study with information gained from interview, document analysis and through open-ended questions and hence, it helps to validate and substantiate the quantitative data. Thus, the approach was preferred on the ground that the influences of school leadership styles were better perceived from the opinion survey of school Principals’ and teaching staff.
3.3 Source of Data

In order to investigate the principal leadership style and the teachers’ performance both primary and secondary source of data were used.

3.3.1 Primary Source of Data

Preparatory secondary schools principals’ and teachers chosen as primary sources of data by expecting that, they have better exposure, experience and firsthand information regarding the issue under the study.

3.3.2 Secondary Source of Data

Documents of Job description to see the records of delegated job to teachers, Document for selection of teachers for workshop, training, promotion and rewards. Documents like new instruction acquaints with teachers (like, General Education Quality Assurance Packages).

3.4 The study site

The Gambella Nation Nationalities Regional State is one of the nine states of Ethiopia. This region is located to the south west of the country at 766kms away from Addis Ababa. Bordering the Oromiya National Regional State in the North, and North West and Southern Nation Nationalities Regional State in the East (GNNRSCB, 2000). The regional government is structured at different tires of regional council, zonal administration, and woreda and kebele councils. The regional government is structured as legislative, executive and judiciary for separation of power to avoid overlap of responsibilities and accountability, transparency is made at each level. According to proclamation No 27/1995Art4(3), the region is structured in three zones namely, Agnwa zone, Mejang zone, Nuer zone and one special woreda (Itang special woreda). These zones vary in their infrastructures, weather conditions and socio economical status. The total numbers of both first cycle and second cycle secondary schools in the region are 30 and the total number of teachers in secondary schools 569 (REB, 2013).

3.5 Population

The determination of the population and sample schools is based on the 2013 Annual statistics report. According to this report there are (30) both first cycle and second cycle secondary schools
in Gambella Region. The study was expected to be conducted in all thirty (30) first and second cycle secondary schools teachers and principals which are included in the regional state of Gambella. Therefore, teachers and principals, (a total of 569) were included in the study.

3.6 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

In order to get relevant and authentic information about the leadership style of principals on teachers’ performance, respondents or the study population were selected by using simple random sampling technique. As mentioned above that there are (30) both first cycle and second cycle secondary schools. Eight schools range from (7-10), eleven schools from (9 – 10), one school from (9-11) and ten schools from (9-12) respectively. But, to obtain similar result, the researcher used only the range (9-12) or (10) first cycle and second cycle secondary schools because Gambella preparatory school incorporates both first and second cycle secondary schools. Therefore, the first cycle secondary schools that ranging from (7-10), (9-10) and (9-11) or (20) schools were removed from the sample.

After selecting ten general secondary schools, sample teachers were selected. The total numbers of teachers in the sample schools were (341). To determine the sample size of teachers, simple random sampling technique, the formula of Paler-Colmorin was used. Thus, out of (341) 180 were taken as a sample in the study. To give equal distribution of teachers between schools proportional allocation to size of teachers in each school was done.

To represent equal proportion of sample teachers in each secondary school William (1977) formula has been utilized. Hence it was done by dividing the targeted sample teachers (180) with the total number of teachers in the sample secondary schools (341) and multiplied by total number of teachers’ in each school.

Mathematically; 
\[ Ps = \frac{n}{N} \times (\text{no of teacher in each school}) \]

Where, 
- \( Ps \) = Proportional allocation to size
- \( n \) = Total teachers’ sample size (180)
- \( N \) = Total number of teacher in the ten selected sample school (341)

After this, the researcher has employed simple random sampling technique this is based on the assumption that it gives equal chances for the respondents to participate in the research,
therefore, especially lottery method has been employed, to select the representative teachers in each school.

Therefore, the general secondary schools principals, of Gambella Regional State were also selected through available sampling technique due to all the participants are few in number and easily manageable by the researchers. Moreover, the respondents are available in the study to get relevant and real information regarding to the issue under the study. Accordingly, 180 teachers and 22 principals were taken as a sample in this study. For detail information on the list of respondents included in the study see Table 3.1

Table 3.1- The summary of the population, sample size and sampling technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Schools</th>
<th>Total Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Sample size and percentage</th>
<th>Sampling techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gambella</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.9 3 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abobo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.5 2 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pignwodo</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2 2 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Godere</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51 3 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mengeshi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50 2 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jikawo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53.3 2 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lare</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55.7 2 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mekwey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3 2 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wantiwa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9 2 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Itang</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3 2 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total | 341             | 180                         | 22                         | 100

Source: GREB 2013 report
3.7 Instrument of data collection.

In order to acquire the necessary information from participants, three types of data collecting instruments was used. These are:

3.7.1 Questionnaire.

Closed ended questionnaire was employed to collect quantitative data from selected teachers. This is because item is convenient to conduct survey and to acquire necessary information from large number of study subject with short period of time. Furthermore, it makes possible an economy of time and expense and also provides a high proportion of usable response (Best & Kahn, 2003). The questionnaire was prepared in English language, because all of the sample teachers can to read and understood the concepts that were incorporated.

The questionnaires have two parts: The first part of the questionnaire describes the respondents’ background information include: sex, academic qualification, field of specialization, teaching load per week, experience and responsibilities holding. The second and the largest part incorporate the whole possible effect of independent variables of principals’ involvement of teachers in decision-making, communication to teachers and delegation of duties to teachers on dependent variables of teachers’ performance in terms of lesson plans preparation, assessments of student progress and involve in co-curricular activities challenge using closed ended question items. The closed ended items were prepared by using likert scales. The value of the scales was between one and five.

3.7.2 Interview

Semi-structured interview was used to gather in-depth qualitative data from (20) principals of the schools. Because interview has greatest potential to release more in-depth information, provide opportunity to observe non-verbal behavior of respondents, gives opportunities for clearing up misunderstandings, as well as it could be adjusted to meet many diverse situations (MoE, 1999). The data through interview was collected by researcher.

3.7.3 Document Analysis

In addition to questionnaire and interview, document analysis was used to substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire and interview. Documents like, Minutes of meeting, policy document, Job description records to see whether job delegated to subordinates, document
for selection of subordinates for workshop, training opportunity, promotion and rewards. Moreover, documents like (like, General Education Quality Assurance Packages).

3.8 Procedure of Data Collection

Before dispatching the questionnaire, two assistant data collectors were selected to gather data from the sample schools. The assistants were selected because of their conversant of the location and their English languages. Their languages and familiarity of the research areas thought to facilitate the data collection process. Then, the questionnaire were dispatched and collected through these assigned data collectors. To make the data collection procedure smart and cleared from confusions, the data collectors were properly oriented about the data collection procedures by researcher. In addition to this, nearby follow up was kept by the researcher. Furthermore, the researcher has provided orientation for all respondents concerning the objective of the study and how the items would be answered. Then, questionnaires were dispatched to sample teachers. In addition, semi-structured interview were also conducted with school Principals by the researcher himself. The researcher had initial contact with the interview to explain the objective of the study. While conducting the interview, the researcher used only notes.

3.9 Method of Data Analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistics such as ANOVA and Post Hoc Test were used to analyze the data collected through questionnaire. The data collected from teachers through closed ended items of the questionnaires that respondents’ background information especially, their sex, academic qualification and subject of specialization, teaching load per week, experience and responsibilities were analyzed by using frequency tables, and percentages. Furthermore, at univariate level the analysis was based on related frequencies tables means and percentages obtained from frequencies tables and descriptive statistics. To investigate the’ level of teachers performance, researcher used ANOVA to compare the independent variables, in simple and understandable way and to make it easy for further interpretation (Aron et al., 2008). It also used to roughly judge which (independent variables) practiced more in general secondary schools of Gambella region. To this effect, the questions related principals’ involvement of the in decision-making (B1.1-B1.6) were combined to from one global average index of principal in decision-making which was categorized into: greater involvement which represented democratic
leadership style, moderate involvement which represented laissez-faire style of leadership and limited involvement which representing autocratic leadership style. Questions on the teacher performance (C1.1-C3.6) in appendix A were combined to form one continuous index of teacher performance and crosstabs with principals’ decision-making and then compared by ANOVA and Post hoc test.

The other two indices: Principals communication with teaching staff was categorize into; (regular communication, moderate communication and irregular communication), and principals’ delegation of duties to teachers were categorizing into; (more delegation, moderate delegation and less delegation. each of these independent categorical variables were also crosstabs with teacher performance and compared by using ANOVA and Post hoc test. Data collected by interview guides were analyzed by organizing it into patterns, categories and through description. A correlation analysis was performed by using Pearson correlation coefficient. This helped to rate the significances of leadership styles in influencing teachers performance in general secondary schools in Gambella region.

3.10 Validity and Reliability Checks

In order to check the validity and reliability of the research instruments, the pre-test was done in Elay, Delkoch and Maremiyia secondary schools with 37 teachers and 6 school principals.

After the dispatched questionnaires’ were returned, necessary modification on 10 items and complete removal and replacement of 4 unclear questions were done. Additionally the reliability of the instrument was measured by using Cronbach alpha test. A reliability test was performed to check the consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. As Cronbach’s alpha shows the results are acceptable (between 0.71 and 0.92), indicating questions in each construct are measuring a similar concept.

3.11 Ethical Consideration

First, the researcher has gone to the study area with the letter of entry which was prepared by Jimma University Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies, Department of Edpm to Gambella Regional State Education Bureaus. The researcher has briefly the objectives of the study. Then, the study was carried out after getting permission from the selected sample of Gambella Secondary and Preparatory Schools.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered by different instruments, mainly questionnaire and semi-structured interview. The summary of the quantitative data has been presented by the use of tables that incorporates various statistical tools. Similarly, the qualitative data was organized according to the themes, analyzed and used to strengthen or to elaborate more that of the quantitative one. Because the research design is descriptive thus, the qualitative data is used to support the result obtained from the interpretation of the quantitative data.

As mentioned earlier, among various data collecting instruments, questionnaire and semi-structured interview and document analysis are used to collect necessary information for this study. Thus a total of 180 questionnaires were distributed to secondary school teachers. But properly filled and returned questionnaires were 170 (94.4 %). The other 10 questionnaires were lost or not included in the analysis, due to the problems from respondents and some contained incomplete information. Among 22 interview respondents 20 (91.1%) are properly participated and gave necessary information on the issue under investigation. In general (93.4 %) of respondents participated and gave necessary information on the issue raised through questionnaire and semi-structured interview. Therefore, the total response rate is sufficient and safe to analyze and interpret the data.

Various scholars provide some insight into leadership styles and how it may be affected by personal characteristics such as Sex, academic qualification, subject of specialization, service year (experience) teaching load per week and responsibilities.

4.1 Demographic Data of the Respondents

The overall results of the matter under investigation as well as respondent’s personal background information are presented brilliantly here under.
### Table 4.2 Teachers response on background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Academic Qualification</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BSC</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA/MSC</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field of specialization</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching Load per week</td>
<td>8-10 Period</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-16 Period</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17-24 Period</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 above Period</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>0-3 Years</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-16 Years'</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17-26 Years</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>H.R.T</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.O.D</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Club, Committees &amp; Unit Leaders</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inbuilt supervisors</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPD Coordinators</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** *HRT* means Home Room Teachers; *HOD* means Head of Department and *CPD* means Continuous Professional Development.

According to the information in Table 4.2 item 1 out of 170 teachers 138 (81.2%) are male and 32 (18.8%) are female. It shows that majority of teachers in general secondary schools of Gambella region are male.
As far as academic qualification is concerned, respondents were categorized into three groups, diploma, first degree, and Master degree. Table 4.2 item 2 reveals that 28 (16.5%) had diploma, and 142 (83.5%) had first degree. From Table 2 one can see easily that qualification of the majority of respondents is first degree. This is in line with the guideline drawn by Ministry of Education, that is at least first degree holders are supposed to teach in general secondary schools of Ethiopia.

According to item 3 in Table 4.2 it can be observed teachers teaching social sciences (History & Geography, Business & Economic, Languages including local languages) 73 (42.9%). While respondents that teaching Natural sciences (Math’s, Chemistry, Biology, Physics, ICT & T.D and Sport) were the majority 97 (57.1%). This was because many students specialized in Natural sciences because of 70% to 30% in preparatory system in Ethiopia. This is due to the government policy of encouraging the teaching of sciences, vocational and business subjects. This is shown by equipping secondary schools with up-to-date laboratories to promote teaching of sciences and opening up of vocational secondary schools to promote the teaching of vocational subjects.

“...The document showed that a certain teachers were deployed to teach a subject that he/she did not specialize in at college and most of the schools like ICT, Liberian and internet lab.”

Regarding respondents teaching load per week as Table 4.2 item 4 indicates that the majority 70 (41.2%) of the respondents had their teaching load ranging from 11 - 16 and 25 (14.7%) respondents had a teaching load of 17–24. 65 (38.2%) respondents are the belonging to a teaching load of 10 and below. While, 10 (5.9%) above 25 period. This means that majority of general secondary school teachers in Gambella region need to meet the required teaching load; a maximum of 18 and 24 lessons per week to teach at higher and normal level sections respectively, as per the recommendations by the Ministry of Education of Ethiopia. Since these teachers are neither over loaded nor under loaded, their performance is expected to be high; but such has not been the case. This prompted the researcher to undertake the current study.

“...Interview teaching load allocation is normally done by the principals in consultation with the deputy as well as the HODs. Most of the principals said that teachers with 8-10 teaching load per week were those holds different responsibilities like H.o.D, H.R.T, Unit Leader, committees, coordinator and supervisors at the schools...”
As far as respondents years of teaching experience is concerned. Item 5 in Table 4.2 indicates that out 170 teachers 63 (37%) of teachers have the services of 3 years and below. But the rest 44 (25%) or 46(27%) and 17(10%) have 4 -7, 8-16 and more than 17-26 year of service respectively. As the result reveals, more teachers are in the service year of three and less, thus a critical support and coaching should be available for them, because they may faced by various methodological problem in class management assessing and recording marks which lead to reducing their performance level. At the same time this: could imply that most teachers have to get sufficient professional knowledge of teaching from others. Moreover, 46 (27%) above 8 years of service therefore, imply that almost teachers are well experienced and it is a good opportunity to share experience.

Teachers, as professionals need to have responsibility to their own works to be effective and good performer. As item 6 in Table above reveals, majority of the respondents had positive feeling on the schools practice in giving responsibility for the teachers work. The researcher further investigated into the responsibilities teachers currently hold at schools. The results in Table 4.2 indicate that 40 (23.5%) respondents are Home room teachers and 35 (20.6 %) respondents are departmental heads. while, 79 (46.5%) respondents are clubs, committees and Unit-leaders responsibilities holder in other activities such as; senior women teachers, guidance and counseling, discipline, population data source, five to one . On the other hand, Inbuilt supervisors 8 (4.7%) and 8 (4.7%) CPD coordinators indicated that they participate in administrative work. This means that apart from teaching, teachers have to take up other responsibilities like financial, report of income guidance teachers have to carried out by the teachers. This was because such teachers have just been newly recruited in the schools, so they needed to learn and understand the school environment before taking up school responsibilities. However, respondents indicated to have no extra responsibility at all.

‘But the interview result indicates that, majority of teachers expect command from the school principal, department heads or other concerned staff members to do their work. It indicates the low initiation of teachers in performing their task without external pressure. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that although teachers indicate their agreement regarding to their responsibility, they did not implement it effectively due to expecting injections from others. This confirms the presence of low initiation among secondary school teachers of the study area; which reduces their involvement in various school issues as well as their efforts in improving the students’ academic achievement.’
4.2 Descriptive Analysis of Variables
After the demographic information of teachers, the researcher presents the descriptive analysis subsequently the opinions of the respondents. This was done by first dealing with the independent variables, followed by dependent variables.

4.2.1 Independent Variables
In this sub-section, the researcher was attracted in establishing the opinions of the respondents where strongly disagree and disagree were combined to mean disagree and this represented autocratic leadership style. On the other hand, neither agree nor disagree would mean that a leader is of a laissez-faire style while agree and strongly agree were combined to mean agree which meant that a leader is democratic in leadership style. To this effect, the researcher asked the respondents to give their opinions on the questionnaires whether their principals involve them in the decision making of the school administration or not. Respondents’ opinions were given and results indicated in Table 4.3

Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents opinion on whether their principals involve Teachers in decision-making or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on Decision-making</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The Principal do not considering teachers’ suggestions and thoughts in decision making for training criteria in school</td>
<td>F 107</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 62.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 My view in Meeting of policy are considered in final decision-making of the school administration</td>
<td>F 86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 50.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 My principals consults me whenever he/she wants to pass final resolution in school meeting</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 My principal allow me to demonstrate high degree of innovativeness, initiative and creativity in decision making process of the school</td>
<td>F 91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 My principals encourages co-operation among the teaching staff during the decision-making process of the school</td>
<td>F 103</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 My principal is uncomfortable with Decision I made for promotion in staff meetings</td>
<td>F 80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 47</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information in Table 4.3 item 1 indicated that 107 (62.9%) of the respondents’ opinions were in agreement that principals do not consider their suggestion and thoughts in decision making for training by the school administration while 33 (19.1%) respondents fairly agreed in their opinions. This left the minority 30 (18%) respondents disagreeing on the question that principals do not consider their suggestion and thoughts in decision making in meetings organized by the school administration. This means that majority 107 (62.9%) of the secondary school teachers’ suggestions and thoughts were not considered in decision making in meetings organized by the school principals. This showed that autocratic leadership style is highly practiced by secondary school principals in general secondary schools. Okoye (1997) viewed that workers should be involved in decision that concern them like general working conditions, fringe benefits and staff development programs as this adds to the attractiveness of the organization climate and for good performance. Ndu and Anogbov (2007) showed that where teachers are not involved in governance, result to teachers behaving as if they are strangers within the school environment. Thus, most teachers do not put in their best to have full sense of commitment and loyalty to the school. On the other hand, Yukl (1994) found that autocratic leaders tend to have the following characteristics: they do not consult members of the organization in the decision-making process, the leaders set all policies, the leader predetermines the methods of work, the leader determines the duties of followers, and the leader specifies technical and performance evaluation standards. Thus, safe to conclude that principals have not gotten wider range of teachers’ suggestions and taught on criteria of training that are needed to enhance teacher performance.

As Item 2 explore the opinions of the respondents on whether their views in meetings were considered in the final decision making of the school administration or not. Information in Table 4.3 indicated that 41 (24.1%) respondents’ opinions were in disagreement that their views in meetings are considered in the final decision of the school administration. This is an indication of autocratic leadership style which does not consider views of the followers. This left 43 (25.3%) respondents’ opinions were fairly in agreement with the question, an indication of laissez-faire leadership style which does not concern whether teachers contribute their views in meetings or not. This is because the leader does not worry about the subordinates, for he/she gives them all the freedom needed to perform any task given. The majority 86 (50.6%) respondents’ opinions were in agreement with the fact that their views in meetings are considered in final decision making of the school administration. This shows that (50.6%) respondents of the general secondary school
teachers’ views in Gambella are considered in the final decision of the school administration. Goldman (2000) states 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. 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.

This means the majority of the principals in the study area practiced democratic leadership style that puts into consideration the views of the subordinates for the smooth running of the institutions. However, there were few principals as showed by (24.1%) of the teacher respondents who do not consider the views of their teachers in final decision-making of the school administration. This is typical of autocratic style of leadership which does not consider subordinates views for proper running of the institutions of learning.

As item 3 examined the respondents’ opinions on whether they are often consulted by principals on issues that the administrators want to make decision. The result in Table 4.3 indicates that 78 (46%) of the respondents’ opinions were in agreement that they are consulted whenever their principals want to pass final resolutions in the school meetings. This left 31 (18%) of the respondents’ opinions were in disagreement. while 61 (36%) respondents fairly agreed in their opinions. This clearly shows that the majority 78 (46%) of teachers in the study area are consulted by their principals whenever they pass final resolutions in meetings. This means that most of the principals in the study area practice democratic leadership style, where principals first consult teachers before passing up the final resolutions in meetings. This motivates teachers to perform to the best of their abilities in order to achieve the goals they themselves resolved in meetings.

The democratic style of leadership emphasizes group and leader participation in the making of policies. Decisions about organizational matters are arrived at 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 (Heenan and Bennis 1999). In this style of leadership, a high degree of staff morale is always enhanced (Mba, 2004). However, there were some principals who practiced Laissez-fair style of leadership. This was indicated by (36%) of the respondents who agreed fairly that they are consulted in meetings.
before passing the final resolutions. The conclusion is because there are certain issues a principal has to pass without consulting teachers, for example disciplining a member of teaching staff.

As item 4 explore the respondents’ opinions on whether their principals allow teachers high degree to demonstrate innovativeness, initiative and creativity or not during the decision making process of the school. The result in Table 4.3 reveals that 91 (53%) respondents’ opinions were in agreement that their principals allow them to demonstrate innovativeness and creativity during decision making process of the school while 40 (24%) respondents’ opinions were fairly agreed with the asked question. However, 39 (23%) respondents were in disagreement with the view that their principals encourage them to demonstrate innovativeness and creativity during decision making process of the school. This clearly shows that the majority 91 (53.5%) of the secondary teachers in Gambella region are encouraged by their principals to be creative and innovative during decision making process in the schools. Thus, right to conclude that this type of principals demonstrate democratic leadership style because they have it in mind that creative and innovative teachers bring new ideas that are needed to achieve school goals and objectives.

Item 5, to find out whether principals encourage cooperation or not among the teaching staff during decision making process of the school. The information in Table 4.3 indicates that the majority 103 (61%) respondents were in agreement that their principals encourage cooperation among the teaching staff during the decision making process of the school. while 41 (24%) respondents’ were in disagreement with the question that their principals encourage cooperation during staff meetings. This left 26 (15%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions. This clearly indicates that most 103 (61%) of the secondary schools teachers in study areas are encouraged by their principals to have cooperation during the decision making process of the schools. “Two heads are better than one”. This means that when two or more people sit and try solving a problem together, they are able to make better decisions than one person. Oduro, (2004) maintains that “problem-solving through consultation is impossible with a single person’s wisdom” Such principals who encourage cooperation among teaching staff are democratic in personality. They know very well that teachers cannot perform to their expectation unless they are in co-operated in school aspects like decision making process.

As item 6 established whether principals were comfortable or not with the decisions teachers made for promotion in staff meetings. The result in Table 4.3 indicated that the 80 (47.%) of the
respondents’ opinions agreed on the issue that principals are uncomfortable with the decisions teachers make in the staff meetings while 45 (26.5%) respondents fairly agreed in their opinions. However, 45 (26.5%) respondents’ opinions were in disagreement that their principals were not uncomfortable with the decisions they pass in staff meetings. This shows that (80 or 47%) of general secondary schools teachers’ views in decision makes principals uncomfortable. Therefore, the majority of secondary schools principals are uncomfortable to views of teachers in meetings; this is an indication of autocratic leadership style practiced by the secondary school principals in the study area that allows no exchange of views and ideas without any one feeling uncomfortable with other people’s views. Such uncomfort-ability in views of one another, leads to poor performance among the teaching staff. Ezeuwa (2005) support the fact that when people are part of decision making process, there is greater opportunity of the expression of mind, ideas, existing disputes and more occasions for disagreements and agreements.

“...When interviewed were conducted to principals on the manner they involve their teachers in decision making of the schools they all responded by saying that they organize staff meetings in which teachers participate in decision-making, setting meeting agenda, exchange ideas and views of how to run the schools. This indicated that most of the principals practiced democratic style of leadership. This is because democratic style of leadership promotes unity, cooperation, teamwork and hardworking among teachers, which in turn enhances their performance.”

The researcher went to establish the respondents’ opinion on how their principals communicate to teachers. On this note, the respondents gave their opinions and the results indicated in Table 4.4

Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents opinion on whether principals communicate to teachers or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on Communication</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal sends memos</td>
<td>F 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal makes Telephones call</td>
<td>F 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principals organizes meeting</td>
<td>F 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principals writes a note</td>
<td>F 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to item 1 in Table 4.4 the majority 63 (37%) of the respondents’ were in agreement that their principals send them memos when they want to communicate to them while 55 (32.4%) respondents disagreed in their opinions. This left 52 (30.6%) respondents fairly agreed that their principals send memos to them when they want to pass any communication to them. This means that 37.1% of the secondary school teachers in Gambella are communicated to by their principals through memos. Supported by House (1968) path-goal theory that stipulates that for subordinates to perform well the leader has to guide or direct them through verbal or written communication in form of notices, memos or meetings. This reveals a democratic style of leadership where principals find it easy to pass information to teachers through memos. This lays a fertile ground for teachers to perform well.

As item 2 examined the respondents’ opinions on whether principals make telephone calls when they want to talk to teachers or not. Results in Table 4.4 indicate that 43 (25.3%) respondents fairly agreed to the asked question while 58 (43.1%) respondents disagreed with the view that their principals make telephone calls when they want to communicate to them. This left majority 69 (40.6%) of the respondents agreed that principals make telephone calls when they want to talk to them. This implied that (40.6%) of the secondary school teachers in study areas are communicated to by their principals through telephone calls. Oxford (2005) found that communication as a process of passing on information from one person to another. This was because it was quicker and safer to talk to the teachers through telephone calls than other modes of communication like; meetings or sending other teachers to pass information to the needed staff member. This conclude that proper communication to teaching staff by principals is a characteristic of a democratic leadership style and if well practiced continuously and at all levels could yield to high teacher performance. This is because teachers are informed in time to do what is expected of them.

As item 3 further investigated the respondents’ opinion on whether principals organize meetings when they want to talk to teachers or not. The result in Table 4.4 indicate 96 (56%) of the respondents agreed that their principals organize meetings when they want to communicate to them while 42 (25%) respondents disagreed with the view that their principals organize meetings when they want to communicate to them. This left 32 (19%) respondents fairly agreeing in their
opinions. This shows that majority (56%) of the secondary school teachers in Gambella are communicated to by their principals through meetings. Armstrong (2003) further notes that, the more open, the culture is, the more open communication is likely to be revealed to the subordinates (enhance teacher performance). This indicates principals in the study area use democratic style of leadership where staff meetings are organized for teachers to exchange their views with their superiors. It is through such meetings that teacher performance is enhanced.

As item 4 investigated the respondents’ opinions on whether principals write notices in the staff notice board when they want to talk to teachers or not. Information in Table 4.4 indicate that 52 (31%) respondents disagreed with the view that principals write notices on the staff notice board when they want to talk to them while 31 (18%) respondents fairly agreed in their opinions to the asked question. This left 87 (51%) respondents’ opinions in agreement that their principals write notices in the staff notice board when they want to talk to them. This indicates that most (51%) of secondary school teachers in study areas are communicated to by their principals through notices written in the staff notice boards. According to Miller (1998), communication plays a pivotal role in our daily lives. To articulate our ideas, feelings, emotions and skills we communicate not only with verbal but also with non-verbal methods. This is because staff notice boards are open and accessible to every teacher to get information.

“....When principals were asked on how they communicate to their teachers, they responded that they organize meetings through which they talk to the teachers. Others said that they communicate to teachers through telephone calls, memos and passing information through other teachers. The researcher therefore notes that a principal who communicates freely to the teaching staff through meetings, memos and telephone calls practices democratic leadership style and usually such communications motivate, encourage and gain information needed for teachers to execute their duties and responsibilities well. On the other hand, a principal who does not communicate to the teachers practices autocratic leadership style and this usually de-motivates, discourages and impedes teacher performance because they are not availed with information in time to do what is expected of them. However, a principal who does not mind to communicate nor take seriousness in providing information to teachers, practices laissez-faire leadership style and this usually makes teachers lazy to perform what is expected of them”

Mullins (1993) identified that delegation of authority as 'the authorization to undertake activities that would otherwise be carried out by someone in a more senior position. Cole (1996) describes it as a process whereby a leader or a senior officer cedes or entrusts some of his authority to subordinates or team mates to perform certain tasks or duties on his behalf. They however warned
that the manager or the senior officer remains accountable for those tasks or duties to his own superior officers.

The researcher went to explored the respondents’ opinions on the questions asked whether principals’ delegate duties to their teachers or not. The results in Table 4.5 indicated below.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Respondents opinion on whether principals delegated duties to teachers or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on Delegation</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am delegated duties by school principals</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am directed by principal on how to perform the delegated duties</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am guided by principal on how to perform the delegated duties</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am supervised by principal on duties delegated to me</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am rewarded by principal for the duties delegated to me</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal delegated duties me that I am knowledge about.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal delegated me duties I am skilled at.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal duties that I am talented at.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal delegated me duties that I have no idea about.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal delegated me duties I have no experience.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be viewed from Table 4.5 item 1 indicates that majority 97 (57%) of the respondents’ opinions was agreement with the view that they are delegated duties by school administrators. On the other hand, 40 (24%) respondents’ opinions were in disagreement with the view that they are delegated duties by the school administrators. This left 33 (19%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions. This means that majority (57%) of the secondary school teachers in study areas are delegated duties by their school administrators. This indicates a democratic style of leadership.
practiced by principals. (Hannagan 2002). Delegation is where a leader transfers power, responsibility, authority and decision making procedures to subordinates working in various departments of any given organization. Thus, once concluded that Proper delegation of duties relieves the school administrators from their many tasks and secondly it inculcates a sense of responsibility, hard working and commitment among the subordinates which in turn enhances teacher performance.

As far as item 2 establishes opinions the respondents’ on whether teachers are directed by the school administrators on how to perform the delegated duties or not. Results in Table 4.5 reveal that (94 or 55%) of the respondents agreed that they are directed by school administrators on duties delegated to them. On the other hand, 44 (26%) respondents fairly agreed in their opinions. This left 32 (19%) respondents disagreeing to the view that they are directed by school administrators on duties delegated to them. Basing on this, it can be noted that majority (55%) of the secondary school teachers in region are directed by their school administrators on duties delegated to them. (Lussier & Achua, 2001) That is, the leader provides both high directive (structure) and high supportive in setting high expectations for work improvement and rewards subordinates when the expectations are met. Hence, safe to conclude that Proper direction by principals to subordinates is a characteristic of democratic leadership style and if this is done continuously teachers’ performance is enhanced.

Regarding to item 3 establishes the respondents’ opinions on whether they are guided by school administrators on how to perform the delegated duties to them or not. Results in Table 4.5 shows that the majority 92 (54.1%) of the respondents agreed in their opinions that they are guided by school administrators on duties delegated to them while 37 (21.8%) respondents’ opinions were in disagreement with the view that they are guided by school administrators on duties delegated to them. This left 41 (24.1%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions to the asked question. This implied that most (54.1%) of the secondary teachers in the region are guided by school administrators on duties delegated to them. Thus, find to conclude that guidance of subordinates by their superiors on what to do is an element found in democratic style of leadership. The researcher discovered that if teachers are guided on how to perform the delegated duties, they become efficient and effective in performing what has been given to them.
According, to information obtained from item 4 opinions of the respondents’ on whether principals supervise them on the delegated duties or not. Results in Table 4.5 reveal that an in excess of whelming majority 94 (55.3%) of the respondents agreed in their opinions that they are supervised by principals on the delegated duties while 34 (20%) respondents opinions were in disagreement with the view that they are supervised by principals on duties delegated to them. This left 42 (24.7%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions to the asked question. This shows that most teachers (94 or 53.3%) in secondary schools in Gambella region are supervised by their principals on the delegated duties. McNamara (1999) identified that for the delegated task to be done well, the supervisor and the subordinate must agree on when the job is to be finished It can be noticed from this information that principals in selected secondary schools in the study area are democratic because they practice proper supervision of subordinates, which is an element embodied in democratic style. The supervision of the delegated duties makes teachers committed, hardworking, effective and efficient in their work.

It is observed in item 5 to find out the respondents’ opinions on whether they are rewarded by principals for the duties delegated to them or not. Results in Table 4.5 indicate that 76 (44.7%) respondents gave their opinions agreeing that they are rewarded by their principals for the duties delegated to them. On the other hand, 57 (33.5%) respondents’ opinions were in disagreement with the view that they are rewarded by principals for duties delegated to them. This left 37 (21.8%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions to the asked question. This shows that most 76 (44.7%) of the secondary school teachers in the study area are rewarded by their principals for the duties delegated to them. Principals who reward their teachers in terms of monetary, promotion, and verbal appreciation for any duty delegated are democratic in nature. Such rewards motivate teachers, make them committed and hard working thereby enhancing their performance.

As item 6 investigated the respondents’ opinions on whether they are delegated duties they are knowledgeable about or not. Results in Table 4.5 indicate that 89 (52.4%) respondents agreed that their principals delegate them duties they are knowledgeable about. However, 40 (23.5%) respondents’ opinions were in disagreement with the view that their principals delegate them duties they are knowledgeable about. This left 41 (24.1%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions to the asked question. Basing on this, majority (89 or 52.4%) of the secondary school teachers in Gambella region are delegated duties they are knowledgeable about by their
principals. Such proper delegation of duties basing on teachers’ knowledge enhances their performance and makes the work simpler. This is highly supported by House (1968) path-goal theory that stipulates that for proper performance of the subordinates and goal achievement, the leader has to distribute different tasks to subordinates according to skills, abilities, knowledge, interests, talents and experience.

The researcher further examined the respondents’ opinions on whether they are delegated duties they are skilled at or not. Results in Table 4.5 reveal that 102 (60%) respondents had their opinions in agreement that their principals delegate them duties they are skilled in while 27(16%) respondents fairly agreed in their opinions to the asked question. This left 41 (24%) respondents’ opinions in disagreement that they are delegated duties they are skilled at. This clearly indicates that most (102 or 60%) of the secondary school teachers in study areas are delegated duties they are skilled at by their principals. This is typical of a democratic leadership style that puts into account the skills one has before any task is given. This is because the skills embodied in teachers through training enables them to be very confident and stable in their responsibilities thus enhancing their performance. However, there were some principals who were autocratic in nature because they assigned duties to teachers irrespective of skills they had. This was revealed by (24%) of secondary school teacher respondents in the study area who indicated that their principals assigned them duties they are not skilled at. The researcher discovered that such principals should not be blamed because there are some teachers who are very rigid to change and unless forced to do tasks they are not skilled at, then they will never acquire new skills.

As Table 4.5 item 8 show that 48 (28.2%) respondents gave their opinions in disagreement with the view that, their principals delegate them duties they are talented at while majority 84 (49.4%) of the respondents’ opinions were in agreement that, their principals delegate them duties they are talented at. This left 38 (22.4%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions to the asked question. This shows that most 84 (49.4%) of the secondary school teachers in the study area are delegated duties they are talented at by their principals. This shows that teacher performance in the study area is enhanced because talents add efficiency and speed up work performed.
“..According to interviews conducted between the researcher and principals on what criteria do principals follow when delegating duties to the teachers? Principals responded that some duties are delegated to teachers basing on knowledge, skills and subject specialization of the teachers. For example, principals said that for one to head of chemistry department must be skilled and knowledgeable in chemistry. Most of the principals said that some duties are delegated depending on the talents of the teachers; for example teachers talented in painting are assigned tasks in pedagogy in order to prepare teaching aids. However, some principals said that they delegate duties to teachers with experience, seniority and those who are committed to work. This was because teachers with skills, knowledge, experience and commitment perform well the duties delegated to them than teachers without such qualities.”

According to item 9 to investigate the respondents’ opinions on whether teachers are delegated duties they have no idea about. Results in Table 4.5 revealed that minority 35 (20.6%) of the respondents gave their opinions in agreement, that principals delegate them duties they have no idea at all while 33 (19.4%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions to the asked question. This left majority 102 (60%) of the respondents disagreeing in their opinions that, their principals delegate them duties they have no idea at all. This indicates that majority 102 (60%) teachers in secondary schools in Gambella region are never delegated duties they have no idea about by their principals. This is because principals are aware that if they delegated teachers duties they have no idea about, such duties are likely to be performed poorly.

“..On interviews conducted with principals on the way they follow when delegating duties, principals said that they usually delegate teachers’ duties they have idea about, in order to enhance their performance.”

As item 10 set up the respondents’ opinions on whether teachers are delegated duties they have no experience at all. Result in Table 4.5 reveals that most 105 (61.8%) of the respondents gave their opinions in disagreement that, principals delegate them duties they have no experience at all. On the other hand, 42 (24.1%) respondents agreed in their opinions that, principals delegate them duties they have no experience at all. This left the minority 24 (14.1%) respondents fairly agreeing in their opinions to the asked question. This means that most (61.8%) of the teachers in secondary schools in the study area are not delegated duties they are not experienced at, by their principals. This was because principals were aware that if they delegated duties teachers had no experience at all, such duties were likely to be performed poorly. Chapman, (2005) found out that
inexperienced or unreliable people will need a lot of close supervision to get a job done to the correct standards. However, there were some principals as indicated by 6.4% of the respondents, who delegated duties to teachers who had no experience at all. Healthfield, (2004) discovered that inexperienced or unreliable people will need a lot of close supervision to get a job done to the correct standards. This was done in-order to make such teachers get some experience through practicing what they are not experienced at.

“When the researcher inquired on the criteria principals use to delegate duties to teachers; some principals responded by saying that they consider the experience a teacher has in performing a given task delegated. This is because experienced teachers are more knowledgeable in performing tasks than un-experienced ones."

The researcher went to summarize the overall distribution of respondents by opinion on principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making, principals’ communication to teachers and head principals’ delegation of duties to teachers and the results are presented in Table 4.6

Table 4.6: Summary of distribution of the respondents by opinion on principal involvement of teachers in decision-making, communication to teachers and delegation of duties to teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question on independent variables</th>
<th>Average respondents’ opinion in favour of</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals involvement of teachers in decision-making</td>
<td>Frequency 85</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percents 50</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ communication to teachers</td>
<td>Frequency 88</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percents 52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals delegation of duties to teachers</td>
<td>Frequency 76</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percents 45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According the overall distribution of respondents by opinion on whether principals involve teacher in decision making or not. Information in Table 4.6 indicate that majority 85 (50%) of the respondents were in agreement that their principals involve them in decision making of the school. This was followed by 44 (25.9%) respondents who disagreed in their opinions. this left the minority 41(24.1%) respondents who are fairly agreed on the view that their principals involve them in decision making of the school. This means that large amount (85 or 50%) of the
secondary school teachers in the study areas are involved in decision making of the schools by their principals. This clearly shows that many secondary school principals in Gambella region practice democratic leadership style which allows subordinates to participate in decision making. Despite this, a considerable number (41 or 24.1%) of the respondents fairly agreed in their opinions, meaning that there were some secondary principals who practiced Laissez-faire leadership style. Therefore, as far as teachers involvement in decision making is concerned, democratic followed by laissez-faire styles of leadership have fairly affected teacher performance in secondary schools in the region.

In examining on whether principals communicate to the teaching staff or not, the overall results in Table 4.6 reveals that 88 (52%) respondents were in agreement that their principals communicate to them while 51 (30%) respondents were in disagreement in their opinions on the asked question. On other hand, only 31 (18%) respondents were fairly agreed on the view that their principals communicate to them. This means that most (88 or 52%) of the secondary school teachers in study area are communicate to by their principals. This shows that a sizeable number of secondary school principals in the study area practice democratic leadership style because proper communication of supervisors to subordinates (teachers) is a feature embodied in democratic style of leadership. In support Heenan and Bennis , (1999) stated that, the leader as much as possible attempts 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 (Mba, 2004).

In analyzing whether principals delegate duties to teachers or not, the overall results in Table 4.6 indicate that 76 (45%) respondents were in agreement in the opinions on the view of principals’ delegation of duties to teachers while 53 (31%) respondents disagreed that, their principals delegate duties to them. This left 41 (24%) respondents were fairly agreed on the view that they are delegated duties by their head teachers. This indicates that secondary school teachers in the region are delegated duties by their principals as indicated by 47% agreeing respondents’ opinions respectively. This means that both autocratic and democratic leadership styles are almost equally practiced by secondary school principals in Gambella region as far as delegation of duties to teachers is concerned. Table 4.7 average teachers’ opinion in favour leadership styles
Table 4.7 Average distribution of teacher respondents by opinion on leadership styles practiced by general secondary school principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership styles</th>
<th>Average teachers’ opinion in favour of</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire</td>
<td>Democratic represented by Agree</td>
<td>Laissez-faire represented by Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentages</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in table 4.7 indicate that the majority 83 (49%) of the respondents’ opinions revealed that their principals practiced democratic leadership style while 59 (35%) respondents indicated that their principals were autocratic in their leadership style. This left 28 (16%) respondents revealing that their principals were Laissez-faire in nature. This means that most of the secondary school principals practiced democratic leadership style as indicated by 49% of the teachers. This is so because principals are aware that teacher performance is enhanced by involving teachers in decision making process of the schools, proper communication to teachers and delegation of duties to teachers. However, results indicated that there are some principals who practiced autocratic leadership style as showed by 35 %. As a result of this teachers who did not want to do school tasks given to them. Therefore, force had to be used to such teachers in order to perform.

To a lesser extent, some principals were found out practicing laissez-faire style as indicated by 16 % of the respondents. The reason was there were some principals in the study area who give freedom to their teachers to perform their duties with minimum interference. This was so because some secondary school teachers in Gambella region are familiar, capable committed and interested in performing school tasks with very little guidance and directives given to them by their principals.

4.2.2 Dependent Variable

Okunola, (1990), Kirk & Gallagher, (1983) acknowledge teacher performance is the most essential group of professionals for our nation’s future. Adepoju, (1996) teacher performances
describes in terms of duties performed by teachers inside and outside the classroom with morale. Inside duties include; preparation for classes, guiding the learning of students, checking students’ progress and setting good example for students while outside duties are; involving students in co-curricular activities like HIV/AIDS, environmental club and fieldwork football, volleyball Hornby (, 2000).

In this section, the teacher performances, were very rarely and rarely were combined to form an index of rarely which indicated low performance which ranged from (0-49%) while, Neither rarely nor regularly indicate moderate performance which ranged from (50-70%) and regularly and very regularly were combined to form an index regularly which indicated high performance which ranged from (71-100%). To this effect, the researcher went to establish the way teachers make lesson preparations and their responses are indicated in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Teachers’ responses on the way they make lesson preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson plan preparation among teachers</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>rarely nor</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I revise in internet lab when preparing lesson plans</td>
<td>93 54.7%</td>
<td>36 21.2%</td>
<td>41 24.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Make schemes of work for the lesson to be taught</td>
<td>115 67.6%</td>
<td>30 17.6%</td>
<td>25 14.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I make plans for the lesson to be taught</td>
<td>132 77.6%</td>
<td>21 12.4%</td>
<td>17 10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I always come with lesson plans to class</td>
<td>95 55.9%</td>
<td>40 23.5%</td>
<td>35 20.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I make record of lesson taught</td>
<td>125 73.5%</td>
<td>24 14.1%</td>
<td>21 12.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing whether teachers revised in internet lab when preparing lesson or not. Results in table 4.8 indicates that 93(54.7%) respondents are regularly revised in internet lab when preparing lesson 41(24.1) rarely revise in internet lab. While, 36 (21.1%) respondents are fairly revise in internet lab. This means that most (54.7%) of secondary teachers in Gambella region revise in internet Lab during lesson preparations. This has revealed to good performance, because teachers get proper content/ matter to give the learners. However, the researcher believes that teachers responded positively on this question because they feared to be drawn in. This is because some of study areas are in rural and remote area, where network, light and facilities like modern text
books and internets are rare.

_This was truly supported by principals when asked whether their teachers revised in internet lab during lesson preparations. Majority of the principals responded that their schools do not have internet lab where teachers get content for teaching._

As item 2 whether teachers’ Make schemes of work for the lesson to be taught or no in Table 4.8 reveals that majority 115(67.6%) respondent are Regularly make schemes of work for the lesson while, 30 (17.6%) fairly making schemes of lesson and this left 25(14.7%) rarely making schemes of work for the lesson. The above implies that majority (67.6%) of secondary school teachers in Gambella region make schemes of work during lesson preparations. This has an implication to good performance because scheming properly guides the teacher to logically follow the order of teaching without skipping some topics. Further, scheming ensures that the syllabi are completed in time.

_Interviews conducted with principals on how teachers prepare for lessons indicated that secondary school teachers in the study areas are given scheme books or papers to be used for scheming every term. To ensure that this was done, scheme books and papers were checked and signed by either vice director of school or principals themselves. Also us for supervising the coverage of contents taught and completion of syllabus. This has ensured hard working and commitment on the side of teachers which in turn has led to good performance._

Item 3 I make plans for the lesson to be taught in Table 4.8 reveals that 132 (77.6) respondents are regularly make plans for the lesson to be taught while, 21(12.4%) fairly make plan this left 17 (10.0%) rarely make plan for the lesson to be taught. This shows that majority (77.6%) of the teachers in secondary schools make lesson plans for the lessons to be taught. This has a positive effect on performance because lesson planning makes teachers organized, ready and prepared to teach. Secondly it is professional for teachers to prepare lessons plans before teaching. The researcher, however, discovered that teachers responded positively on this question because it is against teachers’ professional ethics to teach without a lesson plan.

_‘Interviews conducted with principals on whether teachers make lesson plans during lesson preparations, their responses indicated that majority of their teachers do not make lesson plans. This was because most schools do not have enough money to purchase lesson plan books and carbon papers for their secondary school teachers used in lesson planning.’_

Item 4, teachers always come with lesson plans to class. Result in Table 4.8 indicates that majority
95 (55.9) respondents are regularly come with lesson plans to class while, 40 (23.5) respondent are fairly come with lesson plans to class. This left 35 (20.6) respondents are rarely come with lesson plans to class.

Always teachers come with lesson plans in class 95 (55.9%). Regularly marking record of lesson taught tests. There was also a marked absence of lesson plans by teachers who were found in class teaching. This was contrary to (55.9%) of the respondents who indicated that teachers came with lesson plans in class. Basing on the above responses it is thus, fair to conclude that the majority of the teachers in Gambella general secondary schools were not prepared plan adequately.”

Item 5 I make record of lesson taught information in Table 4.8 shows that majority 125 (73.5%) respondents are regularly make record of lesson taught while, 24 (14.7%) respondents are fairly make record of lesson taught this left, 12 (12.4%) respondents are rarely make record of lesson taught. This has implication to teacher performance because making record of work for lessons taught and not taught helps a teacher to discover topics not taught and those taught. This makes the teachers to teach the topics not taught thus completing the syllabi in time thereby ensuring good performance.

‘Interviews conducted from principals revealed that teachers make records of work for lessons taught and not taught for recording purposes and supervision of teachers whether they have been teaching or not. This has helped principals to find out contents completion of syllabus performing and non performing teachers. The non performing teachers are then directed, guided and motivated to perform well.’ this is highly supported by Yenenew, A. (2012) who study the effectiveness’ of principal instructional leadership in preparatory schools of south wollo zone, found that most school characterized by delay: in the begging time of instructional process, problems of curriculum coverage, burden of makeup class around the end of the semester’

The researcher went to investigate whether teachers are assessing their students’ at schools and responses are indicated in Table 4.9
Table 4.9: Teachers’ responses on how they assess the students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing students by teachers</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give tests to my students</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give home work to my students</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give examinations to my students</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give exercise to my students</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As items 1 in Table 4.9 reveals that there are regularly testing 124 (72.9%), while 27 (15.9%) of respondents are rarely give test to their students. This left 19 (11.2%) of the respondents neither rarely nor regularly give test to students. This means that majority (124 or72.9%) of the secondary school teachers in study areas give tests in the process of assessing students. This is because giving tests to learners has an implication to performance. In this case, the teachers are in position to identify the abilities of different students. Assessing through giving tests, enable the teachers to arrange for extra teaching for weak students. This has inevitably improved students performance within the region.

“...When interviewed whether teachers give tests to students or not, the principals said that assessing students through tests is regularly done in secondary schools. This has helped the students to read harder thus improving their performance, one principal said. To this effect, the researcher discovered that regular giving of tests could help teachers to grade and stream students for proper guidance and teaching and also help teachers to identify students learning abilities. Thus, this could certainly enhance teacher performance.”

Table 4.9 item 2 result in indicates that majority 126(74.1%) of the respondents are regularly giving home work. While, 19 (11.2%) respondent are fairly giving home work. this left 25 (14.7%) rarely giving home work to students. means that most (74.1%) of the secondary school teachers in study areas give home work to their students. This has an effect on performance of students in that regular giving of home work to students mean that they are ever busy after school hours. This has helped students to perform well. The researcher believes that when teachers
assign home work to students, they are extending their teaching roles to helping students revise and be busy after classes. All these are done to help students perform well.

“In interviewing principals whether their teachers give home work to the students, majority of principals responded that their teachers give regular home work to enhance students’ performance.”

Table .4.9 Item 3 information in indicates that majority 112(65.9%) of respondents are regularly giving examination to students. while, 23(13.5%) of respondents fairly give examination to students. This left 35 (20.6%) respondents are rarely give examination to students.

This shows that most secondary school teachers (65.9%) in the study area give examinations to their students. This has an implication to teacher performance because it helps them to screen and marking students according to their intelligence and abilities. It also helps teachers to promote students from one class to another.

“..Interviews conducted with principals on how teachers assess students, their responses indicated that teachers usually give term examinations that help to assess the progress of the learners in secondary schools in Gambella region.’’

The researcher discovered that, despite the government policy of promotion in all secondary schools, teachers in secondary schools in Gambella assess students through examinations to determine their potentials for promotion, of grade to grade, streaming, progress and proper guidance of the learners.

Table 4.9 Item 4 results in indicated that majority 115 (67.6%) respondents are regularly give exercise the students’ .while, 24 (14.1%) fairly give exercise to the students. This left 35 (18.2%) respondents are rarely give exercise to students. This means that most (67.6%) of the secondary school teachers in study area give exercises to their students during assessment process. This has an optimistic call on performance of both teachers and students within secondary education within the region.

For the overall majority 124 (72.9%) and examination of pupils 112(65.0%) of the respondents and give home work to my students 126 (74.1%) Teachers are efficient at maintenance of
students’ abilities through exercise supported by 115(67.6%) of the respondents. Despite this, however, the majority of the teachers’ assesses their students with morale as evidenced from reporting early at school, regular testing and examination of pupils. This was cross-checked in teachers’ records of marks. Although, most teachers claimed to have left their records of marks in their homes on the day when the researcher visited the schools, there was still little evidence of marked pupil scripts possessed by pupils themselves”

The researcher went to investigate whether teachers are involved in the co-curricular activities of schools and their responses are indicated in Table 4.10.

**Table 4.10: Teachers’ responses on the way they involve in co-curricular activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-curricular activities among teachers</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Neither rarely nor regularly</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I participate in football competition organized</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am mobilizing students in Basket ball</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am participate in HIV/AIDS drama in school</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I mobilized students for gardening activities of the schools</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I mobilize students for Question &amp; Answer in the school</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I mobilize students of environmental club to clean the school compound</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Item 1 information in indicate that 61 (35.9%) respondents regularly involve themselves in the football competitions organized by the schools while the majority 72 (42.4%) respondents rarely participate in football competitions. This left 37 (21.8%) respondents indicating that they fairly participate in the football competitions organized by the school. This shows that (42.4%) of the secondary school teachers in study areas are rarely involved in football competitions organized by the schools. This has a positive educational implication because it
helps teachers to develop not only the cognitive domain but also psychomotor domain of the students.

Table 4.10 Item 2 information in indicate that the majority 82 (48.2%) of respondents are rarely participate in basketball and 48 (28.2%) respondents regularly participate in basketball. However, 40 (23.5%) respondents are fairly participating in the basket ball competitions organized by the schools. This shows that 28.2% of secondary school teachers in basket ball participate in netball competition organized by their schools. This is because these teachers have interest and are talented in basketball and yet some principals motivate teachers who participate in basketball competitions by giving them some allowances. The implications these competition have on students are that they make them; physically fit, relieves them from repetitiveness and tediousness of classroom work and open up fitness intelligence for the students to perform well.

Table 4.10 Item 3 results in indicated that 65 (38.2%) respondents regularly participate in HIV/AIDS. while 66 (38.8%) respondents indicated that they rarely participate in HIV/AIDS organized in the school. This left 39 (22.9%) respondents indicating that they fairly participate in HIV/AIDS organized in the schools. This means that most of (66 or 38.8) secondary school teachers in study areas are not involved in HIV/AIDS organized by the schools. This was because most of the schools surveyed were rural based and poorly financed and therefore they had no money to purchase and equip themselves with all facilities needed for HIV/AIDS. This has denied the chances of the students within region to develop their skills and talents in drama. When principals were asked whether their teachers are involved in HIV/AIDS slogan and drama organized by schools administration, they showed a negative response because of the expenses needed to translate the narrated slogan in to national language in their schools.

Table 4.10 item 4 results in indicated that 71 (41.8%) respondents rarely participate in garden activities. while 60 (35.3%) respondents regularly participate in garden activities. This left 39(22.9) respondents are fairly participating in garden activities. This indicates that not sizeable number (35.3%) of secondary school teachers in Gambella region participate in garden activities of the schools. This is because some the schools being zones, woredas, there are vast tracks of jungle which the schools have put under reforestation. This has enhanced good performance among teachers and students.
During the interviews the researcher conducted with principals; on which co-curricular activities they involve their teachers, their responses indicated that teachers participate in football, basketball, in club like HIV/AIDS and environmental garden. They said that this is done because it is part of their teaching curriculum as advocated National Staff Development Council [NSDC]. Even though, the government advocacy for co-curricular activities, the researcher naked that many schools in the area under study lacked facilities like good football, basketball and pitches. The researcher also discovered that in door activities like table tennis were not developed due to lack of facilities. Lack of these facilities has impeded teacher performance in co-curricular activities of general secondary schools in the region. This therefore prompted the researcher to carry out this study.

As Table 4.10, item 5 information in indicates that the biggest number 83 (48.8%) of the respondents regularly mobilized students for Question & Answer competition in the schools activities. while 42 (24.7%) respondents fairly mobilized students for Question & Answer competition in the schools. On the other hand, 45 (26.5%) respondents rarely mobilized students for Question & Answer competition in the schools. This means that 48.8% of the secondary teachers in study areas are mobilized students for Question & Answer competition in the schools.

Table 4.9 Item 6 Information in indicated that majority 119 (70%) of the respondents regularly mobilize students to clean the school compound while 27 (15.9%) respondents indicated that they fairly involve themselves in compound cleaning. On the other hand, a total of 24 (14.1%) respondents rarely participate in school compound cleaning. This shows that a vast number (116) of secondary school teachers are involved in compound cleaning. This is because of the perception that; a clean and health environment is conducive for good teaching and learning process. The researcher however, discovered that majority of the teachers were involved in compound cleaning to do away with hazardous effects of bushy compounds like snake bites and breeding of mosquitoes because of the malaria infection in the region.

"...This was supported by the interviews conducted with principals who said that teachers mobilize students in compound cleaning so as to keep a clean and attractive environment for teaching and learning process. Secondly, clean compounds do away with mosquitoes that interfere with good teaching and learning process because they make them suffer from Malaria fever which impedes good performance among students and teachers. Principals said that both teachers and students perform well when they are health wise well.'

The overall analyses distribution of teachers’ performance in secondary schools in Gambella region. The results are presented in Table 4.11
Table 4.11 Summary of overall distribution of teachers’ by their performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining the overall performance of teachers in terms of lesson preparations, assessing of students and involving students in co-curricular activities results in Table 4.11 indicate that the majority 101 (59%) of the teacher respondents revealed that they regularly make lesson preparations, assess students and involve students in co-curricular activities while 39 (23%) respondents indicated that they rarely perform as expected. This left 30 (18%) respondents indicating that they makes lesson preparations, neither regularly assess students nor involve students in co-curricular activities. This means that most 101 (59%) of the secondary school teachers in Gambella region regularly prepare lessons assess students and involve students in co-curricular activities. Thus, one concluded that regular lesson preparations by teachers assessing of students and teachers involving students in co-curricular activities means that there is an improvement in teacher performance in secondary schools in the area under study.

Depending on the summary of the distribution of teacher performance, the researcher went to rate the teacher performance into low performance ranging from 0-49%, moderate performance ranging from 50%-70% and high performance ranging from 71%-100%. The results of these ratings are presented in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Distribution of ratings of teacher performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher performance</th>
<th>Ratings (%)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low performance</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate performance</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High performance</td>
<td>71-100</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4.12, moderate teacher performance with range of (50%-70%) rated the highest with a total number 101 (59%) of the respondents. This was followed by low teacher performance.
performance with ranging from (0-49) with total number 69 (41%) of the respondents. This means that majority (59%) of the secondary teachers in the study area perform (fairly) moderately in lesson preparations, assessment of students and involvement of students in co-curricular activities. However, results in Table 4.12 indicate that there was none in higher performance. This was on principal leadership styles and teachers performance background that was prompted the researcher to find out why teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella region was not high. To this effect, the researcher went to find out the relationship between independent variable affect dependent variables.

4.3 Relationship between Independent and Dependent Variables

The objectives of the study were to describe the influence of principals’ leadership styles on teachers’ performance. Thus, correlation is a measure of relationship between two variables. Therefore, to test the relationship between independent and dependent variables researcher used ANOVA. To test the difference in a single dependent variable among two or more categories formed by a single independent or classification variable, Ajai S. And et.al, (2009)

To test this, the scores obtained from teachers on leadership styles. All the effects of these research questions were compared using Analysis of variance (ANOVA) because of the conditions that described data presented. In order to use ANOVA, the questions related to; principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making; (B1.1 – B1.6), principals’ communication with teaching staff; (B2.1 – B2.4) and principals’ delegation of duties to teachers; (B3 – B3.10) were each respectively combined to form three total average indices of; principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making, principals’ communication with the teaching staff, and principals’ delegation of duties to teachers.

Each of the above three indices were categorized as follows: principals’ involvement of teachers in decision-making was categorized into greater involvement representing democratic style of leadership, moderate involvement representing Laissez-faire style of leadership and limited involvement represent autocratic leadership style. principal’s communication with the teaching staff was categorized into; regular communication representing democratic style of leadership, moderate communication representing laissez-faire leadership style and irregular communication representing autocratic leadership style. Principals’ delegation of duties to teachers was
categorized into; more delegation representing democratic leadership style, moderate delegation representing laissez-faire leadership style and less delegation representing autocratic leadership style.

Questions relating to teacher performance (C1.1 – C3.6) were combined to form one continuous average index of teacher performance. The first three indices which were categorical in character: principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making, principals’ communication with the teaching staff, and principals’ delegation of duties to teachers were crosstabs with teacher performance and then compared using ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests.

4.3.1 Descriptive statistics, ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests on the Principals Decision-Making

From the objective of the study the research question to what extent the principal’s involvement of teachers in decision making influence teachers’ performance in Gambella general secondary schools.

To investigate the principals’ involvement in decision-making and the effect it has on teachers’ performance. To this effect, questions related to principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making (B1.1-B1.6) where combined to form one global average index of principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making. Further principals’ involvement in decision making was categorized into; greater involvement which represented democratic leadership style, moderate involvement which represented laissez-faire style of leadership, and limited involvement which represented autocratic leadership style.

Questions on teacher performance (C1.1-C3.6) were combined to form one continuous index of teacher performance.

These two indices; principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making were crosstabs with teacher performance then compared using ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests for multiple comparison.

As indicated in table below principals’ who are democratic in involvement of teachers in decision-making have a Means score of 42.2778 with Standard deviation 3.34841 on teachers’ performance. According to this Table the sample means suggest a difference between teachers involvement in decision-making. The teachers (respondents) who have greater involvement in decision making rated themselves highest with a mean = 42.2778. The respondents whose
involvement in decision-making is limited rated the second with means = 28.3226. While those who moderately involvement in decision-making is rated themselves with a mean = 16.5161. This means that democratic style of leadership rated highest followed by autocratic style and laissez-faire was the least rated. This shows that there was a difference in leadership styles practiced by principals as far as their involvement of teachers in decision-making and teacher performance was concerned in secondary schools in the study areas. Therefore, Table 4.13 describes the teachers’ performance and principals’ decision-making.

**Table 4.13 Descriptive Statistic Results Obtain from Principal involvement of Teachers in Decision-Making for Teacher Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>42.2778</td>
<td>3.34841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.5161</td>
<td>2.21917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.3226</td>
<td>4.10193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35.0353</td>
<td>10.75433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To investigate the relationship between principals’ involvement in decision-making and the effect it has on teachers’ performance. And to check whether there was a statistically significance of means difference among three styles, One way ANOVA was performed. The test revealed that there were a statistically significant mean differences among the three average index of principal decision styles on measures of teachers performance (F=797.662, df,2,167 and P=.000). However, to find out the significance of the relationship between principals’ involvement of teachers in decision-making and teacher performance, the computed F value = 797.662 was considered with a p = 0.000 is less than the bench mark sig. = 0.05, the principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making affects teacher performance in secondary schools in the region. The researcher therefore, concludes that the relationship between principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making and teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella region is significant at the five percent level of significance (sig. < 0.05).
Furthermore, multiple comparison tests were performed using Tukey to see which pair of leadership styles was statistically significant. The Tukey test in Table 4.15 below revealed that all leadership styles were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4.15 Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparisons on Decision-Making Using Tukey HSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style (I) and decision-making(J)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-13.95520*</td>
<td>.67858</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>13.8068</td>
<td>-12.3505</td>
<td>-12.3505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic :Laissez-faire : autocratic</td>
<td>25.76165*</td>
<td>.67858</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>27.3663</td>
<td>12.3505</td>
<td>15.5599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.95520*</td>
<td>.67858</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>27.3663</td>
<td>12.3505</td>
<td>15.5599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

4.3.2 Descriptive Statistic, ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests on Principals’ Communication
From the objective of the study the research question stated that to what extent the principal’s communication influence the teachers’ performance in Gambella general secondary schools.

To investigate the relationship between principals’ communication with the teaching staff and the effects it has on performance the questions in (B2.1-B2.4) were combined to form three global average indices of principals’ communication with teaching staff. These indices were further categorized into; regular communication which represented democratic leadership style, moderate communication which represented laissez-faire leadership style and irregular communication which represented autocratic leadership style. Questions on teacher performance (C1.1-C3.6) were combined to form one continuous average index of teacher performance. These two indices; the principals communication to teaching staffs and teacher performance were crosstabs and then compared using ANOVA and Tukey for multiple comparison. As indicated in table below principals’ who regularly communicate to teaching staff have a means score of 43.6023 with standard deviation 1.83541 on teachers’ performance. The results obtained on average index score about 88 teachers believed that the principals were democratic related to communication. In this Table 4.14, the sample means suggest a difference between principals’ communication to the teachers. The respondents who indicated that they have regular communication rated themselves highest with a sample mean = 43.6023. The teacher respondents who revealed that they have moderate communication rated themselves second with a mean = 35.7037.while the respondents who indicated that they have irregular communication were the least rated with a mean = 21.0000. This means that democratic leadership style rated highest, followed by Laissez-faire and autocratic style was the least rated.

Table 4.16 Descriptive Statistic Results obtain from Principals’ Communication to Teachers on Teachers Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals’ Communication to teachers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular communication</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43.6023</td>
<td>1.83541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate communication</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.7037</td>
<td>2.12702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular communication</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.0000</td>
<td>5.82142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35.0353</td>
<td>10.75433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To investigate the relationship between principals’ communication with the teaching staff and the effects it has on teachers’ performance. And to check whether there was a statistically significance of means difference among three styles, One way ANOVA was performed. The test revealed that there were a statistically significant mean differences among the three index of communication styles on measures of teachers performance (F=644.874, df= 2, 167 and P=.000). This indicated that there is a difference in principals’ styles of leadership as per their communication to the teaching staff and teacher performance in secondary schools in region was concerned. However, to determined the significance of relationships between principals’ communication with teaching staff and teacher performance.

The calculated F value = 644.874 was put into consideration with a p. = 0.000. Since the sig. = 0.000 is less than the cut-off point sig. = 0.05, communication with the teaching staff affects teacher performance in secondary schools in the study areas. The researcher therefore, concludes that the relationship between principals’ communication with the teaching staff and teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella region is significant at the five percent level of significance (Sig. < 0.05).

**Table 4.17 ANOVA Results Obtain from Principals’ Communication to Teachers on Teachers Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>17305.079</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8652.540</td>
<td>644.874</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the groups</td>
<td>2240.709</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>13.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19545.788</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to ANOVA, the multiple comparison tests using Tukey was performed on communication to see which pairs of leadership styles were statistically significant. The Tukey HSD test in Table 4.18 below revealed that all leadership styles were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.
Table 4.18  Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparisons on Communication Using Tukey HSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership styles (I) and communication (J)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic: liaises-faire : democratic</td>
<td>-14.70370*</td>
<td>.86075</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-16.7392</td>
<td>-12.6682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-22.60227*</td>
<td>.62962</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-24.0912</td>
<td>-21.1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaises-faire: autocratic : democratic</td>
<td>14.70370*</td>
<td>.86075</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>12.6682</td>
<td>16.7392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-7.89857*</td>
<td>.80586</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-9.8043</td>
<td>-5.9929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic : autocratic : laissez-faire</td>
<td>22.60227*</td>
<td>.62962</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>21.1133</td>
<td>24.0912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.89857*</td>
<td>.80586</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.9929</td>
<td>9.8043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

4.3.3 Descriptive Statistic, ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests on Principals’ Delegation of Duties

From the objective of the study the research question which stated that to what extent the principal’s delegation of duties influence level of teachers’ performance in Gambella general secondary schools?

On this note, the principals’ delegations of duties to teachers were combined to form three average indices of principals’ delegation of duties to teachers. Thus, the principals delegation of duties to teachers was categorized into; more delegation which represented democratic leadership, moderate delegation which represented laissez-faire leadership style and less delegation which represented autocratic style of leadership.

To test the influence principals’ delegation of duties and teachers performance the questions on principals’ delegation of duties to teachers (B3.1-B3.10) were crosstabs with questions on teacher performance (C1.1-C3.6) and then compared using ANOVA and Tukey for multiple comparisons. As indicated in table below principals’ who are more delegator of duties to teachers have a means score of Mean= 44.0789 with Standard deviation 1.47660 on teachers’ performance. From the score of average index in this Table 4.19, about 76 teachers were in agreement that the principals’ are democratic delegator of duties.
Therefore, the sample means suggested a difference between principals’ delegation of duties to teachers. The respondents who indicated that there is more delegation of duties rated themselves highest with a mean = 44.0789. This was followed by the respondents who indicated that there is less delegation of duties with a mean = 35.0353. The least rated respondents were those who indicated that there is moderate delegation had a mean = 18.2195. This means that Democratic leadership style rated the highest followed by autocratic, and the least rated leadership style was laissez-faire. This shows that there is a difference in leadership styles practiced by principals as far as delegation of duties to teachers and teacher performance in secondary schools in the study areas were concerned.

Table 4.19 Descriptive Statistic Results Obtain from Principals’ Delegation of Duties to Teachers on Teachers Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals’ delegation of duties</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More delegation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44.0789</td>
<td>1.47660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate delegation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.2195</td>
<td>3.65043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less delegation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35.0353</td>
<td>4.47147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35.0353</td>
<td>10.75433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test relationship between principals’ delegation of duties and the effect it has on teachers’ performance. And to check whether there was a statistically significance of means difference among three styles, One way ANOVA was performed. The test revealed that there were a statistically significant mean differences among the three average index of delegation styles on measures of teachers performance (F=865.500, df,2, 167 and P=. 000 ) in Table 4:20 below . However, the examined significance of the relationship between principals delegation of duties to teachers and teacher performance, the calculated F value = 856.500 was considered with a p. = 0.000. Since the p. = 0.000 in less than the bench mark sig. = 0.05, the objective maintained; that is, principals’ delegation of duties to teacher affect teacher performance in secondary schools in the study areas. The researcher therefore, infers that the relationship between principals’ delegation of duties to teachers and teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella region is significant at the five percent level of significance (sig. <0.05).
Table 4.20 ANOVA Results Obtain from Principals’ Delegation of Duties to Teachers on Teachers Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>17809.539</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8904.770</td>
<td>856.500</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the groups</td>
<td>1736.249</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10.397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19545.788</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides, the multiple comparison tests were performed using Tukey to see which pair of leadership styles was statistically significant. The Tukey test in Table 4.21 below revealed that all leadership styles were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4.21 Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparison on Delegation of duties Using Tukey HSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style(I) and delegation of duty (I-J)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic: laissez-faire</td>
<td>-16.85596</td>
<td>.67063</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-18.4419</td>
<td>-15.2701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: democratic</td>
<td>-.25.85944*</td>
<td>.62480</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-27.3370</td>
<td>-24.3819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire: autocratic</td>
<td>16.85596</td>
<td>.67063</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>15.2701</td>
<td>18.4419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: democratic</td>
<td>-.900348</td>
<td>.57703</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-10.3680</td>
<td>7.6389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic: autocratic</td>
<td>25.85944*</td>
<td>.62480</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>24.3819</td>
<td>27.3370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: laissez-faire</td>
<td>9.00348*</td>
<td>.57703</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>7.6389</td>
<td>10.3680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

4.3.4 Pearson Correlation Statistics of Variables

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient is a statistic that indicates the degree to which two variables are related to one another. The sign of correlation coefficient (+ or -) indicates the direction of the relationship between -1 and +1. Measuring the strength and the direction of relationship that occurred between variables is, therefore, important for further statistical significance. To this end the Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient is computed for the purpose of describing the relationships between various styles of principal leadership variables and level of teachers’ performance. Variables may be positively or negatively
correlated. A positive correlation indicates a direct and positive relationship between two variables. A negative correlation, on the other hand, indicates an inverse, negative relationship between two variables (Leary, 2004). Therefore, to answer the first basic research questions Pearson correlation is calculated. The result of correlation analysis indicates the degree of relation that occurred between leadership styles (independent variables) and teachers’ performance (dependent variables). The result of correlation presents in Table 4.22 here under.

**Table 4.22: Pearson correlation statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher performance</th>
<th>Teachers performance</th>
<th>Leadership styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.980**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.16: indicates that there is a positive relationship between principal leadership styles and teachers performance \((r = 0.890)\). The relationship is statistically significant \((\text{Sig.} = 0.000)\) at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that increase in democratic leadership styles (like encourage co-operation among teachers in decision-making, organizing meeting for policy implementation with teaching staff and increase delegation according to knowledge, talent and skill) helps to enhance teachers’ performance. Democratic is the form of leadership styles that positively affects performance. Thus, the study findings indicated that there is a positive relationship between leadership styles and performance of teachers in general secondary schools in Gambella. Basing on this finding, therefore, it is fair to conclude that the majority of the respondents had leadership styles evidenced by increased participation in decision-making, communication and delegation recognition, supervision, commanding control over other teachers in the school and the nature of the teaching profession and having realized their goal in life which was training the nation. From the result in Table above one understands that strong relationship in describing the influence principals’ leadership styles on teachers’ performance in secondary schools of Gambella region.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These parts of the study deals with the summary of the major findings, general conclusion drawn on the bases of the findings and recommendations which are assumed to be useful to enhance the teachers’ level of performance in general secondary schools of Gambella region are forwarded for all concerned academic staffs.

5.1 Summary of the findings

Leadership style seems to be one of the most important tools of human resource management. Principal encourage employees to perform in the most effective way but also to attract potential teachers. Therefore, where teachers are highly motivated, this can be translated into good performance and improve the quality of education delivered to students. To this end, the key to create the efficient leadership styles is an answer to the question what really enhance employees’ performance. Thus, this research seeks to provide the current principal leadership styles on the improvement of teachers’ performance. Therefore, the study is aimed on assessing principal leadership styles on teachers’ performance in secondary schools of Gambella region. In order to meet this purpose, the following basic research questions are designed.

- What is the significant relationship between the principal’s leadership styles with the teachers’ performance of general secondary schools?
- What type of leadership style of school principal enhances teachers’ performance?
- To what extent does school principals’ decision-making affect teachers’ performance in general secondary schools?
- To what extent does school principals’ communication affect teachers’ performance?
- To what extent does school principals’ delegation of duties influence teachers’ performance in the general secondary schools?

To answer these research questions, descriptive survey method is employed. To this effect, the study is conducted in 10 randomly selected secondary schools of Gambella region. A total of 180 teachers are selected through random sampling technique, especially lottery method, to participate
in the study. Furthermore, 22 principals were selected by available, since they have direct relation in supporting and motivating teachers. To gather necessary information on the issue 180 questionnaires are distributed to teachers, and only 170 are properly filled and returned.

In addition, semi-structured interview was conducted with 20 school principals to extract in-depth information regarding to leadership styles on teachers performance.

The data collected from teachers through closed ended items of the questionnaire is analyzed and interpreted by using different statistical like, percentage, means, frequencies tables, crosstabs, one-way ANOVA and Post Hoc Test. The analysis of the quantitative data is performed in the help of SPSS version 20 computer program. The data gathered through open ended items of the questionnaire and semi-structured interview is analyzed qualitatively using narrations to support the result obtained from quantitative analysis. Finally the research came up with the following major findings.

- In the analysis it was found that there is a positive relationship between principal leadership styles and teachers performance \((r = 0.890)\). The relationship is statistically significant (Sig. = 0.000) at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that increase in leadership styles (like increase involvement in decision-making, in communication and increase delegation of duties according to knowledge, talent and skill) helps to enhance teachers performance in general secondary schools of Gambella region

- The findings indicating a moderate level of teachers’ performance in the schools shows that teachers have not been performing to expectation in general secondary schools of Gambella region. A situation whereby the level of teachers’ performance in the schools was just (59%) on the average does not predict well for effective teaching and learning in the schools.

- The study finding indicated that achievement of better performance depends on principals who allow demonstrate, initiation, creative and innovative of teachers in decision making of the schools. It should be noted that teachers were willing to participate in decision making if they perceive that their principals sought their opinions but allowing teachers that opportunity to make the final decision

- The Finding revealed that achievement of better performance based on principals who consideration teachers ideas and taught in decision-making of training criteria for the smooth
running of the institutions. When interviewed were conducted to principals on the manner they involve their teachers in decision making of the schools they all responded by saying that they organize staff meetings in which teachers participate in decision-making, setting meeting agenda, exchange ideas and views of how to run the schools. This indicated that majority of the principals practiced democratic style of leadership. This is because democratic style of leadership promotes unity, cooperation, teamwork and hardworking among teachers, which in turn enhances their performance”.

- The study accomplished that; the way principals involve teachers in decision-making has a significant effect on teacher performance in secondary schools in study area. The findings revealed that principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making has an effect on teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella region.

- This was confirmed by the test carried out by ANOVA results $F$ value = 797.662 which indicated that the relationship between principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making and teacher performance in general secondary schools in the study area was significant at a five percent level of significance (sig. < 0.05)

- On the other hand the principals’ communication with teachers enhances teachers’ performance. The finding revealed that principals’ communication with teaching staff makes teachers to perform well because they are informed about what to do and how to do. This was because it was quicker and safer to talk to the teachers through telephone calls than other modes of communication like; meetings or sending other teachers to pass information to the needed staff member. This conclude that proper communication to teaching staff by principals is a characteristic of a democratic leadership style and if well practiced continuously and at all levels could yield to high teacher performance. This is because teachers are informed in time to do what is expected of them.

- The findings showed that organized meeting for teachers to exchange their views with their superiors. It is through such meetings that teacher performance is enhanced.

- The finding indicated that there is a difference in principals’ styles of leadership as per their communication to the teaching staff and teacher performance in secondary schools in region as it was concerned. However, this confirmed by $F$ value = 644.874 with $P.$ = 0.000. Since the $P.$ = 0.00 is less than the cut-off point $P.$ = 0.05. The researcher therefore,
accomplished that the relationship between principals’ communication with the teaching staff and teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella region is significant at the five percent level of significance (Sig. < 0.05).

- Furthermore, the study finding indicated that principals’ proper delegation of duties makes teachers to inculcate a sense of responsibility, hard working and commitment among themselves which in turn enhances teacher performance. The findings discovered that if teachers are guided on how to perform the delegated duties, they become efficient and effective in performing what has been given to them.

- The study indicated that proper supervision of the delegated duties makes teachers committed, hardworking, effective and efficient in their work. Interviews conducted with principals revealed that teachers make records of work for lessons taught and not taught for contents coverage purposes and check up of teachers whether they have been teaching or not. This has helped principals to supervise completion of syllabus among performing and non performing teachers. The non performing teachers are then directed, guided and motivated to perform well by re-arranging makeup classes for curriculum coverage.

- The finding indicated that the better performance depends on Principals who reward their teachers in terms of monetary, promotion, and verbal appreciation for any duty delegated are democratic in nature. Such rewards motivate teachers, make them committed and hard working thereby enhancing their performance. The finding revealed that the better performance depends on proper delegation of duties basing on teachers’ knowledge enhances their performance and makes the work simpler.

- The researcher discovered that such principals should not be blamed because there are some teachers who are very rigid to change and unless forced to do tasks they are not skilled at, then they will never acquire new skills.

- When the researcher inquired on the criteria principals use to delegate duties to teachers; some principals responded by saying that they consider the experience a teacher has in performing a given task delegated. This is because experienced teachers are more knowledgeable in performing tasks than un-experienced ones.
• This shows that teacher performance in the study area was enhanced because talents add efficiency and speed up work performed. This is because principals are aware that if they delegated teachers duties they have no idea about, such duties are likely to be performed poorly. On interviews conducted with principals on the way they follow when delegating duties, principals said that they usually delegate teachers’ duties they have idea about, in order to enhance their performance.

• Interviews conducted between the researcher and principals on what criteria do principals follow when delegating duties to teachers? Principals responded that some duties are delegated to teachers basing on knowledge, skills and subject specialization of the teachers. For example, some principals said that for one to head chemistry department must be skilled and knowledgeable in chemistry. Most of the principals said that some duties are delegated depending on the talents of the teachers; for example teachers talented in painting are assigned in pedagogy center for tasks in teaching aids and on wall of the schools. However, some principals said that they delegate duties to teachers with experience, seniority and those who are committed to work. For example document show that some teachers of Ict and heads of clubs. This was because teachers with skills, knowledge, experience and commitment perform well the duties delegated to them than teachers without such qualities.
5.2 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were drawn:

- The results indicated that the independent variables (communication, decision-making and delegation) on dependent variable (lesson plan, assessing student and co-curricular) of the general secondary schools in Gambella region were found to be moderate. These would have significant influence on achievement of educational goals and objectives in general secondary schools. However, decision-making of principals in general secondary schools were not in right tracks to consider teachers ideas and taught the styles that the educational leadership could actively do.

- Furthermore, the study showed that the better performance in general secondary schools might be well motivated teachers by principals. The study concluded that; the way principals’ involve teachers in decision-making have a significant effect on teachers’ performance in general secondary schools of Gambella region. This indicates that principals involve teachers in decision-making through staff and departmental meetings and teachers’ views in meeting are valued and implemented in final decision of the schools. This has greatly enhanced teachers’ performance in the region.

- Regarding communication findings revealed that regular communication between the principals and teaching staff makes teachers effective in their performance because they were informed on what to be done and how to be done. The finding concluded that the way principals communicate with teaching staff has a significant effect on teachers’ performance in general secondary schools of Gambella region. This shows that principals’ communicate with teachers through meetings, memos, note board and telephone call has made teachers well informed of what to do and how to do it. Thus enhanced their performance.

- On another hand, the researcher concluded that Principals’ delegation of duty to teachers has a significant effect on teachers’ performance in general secondary schools of study areas. This implies that principal delegation of duties to teachers according to their teaching experience, skills, talent, commitment and knowledge of subject specialization
has enhanced performance of teachers in Gambella region. This was confirmed by the calculated F value = 856.500 with P. = 0.000. The researcher therefore, infers that the relationship between principals’ delegation of duties to teachers and teacher performance in secondary schools in Gambella region is significant at the five percent level of significance (sig. <0.05).

### 5.3 Recommendations

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations were forwarded to be the remedy of the effect by concerned bodies to alleviate and to improve the principal leadership styles which are associated with teachers’ performance in general secondary schools of Gambella region.

1. The basic influence on teachers performance not to work as expected were found to be Principals’ improper style used and unequal treatment of thoughts among teachers in decision-making process. Therefore, Regional Education Bureau, Zonal Education Office and Woreda Education Office are advised to ensure the right tracks of involving teachers in decision-making of general secondary schools trains principals on how to involving teachers’ in committees like CPD, finance, disciplinary and welfare to discharge their responsibility.

2. Regional Education Bureau, Zonal Education Office and Woreda Education Office are advised to provide communication skill trainings for school principals on effects of communication and on how to communicate with teaching staffs to enhance their performance. So that principal should organized regular meetings like three times a term, writing notices and posting in the staff notice board, and sending memos to teachers and using telephone calls.

3. For the proper delegation of duties, by the general secondary schools principals’ to teachers Regional Education Bureau, Zonal Education Office and Woreda Education Office should recognize the major duties and criteria of delegating them to teachers providing further training, refresher course, seminar and workshop to both principals and teachers so as to be well equipped with new skills and knowledge needed to perform the delegated school tasks.
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Appendix-A

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTION OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT
QUESTIONNAIRES TO BE FILLED BY TEACHERS

Dear Respondents:

I am a post graduate (Master) student of Jimma University, Ethiopia. I am carrying out a study on the topic: Principal Leadership styles and Teacher Performance in general secondary schools in Gambella Regional State.

Thus, the main purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant information to compliment this research work. This questionnaire is for a general secondary school teacher like you who is expected to perform well in the school duties. It is on this background that you have been randomly selected to participate in the research by completing the questionnaire. I request for your co-operation by helping to answer the questionnaire as per the instructions at the beginning of each section. The success of this study directly depends upon your honest and genuine response to each question. You are requested to be as frank as possible when answering this questionnaire. Your responses will be highly respected and accorded the highest confidentiality.

Thank you.

Show your agreement to fill the questionnaire by answering the question.

Would you fill questionnaire voluntary?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Note:
You do not have to write your name.

Your answer should represent your thinking.

Be frank. Give a true picture of your thinking about the present performance.

Be sure to keep the statement in mind when deciding how you think about the aspect on your performance.

Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible by filling in the spaces provided or ticking the appropriate alternative.

**Part I:** This part of questionnaire contains the personal information. Thus, please fill the necessary answer for each item properly by writing in the space prepared.

A1. Year Sex

A2. Your Academic qualification

A3. Field of your specialization

A4. Your teaching load per week

A5. Your years of teaching experience

A6. Responsibilities you are currently holding at school

**SECTION B: INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: LEADERSHIP STYLE**

**Part II:** this part of the questionnaire containing close ended items that focused on the leadership styles under investigation. Based on the concept of each item, please select the option that directly represent your opinion on leadership styles and rate the following using a scales where;

1=Strong Disagree (SD); 2=Disagree (D) 3=neither Agree nor disagree (nAnd); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strong Agree (SA)
B. Items related to Involvement in decision-making are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1=SD</th>
<th>2=D</th>
<th>3=nAnd</th>
<th>4=A</th>
<th>5=SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1.</td>
<td>The Principal do not considering teachers’ suggestions and thoughts in decision making for training criteria in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>My view in Meeting of policy are considered in final decision-making of the school administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>My principals consults me whenever he/she wants to pass final resolution in school meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>My principal allow me to demonstrate high degree of innovativeness, initiative and creativity in decision making process of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>My principals encourages co-operation among the teaching staff during the decision-making process of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>My principals is uncomfortable with the decision I made for promotion in staff meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.2.0 Items related communication to teaching staffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1=SD</th>
<th>2=D</th>
<th>3=nAnd</th>
<th>4=A</th>
<th>5=SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>My principals sends memos when he wants to communicate tome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>My principals make telephone calls when he/she wants to talk to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>My principals organizes meeting when he/she wants to talk to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>My principals writes a note in the staff notice board when he/she wants to talk to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.3.0 Items related to Delegation of duties you
### B.3. Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1=S D</th>
<th>2=D</th>
<th>3=nAnd</th>
<th>4=A</th>
<th>5= SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>I am delegated duties by school principals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>I am directed by the school leaders on how to perform the delegated duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>I am guided by the school leaders on how to perform the delegated duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>I am supervised by the school principals on duties delegated to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>I am rewarded by my principals for the duties delegated to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>My principals delegated me duties that I am knowledge about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>My principals delegates me duties I am skilled at.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>My principals delegates duties that I am talented at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>my principals delegates me duties I have no idea about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>My principals delegates me duties I have no experience at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION C: DEPENDENT VARIABLE: TEACHER PERFORMANCE

**PART III:** this part of the questionnaire containing close ended items that focused on the teachers’ performance under investigation. Based on the concept of each item, please select the option that directly represent your opinion on teachers performance and rate the following using a scales where;

1=Very rarely; 2=Rarely; 3=neither rarely nor regularly; 4=Regularly; 5=Very Regularly

1. Items related to Lesson Plan Preparations
### Items related to Assessing Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1=Vr</th>
<th>2=R</th>
<th>3=nRnR</th>
<th>4=R</th>
<th>5=VR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>I give tests to my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>I give home work to my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>I give examinations to my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>I give exercise to my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Items related to Involvement in co-curricular activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1=V</th>
<th>2=</th>
<th>3=nRnR</th>
<th>4=</th>
<th>5=V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>I participate in football competitions organized by the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>I mobilize students in basketball organized by the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>I participate in HIV/AID drama organized by school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>I mobilized students for gardening activities of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>I mobilize students for Question &amp;Answer in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>I mobilize students of environmental club to clean the school compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other involvement; ____________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________
Appendix-B

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTION OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

INTERVIEW FOR SCHOOLS PRINCIPALS

Dear principals:

I am a post graduate (Master) student of Jimma University, Ethiopia. I am carrying out study on Topic: *principals’ leadership style and teachers’ performance in general secondary schools of Gambella Regional State.*

This interview guide is for general secondary schools like you who were expected to carry out the leadership styles to enhance teachers’ performance. It is on this background that you have been randomly selected to participate in the research by faithfully answer the question asked by the researcher. You are requested to be as honest as possible when answer these questions. Your response will be highly respected and accorded with highest confidentiality.

Thank you for your progress kindly cooperation!

1. Background Information of the Principals.

1.1 Your subject of specialization ..........?

1.2 Your service year in this school ...........

1.3 How long have you been a principal ....?

1.4. In which ways do you involve teachers in decision-making of the school ..?

1.5 How do you communicate to your teachers....?
1.6 What criteria do you when delegating duties to your teachers..?

1.7 How do your teachers prepare lesson plans..?

1.8 What methods do your teachers use to assess the students..?

1.9. In which co-curricular activities do you involve your teachers..?

1.10. In what ways do your leadership styles affect teacher’s performance..?
Appendix-C

To determine the sample size of teachers (in probability sampling technique) the formula of Paler-Calmorin and Calmorin was employed. This formula was used because it is one of the formulas in determining the sample size in probability sampling technique. Then the sample sizes were computed as:

\[
 n = \frac{NZ + (Se)^2 X (1 - p)}{NSe + Z^2 X P(1 - P)}
\]

Where:

- \( n \) = sample size
- \( N \) = total number of population (341)
- \( Z \) = the standard value (2.58) of 1% level of probability with 0.99 reliability
- \( Se \) = Sampling error or degree of accuracy (0.01)
- \( p \) = the population proportion (it is assumed to be 0.5 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

Therefore,

\[
 n = \frac{341(2.58) + (0.01)^2 X (1 - 0.5)}{341(0.01) + (2.58)^2 X 0.5(1 - 0.5)}
\]

\[
 n = 180
\]

Thus one hundred eighty secondary school teachers are necessary to represent the whole population of the study.