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The problem of this study was to determine what relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of principals' executive professional leadership and teachers' perceptions of principals' behavior in five aspects of administrative behavior. These administrative areas include Principals' support of teachers' authority (EPA), principals' egalitarian relationship with teachers (EPR), principals' involving teachers in decision-making processes for the school (EPI), principals' support of teachers in managerial matters (EPM), and principals' social support.

Subjects for the study were grouped according to gender, length of service and level of education for descriptive purposes and to determine variations in their perceptions of the principals' administrative behaviors.
Significant relationships were found to exist between teachers' perceptions of principals' EPL and EPI leadership and teachers' perceptions of principals willingness to involve them in decision-making processes for the schools (EPI).

A significant negative relationship was also found to exist between the teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership (EPL) and teachers' perceptions of the managerial support (EPM) provided by principals.

A slight negative relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership (EPL) and teachers' perceptions of social support (EPS) received from principals.

There was a slight but insignificant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' executive professional leadership (EPL) and teachers' perceptions of egalitarian relationships (EPR) which existed between the teachers and principals.

A positive but not significant relationship was also noted between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership (EPL) and teachers' perceptions of the manner in which principals granted them professional authority (EPA).

When teachers were grouped by demographic variables, two important trends in perceptions were noted regarding
principals' executive professional leadership. (a) Female teachers had a tendency to perceive principals as having lower professional leadership than did male teachers. (b) Teachers with higher educational levels perceived principals as having less professional leadership ability than teachers with relatively low educational levels.

Teachers' level of experience did not appear to have any systematic significant impact on their perceptions of the principals' executive professional leadership.

It was recommended that those who train principals should be aware of the need to emphasize professional administrative areas which are critical to teachers' perceptions of leadership in the schools because teachers' perceptions affect their teaching performance.
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The role of education has been debated in African countries since their independence. These discussions are sharpened by an awareness that education consumes a great portion of the governmental budget. Education has been hailed as a tool for liberation and a solution to social and economic problems, but at the same time its implementation has encountered difficulties (Maliyamkono 1982).

During the colonial period, before Kenya's independence in 1963, Kenyan education was modeled on the British system. Precepts and practices were introduced without regard for or adaptation to, Kenyan circumstances (Cameron 1970). The management and maintenance of schools were in the hands of missionaries and private individuals who charged high tuition for children to attend the schools. This meant that education was only available to children whose families could afford to pay the high tuition. The teaching profession and the administration of schools was open to very few Kenyans. A typical elementary school was staffed with a headmaster.
and seven teachers, whose average education was eight years of primary school and two years of teaching preparation. The performance of students on national examinations was often very poor, resulting in their inability to gain positions in the few secondary schools (Edwards 1973).

The duties of the school headmaster included regular teaching, scheduling, and meeting with school committees to make decisions on how and where to erect new school facilities. The administration and supervision of curriculum was therefore of secondary importance to the headmaster (Stabler 1969).

Supervision of schools was generally conducted by officers who were located at the missionary headquarters and were detached from the everyday functions of schools. However, the missionaries were responsible for the introduction of education and accomplished as much as was possible with the available resources.

After Kenya's independence, education was placed under political and economic pressures because the regions which benefited from colonial influence were the best lands for agriculture—the mainstay of Kenya's economy. These areas also had the best schools and, therefore, produced the best-educated citizens who, in turn, gained political and economic power and...
influence decisions affecting educational patterns and systems (Kinyanjui 1974).

Since Kenya's independence, there has been a self-reinforcing and perpetuating pattern in which the best headmasters and teachers are staffed in the best schools. The result has been a disparity in students' performance on national examinations (Esniwani 1985).

In order to break the cycle, the Kenyan government, through the Ministry of Education, formed a National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies (NCEOP) in 1976 to formulate a specific program of action for the purpose of making education equitable and available to all Kenyan children.

The NCEOP formulated the following goals and aims.

1. Education should promote national unity by removing social and regional inequalities.

2. Education should promote the development of the talents and personality of individuals on a national line and within the context of mutual responsibility by promoting cooperative, cultural and ethical values conducive to national unity and positive attitudes toward work.

3. Education should promote national development and an equitable distribution of income and assist young students to grow into self-disciplined, mature adults.
4. Education should be integrated with rural developments. This should be done by allocating resources and activities of the educational institutions with development in their localities.

5. Education should direct the traditional development of the country in order to serve as an effective expression of the values and mores of the people of Kenya by adopting various ethnically-based traditional practices as a part of national culture.

6. Education should enable and motivate Kenyans to utilize available resources, with particular attention given to subjects which emphasize national values of such fundamental activities as agriculture (NCEOP, Government Printer 1976, 21-34).

Few administrative officials of schools in Kenya, who manage and administer the school systems, have greater potentialities for directly influencing the achievement of these goals than primary school headmasters. The headmaster is the school executive and is in closest contact with the central function of the schools—teaching and learning. The headmasters' position of formal leadership provides them with the opportunity to motivate the staff and improve the standards of teaching performance. They can make teachers' meetings an important and stimulating educational experience.
They can maximize the various skills and talents of the teachers and help them develop their competencies in order to attain the stated national education goals.

The principal (primary school headmaster) enjoys substantial opportunities to provide a high level of staff leadership and development. In order to provide this, the principal should be perceived by teachers as possessing a high level of executive professional leadership (EPL). Gross and Herriot (1965) agree that leadership behaviors of a principal, as perceived by teachers, are important in the leader-follower relationships that can directly influence teachers' performance in the classroom. Silver (1983) also concurs that leader effectiveness is reflected in terms of subordinate performance, and that the performance of subordinates is, in part, a function of their perception of their leader's administrative behavior.

The concept of executive professional leadership refers to a principal's ability and efforts to conform to a definition of his role which stresses the obligation to improve the quality of teacher performance (Gross and Herriot 1965).

The theoretical formulation of EPL by Gross and Herriot was based on specific ideas regarding the process of socialization or role learning to which school
administrations are exposed. One idea is that principals go through a preparatory phase. This is the period of formal training which must be experienced by school principals. During this period, they are exposed to skills, values, knowledge and attitudes that their educators judge to be prerequisites for the principalship. During this period, candidates encounter only a few of the realities that they will confront later in schools where they will work. This is due to the fact that training institutions typically have little detailed information as to the environments in which students will eventually be assigned.

Another idea is that there exists a second phase of training which begins when the candidate, having successfully completed the preparatory phase, assumes an administrative position in a specific school. This is described as the phase of organizational reality—the period when the principal confronts the complex realities of organizational life. He no longer deals with the ideas of authors of textbooks, but with values, attitudes and convictions of individuals with whom he must work.

Gross and Herriot (1965) contend, to some degree, a principal internalizes an EPL conception of his role during the preparatory phase of training and that organizational reality often provides certain obstacles which
make it difficult to conform to his role definition. The principal's executive professional leadership is therefore a function, in part, of conditions that will lead to the maintenance, reduction, or surmounting of these obstacles.

Conditions that perpetuate or accentuate obstacles serve to decrease a principal's executive professional leadership, while conditions which reduce obstacles or permit the principal to overcome them serve to increase the principals' executive professional leadership.

Some of the conditions in a principal's work environment which reduce or maintain obstacles to EPL are higher administrators of the school system and their behaviors that influence the principal's leadership, characteristics of the principal associated with personal leadership style, and the perceptions of teachers toward a principal's executive professional leadership (Gross and Herriot 1965).

The need to examine and analyze the professional leadership of elementary school principals in Kenya is directly related to increasing enrollments created by national free basic education and new policy formulations. A principal is in the position, and has the potential to direct and motivate teachers who work under
his supervision toward the realization of the Kenyan
government's educational goals.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine what
relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of
their principals' Executive Professional Leadership (EPL)
and teachers' perceptions of principals' in five specific
administrative areas that describe the principals'
efforts to conform to a definition of their role as
school leaders as perceived by elementary school
teachers in Nyanza Province, Kenya. These specific
areas are: (a) a principals' support of teacher's
authority (EPA), (b) principals' egalitarian relation-
ship with teachers (EPR), (c) principals' involving
teachers in decision-making process for the school
(EPI), (d) principals' social support of teachers
(EPS), and (e) principals' support of teachers in
managerial matters (EPM).

Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses, using the total group of
teacher respondents, were tested at .05 level of signifi-
cance. Additional analyses, however, using this criter-
ion were conducted to determine whether or not there were
significant relationships between teachers' perceptions
on each of the independent demographic variables of the
study such as their gender, years of experience, and their levels of education (certification) as a teacher in Nyanza Province, Kenya.

1. There will be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and teachers' perceptions of the manner in which their principals support their authority (EPA).

2. There will be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' EPL and teachers' perceptions of egalitarian relationships they have with the principals (EPR).

3. There will be no significant relationship between teachers' perception of their principals' EPL and teachers' perceptions of the manner in which the principals involve them in the decision-making process for the schools (EPI).

4. There will be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principal's EPL and teachers' perceptions of the manner in which their principals offer them social support (EPS).

5. There will be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and teachers' perceptions of the manner in which the principals provide them managerial support (EPM).
**Definition of Terms and Concepts**

The following terms and concepts were used in the study as defined:

**Executive professional leadership (EPL)** is defined as the broad leadership behavior of principals as perceived by teachers and reflected in their responses to the Executive Professional Leadership Instrument, Part B (See Appendix).

**Support of teacher's authority (EPA)** includes factor scores of teachers' responses to part C of the instrument (See Appendix), defined as the extent to which the principal is seen as being supportive of teachers' authority.

**Egalitarian relationship (EPR)** includes factor scores of the teachers' responses to part D of the instrument (See Appendix), defined as the extent to which teachers believe that the principal promotes an atmosphere of professional equality with teachers.

**Teacher involvement in decision making process of the school (EPI)** includes teachers' responses to part E of the instrument (See Appendix), defined as the degree to which teachers see themselves as being involved in the decision making process for the school.

**Social support offered to teachers (EPS)** includes teachers' responses to part G of the instrument (See Appendix), defined as the extent to which teachers
perceive their principal as an individual who understands and supports their position.

Managerial support of teachers (EPM) includes teachers' responses to part F of the instrument (see Appendix), defined as the degree to which teachers see their principal as providing and facilitating managerial services.

Primary school is a school which serves students in kindergarten through eighth grade.

Levels of teachers' education certificates are (a) BA -- a teacher with four years of college or university education, (b) S1 -- a teacher with 14th grade education and two years in teacher's training college, (c) P1 -- a teacher with 12th grade education and two years in teacher's college, (d) P2 -- a teacher with 10th grade education and two years in teacher's training college, (e) P3 -- a teacher with 8th grade education and two years in teacher's training college. Then data was collected, however, there were no teacher respondents who had obtained the B.A. teaching certificate.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that participants' responses on the EPL instrument and in the five areas of the principal's administrative behavior were true reflections of their perceptions of such behavior. It was also assumed that
each participant completed the instruments without coercion or fear of reprisal from colleagues or superordinates.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study was limited to the perceptions of teachers in Nyanza Province primary schools. For this reason, no implication is made concerning any other provinces in Kenya or any public school administrators other than those included in the study. The data collected include only the perceptions of teachers who were teaching during the 1986-1987 school year.

**Purposes of the Study**

The purposes of this study were (1) to bring to the attention of those concerned with primary school administration in Nyanza Province, the perceptions that teachers hold for principals and the conditions under which those perceptions appear operative; (2) to offer recommendations on how primary school principals in Nyanza Province can be better trained to provide increased executive professional leadership based on the data from this study; (3) to explain reasons for possible differential perceptions held for Nyanza Province Primary School principals in their executive professional leadership and other leadership behaviors.
Significance of the Study

The data provided by this study are significant in that it can: (1) provide a sounder basis for the solution of some of the persistently recurring problems between teachers and principals that imperil teachers' morale and the education of students; (2) provide a database on administrative behaviors that can aid Nyanza Province elementary school principals in their review of administrative behaviors in order to improve and become more effective educational leaders; and (3) provide teachers who aspire for principalship positions with data on perceptions of primary school teachers in Nyanza Province regarding quality executive professional leadership.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

For purposes of this investigation the related literature and research were concentrated on the following major topics: (1) a theoretical framework of leadership, (2) the principalship and leadership behavior, (3) instructional leadership, (4) education in Kenya, and (5) the role of the headmaster (principal) in Kenya.

Theoretical Framework of Leadership

Leadership has been studied over the years through three theoretical frameworks. Prior to the 1960's, research efforts were concerned with the identification of key traits or personality characteristics of those in leadership positions. Research failed to reveal any consistent trait patterns of good leaders. During the early 1960s and 1970s studies were concentrated on behavioral patterns of leaders and, more recently, research attention has been focused on contingency or situational leadership.

During the trait leadership study period, Bower (1951), for example, concluded that leadership could be accounted for by personal traits of the leader. In one of his studies involving 1,313 gangs of boys in Chicago,
he concluded that physical prowess, speed and finality in decision-making were traits which most often determined leadership in gang situations.

After World War II, Stogdill (1948) reviewed 124 studies of psychological traits related to leaders with the purpose of determining what discrete psychological traits distinguish leaders from followers and made the following conclusions:

... the average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of his group in the following respects: (1) intelligence, (2) scholarship, (3) dependability in exercising responsibility, (4) activity and social participation, and (5) socio-economic status. The following are supported by uniformly positive evidence from 10 or more studies surveyed: The average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of his group to some degree in the following respects: (1) sociability, (2) initiative, (3) persistence, (4) knowing how to get things done, (5) self-confidence, (6) alertness to and insight into situations, (7) cooperativeness, (8) popularity, (9) adaptability, and (10) verbal facility.

(p. 63)

Stogdill stipulated that none of these traits should be considered in isolation to determine good leadership potential, however when clusters, or combinations of these traits are considered, they interact in a way advantageous to individuals seeking leadership positions. He identified these combinations as follows:

1. Capacity -- (intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, judgment);
2. Achievement — (scholarship, knowledge, athletic accomplishments);

3. Responsibility — (dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, desire to excel);

4. Participation — (activity, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, humor);

5. Status — (socio-economic position, popularity);

6. Situation — (mental level, status skills, needs and interests of follower, objectives to be achieved, etc.) (Stogdill 1974, 64).

In examining the combination of traits clustered above, it can be seen that leadership effectiveness may be determined by meeting different trait combinations under different situations which Stogdill (1974, 72) admitted in the following statement.

... strong evidence indicates that different leadership skills and traits are required in different situations. The behaviors and traits enabling a mobster to gain and maintain control over a criminal gang are not the same as those enabling a religious leader to gain and maintain a large following. Yet certain general qualities—such as courage, fortitude and conviction appear to characterize both.

During the behavioral study period, many psychologists such as Halpin (1966), Brown (1967), Parsons (1951), Hemphill (1950), Bales (1953), Fiedler (1967), and Getzels (1957), conducted studies on leadership and all these
studies noted two key elements in leadership orientation, namely, initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure on the part of the leader includes actions that are intended to clarify roles of group participants, establish patterns of interaction among the participants, and delineate the tasks to be accomplished, and the belief that the leader's behavior tends to emphasize production, structure, representation, and persuasiveness.

Consideration dimension, on the other hand, are behaviors directed primarily toward satisfying the needs and preferences of individuals within the organization and the leader's behavior tends to emphasize tolerance, uncertainty, freedom, consideration and integration.

Situational leadership study evolved primarily as a reaction to the failure of the traitist approach in attempting to uncover particular sets of traits that would be suited for one best leadership style. James Lipham (1964) describes that change:

... during the year following World War II, emphasis shifted from the study of psychological factors of individuals to social factors of groups. This change of focus was rapid and drastic--bearing some similarity to ancient nature vs. nurture; heredity vs. environment; and intrinsic vs. training controversies, a struggle ensued between the "traitists" and the "situationists," the latter emerging victorious from the fray. (Lipham 1964, 130)

Four major variables involving leadership studies by situationists have been noted in the studies. These are:
(1) characteristics of the leader; (2) the attitudes, needs, and other personal characteristics of the followers, (3) the characteristics of the organization such as its purpose, structure, and the nature of tasks to be performed; and (4) the social, economic and political structure of the organization. These variables are important considerations in any leadership study.

**Principalship and Leadership Behavior**

Much of the research in educational leadership has concerned the definition of which specific aspects of the principal's behavioral patterns have the greatest impact on teachers' morale, attitudes, school climates and performance of the students. The importance of the principal's position is underscored in the following statement:

> ... from the moment that a principal is named, a number of groups of individuals will perceive this person as a superordinate ... for students and teachers, and other staff employees, parents and patrons of the school attendance area, the principal has the role, power, and role responsibility to make decisions which will influence their lives ... regardless of the principal's leadership behavior, the principal is the individual most responsible for the climate of the school, the outcomes, productivity, satisfaction attained by students and staff. (Kelley 1980, 41)

Goldman and Heald (1966), in a study of teacher expectations and administrative behavior, concluded that teachers put considerable emphasis on the level of staff involvement in decisions affecting their work, and also
the social, and professional help they receive from the principals are determining factors of their satisfaction in working at a particular school. Cloud (1984) and Doster (1982) also concur that there is a positive relationship between teacher participation in the decision-making process for the school, and the teacher's level of satisfaction in working under a particular principal.

In a study exploring the relationship between morale and participation in decision-making (the extent to which teachers participate in decision-making), as involved by principals, Redding (1984) made conclusions that teachers' morale were influenced by the actual decision-making in general, and specifically in areas of staff-personnel and pupil-personnel, and that teachers' morale were influenced by the difference between actual and desired participation. Calzim (1983), in a comparative study of the principal's leadership behavior and school climate, also found that teachers in schools with "open" climates perceived themselves as more involved in the decision-making process for the schools than did the teachers who perceived their schools to have "closed" climates. Whether the teachers in open climates were actually involved in decision-making than teachers in closed climates is questionable but it is reasonable to conclude that
climate of the school created by the administration is a determining factor on how teachers perceive themselves as involved in the decision-making process. Hudson (1983) studied the relationship between perceived leadership behavior and the organizational climate of the middle school principals in Atlanta using OCDQ and LBDQ measurements and detected correlational coefficients between initiating structure and espirit, production emphasis, thrust and consideration and OCDR and aloofness to be significantly positively correlated, and that teachers who have healthy perceptions of principals' leadership behavior also have healthy perceptions of the school climate.

Gross and Herriot (1965), in a study of principal-teacher relationship, tested five hypotheses concerning principals' relationships with teachers that theoretical formulation led them to anticipate would-be related to the principals' Executive Professional Leadership (EPL). The first hypothesis stated that "the more a principal permits teachers to share in decision-making, the greater the principal's EPL" (p. 122).

They reasoned that a principal who permits teachers to share in the decision-making process is letting teachers know that the principal recognizes them as a colleague in a common educational endeavor. The
teachers, in turn, tend to view such a principal as a superordinate who seeks to enlist their full cooperation in accomplishing educational objectives, that the principal, by so doing, sets in motion forces which reduce the barrier to EPL. The data they gathered supported this hypothesis with sixty-four percent of principals who permitted teachers to participate in decision-making having the highest EPL scores as compared to only five percent of principals who granted teachers the least involvement in the decision-making process.

The second hypothesis stated that: "the more egalitarian a principal's relationship with teachers, the greater the principal's EPL" (p. 125). The findings relating to this hypothesis indicated that principals that teachers perceived to have the lowest egalitarian relationship were also perceived to offer the least EPL. The difference between EPL scores of principals with the highest egalitarian relationship scores and those with the lowest egalitarian relationship scores was 0.33 and was statistically significant.

The third hypothesis stated that: "the more social support a principal offers to teachers, the greater the principal's EPL" (p. 127). The findings were in the direction stated. The principals who offered the least social support had a mean EPL score of 1.54 as compared
to principals who offered the most social support with a mean EPL score of 2.72. The difference between the means, 1.18, was statistically significant.

The fourth hypothesis Gross and Herriot tested was that: "the greater the managerial support a principal offers to teachers, the greater the principal's EPL" (p. 128). The findings supported this hypothesis. The principals with the highest managerial support scores also had the highest EPL scores. The difference between the two EPL means was 1.38 and was statistically significant.

The fifth and the last hypothesis they tested stated that: "the greater the principal's support of teachers in cases of conflict between teachers and students, the greater the principal's EPL" (p. 130). The findings supported this hypothesis. The principals who gave teachers strong support for teachers' authority had a mean EPL score of 2.41 as compared to principals who gave teachers the least authority with a mean EPL score of 1.90. The difference between these mean scores, 0.51, was statistically significant. From this study it was apparent that teachers' perceptions of principals' executive professional leadership is directionally related to the teachers' perceptions of the principals' behavior in other administrative areas and has an effect on teachers'
morale, attitudes and performance (Gross and Herriot, 1965).

Schneider (1984) found that a high interactive effect between job satisfaction and participation in decision-making existed for the respondents when she explored the relationship between administrative processes and the school operation; and in an exploratory study of organizational structure, leader behavior and ward atmosphere in a hospital situation, Jemison (1983) found no difference in the importance employees attach to interpersonal and task orientation behaviors of leadership from those in educational organizations. Smith (1984) also concluded that there does exist a relationship between the manner in which the building principal supervises, and the organizational climate of the elementary school environment.

As early as 1949, Henri Fayol wrote that good leaders and managers have qualities in common that are important to their success:

... they dash if need be, they have courage to accept responsibility, they are steady, persistent and have thoughtful determination, they have managerial ability—embracing foresight, and the ability to draw up and have drawn up plan of action, and in particular they have knowledge of how to build up an organization—they also command the art of handling men—coordinating—harmonizing all of their activities, they have sound general
education and knowledge of all essential functions of the organization . . . (Fayol 1949, 73)

Fayol also suggested that moral quality, health and mental vigor were important leadership qualities that would serve as good examples to subordinates.

Krajewski (1983) writes that since 1928 the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) has conducted, once every ten years, a survey of the elementary principalship and concludes that these studies collectively reflect both the changing role and role concerns of elementary school principals as being influenced and determined by the changing role of schools and new demands of society and has appropriately suggested methods that principals, as the school leaders, may use to cope with the changing situations:

- Principals must be willing to delegate to other school personnel authority and responsibility.
- Principals must seek input from parents, teachers and students.
- Principals must be effective managers.
- Principals must be aware of how decisions are made within the whole school system because political naivete may be deadly to the principals and potentially detrimental to the school program.
- They must seek ways to better interpret, understand and work through local, state and federal guidelines in order to obtain the best possible help in improving the school program. (p. 5)

In speaking of political awareness of principals, Tolcater (1986) warns the principals: "... cultivate your political skills and keep your career on track." He
asserts that few principals lose their jobs because they are incompetent:

... they get fired or transferred from one school to another because they know or care nothing about politics. Believe me! To be an effective school executive these days, you must learn to be what I call a "political principal"--knowing how to use the skills of a political principal is critical given the difficult nature of the principal's job. (p. 17)

Tolcater offers some tips on how principals may develop skills and support to keep their jobs; that they must take the offensive, that means they must stop responding defensively and make others understand their actions, that they must think politically and be sure to let parents and community residents know what goes on in the school, anticipate problems and react before they become real problems, develop school guidelines and make them known, manage by walking around, to be familiar with what goes on everywhere in the school each time. He also recommends that principals must "polish" their image because how people view the principal is important--including how their office looks and above all they must "build" their network through superintendents, immediate supervisors, school board members, teachers, students and the community.

Getzels (1958) concurs with Tolcater when he noted that in order for principals to perform their roles
properly, they must have the total picture of the educational system and perform their administrative roles knowing how to interact with reference groups, namely, teachers, students, parents and the community, because these reference groups play roles which complement the role of the principal.

Hughes and Ubben (1984) identify functions of the elementary school principal regardless of size and location of the school as being comprised of community relations expert, staff-personnel development specialist, pupil-personnel developer, educational program developer, and school building manager. They insist that a good principal may be effective in all these areas even though he must not personally perform all the tasks because by delegating, the principal can relieve himself to perform other duties.

Sergiovanni (1984) writes that "excellent schools need freedom within boundaries" and that the school principal has five forces to work within this boundary to bring about or preserve changes needed to improve the school's effectiveness. Sergiovanni identifies the five forces as follows:

1. Technical -- derived from sound management techniques.

2. Human -- derived from harnessing available social and interpersonal sources.

4. Symbolic -- derived from focusing the attention of others on matters of importance to the school.

5. Cultural -- derived from building a unique school culture. (p. 6)

Sergiovanni contends that a principal who uses these forces effectively and consistently can, without a doubt, achieve school objectives. In a study conducted over a five year period to identify effective principals in elementary and secondary schools, Rutherford (1985) concluded that effective principals in both elementary and secondary settings are distinguished by five qualities:

1. They have clear, informed vision of what they want their schools to become—visions that focus on students and needs. 2. They translate these visions into goals for their schools and expectations for teachers, students and administrators. 3. They establish school climates that support progress toward these goals and expectations. 4. They continually monitor progress. 5. They intervene in a supportive or corrective manner when necessary (Rutherford, 1985, 32).

In selecting one hundred top executive educators in the United States for the 1987 school year, the independent panel of jurors used the following criteria to assess each nominee's record of accomplishments and leadership ability in educational administration:
1. Competence in fulfilling the responsibilities of administrative assignments.

2. Effectiveness in maintaining and improving the academic achievement of students especially in difficult or unusual circumstances.

3. Success in conceiving and implementing innovations and improvements in educational programs and administrative practices.

4. Leadership in developing professional competence of staff members, identifying persons with potentials for administration and promoting careers in education for persons with outstanding potential.

5. Excellence in creating links to the community and leading the community through difficult social problems.

6. A record of stable and consistent executive leadership.

7. Evidence of contributions to the profession at large.

8. Success in developing and maintaining constructive relationships with other members of the administrative team and with the school board.

9. Effectiveness in working with the political system.

10. Excellent in human relations, especially as demonstrated by garnering the respect of peers, school staff members and members of the community.

11. The ability to anticipate and analyze emerging problems and opportunities and the capability to address them constructively. (Downy 1987, 3)

Although the majority of the one hundred top executive educators for the year 1987 were school superintendents and the minority were school principals, it is reasonable to conclude that any school principal that has and
practices these "hallmarks of excellence" can achieve the objectives of schooling--the learning of students.

Instructional Leadership

The central purpose of schools is to educate students. Central to any school organization is that students learn. The attention of school administration should be focused on ensuring that every single child that enters the school is educated to his or her fullest potential and that the process of educating them proceeds as efficiently and effectively as possible--this is the job of the school principal.

Glickman (1985), however, notes that anyone with direct responsibility for improving classroom and instruction should be regarded as an instructional leader:

. . . instructional leaders, department heads, master teachers, central office consultants, coordinators and assistant superintendents are regarded as instructional leaders and instructional leadership is a process and a function, not a particular position or person because formal titles vary from school to school therefore what is crucial is not the person's title but rather his or her responsibilities. (1985, 6)

According to Kaiser (1985), a well articulated administrative structure for the schools is of prime importance if all elements such as curriculum, staff, facilities and schedule are to mesh into a cohesive, productive educational program and the leadership exercised by the school
principal can make the difference between a school that operates effectively to educate the children and one that is ineffective in achieving its goals. Rogus (1988) also concurs that for instructional leadership to succeed, the principal must set it as a priority and must define the school's reason for being and communicate that purpose to others—explaining the school's purpose in terms of curriculum, and instructional outcomes, and then generate faculty support for those outcomes. Rogus insists that for a principal to succeed as an instructional leader, he should interact with department heads, teachers and students on a regular basis and identify a set of daily activities that are helpful to instruction.

In a recent study, Mangieri (1986) examined the leadership functions of junior high and high school principals whose schools had been identified as excellent and found that the three most important jobs of these principals involved instructional leadership, evaluation of teacher performance, and curriculum development. In describing the role of the principal as an instructional leader, Neagley (1969) states:

... the best instructional program is only as good as the school in which it is implemented. And by many measures, a school is only as good as its principal—and as the educational leader of his facility, the principal sets the tone for the entire educational process. His enthusiasm for
excellence in teaching and learning is infectious. As he visits classrooms and other learning centers of his school, he observes the curriculum and learning resources in action. He works with individual teachers and with the entire staff, helping them to become a team. If the principal is really sincere and concerned about good instruction, most of the faculty will join him in the effort to provide it. (p. 62)

In an attempt to see what influence principals have on elementary schools and activities of teachers, Bredo (1983) also conducted a study involving forty-six principals and 460 classroom teachers in San Francisco Bay area elementary schools. From that study she concluded that principals' task emphasis and personally participating with teachers on instructional tasks was the main predictor of the actual influence the principals had on instruction--while the social emphasis which referred to the things which the principals did to promote good social relations was the strongest predictor of the potential influence the principals had on instructional success.

Rasmussen (1976) collected data from 996 elementary schools in California to identify successful and unsuccessful schools. Of the twenty-five schools that were noted as successful, it was determined that the magnitude and direction of correlation between principals' leadership and teacher-peers relations and student achievement were positively correlated. In a similar study, Liu
(1985) also investigated principals' instructional leadership behaviors in effective and ineffective high schools and detected correlational trends yielding a significant relationship between the principals' instructional leadership behaviors and the schools' effectiveness. Multivariate special contrasts analysis comparing principals' instructional leadership between effective and average schools, and between effective and non-effective schools approached significance.

Studying the characteristics of schools with high instructional outcomes consistently indicate that principals' leadership is an important factor. Copeland (1983) investigated the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the school climate and the school outcomes and found an overall correlation between teachers' perceptions of school climate and teachers' perceptions of the school outcomes to be $r = .86$ at $p < .001$, indicating that the conductivity of school climate positively affects teachers' perceptions. Smith (1984) also makes the same conclusions after studying the relationship between principals' instructional leadership and schools' organizational climate in 152 urban schools graded K-8, that the principals' instructional leadership is associated with all aspects of the school climate.
Perceptions of teachers toward instructional leadership seems to influence their performance and those of students in various geographical areas and at different school levels. Williams (1983) investigated the perceptions of teachers and students about instructional and leadership effectiveness of a successful District of Columbia public junior high school. He examined 599 students and 35 teachers and concluded that the perceived quality of instruction, leadership style, and administrative effectiveness were significantly correlated to the actual students' interests, motivation, and their performance.

To improve instructional leadership and school climate are imperative if the learning outcomes are to be achieved. Culbertson (1974) lists eight key responsibilities in administering and improving instructional programs:

1. Developing school unit goals and objectives to guide the instruction — in this area the principal as an instructional leader is expected to initiate a diagnostic test in order to select appropriate tests to identify specific needs of individual students, stimulate the guidance and counseling staff to conduct a survey of needs as perceived by the students, recommend a modification to
accommodate the needs of students, and take action to correct deficiencies meeting curriculum requirements.

2. Allocating staff-personnel to accomplish instructional goals -- in this area the principal has to imitate a study of the effectiveness of various instructional processes in producing specific outcomes and get teachers that can effectively accomplish instructional objectives.

3. Allocating time and space to accomplish instructional goals -- by inventorying the changing needs for time for various instructional purposes.

4. Developing and utilizing equipment and facilities to accomplish instructional goals -- inventorying the changing needs for materials equipment and facilities.

5. Coordinating and supporting non-instructional services for effective instruction.

6. Developing school-community relations -- by establishing communication with the aim of assessing needs for broad instructional goals.

7. Developing in-service training programs relating to performance needs.

8. Assessing the needs of the school unit and evaluating the process and product of instruction in order to improve on them (Culbertson 1974, 159).

As can be seen from the above list, instructional leadership is not limited to the school principal because
other staff and central office personnel exercise leadership in different components of instruction. Neagley (1980) notes that central office staff, other building personnel, individuals outside the classroom, and groups may be used to improve instruction and learning because many changes have made it difficult for the principal to perform as an instructional leader alone, indicating that:

Writers in the field of educational leadership have been saying for years that improvement of instructional programs and curriculum is the principal's most important job. The interpretation of the principal's role in instructional leadership and curriculum improvement now may be quite different from that previously made by writers and practitioners in the field of educational leadership. Formerly, when the principal had primary responsibility for supervision and improvement of instruction, it meant that the principal personally would carry out many of the activities with modern instructional program. It is still ideal, but practically it has proved to be a difficult task for many reasons. (Neagley 1980, 124)

Kelley (1980) also argues that setting the school climate and instructional leadership vary from school to school and from school district to school district and therefore such leadership cannot be attributed to one particular individual--the principal--and states that in small school districts where there is one superintendent and one principal at each level, the superintendent may serve both as an instructional leader and a climate setter and that
in other instances the effectiveness of the principal as an instructional leader and climate setter is limited when cliques having both power and leadership exist. Such cliques, she states, may include parents, teachers who have a reputation of expertise and prestige within the school and the community. Yet Sweeney (1982) disagrees, stating that the direct responsibility for improving instruction and learning rests in the hands of school principals, asserting that research indicates that it is the principals that make high achievements of schools possible.

**Education in Kenya**

The educational system in Kenya in the 1980s is based on the Education Act of 1968 (Mbiti 1987). This Act embodies all the necessary premises of the whole country. Education comes under the Ministry of Education and its headquarters are in the capital city of Nairobi. The head of Kenya's educational system is the Minister of Education. He has two assistants. The duty of the minister is to promote the education of all of the people through progressive education, from kindergarten to the university level.

Kenya has public and private (Harambee) school systems. The Harambee schools are mainly conducted by
local communities with little assistance from the government in the form of staffing; this is a way to control the quality of education. Mbìti (1987) describes the duty of the Minister as involving two aspects.

1. The first aspect involves the quantitative aspect of educational facilities at all levels to meet the ever-expanding Kenyan population who demand educational opportunities. The demand calls for increases in buildings, equipment and personnel. It is the duty of the minister to influence the government to allocate money, based on his recommendations.

2. The second, or qualitative aspect, involves seeking the attainment of high standards of education, therefore ensuring that personnel, facilities, and equipment are updated constantly to meet today's standards of education. The Minister of Education is a cabinet minister.

Other senior positions in Kenya's Ministry of Education include the following:

The **Permanent Secretary** is the top civil servant in the Ministry of Education who is concerned with executing all policy matters of the national education system. Overall supervision, administration, policy formulation and implementation come under him; he is therefore accountable to the government for the educational
expenditures every year. The Permanent Secretary is appointed by the President (p. 119).

The **Director of Education** is the head of the professional section of the Ministry, and is responsible for improvement and maintenance of educational standards, and for introducing new programs and techniques for the updating of the curriculum. He is also in charge of the issuance of teachers' certificates as well as other academic certificates to students in the entire public school system. The Director of Education is appointed by the Public Service Commission of Kenya (p. 119).

The **Deputy Secretary** is responsible for public relations, control and administration of finance and higher education policy. Since he deputizes the Permanent Secretary, he is responsible for the administration division of the Ministry (p. 119).

The **Chief Inspector** is next to the Director of Education. He is head of the Inspectorate Division of the Ministry, is responsible for inspections, examinations and curriculum development, and is the Chairman of the Professional Committee of the Kenya Institute of Education. Under the Chief Inspector of Schools are subject inspectors who are charged with the responsibility of inspecting schools to ensure that teaching standards are maintained. They are also responsible for evaluating
published materials in their subject areas to ensure accuracy and suitability for use in the schools.

The **Deputy Director of Education (Administration)** is in charge of school administration. Under him are the heads of primary, secondary, teacher education sections and provincial education officers.

The **Deputy Director of Education (Development)** is in charge of physical development, planning, expansion and control of education in the country. The director works with economists, statisticians, demographers, and architects toward the implementation of development recommendations. Figure 1 illustrates the organizational structure of Kenya's Ministry of Education.

The inspectorate section of the Ministry of Education is responsible for quality control of all levels of education. This is attained through inspection, guidance and advice to all schools. Such inspection is done by periodic visits to institutions in order to check facilities, equipment, and administration and also the actual teaching methods of individual teachers. During such visits, inspectors may give advice to the principal and staff, but day-to-day supervision is the responsibility of the principal of each school.

The law governing the inspection of schools was incorporated in the Education Act of 1968 and states
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that: (1) inspectors may enter any school for inspection at any time with or without notice; (2) inspectors may audit the accounts of the school, the records and maintenance procedures therein; (3) inspectors may request the headmaster or principal to place at their disposal all the facilities, records, examination scripts, and any other material belonging to the school that they may require for inspection and auditing purposes.

The Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) was also established by the Education Act of 1968 and its function is (1) to coordinate the programs of teachers' colleges, university colleges and assess the students of these institutions during the students' teaching practices; (2) to conduct examinations in teachers' colleges; (3) to conduct research related to the promotion of education in the entire country; and (4) to prepare educational materials through relevant subject expert panels and write curriculum contents that keep up with the changing needs of society.

The educational administration of eight of the Kenyan provincial levels is under each Provincial Education Officer (PEO). The PEOs are responsible for secondary school administration and have nothing to do with primary school administration. The primary school administration is, however, under the District Education
Officers (DEO). Assisting the DEOs are Assistant Education Officers (AEO) who, in turn, are assisted by primary school inspectors who work as a team to aid the primary school principal in whatever area is needed for the advancement of education in primary schools (Mbiti 1987).

The governing council of the KIE is the Board of Delegates whose chairman is the Director of Education. The board is composed of representatives from the Ministry of Education, university teachers, the Teachers' Service Commission, the Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT), church organizations and the Secondary School Heads Association. The board is responsible for making recommendations that guide the educational functions of the KIE.

The academic branch of the board is called the Professional Committee and its chairman is the Chief Inspector of Schools. This committee is responsible for academic areas of the institute.

Educational Administration at the Provincial Level (p. 123)

Each of the eight Kenyan provinces, for educational purposes, has a Provincial Education Officer (PEO) assisted by an Inspector of Schools, an Education Officer (EO) and a Women's Education Officer (WOE). This team is
directly responsible for education in secondary schools and teachers' colleges of the province and are directly responsible to the Director of Education. However, for primary schools, each province is divided into districts. Each district is under a District Education Officer (DEO), assisted by a team of Assistant Education Officers (AEO) and Primary School Inspectors (PSI).

Management of Educational Institutions (Local)

Secondary Schools and Teacher Colleges (p. 124)

The management of each maintained or assisted secondary school or teachers' college is vested in the Board of Governors in accordance with Section 10 of Kenya's 1960 Education Act (Mbiti 1987).

Constitution of the Board of Governors

According to the Act, a school board shall consist of: (1) a chairman appointed by the Minister of Education, or in the case of church-related schools, by the Minister of Education with consultation with the church; (2) three members representing the community served by the school, appointed by the Minister of Education; (3) four persons representing bodies or organizations which the Minister feels should be represented on the board, appointed by the minister; (4) not more than three other
people considered by the Minister to be necessary on the school board, appointed by the Minister; (5) not more than three people co-opted by the school's Board.

Some Orders Governing the Functions of the Board of Governors

(1) Governors hold office for a period of three years, but each is eligible for reappointment for indefinite three-year terms. (2) Any vacancy caused by resignation or death of a governor is filled immediately. Anyone so appointed holds office for the remaining period of the governor who vacated. (3) Any governor who is absent from all meetings of the Board during a one year period, or who is adjudicated bankrupt is required to resign from the board. (4) No governor holds any interest in any property belonging to the school of which he is a governor or receives any payment or is interested in any contract in which the school is concerned, without the approval of the Minister of Education. (5) The income of the school is spent entirely on those matters which have to do with the promotion of the school (Mbiti 1987, p. 124).

Primary Schools (Elementary) (p. 125)

All primary schools in the country, except those which are privately owned, are managed by local
authorities--City Council of Nairobi, town municipalities and county councils in the case of rural areas.

The management of primary schools is vested in the District Education Boards as stipulated in the Education Amendment Act, 1971 (Mbiti 1987).

Membership of District Education Boards, Section 27B(1) of the Education Amendment Act, 1971, states that each District Education Board shall consist of not less than ten nor more than fifteen members appointed by the Minister of Education. These include (1) the Provincial Education Officer, (2) the Clerk to the council of the local authority, (3) three members nominated by the local authority, (4) three members named by the managers or sponsors of the schools of which the board has jurisdiction, (5) one member nominated by the teachers' union (KNUT), and (6) six members appointed by the Minister of Education to represent other interests. The Minister of Education appoints one member of the Board to be chairman and the District Education Officer to be the Secretary and Executive Officer of the Board.

Tenure of Office

1. A member holds the office for three years unless he resigns or dies or the minister revokes his appointment.
2. Vacancies are filled by ministerial appointments. A member so appointed holds office for the remainder of the period of office of the replaced member.

Functions of the District Education Board (DEB)

The functions of the DEB in respect to the area under its jurisdiction are:

1. Educational development. It is the responsibility of the DEB to submit to the minister plans for the development of education in the district and to advise the minister on the establishment of new schools in the district.

2. Finance. (a) The DEB must prepare and submit estimates of revenues and expenditures for the minister's approval. (b) The DEB is authorized to receive grants and to administer such grants in accordance with the approved estimates of the expenditure. (c) Proper accounts must be kept for auditors' inspection at any time.

3. School Management. The management of schools within the area is the responsibility of the DEB. But since there are very many primary schools in the district, school committees are directly responsible for the management of the primary schools.
School Committees

Primary school committees are governed by the Education Act of 1971. According to these regulations:

1. Every primary school committee established by local authority must consist of the following members appointed by the D.E.B.: (a) three people appointed by local authority who need not be councillors of the local authority, (b) three people nominated by parents served by a particular school, and (c) three people nominated by the sponsor of the school in the case of church-related schools appointed by the local authority from among persons dedicated and experienced in the field of education.

2. (a) The committee elects a chairman at its first ordinary meeting in each year, and (b) the headmaster of the school is the secretary to the committee and attends all meetings and takes part in the deliberations but does not have the right to vote.

3. Each member of a school's committee serves for a period of three years but is eligible for re-appointment.

4. (a) A quorum at any meeting of a committee consists of five members. (b) In the absence of the chairman at any meeting, the members elect a chairman from among them for that meeting, who holds that position for so long as the chairman is absent. (c) Questions
before the school's committee are decided by the votes of a majority of the members present and voting and in case of an equality of votes, the chairman has a second or a deciding vote.

5. If a member of a committee is absent from two consecutive meetings without an explanation satisfactory to the committee, the member is deemed to have resigned.

6. (a) If a member resigns or dies, a new member is appointed to replace him for the remainder of the term. (b) The appointment of any member may be revoked by the DEB in a letter addressed to the member informing him of such revocation. The DEB then appoints a new member.

7. No member of the staff of a school may be a member of the school committee.

8. (a) A committee holds two ordinary meetings each year. (b) The chairman may convene a special meeting of the committee at any time at the request of the DEB or of any five members of the committee.

9. Minutes of the proceedings at every meeting are open to the inspection of the DEB.

The functions of the school committees are: (1) in respect of a sponsored school, to maintain the religious traditions of the school, (2) to advise the local authority on matters affecting the general interest of the school and the welfare of the pupils, and (3) to exercise
general oversight regarding admission of pupils to the school and discipline.

Any party organized by the action or decision of the committee has the right to appeal to the local authority in the first instance and may thereafter appeal to the Minister of Education, whose decision shall be final (Mbiti 1987).

The Teachers' Service Commission (TSC) (p. 128)

The teaching service in Kenya was brought under one employer in 1967, when the Teachers' Service Commission Act was introduced (Mbiti 1987).

The Teachers' Service Commission is the employment agency of all Kenyan public school teachers. Its functions are to register teachers, to provide terms of service, to determine salary structures for teachers, and to cancel teachers' registration in case of professional misconduct.

Before any teacher or person is employed to teach, he or she must be registered by the TSC and be given a TSC number. The registration is done after a candidate applies formally with the commission. Application forms are obtained from Nairobi, the TSC headquarters, or any education office in the country. When one has registered as a teacher, he is given a letter of appointment by the
TSC and then assigned a particular school, of choice or where services are needed most.

TSC formulates regulations affecting the service terms, with the approval of the Minister of Education. Some of the regulations of the TSC include appointments, probation, and retirement from service.

The letter of appointment from TSC constitutes a contractual agreement between the applicant and the TSC. A letter of permanent appointment is given only to trained teachers, and a letter of temporary appointment is given to unqualified teachers, missionaries and others appointed for a limited period of time. The letters contain agreements on salary commensurate to the individual's qualifications (grade levels).

Probation with TSC is normally two years. After this period, the TSC either confirms permanent appointment or terminates the agreement between the individual and the commission.

Before teachers can retire, with pension benefits from the TSC, they must serve for ten continuous years, as well as reach the age of fifty.

The TSC determines and specifies salary structures for different grades of teachers under its employment. Such salary structure takes into account incremental dates,
promotions, and responsibility allowances, and is done by the remuneration committee of the TSC.

Just as the Commission has the legal power to employ teachers, it also has the legal authority to dismiss teachers from employment. In order to maintain professional discipline, the TSC has established procedures for determining disciplinary proceedings regarding various agencies and has also established the Teachers' Service Appeals Tribunal (TSAT). Its procedures are laid down in the Teacher's Service Commission Act, Sections 11 and 12 (Mbiti 1987, 131).

The Kenya National Union of Teachers (K.N.U.T) (p. 131)

KNUT is a teachers' union which is concerned with the improvement of teachers' terms of service throughout the country. It is important for teachers to be members of the union, because it works for better salaries for all teachers, but can only protect registered KNUT members from victimization and undue harassment by the employer or its agents.

The chief executive officer of the KNUT is the General Secretary, whose office is in the capital city of Nairobi. There are branches in every district dealing with local matters relating to teachers' needs. Each branch office retains a portion of the registration fees.
and monthly deductions from the salary of the members, but the remainder of the money is sent to the KNUT national headquarters in Nairobi. Since its inception, in 1958, KNUT has championed the improvement for terms of service for all teachers. The establishment of the Teachers' Service Commission (TSC) as a single employer of all teachers in the public school system was a direct result of efforts by KNUT (Mbiti 1987).

The Primary School Principal (Headmaster) in Kenya (p. 48)

Mbiti (1987) reveals that the chief executive of an individual Kenyan school is the headmaster and that the success of a school depends on how effective the administrator functions within that role. Mbiti notes that many Kenyan teachers are picked as headmasters without formal preparation for the position and warns that teachers who aspire for principalship (headmastership) positions may find themselves in a different world altogether with the following new responsibilities.

1. Responsibility to the employer (TSC). In that capacity the headmaster must bear in mind that the TSC expects high quality administrative work, loyalty, and integrity. The headmaster must therefore conduct himself or herself in a manner that creates a proper public image. The headmaster should report to duty punctually
and be resourceful to teachers' needs in order that the
learning of pupils is maximized. The headmaster must
also be exemplary and shun temptations to abuse responsi-
bilities.

2. Responsibility to the profession. Mbiti further
advises that the headmaster must be both a teacher and
administrator and must uphold ethical codes of the teach-
ing profession. The headmaster must know that (a)
certain behaviors which may be acceptable to other people
in the society are not accepted in the teaching profes-
sion; (b) that there are places of social gatherings
which are out of bounds for those in the teaching
profession; (c) that there are types of language that do
not suit the teacher and headmaster; (d) that some forms
of dress, such as micro mini skirts, are not acceptable
for a teacher or principal. The headmaster must not only
refrain from these things, but must make sure that teach-
ers working in his school adhere to acceptable practices
of the teaching profession. Although unwritten, the
public demands on teachers are firm beliefs in almost
every society.

3. Responsibility to the community served. Mbiti
reiterates that no school is an island but rather a part
of the community in which it is located. Therefore the
headmaster must go to great lengths to ensure that the
community is interested in the learning of children in the schools and that the pupils practice hygiene and agriculture they learn in order to improve the standard of life in their community.

4. Responsibility to the parents. Each school has a committee of members from the community. The headmaster must respect the committee members' opinions and listen to their suggestions and seek their advise and support so that they work together for the accomplishment of the school objectives.

5. Responsibility to the staff in his or her school. Mbiti (1987) likens the headmaster to the captain of a team who therefore must be fully skilled in such areas as official procedures, delegating duties, communication relations, and modern educational techniques that he or she must share with the faculty. The headmaster must (a) avoid showing favoritism toward a particular staff member; (b) treat confidential matters of teachers as such; (c) provide opportunities for teamwork; (d) create a sense of trust in every teacher; (e) create a high sense of morality and professional commitment; (f) set an example of courtesy and trust toward other people; (g) delegate certain responsibilities; (h) consult with staff members on school matters before taking action; (i) communicate well with students; and
(j) counsel and give advise to individual teachers individually when need arises.

6. Responsibility to the pupils. Mbiti asserts that pupils go to school to learn. He believes pupils are like fertile soil that needs new seeds planted. The headmaster, therefore, has a great responsibility of directing and enabling teachers to impart knowledge to the students (Mbiti 1987).

Other responsibilities of the principal include providing a good learning atmosphere so that teachers can (1) lead pupils to discover, (2) foster the spirit of inquiry in the pupils, (3) promote a spirit of initiative and self-reliance, (4) provide the spirit of harambee, and (5) widen pupils' experiences. Administrative responsibilities also include conducting a daily assembly of teachers and students, conducting staff meetings, evaluating teachers' performances, scheduling, and disciplining teachers and pupils appropriately (Mbiti 1987, 54).
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Theoretical Framework and Design of the Study

Survey and correlational research, the methods used in this study, are used quite extensively in the field of sociology, education, economics, anthropology, psychology and public health. Borg and Gall (1976) report, however, that studies involving surveys account for a substantial portion of research done in the field of education. Information gathered by this methodology has proven to be quite useful in studying leader-behavior, leader effectiveness, and leadership styles of administrators in various organizations. The measurement instruments that are used can be readily adapted for use in different organizational settings with different groups of respondents. By changing a few words, many of these instruments seeking leadership data can be used in both industrial and educational settings (Blalock, 1960).

Questionnaires, opinionnaires, interviews, and observations are among the data collection instruments of survey research; and the use of correlational analyses
have been used to identify whether or not relationship exists between two or more observations, opinions, or phenomena. While such information is important or revealing, such data do not indicate that one event causes the other, or that any other cause and effect relationship exists. The design of this study has been conducted under this limitation.

Procedures used in this study involved the use of the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) instrument developed by Gross and Herriot (1965) to measure leadership behaviors of educational administrators as perceived by their subordinate teachers. The basic endeavor of the present study was to determine the relationship between elementary school principals' EPL, which is interpreted as broad leadership behaviors of the principals, and their behavior in five specific areas of administration as perceived by the teachers who work with them.

Specifically, this study sought to determine whether or not there is a significant relationship between the teachers' perception of their principals' EPL and teachers' perceived manner in which the principal: (a) support teachers' authority (EPA), (b) exercise egalitarian relationship with teachers (EPR), (c) involve teachers in the decision-making process for the school (EPI), (d) offer teachers social support (EPS) and (e) provide teachers with managerial support (EPM).
Population and Sample of the Study

The population of this study were 7,700 teachers from 553 schools of Nyanza Province, Kenya during the 1987-1988 school year. Nyanza Province consists of 4 districts, namely, Siaya District with 100 schools, Kisii District with 103 schools, Kisumu District with 123 schools, and South Nyanza District with 127 schools.

The stratified random sample of schools and subjects in this study contained 550 teachers from fifty-five (55) schools or ten percent (10%) of the 553 schools in Nyanza Province, Kenya. The fifty-five (55) schools comprising the sample of the study were chosen by placing the names of schools from each of the four districts of Nyanza Province in respective baskets and were picked from each basket alternatively without replacement. As a result, there were thirteen schools from Siaya District, 13 schools from Kisii District, and 15 schools from Kisumu District chosen as the sample of schools to participate in the study. From this stratified sample of fifth-five schools chosen to participate in the study, the principal of each school randomly selected ten of their teachers to participate in the study for a total sample of 550 teachers. However, out of the fifty-five schools participating in the study, completed instruments were received from forty-seven schools which represented a 58.18 percent
return from the sampled schools. Also, from these forty-seven schools, there were 320 instruments returned by the teachers, but only 304 of them or 55.27 percent of them were fully completed instruments that were usable for purposes of this study.

**Procedure for Collecting Data**

A letter (see Appendix) was sent to the headmasters of each of the fifty-five randomly selected schools requesting their permission to allow their teachers to participate in the study. Each headmaster (principal) was requested to randomly select ten teachers in their schools using the following process:

1. Each principal was asked to write the names of all teachers in their school on separate pieces of paper and fold each piece and drop it in a basket.
2. Each principal was asked to shake the basket to ensure randomness.
3. Each principal was then asked to pick, without replacement, the names of ten teachers. Each teacher chosen was then handed an envelope containing the EPL questionnaire. The envelope given to each teacher contained the following instructions: (a) Each teacher was asked to fill in the demographic portion of the questionnaire; (b) they were then instructed to answer all of the questions in each of the sections of the instrument. They
were then asked to seal the completed instruments in the enclosed envelopes before returning them to their principal who then was asked to mail all the instruments from his school in one large envelope to the researcher for data analysis.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used to measure the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) and its five specific administrative behavior areas of elementary school principals was developed and designed by Gross and Herriot (1965). To validate the instrument, they asked 1,750 teachers from 175 schools in forty cities across the United States to report how frequently ("always," "almost always," "frequently," "occasionally," "almost never," "never") their principals engaged in the behavioral statements contained in the EPL instrument and its sub-sections (see Appendix). One thousand, three hundred and three teachers (1,303) in the Gross and Herriot study, fully completed the questionnaire and their responses were used as the EPL scale and the five administrative areas.

The statements that were constructed for the EPL portion of the instrument were designed to measure generalized leadership behavior of the principals while statements for the five administrative areas were designed to measure the specific administrative behavior of the
principal. The five specific administrative areas are as follows:

EPA—(support of teachers authority)—the extent to which the principal is seen as being supportive of teachers' authority;

EPR—(egalitarian relationship)—the extent to which teachers believe the principal promotes an atmosphere of professional equality with the teachers;

EPI—(level of involvement)—the degree to which teachers see themselves as being involved in the decision making process of the school;

EPS—(level of social support)—the degree to which teachers perceive their principal as an individual who understands and supports their position; and

EPM—(level of managerial support)—the extent to which teachers see their principal as providing and facilitating managerial services.

The responses of teachers on each statement from all sections of the EPL instrument and its five administrative areas were scored as follows: always = 6 points, almost always = 5 points, frequently = 4 points, occasionally = 3 points, almost never = 2 points, and never = 1 point. Total scores were determined by adding individual responses to each item. Grand mean scores for each section was calculated and was determined to measure
the principals' leadership behavior in that particular area as perceived by the teachers. A mean score between 4.60 and 6.00 was considered "high," a mean score between 2.60 and 4.50 was considered "moderate," and a mean score between 1.00 and 2.50 was considered "low" leader behavior exhibited by principals on the EPL, EPR, EPI, and EPS sub-scales; however, on the EPM sub-scale, there is a reversal in interpretation, a mean score between 4.60 and 6.00 was considered "low," a mean score between 2.60 and 4.50 was considered "moderate," and a mean score between 1.00 and 2.50 was considered "high" leader behavior exhibited by the principal.

The EPL instrument and its subscales has a high test-retest reliability coefficient of .978. Its construct validity was also established when Gross and Herriot (1965) controlled the possibility that some of the respondents would be systematically biased negatively or positively in their responses about the principals' administrative behavior. The results they derived indicated that the EPL instrument and its subscales reflected accurate perceptions by teachers of their principals' administrative behavior.

Procedures of Analysis of Data

Each returned instrument was scored in the following manner: individual responses to each statement on the
EPL section were added together and a mean score of each respondent was calculated. Grand mean score was then calculated by adding the individual mean scores and dividing that by the number of respondents. The mean score thus obtained was determined to measure the principals' Executive Professional Leadership as perceived by the teachers. Total scores for each area of administration (EPA, EPR, EPI, EPS, and EPM) were determined by adding individual responses to each item. Mean scores for each area of administration was calculated across all independent demographic variables of the study. For the EPA, EPR, EPI and EPS sections of the instrument, a mean score between 1 and 2.5 was considered "low," a mean score between 2.6 and 4.5 was considered "average," and a mean score between 4.6 and 6.0 was considered "high."

For the EPM section of the instrument, the interpretation was reversed, i.e., a mean score between 1 and 2.5 was considered "high," a mean score between 2.6 and 4.5 was considered "average," and a mean score between 4.6 and 6.0 was considered "low."

The respondents were grouped according to their demographic variables--gender, experience, level of education (certification). The differences in their perceptions of their principals' EPL and each administrative area was analyzed using a series of three-way
analysis of variance statistics. The p < .05 level of significance was used to determine if significant differences existed between groups of respondents.

Relationship between EPL scores and each of the five administrative area scores was determined using Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient statistics. The p < .05 level of significance was established for rejection of all the hypotheses.

Variables of the Study

The dependent variables of this study were defined operationally as the respondents' averaged summed scores on the EPL instrument and its sub-scales, the EPA, EPR, EPI, EPS, and EPM as perceived by elementary school teachers in Nyanza Province, Kenya.

The independent demographic variables of the study were: the teachers' gender (male or female), the teachers' experience (0-5 yrs., 6-10 yrs., 11+ yrs.), and the teachers' educational (certification) levels (S1, P1, P2, P3). The study compared the executive professional leadership (EPL) scores, the five administrative area scores of the principals as perceived by their teachers grouped according to each of these independent variables and as a total group.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The problem of this study was to determine the relationship between executive professional leadership and five specific administrative areas of elementary school principals in Nyanza Province, Kenya, as perceived by the elementary school teachers on the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) Scale developed by Gross and Herriot (1965). The forced-choice responses of the teachers to each of the statements on the EPL scale, which were indicative of behavior exhibited by their principals, could be as follows: always = 6 points, almost always = 5 points, frequently = 4 points, occasionally = 3 points, almost never = 2 points, and never = 1 point.

The EPL and its other subscale administrative behavior scores were determined by summing their responses and calculating mean scores across all independent variables of the study, with mean scores between 1 and 2.5 being indicative of a low score, i.e., the principal exhibited low levels of EPL; between 2.6 and 4.5 being indicative
of an average score, i.e., the principal exhibited average levels of EPL; and between 4.6 and 6 being indicative of a high score, i.e., the principal exhibited high levels of EPL.

The EPM section of the instrument was analyzed in the reverse, the lower the mean score, the higher the principals' perceived leader behavior. A mean score between 1 and 2.5 was indicative of a high leader behavior score, mean score between 2.6 and 4.5 was indicative of an average score, and a mean score between 4.6 and 6.0 was indicative of a low leader behavior score.

Descriptive statistics across each of the independent variables—gender, experience, and educational level of teachers—were obtained. The data were analyzed using three-way analyses of variances to determine if significant differences existed between each of these groups of respondents' perceptions of their principal's EPL and to each of its subscales, namely, the principal's: support of teachers' professional authority (EPA), egalitarian relationships (EPR) with teachers, teacher involvement in the decision-making process of the school (EPI), managerial support of teachers (EPM), and the principal's social support offered to teachers (EPS). In addition, the null hypotheses of the study concerning whether a non-significant relationship existed between the teachers'
perceived executive professional leadership (EPL) of their principal and each of the five specific administrative behavior areas were tested using Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient statistics. The $p < .05$ level of significance was established as the criterion for rejecting all hypotheses.

**Descriptive Data and Analyses of Differences Between Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principals Leadership Behavior**

Executive professional leadership (EPL) was operationally defined as the broad leadership behavior of principals in their attempts to conform to the definition of their roles as perceived by teachers and as reflected in their responses to the Executive Professional Leadership Instrument and five specific administrative areas (see Appendix for a copy of the Scale). The data in Table 1 shows the means and standard deviation scores of the 304 teachers in the sample of this study grouped by their demographic variables—gender, experience, and educational (certification) level. Each of the following sections discusses these data and presents a three-way analysis of variance statistics table and discussion explaining how each of these groups of teachers differed in their perceptions of their principal's executive professional leadership and the five administrative behavior areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>EPL</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>E PA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>E PR</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>E PR</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>E R M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>E R M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>4.918</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In analyzing the data on the ERM sub-scale, the interpretation of scores are reversed, i.e., a low score is indicative of high managerial support provided to teachers by their principals and a high score is indicative of low levels of managerial support provided to teachers by their principals.
Executive Professional Leadership (EPL)

The means and standard deviation scores of teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL are contained in Table 1; and the three-way analysis of variance on these data are contained in Table 2.

When grouped by educational levels, teachers at level S1 perceived that their principal exhibited a mean EPL score of 5.28; those at level P1 recorded a mean score of 4.77; those at level P2 recorded a mean score of 4.98, and those at level P3 recorded a mean score of 5.18. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant differences in teachers' perceptions of their principal's EPL when grouped by grade level.

Teachers grouped by gender showed that males perceived that their principals exhibited a mean EPL score of 4.97, and the females recorded a mean score of 4.83. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant differences between male and female teachers' perceptions of their principal's EPL.

When grouped by the experience variable, teachers with 0-5 years of service perceived that their principals exhibited a mean EPL score of 4.66, those with 6-10 years of service recorded a mean score of 4.98, and those with 11+ years of service recorded a mean score of 5.13. The
### TABLE 2

PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS CONCERNING THEIR PRINCIPAL'S EXECUTIVE PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP (EPL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Educational Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>1.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Gender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.291</td>
<td>5.064**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.013</td>
<td>4.636**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2) x (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05, two-tailed test  
** p < 0.01, two-tailed test

Analysis of variance on these data showed that there were significant differences, p < .01, between them. From perusing the means of these data in Table I, it reveals that teachers with more (11+) years of service or experience perceived their principals to exhibit higher levels of EPL than those teachers with less years of service. In addition, the analysis of variance showed that there was significant interaction between teachers' perceptions...
of the principal's EPL when grouped, collectively, by the grade levels and their experience as a teacher.

This specific set of data, overall, indicates that teachers in Nyanza Province, Kenya perceived that their principals exhibited high levels of EPL, 4.918, even though there were some significant differences in their perceptions when grouped by their years of service as a teacher.

Principal's Support of Teacher Authority (EPA)

The means and standard deviation scores of teachers' perceptions of principals EPA are contained in Table 1; and the three-way analysis of variance on these data are contained in Table 3.

When grouped by educational (certification) levels, the teachers at level S1 perceived their principal to have a mean EPA score of 4.78, those at level P1 recorded a mean score of 3.82, those at level P2 recorded a mean score of 3.64, and those at level P3 recorded a mean score of 3.77. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there were significant differences, p < .01, between them in their perceptions of their principal's EPA. It appears that most of those differences were between the teachers at the S1 level than at the other teaching levels; teachers at the S1 level indicated that
their principal exhibited a high EPA while those teachers and the other levels rated their principals in the average range.

**TABLE 3**

PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS CONCERNING THEIR PRINCIPAL'S SUPPORT OF THEIR PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY (EPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Educational Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.963</td>
<td>3.844**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.431</td>
<td>6.080**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.651</td>
<td>2.354*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2) x (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.05 two tailed test
**p > 0.01 two tailed test

Teachers grouped by gender showed that males perceived their principals to have a mean score of 3.82 and females recorded a mean score of 3.77. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there was no significant difference between males and females on the perceived amount of support for the professional authority of teachers provided by their principals.

When grouped by the experience variable, teachers with 0-5 years of service perceived that their principals
exhibited a mean EPA score of 4.10, those with 6-10 years of service recorded a mean score of 3.78, and those with 11+ years of service recorded a mean score of 3.45 of their principal's EPA. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there were significant differences, \( p < .01 \), between them. It appears from examining these data that teachers with lesser years of service were provided more support for their professional authority than those with the more years of service where the rating was more in the average range. In addition, the analysis of variance showed that there was significant interaction between teachers' perceptions of the principals' EPA when grouped, collectively, by their educational levels and their experience as a teacher.

On this specific set of data, teachers, overall, perceived their principals to provide average EPA; however, teachers at the SI teaching level perceived their principals to be providing high levels of EPA while all other groups of teachers rated their principals as providing average levels of EPA.

Egalitarian Relationships With Principal (EPR)

The means and standard deviation scores of teachers' perceptions of principals' EPR are contained in Table 1;
and the three-way analysis of variance on these data are contained in Table 4.

When grouped by educational levels, the teachers at level S1 perceived their principals to have a mean EPR score of 3.31, those at level P1 recorded a mean score of 3.18, those at level P2 recorded a mean score of 3.24, and those at level P3 recorded a mean score of 3.37. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant differences in their perceptions of their principal's EPR.

**TABLE 4**

PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS CONCERNING THEIR PRINCIPAL'S EGALITARIAN RELATIONSHIP WITH THEM (EPR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Education Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>4.115*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>1.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2) x (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  
** p < 0.01
Teachers grouped by gender showed that males perceived their principal to have a mean EPR score of 3.30 and females recorded a mean score of 3.12. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there was a significant difference between them in their perceptions of their principal's EPR. Male teachers perceived that their principals exhibited higher levels of EPL than the female teachers.

When grouped by the experience variable, teachers with 0-5 years of service perceived their principal to have a mean EPR score of 3.24, those with 6-10 years of service recorded a mean score of 3.26, and those with 11+ years of service recorded a mean score of 3.15; and, the analysis of variance on these data show that there were no significant differences between them in their perceptions of their principal's EPR.

On this specific set of data, teachers, overall, perceived that their principals exhibited average EPR (3.23). The only significant differences among teachers on this subscale were between male and female teachers, with males rating the principal higher than females within the average range.
Teacher Involvement in Decision-Making Process of the School (EPI)

The means and standard deviation scores of teachers' perceptions of principals' EPI are contained in Table 1, and the three-way analysis of variance on these data are contained in Table 5.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Educational Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.653</td>
<td>2.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.910</td>
<td>8.400**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.043</td>
<td>2.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2) x (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  two-tailed test  
** p < 0.01  two-tailed test

When grouped by educational levels, the teachers at level S1 rated their principal with a mean EPI score of 4.82, those at level P1 recorded a mean score of 4.63, those at level P2 recorded a mean score of 4.81, and
those at level P3 recorded a mean score of 4.56. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant differences between them in their perceptions of their principal's EPI.

Teachers grouped by gender showed that males perceived that their principals exhibited a mean EPI score of 4.79 and females recorded a mean score of 4.55. The analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant difference between the perceptions of males and females concerning the EPI of their principals.

When grouped by the experience variable, teachers with 0-5 years of service perceived their principals to have a mean score of 4.39, those with 6-10 years of service recorded a mean score of 4.82, and those with 11+ years of service recorded a mean score of 4.87. The analysis of variance on these data show that there were significant differences, \( p < .01 \), between them. It appears from examining these data that teachers with less years of service were provided less EPI than those teachers with progressively more years of service as a teacher.

On this specific set of data, teachers, overall, perceived that their principals exhibited high levels of EPI (4.69). The only significant differences among teachers on this subscale were between teachers, with
more experience rating the principal somewhat higher than lesser experienced teachers.

Social Support of Teachers (EPS)

The means and standard deviation scores of teachers' perceptions of principals' EPS are contained in Table 1; and the three-way analysis of variance on these data are contained in Table 6.

When grouped by educational levels, the teachers at level S1 had a mean EPS score of 3.12, those at level P1 had a mean EPS score of 3.29, those at level P2 had a mean score of 3.11, and those at level P3 had a mean score of 3.28; and, the analysis of variance on these data show that there were no significant differences among them. Teachers grouped by gender showed that males had a mean EPS score of 3.27 and females had a mean score of 3.16; and, the analysis of variance on these data show that there were no significant differences between males and females on the amount of support for the professional authority of teachers provided by their principals.

When grouped by the experience variable, teachers with 0-5 years of service had a mean EPS score of 3.24, those with 6-10 years of service had a mean score of 3.24, and those with 11+ years of service had a mean score of 3.16; and, the analysis of variance on these
data show that there were no significant differences among them. In addition, the analysis of variance showed that there was significant three-way interaction \( F = 3.430; p < .05 \) between teachers' perceptions of the principals' social support when grouped, collectively, by their grade level, experience as a teacher and gender.

**TABLE 6**

PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS CONCERNING THEIR PRINCIPAL'S SOCIAL SUPPORT PROVIDED TO THEM (EPS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Educational Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>1.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>2.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) x (2) x (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>3.430*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>1.838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < 0.05 \)

Managerial Support of Teachers (EPM)

The means and standard deviation scores of teachers' perceptions of principals' EPM are contained in Table 1; and the three-way analysis of variance on these data are contained in Table 7.
### TABLE 7

**PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS CONCERNING MANAGERIAL SUPPORT PROVIDED BY THEIR PRINCIPALS (EPM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Educational Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>1.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>1.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) x (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) x (2) x (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05 two-tailed test  
** p < 0.01 two-tailed test

When grouped by educational levels, the teachers at level S1 had a mean EPM score of 2.06, those at level P1 had a mean EPM score of 2.33, those at level P2 had a mean score of 2.15, and those at level P3 had a mean score of 2.25; and, the analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant differences among them.

Teachers grouped by gender showed that males had a mean EPM score of 2.21 and females had a mean score of 2.31; and, the analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant differences between males
and females on the amount of managerial support of teachers provided by their principals.

When grouped by the experience variable, teachers with 0-5 years of service had a mean score of 2.40, those with 6-10 years of service had a mean score of 2.19, and those with 11+ years of service had a mean score of 2.14; and, the analysis of variance on these data showed that there were no significant differences among them.

On this specific set of data, the EPM sub-scale, the interpretation of scoring is reversed. A low score between 1 and 2.5 is considered a high exhibition of managerial support, a score between 2.6 and 4.5 is an average exhibition of managerial support, and a score of 4.6 to 6 is interpreted as a low exhibition of managerial support for teachers. Therefore, overall, the teachers as a group perceived their principals as providing high levels (2.25) of managerial support (EPM) to them and there were no significant differences between and assessing the teacher grouped by the demographic variables of the study.

**Relationship Between Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) and the Five Administrative Behavior Areas: EPA, EPR, EPI, EPS and EPM**

This section of the study tests the null hypotheses of no significant relationships between teachers' perceptions of their principals' executive professional
leadership and the five administrative behavior areas—the principals' support of teachers' authority (EPA), principals' egalitarian relationships with teachers (EPR), teachers' involvement in the decision-making process of the school (EPI), social support offered to teachers (EPS), and managerial support offered to teachers by the principals (EPM)—across each of the independent variables of the study. These data are located in Table 8. A p < .05 was used as the criterion for rejection of each hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1—Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principal's EPL and EPA

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principal's executive professional leadership and the teachers' perceptions of the principals' support of their authority (EPA).

On a gender basis, there was a significant positive relationship (r = 0.17929; p < .05) between the principal's EPL and EPA as perceived by male teachers but not by female teachers. When grouped by length of service as a teacher, there was a significant positive relationship (r = 0.35012; p < .01) between the principal's EPL and EPA as perceived by teachers with 0–5 years of service,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORRELATION BETWEEN EPL AND THE FIVE ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS BY TEACHERS' VARIABLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Significant at p &lt; .05 two tailed test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Significant at p &lt; .01 two tailed test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># In studying the data on the relationship between EPL and EPM, a negative correlation is indicative of a &quot;positive&quot; relationship because of the reversal in scoring and interpretation of raw scores.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but not for teachers with 6-10 and 11+ years of service. Also, analyzing the perceived relationship between EPL and EPA by teachers' educational levels, there was a significant relationship \( r = 0.22183; p < .05 \) between the principal's EPL and EPA as perceived by Si level teachers, but not by Pl, P2, or P3 level teachers. Finally, as a total group, the perceived positive relationship between the principals' EPL and EPA \( r = 0.12227 \) was non-significant.

As a total group, the hypothesis of no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and EPA was retained. However, male teachers, teachers with 0-5 years of service, and Si teachers did perceive that there was a significant relationship between their principals' EPL and EPA in Nyanza Province, Kenya.

Hypothesis 2—Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principal's EPL and EPR

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' executive professional leadership and their egalitarian relationship with teachers.

On a gender basis, there was a significant positive relationship \( r = 0.18220; p < .05 \) between the principals' EPL and EPR as perceived by male teachers. Also
female teachers perceived a significant positive relationship between the principals' EPL and EPR ($r = 0.33520; p < .01$). When grouped by years of service as a teacher, there was no significant relationship between the principal's EPL and EPR for those teachers with 0-5 years of service and for teachers with 6-10 years of service, but for teachers with 11+ years of service there was a significant positive relationship between the principals' EPL and EPR ($r = 0.33637; p < .01$).

In analyzing the perceived relationship between principals' EPL and EPR, according to teachers' educational levels, SI and PI teachers perceived that there was no significant relationship between the principals' EPL and EPR. P2 teachers perceived that there was a significant positive relationship between the principals' EPL and EPR ($r = 0.20340; p < .05$) and P3 teachers also perceived that there was a significant positive relationship between the principals' EPL and EPR ($r = 0.21863, p < .05$).

As a total group, the perceived relationship between the principals' EPL and EPR was non-significant and the hypothesis of no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and EPR was retained. However, male teachers and female teachers perceived a significant relationship between principals' EPL and EPR, also teachers with the most years of service,
11+ years and P2 and P3 teachers perceived a significant relationship between the principals' EPL and EPI.

Hypothesis 3--Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principal's EPL and EPI

Hypothesis 3 stated that there would be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' executive professional leadership and their involvement in the decision-making process.

On a gender basis, there was a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.56362; p < .01$) between the principal's EPL and EPI as perceived by male teachers, and ($r = 0.56660, p < .01$) as perceived by female teachers. When grouped by years of service as a teacher, there was a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.64102; p < .01$) between principals' EPL and EPI for teachers with 0-5 years of service, a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.41524; p < .01$) between EPL and EPI for teachers with 6-10 years of service and a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.58010; p < .01$) between EPL and EPI for teachers with 11+ years of service.

When teachers were grouped according to their educational levels, S1 teachers perceived a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.32777; p < .01$) between the principals' EPL and EPI, P1 teachers perceived a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.62307; p < .01$) between
the principals' EPL and EPI, P2 teachers perceived a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.55845; p < .01$) between the principals' EPL and EPI and P3 teachers also perceived a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.42304; p < .01$) between the principals' EPL and EPI.

Finally, as a total group, and across all variables, there was a significant positive relationship perceived ($r = 0.56826; p < .01$) between the principals' EPL and EPI; therefore, for the total group, the hypothesis of no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and EPI was rejected.

Hypothesis 4—Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principal's EPL and EPS

Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be no significant relationship between teacher's perceptions of their principals' executive professional leadership and their principals' social support.

On a gender basis, there was no significant relationship between principals' EPL and EPS as perceived by male and female teachers. When grouped by years of service as a teacher, there was a significant positive relationship ($r = 0.20719; p < .05$) between principals' EPL and EPS as perceived by teachers with 0-5 years of service, and for teachers with 6-10 years of service there was a significant negative relationship ($r =$
0.19678; p < .05) between the principals' EPL and EPS. There was no significant relationship between the principals' EPL and EPS for teachers with 11+ years of service. When teachers were grouped by their educational levels, there was no significant relationship perceived on the principals' EPL and EPS by all educational levels of teachers. Finally, as a total group, the perceived relationship between the principals' EPL and EPS was non-significant; therefore, the hypothesis of no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and EPS was retained. However, teachers with 0-5 years of service and 6-10 years of service did perceive that there was a significant relationship between the principals' EPL and EPS.

Hypothesis 5—Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principal's EPL and EPM

Hypothesis 5 stated that there would be no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' executive professional leadership and their managerial support to teachers (EPM).

In analyzing the data on the EPM subscale, the interpretation of scores and correlations are reversed, i.e., a low score is indicative of high managerial support provided to teachers and a negative correlation is indicative of a "positive" relationship between the perceived
principals' Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) and
the managerial support (EPM) provided to teachers. The
discussion of these data that follow reflect this inter-
pretation.

On a gender basis, there was a significant
"positive" relationship \( r = -0.35287; p < .05 \) between
principals' EPL and EPM as perceived by male teachers,
there was also a significant "positive" relationship \( r =
-0.48947, p < .05 \). When grouped by years of service as
a teacher, there was a significant "positive" relation-
ship \( r = -0.37844; p < .01 \) between principals' EPL and
EPM for those teachers with 0-5 years of service, a sig-
ificant "positive" relationship \( r = -0.45730; p < .01 \)
between principals' EPL and EPM for those teachers with
6-10 years of service, and a significant "positive" rela-
tionship \( r = -0.29871; p < .01 \) between the principals'
EPL and EPM for teachers with 11+ years of service.
Also, analyzing the relationship by teachers' educational
levels, there was a significant "positive" relationship
\( r = -0.46443; p < .01 \) between principals' EPL and EPM
as perceived by S1 teachers, there was a significant
"positive" relationship \( r = -0.42328; p < .01 \) between
principals' EPL and EPM as perceived by P1 teachers, a
significant "positive" relationship \( r = -0.34164; p <
.01 \) between principals' EPL and EPM for P2 teachers and
a significant "positive" relationship \( r = -0.46720; p < .01 \) between principals' EPL and EPM for P3 teachers.

As a total group, there was a perceived significant "positive" relationship between the principals' EPL and EPM \( r = -0.41371; p < .05 \); therefore, the hypothesis of no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and EPM was rejected.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Literature and research studies explained in this study indicate that teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership affect their morale, attitudes, and their performance and consequently the learning of students. It, also, has been documented that schools that excel in attaining their goals—the attainment of high academic achievement by students, have principals who are rated as being "high" on their leadership ability by teachers who work under them. Hughes and Ubben (1984) stated that principals who delegate to teachers some of their responsibilities and involve teachers and the community in the educational enterprise, as a whole, are more likely to succeed in their leadership endeavors than principals who do not. It, also, has been revealed that in any organization, business, industry, or education, that effective leadership seems to be an important factor in determining the success or failure in accomplishing organizational objectives.
This particular study was undertaken to determine whether or not there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) and the teachers' perceptions of the principals' behavior in five specific areas of administration, namely, principals' support of teachers' authority (EPA), principals' egalitarian relationship with teachers (EPR), principals' involving teachers in their decision-making process for the school (EPI), principals' social support of teachers (EPS), as perceived by elementary school teachers in Nyanza Province, Kenya. High levels of administrative leadership behavior in each of these areas are considered to be desirable aspects of effective leadership (Gross and Herriot, 1965). The perceptions from a sample of 304 teachers from 44 schools in Nyanza Province, Kenya, using the Executive Professional Leadership scale developed by Gross and Herriot (1965) were gathered and analyzed for purposes of this study.

The data were first analyzed descriptively using means and standard deviation scores across all demographic variables of the study, namely, gender, experience and educational levels of the teachers. The data then were analyzed inferentially using a series of three-way analysis of variance across the variables of the
study to determine whether or not significant differences existed between and among the respondents' perceptions of their principals' Executive Professional Leadership and those five administrative behavior areas. Finally, the data were analyzed using the Pearson-Product Moment Correlation statistic to test the null hypotheses of no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL and each of the five specific leadership behaviors.

Findings

The descriptive analyses of the data revealed that the teachers, as a total group in Nyanza Province, perceived that their principals exhibited: (a) high levels (4.918) of Executive Professional Leadership (EPL); (b) average levels (3.80) of EPA; (c) average levels (3.23) of EPR; (d) high levels (4.69) of EPI; (e) average levels (3.22) of EPS; and (f) high levels (2.25) of EPM (the interpretation of scoring on this subscale is reversed).

Analyses of the data using a series of three-way analyses of variance statistics on each of the leadership behaviors revealed that the:

1. teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPL differed significantly from each other only on the experience variable, i.e., teachers with more years of
service perceived that their principals exhibited higher levels of EPL than teachers with less years of service.

2. teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPA differed significantly from each other according to their educational level and experience. Teachers at SI level rated their principals as exhibiting high levels of EPA, while those at the other levels rated their principals as exhibiting average levels of EPA. Teachers with lesser years of service perceived that they were provided with more EPA than teachers with more years of service.

3. teachers' perceptions of the principals' EPR did not differ on any variable except on gender variable, i.e., male teachers perceived that their principals exhibited higher levels of EPR than what female teachers perceived their principals provided.

4. teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPI differed significantly from each other only on the experience variable, i.e., teachers with more years of service were provided high levels of EPI than teachers with lesser years of service.

5. teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPS did not differ significantly from each other on any variable, and
6. teachers' perceptions of their principals' EPM did not differ significantly from each other on any of the variables.

Analyses of the data using the Pearson-Product Moment Correlation statistics to test each of the hypothesis of the study revealed that:

1. for the total group of teachers, there was no significant relationship between their principals' EPL and EPA, therefore hypothesis I was retained; however there was a significant relationship for teachers with 0-5 years of service and for S1 level teachers.

2. for the total group of teachers, there was no significant relationship between their principals' EPL and EPR, therefore hypothesis II was retained; but there was a significant relationship for male and female teachers, for teachers with 11+ years of service, and for P2 and P3 level teachers.

3. for the total group of teachers, there was a significant relationship between their principals' EPL and EPI as well as across all demographic variables, therefore hypothesis II of no relationship was rejected.

4. for the total group of teachers, there was no significant relationship between their principals' EPL and EPS, therefore hypothesis IV was retained; but there
was a significant relationship for teachers with 0-5 and 6-10 years of service.

5. for the total group of teachers, there was a significant relationship between their principals' EPL and EPM across all variables, therefore hypothesis V of no relationship was rejected.

Implications and Conclusions

Based on the findings, and within the limitations of this study, the following conclusions and implications seem to be supported by the data:

1. Teachers as a total group in Nyanza Province, Kenya perceive their principals to be high in (a) providing Executive Professional Leadership (EPL), (b) in involving teachers in the decision-making process of the school (EPI), and (c) in providing managerial support to teachers (EPM). These data concur with the findings obtained by Gross and Herriot (1965).

2. Teachers as a total group in Nyanza Province, Kenya perceive their principals to be average in: (a) providing support for teachers authority (EPA), however, teachers with the most education (Sl level teachers) perceive their principals as providing high levels of support for teachers, (b) in exhibiting egalitarian relationships with teachers (EPR), and (c) in providing social support to teachers (EPS). Even though these
perceptions of teachers are not as high as the perceptions of the teachers in the Gross and Herriot (1965) study, they do not contradict the findings of their study.

3. Teachers, as a total group and across each of the demographic variables in Nyanza Province, Kenya, perceive a significant positive relationship between their principals' Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) and their principals' involvement of them in the decision-making process (EPI) and their principals' managerial support of teachers (EPM). These data support the findings of Gross and Herriot (1965) in which they found that the more teachers are involved in the decision-making process (EPI) of the school, the more the principal is perceived positively in his or her executive professional leadership (EPL). They, further, found that the more principals provide managerial support to teachers (EPM) the higher the teachers perceive their EPL, and the data of this study, also, supports their findings.

4. Furthermore, as a total group, the teachers in Nyanza Province, Kenya did not perceive a significant relationship (a) between their principals' EPL and the principals' support of teachers' authority (EPA), however, there were significant relationships perceived between
the principals' EPL and EPA for male teachers and for teachers with 0-5 years of experience; (b) between the principals' egalitarian relationships with teachers (EPR), however, there were significant relationships perceived between the principals' EPL and EPR for both males and females and for teachers with 11+ years of experience; and (c) the principals' social support of teachers (EPS), however there were significant relationships between teachers with 0-5 and 6-10 years of experience. This specific set of data does not totally support nor does it totally contradict the findings of Gross and Herriot (1965).

The data collected and analyzed in this study only partially supports the findings of Gross and Herriot (1965). It, therefore, may be implied from these findings, which differ and are contrary to the findings from the Gross and Herriot data, that this instrument may not be an appropriate one for use with subjects in countries other than the United States. However, the diverse nature of the findings may be due to the fact that Gross and Herriot (1965) analyzed their data by the total group and then further split the group into principals who were rated high on EPL by their teachers and then they compared how principals were rated on each of the other five administrative behavior areas by their teachers; whereas,
in this study the data were analyzed by the total group and then by demographic variables using a series of three-way analysis of variances and then analyzing the data for significant relationships using Pearson Product-Moment correlational analysis statistic.

Since these data tend to support and do not contradict the findings of Gross and Herriot (1965), it may be concluded that the higher the principals are perceived by teachers as providing support for teachers' authority (EPA), egalitarian relationships with teachers (EPR), teacher involvement to the decision-making process (EPI), social support for teachers (EPS), and managerial support for teachers (EPM), the higher they will be perceived in their Executive Professional Leadership. Further, it can be concluded that the principals can expect that the perceptions of teachers will vary when they are viewed as belonging to various groups such as that based on gender, years of experience as a teacher, and the teachers' levels of education.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the present study, which was based on teachers' perceptions of the principals' executive professional leadership in Nyanza Province—one of the
eight provinces of Kenya, the following recommendations are submitted:

1. Those who are in charge of training principals in Nyanza Province need to analyze the data of this study so as to modify their training programs to emphasize how headmasters (principals) can best provide higher levels of social support (EPS), professional authority (EPA), and egalitarian relationship (EPR) to teachers.

2. Nyanza Province elementary school principals who want to improve teachers' perceptions of their leadership should study the administrative areas contained here so as to improve on areas in which they perceive themselves as being average or weak.

3. Studies concerning leadership behavior of headmasters (principals) in Kenya should be continued, using instruments and methods appropriate to the culture of the people.
The headmaster/mistress

Primary School

Dear Sir, Madam:

We need your help. I am a doctoral student at North Texas State University. I have undertaken a study to determine the leadership patterns of elementary principals in Nyanza Province as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the doctorate degree in educational administration.

Your school has been drawn randomly from all of the primary schools in Nyanza to participate in this study. Please take a few minutes of your time and write the names of all the teachers on small separate pieces of paper, fold them and drop them in a basket or a hat, shake it to ensure randomness.

Please pick out 10 names from the basket, one at a time, and then give each of these teachers a packet that contains a questionnaire for them to complete. Ask each of the participating teachers to completely fill out the questionnaire and then mail it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. The participating teachers are not asked to identify themselves. I ask that you assist me in keeping their identity anonymous.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Paul Otieno Amimo

Major Advisor: ___________________________

Dr. Roosevelt Washington, Jr.
Professor of Education Administration
North Texas State University

Enclosures
Dear Teacher,

Your headmaster/mistress has drawn your name randomly to participate in the study of leadership patterns of principals in Nyanza Province Primary Schools. This study is undertaken as part of the requirements toward my doctorate degree in educational administration at The University of North Texas (USA).

Please take a few minutes of your time and complete the following questionnaire. Please provide a response to each of the items on the questionnaire and then mail the completed questionnaire to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Everything has been done to assure your anonymity. A summary of this study will be made available to you if you request.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Otieno Amimo
PART A.

Instructions: Please indicate by a check mark (✓) your personal data.

1. Your sex: Male _____ Female _____

2. Your length of service as a teacher:

   From 1-5 yrs _____ 6-10 yrs _____ 11+ yrs _____

3. Level of your education:

   BA ____ SA ____ P1 ____ P2 ____ P3 ____

PART B.

Please indicate by check mark (✓) in the following spaces how you perceive your principal/headmaster as he/she relates to the statements. It is important for you to respond to each of the 12 statements in Part B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Principal of my school:

1. Gives teachers the feeling that their work is an important activity
   
   — — — — — —

2. Displays a strong interest in improving quality of the educational system.
   
   — — — — — —

3. Gives teachers the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students.
   
   — — — — — —

4. Helps teachers to understand the sources of important problems they are facing.
   
   — — — — — —
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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PART C: Instructions: Please respond to each of the four statements.

EPA

My principal:

1. Supports a teacher's discipline decision that the principal believes is grossly unfair to the child.

2. Insists that students obey teachers' instructions first and complain about them later.
My principal:

3. Sides with the teacher when a student complain about the teacher’s behavior even if the student complaint is legitimate.

4. Backs the teacher in any public controversy between teacher and student.

PART D. Instructions: Please respond to each of the five statements.

EPR

How frequently does your principal:

1. Discourage teachers from treating him as "one of the gang" at informal gatherings of teachers.

2. Encourage teachers to call him by his first name, when students are not present.

3. Make it a practice to have lunch with teachers in his school.

4. Avoid first name relations with his teachers.

5. Insist, tactfully, that teachers show due respect to his position as principal.
PART E: Instructions: Please respond to all of the four statements.

EPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How frequently does your principal:

1. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining level of satisfactory student performance in the school.

2. Share with teachers the responsibility for evaluating how good a job the school is doing.

3. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining how teachers should be supervised.

4. Share with teachers the responsibility for developing a policy for handling student discipline problems.
Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Never Never
6 5 4 3 2 1

PART F: Instructions: Please respond to all of the six statements.

How frequently does your principal:

1. Put you at ease when you talk to him. _ _ _ _ _ _
2. Rub people the wrong way. _ _ _ _ _ _
3. Develop a real interest in your welfare. _ _ _ _ _ _
4. Develop a "we-feeling" in working with others. _ _ _ _ _ _
5. Make those who work with him feel inferior to him. _ _ _ _ _ _
6. Display integrity in his behavior. _ _ _ _ _ _

PART G: Instructions: Please respond to all of the six statements.

How frequently does your principal:

1. Procrastinate in his decision making. _ _ _ _ _ _
2. Display inconsistency in his decisions. _ _ _ _ _ _
3. Have relevant facts before making important decisions. _ _ _ _ _ _
4. Require teachers to engage in unnecessary paperwork. _ _ _ _ _ _
5. Make a teacher's life difficult because of his administrative ineptitude. _ _ _ _ _ _
6. Run meetings and conferences in a disorganized fashion. _ _ _ _ _ _

Please review to see that you have provided responses to each of the statements in all parts of this instrument.
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