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Abstract

The aim of this research was to identify the dominant school leadership style in practice by school principals and to assess the leadership style that promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. In the empirical investigation, a mixed-approach sequential explanatory design was used. In the qualitative phase, the data collection was done by means of self-constructed structured questionnaire that focused on dimensions of leadership styles and factors of job satisfaction. Data was collected from a total of 328 respondents constituting 296 teachers and 32 principals drawn from 15 sample schools in 4 randomly selected sub-cities. In the second phase, namely qualitative phase, interviews were conducted with a sample of 5 teachers and 5 principals who were randomly selected form the larger sample. The data analyses for quantitative and qualitative phase were done by SPSS and constant comparative method respectively. The findings indicated that the dominant leadership style currently in practice by private primary school principals of Addis Ababa City Administration was transactional leadership. Laissez-fair leadership style was emerged as the least preferred leadership style in the area under study. The findings also indicated that both transactional and transformational leadership styles promote high teachers’ job satisfaction in the area under study. The exchange relationship between benefits and performance and high principals’ inspirational motivation skills emerged as the most satisfying elements of the two leadership styles respectively. Moreover, laissez-faire leadership style was the least satisfying leadership style in the area. The area of dissatisfaction in relation to laissez-faire leadership style was related to poor communication about school decisions. Finally, recommendations were made in the areas of design of active monitoring and evaluation, adoption of a mix of transformational and transactional leadership styles and establishment of a reward scheme to enhance teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration.
CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

In this chapter background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, the scope and depth where the study is confined, the limitations of the study, the operational definition of key terms used in the study and brief explanation as to how the study is organized are presented.

1.1. Background of the Study

Leadership is the development of a clear and complete system of expectations in order to identify, evoke and use the potentials of all resources in the organization the most important of which is people (Ololube, 2004). This is possible when one or more members of a group structure and restructure the situation and the perceptions and expectations of other members (Bass, 1999). This means that one group member (the leader) modifies or influences the motivation or competences of others (followers) in the group so that they strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the achievement of school goals (Ezeuwa, 2005). To do so, leaders use a pattern of behavior called leadership styles. According to Mosadegh (2003b) leadership style is a series of attitudes, characteristics and skills used by a leader in different situations in accordance with individual and organizational values. The use of a particular school leadership style by the principal affects both job satisfaction and productivity of the teachers. Leaders use different styles in different situations with different subordinates to motivate them to perform at their utmost potential. In the same vain, principals adopt various leadership styles or they exhibit various behavior patterns to influence teachers. These behavior patterns have different effects on teachers’ job satisfaction and in turn achievement of school goals.

Leadership theories have proposed several leadership styles such as: autocratic, bureaucratic, laissez-faire, charismatic, democratic, participative, situational, transactional, and transformational leadership. But there is consensus among researchers that a particular leadership style will yield result in a particular situation. In other words, a single leadership style is not ideal for every situation. And a leader may be more effective in a particular situation but may not emerge as effective a different situation (Mosad and Yarmohammadian, 2006).
An organization’s leadership style is considered to have a direct impact on the relations between superiors and employees, thus affecting both the latter’s performance, job satisfaction and commitment and the organization’s total coherence (Wilderom, Berg and Peter, 2004). Moreover, studies have shown that in organizations which are flexible and adopt a participative leadership style, with emphasis in communication and employees’ reward, the latter are more likely to be satisfied, resulting in the organization’s success (Mckinnon, Harrison, Chow and Wu, 2003). Furthermore, a number of scholars (Greenleaf, 1977; Podsakoff et al, 1990; Davis, 2003; Yukl 2002) pointed out that research on leadership style have generated empirical results that have verified the impact of leadership style on employees’ attitude, effort and in-role performance.

Similarly, Halliger and Henk (1998) found that a school leader’s leadership style is the main factor that generally influences school effectiveness and should be underscored. Effective principalship is, in general, a function of adopting appropriate leadership style contingent on the school condition. Failure to engage in appropriate leadership style would lead to subordinate action to be dysfunctional rather than become productive and satisfied (Bogler, 2001).

In relation to this, Spector (1985) found that if the employees find their job fulfilling and rewarding, they tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. School leaders are supposed to possess the ability of influencing their staffs, parents and other stakeholders of education to make sure their schools successfully attain its pre-intended objectives by making sure that teachers perform well in their responsibilities and learners perform well in their academic as anticipated. Therefore, appropriate leadership style that promotes teachers’ job satisfaction and productivity should be employed.

In general, theoretical and empirical support for the influence of leadership styles and job satisfaction has been reported in a number of studies undertaken in different countries in a variety of organizational contexts, among both non-educational and educational organizations. However, in spite of the extensive research and accumulated evidence on the effects of leadership style on performance and job satisfaction similar stream of research has been very limited in educational settings (Leithwood et al., 1999). The situation appears to show that a reasonable large corps of evidence by social science standards is available but it is quite uneven in quality and distribution across many different types of outcomes. In this regard, therefore, Edwards and
Gill (2012) have strongly argued that more research is needed to understand the effects of leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in school settings. Out of the many different school settings, private primary schools are obviously included. In Ethiopia, poor school leadership is ranked as the most de-motivating issue in the teaching profession (Gedefaw, 2012). Studies verified that principals’ leadership style employed by school directors has a profound impact on teachers’ job satisfaction and school effectiveness and, therefore, on the quality of education (Bogler, 2001).

This present study; therefore, focuses on identifying the influence of leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. The study expects to add more knowledge and understanding of the effects of leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in school settings especially in private primary schools.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Principal leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction are two very important factors for the work of the school. A large number of researchers came to a conclusion that the principal leadership style is one of the most important factors of teachers’ satisfaction (Herzberg et al. 1959; Kusum and Billingsley, 1996; Perie and Baker, 1997; Dinham and Scott, 1998; Evans, 1998; Tillman and Tillman, 2008; Sharma and Jyoti, 2006). There is variety of styles among leaders. These consist of autocratic, situational, laissez-faire, democratic, transformational, charismatic, participative, transactional and bureaucratic (Rad, 2006).

Styles of all leaders do not have same effect on person and job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001). It is significantly associated with discrimination level at work place. The more the discrimination by supervisor, the less the job satisfaction in employees but the leaders and employees who face more interaction with each other might have more impact on job fit and person by influencing behaviors values and attitudes of employees (Meglino et al, 1991; Weiss, 1978). A single leadership style may not be applied in different situations. Among these styles, leaders should adopt a combination of some traits of these styles for effective management of personnel. Therefore, the kind of leadership style that promotes teachers’ job satisfaction in educational setting (institutions) has remained a problem in many countries all over the world including Ethiopia.
In this regard, the Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia emphasized the management of teachers, and other education personnel to be democratic, professional, coordinated, effective and efficient (TGE, 1994). The democratic leadership style is mutually respectful style of organizing a team. Ideas travel liberally and debate is comparatively free flowing. Along the leadership styles (democratic, autocratic and laissez fair), people adopting democratic leadership style are the most successful and they have a positive impact on the performance of their employees (Mgbodile, 2004).

Moreover, following the fundamental change schools undertaken during the past decade in areas such as curriculum development, students’ and teachers’ roles, and learning strategies all of the world including Ethiopia, school leaders are required to be transformational leaders who are visionaries and motivate their followers towards achieving higher levels of morality and motivation rather than creating routinized, non-creative and stable environment. In this respect, the government of Ethiopia launched a major nationwide reform program, quality education packages, or GEQIP (General Education Quality Improvement Program) in primary and secondary schools, aimed to improve the quality of general education throughout the country.

There are six components which will be applicable for the project: Curriculum, textbooks and assessment; Teacher Development Program (TDP); School Improvement Program (SIP); Management and Administration Program (MAP); Information Communication Technology (ICT), and Civic and Ethical Education. At the center of strategies for accelerating the achievement of quality education is effective leadership at all levels of the school system (ibid). Effective school leadership is imperative for schools to function successful (Sergiovanni 1991, Glatthorn cited in Jacobs, Kritsonis 2006). Accordingly, the third domain of SIP called school leadership, explained the need for shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning, the need for effective communication about school polices, strategies, procedures and regulations and effective implementation of decision making and administrative processes. This kind of leadership practice maximizes the benefits obtained from democratic leadership style regarding teachers’ job satisfaction and school quality improvement (Bogler, 2007).
However, along with the other factors contributing to teachers’ job satisfaction, the misuse or improper use of the leadership styles stated in the policy documents resulted in poor teachers’ job satisfaction in the country (Gedefaw, 2012). This is also evident in most private primary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration despite the better position they hold to exercise school-based management and have had demonstrated influence over school policies than government-led schools (Seboka, 2003).

The problem is to a great extent observed by the high teacher turnover, the low proportion of qualified teachers, and problems such as de-motivation, low teacher morale and the poor quality of the teachers’ working environment (Abdo, 2000:107-108; Centre for British Teachers and Voluntary Services Overseas [CfBT & VSO], 2008:15; Kemppainen, Lasonen, & Raheem, 2005; Voluntary Services Overseas [VSO], 2008:69). This study, therefore, took up the task of filling the existing gap through an empirical investigation of the leadership styles used by principals in private primary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the dominant leadership style exercised by principals in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration?

2. Which leadership style promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective of the Study

The general objective of the study was to identify the dominant school leadership style in practice by school principals and to assess the leadership style that promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration.
1.3.2. **Specific Objectives of the Study**

i. To examine the dominant leadership style in use by principals in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration and;

ii. To identify the type of leadership styles that promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction among the teachers in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration.

**1.4. Significances of the Study**

The misuse or improper use of leadership styles resulted in poor teachers’ job satisfaction in Ethiopia (Gedefaw, 2012). Therefore, this study is important in the following respects:

1. It is hoped that the findings and recommendations of this study may help principals, school owners, and human resource managers of primary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration, revise their leadership style and understand the best situation under which maximum teacher job satisfaction is attained. Moreover, the study may also help school principals to retain their staff and positively reinforce them towards the success of school goals and objectives.

2. The study may add more knowledge and understanding on the effects of leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in school settings especially private schools. It will set a new paradigm for the understanding of leadership styles and teachers’ job satisfaction.

3. The situations under which a particular leadership style will yield maximum teachers’ job satisfaction should be understood. Therefore, the study may bring to the attention of policy makers and planners the issues and constraints and may help to take the necessary measures in order to remedy the inadequacies.

4. The information may be helpful for higher officials of the regional, zonal and district level regarding how the school principals apply their leadership style to achieve educational objectives effectively.

5. The findings may hopefully assists in enriching the existing literature on the issue of principal leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction.
1.5. Delimitation of the Study

There are varieties of styles among leaders. These consist of autocratic, situational, laissez-faire, democratic, transformational, charismatic, participative, transactional and bureaucratic (Rad, 2006). Hence, among the leadership styles proposed by scholars this study would be delimited to transformational, transactional and laissez-faire kind of leadership styles. This is for the fact that these leadership styles form a new paradigm for understanding both the lower and higher order efforts of leadership styles. This paradigm builds on earlier sets of autocratic versus democratic or directive versus participative leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Furthermore, due to literature gap available on the area of leadership style and job satisfaction in school settings especially private schools, this study would be delimited to private primary schools in Addis Ababa City Administration. Addis Ababa City Administration is the capital city of the country where the vast majority of private primary schools are found (ESA, 2006). Hence, the findings were applicable to the area under consideration.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

The results of the study should be interpreted with the following limitations in mind, namely:
Since the study was delimited to private primary schools in the capital of the country, the results cannot be generalized to all private primary schools in the country. Secondly, in addition to principals’ leadership style, teachers’ job satisfaction was influenced by many factors such as: the working condition, work itself, supervision, policy, advancement, compensation, interpersonal relationships and empowerment (Castillo and Cano 2004). Therefore, the study was confronted as to how each dimension of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles were linked with job satisfaction aspects. Thus, limitations were observed in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data.
1.7. Definition of Key Terms

**Leadership:** Leadership is defined as an influence process relationship among leaders and followers to perform in such a way to reach a defined goal or goals (E.g. Bennis and Nanus 1985; Burns 1978, Yukl and Vanfleet, 1992).

**Leadership Styles:** Leadership style is a pattern of behavior leaders prefer to use (Marie et. al, 2011).

**Transactional Leadership:** Transactional leadership refers to the bulk of leadership models, which focuses on the exchanges that occur between leaders and followers (Northouse, 2010).

**Laissez-fair Leadership:** Laissez-fair leadership is a passive kind of leadership style where there are no relationship exchange between the leader and the followers. (Fatemeh, 2009).

**Principal:** The principal is the one who is the head of the school, the educational leader who has the most opportunity to exercise leadership in a school (Drysdale, Gurr, and Mulford, 2006:371).

**Job Satisfaction:** Job satisfaction is more of an attitude, an internal state. It could, for example, be associated with a personal feeling of achievement, either quantitative or qualitative (Mullins, 2005).
1.8. Organization of the Study

The study constituted five chapters organized as follows:
Chapter one introduces the research problem, the background to the study, the problem statement, the researcher motivation for the study, objectives specifying the kind of knowledge the study expected to obtain, the importance and urgency of the study, the scope and depth where the study is confined and the uncontrollable variables that confront the study. Chapter two of this study comprises of review of the literature relating to the area of leadership and job satisfaction. This chapter provides the reader background information on two of these topics, and show what has already been done in regard to research on each. Chapter three of this study provides an overview of the research methodology used. This chapter clarifies the instrumentation, measures, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, and statistical software used to measure the data. Additionally, the chapter provides an overview of the reliability and validity tests conducted on the survey instrument.

Chapter four of this study provides an analysis of the data collected. This chapter provides presentation of results in the form of tables and interviews. The researcher discusses the demographic information of the respondents to the survey, and show whether or not an adequate response rate based on the population size is achieved. Chapter five of this study provides the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data and provides the reader with ideas for additional research studies which can be conducted in the future either by the researcher of this study or another researcher.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the literature related to leadership styles and job satisfaction will be reviewed to get a better understanding of the influence of leadership styles on teacher’ job satisfaction. The most important reviews which are relevant for this study, and which will be explained in the following sections are leadership, leadership styles (transactional, transformational, and laissez faire), job satisfaction, and the relationship between leadership styles and teachers’ job satisfaction.

2.2 Leadership and Leadership styles

2.2.1. Leadership

Most researches conducted in the field of leadership explained the construct as an influence process relationship among leaders and followers to perform in such a way to reach a defined goal or goals (e.g. Bennis and Nanus 1985; Burns 1978, Yukl and Vanfleet, 1992). Such influence relationships according to most literatures is guided by the leader, where he/she attempts to influence followers to achieve a common goal. (e.g. Fleshman, 1973). Developing on the points stated earlier school leadership as studied by (Sisungo,2002; Aghenta, 2001; Black and Mouton ) is described as the principal’s ability to influence teachers, students and other stakeholders so that they enthusiastically and willingly make every effort towards the achievements of school goals.

As to the pattern of interactions between school leaders (principals) and teachers, various earlier studies have come up with an answer. Therefore, the following section of the review literature compares the advantages and the limitations of those major studies conducted on leadership patterns or styles in relation to principals in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration.
2.2.2. Leadership Styles

A great deal of scholars believes that leaders differ in their way of interactions with subordinates (e.g. Hersey and Blanchard, 1993; Miller et al., 2002). This statement states that leaders may use a wide range of behaviors or patterns to influence their followers. This is similarly true to school principals in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. Based on the methods and techniques used by principals to influence teachers, researchers have discerned a number of school leadership patterns and styles. The most commonly known having been identified by renowned social scientist Kurt Lewin and his colleagues in 1939 are authoritarian or autocratic, democratic or participative and laissez-faire or passive.

According to Kurt Lewin, the authoritarian leader makes all decisions, independent of members’ input; the democratic leader welcomes team input and facilitates group discussion and decision-making; and the laissez-faire leader allows the group complete freedom for decision-making without participating himself/herself. The statement made by Kurt Lewin demonstrates that the more the principal takes the sphere for decision making, the more autocratic he/she would be and the more the teachers takes the sphere for participation and decision making, the more democratic and laissez the principal would be.

Developing on the points made by Kurt Lewin, Likert (1967) suggested another set of styles: exploitive authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participative. In exploitive authoritative style, the leader has low concern for people and uses such methods as threats and punishments to achieve conformance. When an authoritative leader becomes concerned for people, a benevolent authoritative leader emerges. The leader now uses rewards to encourage appropriate performance and listens more to concerns, although what he/she hears is often limited to what subordinates think that the leader wants to hear. In consultative style, the leader is making genuine efforts to listen carefully to ideas; nevertheless, major decisions are still largely centrally made. At the participative level, the leader engages people in decision-making; people across the organization are psychologically closer and work well together at all levels.

Further studies conducted by Burns (1978) brought another set of school leadership styles: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. These two styles have dominated scholarly debate as the major conceptual models of school leadership since the early 1980s (Hallinger, 2003;
Marks and Printy, 2003). Along with passive/avoidant leadership, transactional and transformational leadership form a new paradigm for understanding both the lower and higher order efforts of leadership styles. This paradigm builds on earlier sets of autocratic versus democratic or directive versus participative leadership (Avolio and Bass, 2004). Considering the statement made earlier into account, the following part of the review will take up the major assumptions and descriptions of transactional leadership, transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership.

2.2.2.1. Transactional Leadership

Review of literatures conducted on transactional leadership take up three themes: namely studies that dwell on characteristics related to principals ability specifying the compensation and rewards expected upon successful completion of the tasks; studies related to the role of the leader to maintain the status quo and studies done on the dimensions of transactional leadership. The following will explain these issues done on different literatures.

Considerable work conducted to understand the assumption of transactional leadership have verified that transactional leaders use rewards, praises, and promises that would satisfy followers immediate needs (Northouse, 2010; Bogler, 2001; Burns, 1978). Such relationship is considered as exchange relationship where each of them (principal, teacher) enters the transaction because of the expectation to fulfill self-interests (Bogler, 2001). In such cases, if a teacher in private primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration does something good, he/she will be rewarded; if he/she does something wrong, he/she will be punished.

Other groups of literatures describe transactional leader as a leader who focuses on the continuing of the works of the past and transferring them to the future. (e.g. Tengilimoğlu , 2005). This statement emphasizes that the role of the leader in such cases is to maintain the status quo (Bogler, 2001). In accordance with these, Nguni, Sleegers, and Denessen (2006) suggest that transactional leaders prefer a policy which is about preserving the current situation. According to the studies stated earlier principals working in private primary school of Addis Ababa City Administration will be considered as transactional leaders if they motivate their teachers and making them do the works with the help of external motivators such as organizational rewards (Bass, 2000).
Studies that focus on the dimensions of transactional leadership proposed that transactional leadership consists of three dimensions, namely contingent rewards, management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive) (E.g. Bass and Avolio, 1995). If the leader clarifies the work that must be achieved and use rewards in exchange for good performance, it is said to be contingent reward (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). Management by exception (passive) refers to leaders intervening only when a problem arise whereas management by exception (active) refers to leaders actively monitoring the work of followers and make sure that standards are met (Antonakis et al., 2003). Other studies by (Bass, 2000; Karip, 1998) added laissez-faire as fourth dimension of transactional leadership. Laissez-faire is a leadership style in which the leader never intervene the administrative processes and gives limitless freedom to the followers (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Karip, 1998). Based on the above studies, being a transactional leader is a function of contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive) and sometimes laissez faire. This means that a principal who exercises transactional leadership in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration may display each of the dimensions of transactional leadership in varying degree.

2.2.2.2. Transformational Leadership

To understand the assumptions underlying transformational leadership style, previous studies are reviewed. The review of these literatures is summarized into two points, namely: studies that describe the patterns of behavior that transformational leaders’ exhibit and studies that concentrate on the dimensions encompassing transformational leadership.

Much of the literature is devoted to describe transformational leaders as leaders that provide a vision and a sense of mission, inspire, pride and gain respect and trust through charisma (e.g. Bass et al., 1990). Unlike transactional leaders, transformational leaders are change agents and visionaries encouraging individuals and having the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty (Tichy and Devanna, 1996). This is to mean that transformational principals can fit to today’s dynamic and complex school environments specially private schools where principals are often seen as ideal agents of change (Bogler, 2001). Furthermore, various publications on transformational leadership verified that leaders provide every possibility to meet the needs of followers to foster followers’ commitment to the organizations and inspire them to exceed their expected performance
(Bass, Avolio, Jung and Benson, 2003; Currie and Lockett, 2007; Sivanathan and Fekken, 2002; Ali, 2006). Based on the concepts stated earlier principals in private schools of Addis Ababa city administration can be considered transformational if they provide inspirational guide to teachers and staff to achieve higher level of morale and motivation at work (Burns, 1978). A great deal of researches on dimensions of transformational leadership have identified four dimensions in transformational leadership styles such as having consideration for the teacher, having inspirational motivation, promoting intellectual stimulation, and making individualization a priority (e.g. Avolio et al., 1999; Bass 1985; Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). The following paragraphs will discuss the reviews made on the four dimensions of transformational leadership.

Firstly, according to many researches undertaken on idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership: Idealized influence is understood as formulation and articulation of vision and challenging goals and motivating followers to work beyond their self-interest in order to achieve common goals (Karip, 1998; Avolio et al., 1991; Bass and Riggio, 2006). Based on the statements made earlier, private school principals can be considered as having idealized influence when they determine institutions’ vision and mission by incorporating the teachers to the process (Karip, 1998).

Secondly, inspirational motivation is described in many literatures as leaders’ ability to foster strong team spirit as a means of leading team members towards achieving desired goals (Hall, Johnson, Wysocki and Kepner, 2002; Bass and Riggio, 2006; Antonakis, Avolio and Sivasubramaniam, 2003). According to these studies private school principals can be considered as inspirational motivators if they expressly and characteristically emphasize to teachers in teams the need to perform well and helps to accomplish the school goals.

Thirdly, according to many literatures intellectual stimulation is leaders’ ability to support the followers for being creative and innovative (Bass, 2000, Bass and Riggio, 2006; Nicholason, 2007). In a similar vein, private school principals said to have such skills if they stimulate innovation and creativity in their teachers by questioning assumptions and approaching old situations in new ways (Bass and Riggio, 2006). For instance, if a principal allows teachers to develop their own ways of lesson planning for better teaching learning process, he/she is said to have intellectual stimulation skill.
Fourthly, researches devoted on individualized consideration explained the concept as a creation of a suitable and supportive environment in which individual differences and needs are considered (e.g. Bass, 1989) and the thoughts of the followers are valued (Tourish and Pinnington, 2002). According to the studies individual differences are recognized and assignments are delegated to followers to provide learning opportunities (Avolio et al., 1991). Principals in private schools are said to possess such skills if they pay special attention to each teacher’s need for achievement and growth by acting as a coach and mentor.

2.2.2.3. Laissez-Faire Leadership

Studies done on laissez faire leadership style indicated that this leadership style is a kind of leadership where there are practically no rules in the organization (Nzuve, 1999). This kind of leadership pattern is practically similar to one of the dimensions of transactional leadership as studied by (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999; Karip, 1998). Further studies on laissez faire leadership style pointed out that the style is the most effective in cases where followers are mature and highly motivated (Zervas and Lassiter, 2007). Private school principals can be expressed as laissez faire leaders if they give all the authority or power to teachers to determine, make decisions and resolve problem on their own (Doran, 2003).

2.3. Job Satisfaction

In many literatures job satisfaction is understood as a positive emotional response from the assessment of a job or specific aspects of a job (e.g. Locke 1976; Smith et al. 1969). Furthermore, much of the literatures on job satisfaction dwell on points like: what influences job satisfaction, what explains job satisfaction and the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and reviews regarding teachers’ job satisfaction.

According to many literatures job satisfaction is influenced by factors such as: the working condition, work itself, supervision, policy and administration, advancement, compensation, interpersonal relationships, recognition and empowerment (e.g. Castillo and Cano, 2004). As suggested by Bolin (2007:49), the factors influencing job satisfaction identified by different studies are not identical, but the contents of the items are basically similar. However, Ellickson (2002) suggests that, irrespective of the approaches used to study job satisfaction, most studies identified
at least two general categories of antecedent variables associated with job satisfaction, namely: the work environment and factors related to the work itself, and the personal characteristics of the individual. Though the above stated factors cause job satisfaction, the fact that they cause job dissatisfaction must be kept in mind. Therefore, the issue whether job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are two opposite and excludable phenomena? There is no consensus regarding the issue among authors. Herzberg two factor theory is probably the most often cited point of view. The main idea is that employees in their work environment are under the influence of factor that cause job satisfaction and factors that cause job dissatisfaction. Therefore, all factors that have derived from a large empirical research are divided in factors that cause job satisfaction (motivators) and factors that cause job dissatisfaction (Hygiene factors). The hygiene factors include: company policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, work conditions, salary, status and job security. Motivators include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth (Herzberg, 1976). Further studies have also identified leadership styles as an influencing factor of teachers’ job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001).

Regarding what explains employees’ job satisfaction; studies take a conflicting view point. For instance, according to Quick (1998), each person has a different set of goals and can be motivated if he/she believes that: there is a positive correlation between efforts and performance; effective performance will result in a pleasing reward; the reward will satisfy an important need; and the desire to satisfy the need is strong enough to make the effort meaningful. In support of this view point, other studies like Vroom (1964) explained that the motivation to work depends on the relationships between expectancy, instrumentality and valence. Expectancy is a person's belief that working hard will result in a satisfying level of job performance. Instrumentality is an employee’s belief that successful performance will be followed by rewards. And valence is the value a person holds with respect to outcomes (rewards) (Vroom. 1964).

However, other studies suggest that employees form their attitude towards their jobs taking into account their feelings, beliefs and behaviors (Robbins, 2005; Akehurst, Comeche, and Galindo, 2009). This means that if teachers found their job fulfilling and rewarding, they tend to be more satisfied with their jobs (Spector, 1985). The other conflicting idea about what derives job satisfaction is evident from the theory of Abraham Maslow; according to him employees’ needs should take a paramount importance for job satisfaction. He arranged employees’ needs in series of
levels, in the hierarchy of importance. Based on this hierarchy, Maslow identified five needs. From the lowest level, these are physiological needs, safety and security needs, love needs, esteem needs, and the need for self-fulfillment at highest level (Maslow, 1954). This means that until the needs at each level have been satisfied to some extent and until they are met, teachers working in private primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration will find it difficult to respond to the higher order needs (Steyn, 2002). Once the lower order need is satisfied it is no longer a motivator or satisfier (Mullins, 2005).

Considering the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational success, a vast majority of studies believe that successful organizations normally have satisfied employees while poor job satisfaction can cripple an organization (e.g. Galup, Klein and Jiang, 2008). Literatures have also indicated that job satisfaction affects levels of job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, grievance expression, tardiness, low morale, high turnover, quality improvement and participation in decision making (Lee and Ahmed, 2006). These factors according to many studies affect the overall performance of the organization (Klein Hesselink, Kooij-de Bode, and Koppenrade, 2008; Page and Vella-Brodrick, 2008; Pitts, 2009; Riketta, 2008; Scroggins, 2008). While others believe that organizational well-being includes employees’ physical and mental health, sense of happiness and social well-being, which are all attributed with the term job satisfaction (Grant, Christianson and Price, 2007).

Teachers are the most important resources in a school. They are the key figures for any changes (e.g., educational reforms) needed in schools. The provision of a high quality education system depends on high quality teachers (Jyoti and Sharma, 2009; Perie, Baker and The American Institute for Research, 1997). Since teachers’ job satisfaction is the major issue in the present study previous studies is reviewed. The review of the literature form three important point of focuses: the contributing factors of teaches’ job satisfaction, the importance of teachers job satisfaction and the status of teachers job satisfaction in Ethiopia.

One of the major factors that influence teachers’ job satisfaction is working condition (Gedefaw, 2012). According to him, working condition refers to salary, fringe benefits, administrative support, school management and leadership style as well as work load. Some working conditions will have a positive effect on the teachers’ contentment, whereas others will have a negative effect. Some studies, for example one by Chang, et al. (2010:2), revealed that for the past 10 to 20 years
working conditions emerged as the major source of teacher job dissatisfaction and attrition. Ladebo (2005:365) also found that, if working conditions are poor, these situations have a negative impact on the job satisfaction of the teachers. Other studies confirmed that favorable teacher perceptions of their working conditions are related to higher job satisfaction (Perie, et al., 1997:IX). Thus, working conditions, such as salary, fringe benefits, school management and leadership, administrative support, and workload could impact on the job satisfaction of teachers in private school of Addis Ababa City Administration either positively or negatively.

Teachers’ job satisfaction has important consequences as stated by many literatures. It means that the teachers are happy, dedicated and committed, and it also helps them to bring their best qualities to their schools, so that students, parents, and the society may benefit from their services (Ofoegbu, 2004). As indicated by Jaiyeoba and Jibril (2008), satisfied and motivated teachers are important for any educational system. The success or failure of the education system depends mainly on satisfied teachers, but also on satisfied school managers and administrators. Teachers, specifically, spend a great amount of time with their students in class, and hence they have a significant impact on student achievement (Correnti, Miller and Rowan, 2002; Jyoti and Sharma, 2009).

Seco (2002) also believes that for a number of years, teacher job satisfaction has been accepted as extremely important for the implementation of educational reform, for the sustainment of the teacher in life-long learning, for the quality of the teaching-learning process, and for satisfaction with life in general. Further support for this conclusion is provided by Christodoulidis and Papaioannou (2007), who succinctly stated as follows, “One should wonder whether education could be improved with demoralized and unsatisfied teachers”.

According to Mwamwenda (in Badenhorst, George and Louw, 2008), a lack of teacher job satisfaction results in frequent teacher absenteeism from school, aggressive behavior towards colleagues and learners, early exits from the profession, and psychological withdrawal from the work. All of these negative results lead to poor quality teaching. Other studies showed that a lack of job satisfaction is often accompanied by feelings of gloom, despair, anger, resentment and futility (Pinder, 2008). Thus, a lack of job satisfaction has serious implications for the teacher, as well as for the educational system in which he or she is employed.
A satisfied teaching force leads to higher commitment and productivity because of fewer disruptions, such as absenteeism, the departure of ‘good’ employees, and incidences of destructive behavior (Robbins, in Green, 2000). The presence of satisfied teachers also translates into lower medical and life insurance costs. According to Arnold and other researchers (in Perrachione, Petersen and Rosser, 2008), personal satisfaction, along with professional responsibility, is an important indicator of a person’s psychological well-being, as well as a predictor of work performance and commitment. In a study by Hongying (2008), teacher job satisfaction was found to affect teaching, the effectiveness of school administration, and the quality of the school. Thus, job satisfaction affects the teachers’ work and psychological health.

Regarding the status of teachers’ job satisfaction in Ethiopia, studies have verified that poor teachers’ job satisfaction is evident (e.g. [STURE] Report (in Centre for British Teachers, 2008). While many factors have been identified as contributing to the poor teachers’ job satisfaction in Ethiopia, the problem has, to a great extent, have been attributed to the low respect for and the low status of teachers’ living conditions, inadequate salaries as well as failing school management and leadership (Evans, 2000; Papanastasiou and Zembylas, 2006; VSO, 2008).

Referring to leadership style as one of the factors contributing to teachers’ job satisfaction much is known in other parts of the world; however, not much research have been done on the influence of this factor on teachers’ job satisfaction. Specially, there exists a need to gain more information on the influence of leadership style on job satisfaction of private primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration.

2.4. Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction

Leadership style is an important determinant of employee job satisfaction. The reactions of employees to their leaders will usually depend on the characteristics of the employees as well as on the characteristics of the leaders (Wexley and Yukl 1984). Employee job satisfaction is influenced by the internal organization environment, which includes organizational climate, leadership types and personnel relationships (Seashore and Taber 1975). The quality of the leader-employee relationship – or the lack thereof - has a great influence on the employee’s self-esteem and job satisfaction (Chen and Spector 1991; Brockner 1988; DeCremer 2003). Furthermore, as indicated by Lashbrook (1997) leadership style plays a vital role in influencing
employees’ job satisfaction. Some researchers discovered that different leadership styles will engender different working environment and directly affect the job satisfaction of the employees (Bogler, 2001, 2002; Heller, 1993; McKee, 1991; Timothy and Ronald, 2004).

According to (Yukl 1971), employees are more satisfied with leaders who are considerate or supportive than with those who are either indifferent or critical towards subordinates. In support of this idea, Wilkinson & Wagner (1993) argued that, it is stressful for employees to work with a leader who has a hostile behavior and is unsupportive. If subordinates are not capable of figuring out how to perform the work by themselves they will prefer a leader who will provide adequate guidance and instructions (Wexley and Yukl, 1984). Negative leader-employee relations reduce productivity and increase absenteeism and the turnover to the organization can be quite high (Keashly, Trott, & MacLean 1994; Ribelin, 2003).

Similarly, the leadership style of school principals also significantly influences the job satisfaction of the teachers (Bogler, 2001). A leadership style that involves the teachers in the decision-making processes will give the teachers a higher level of job satisfaction than if they were not involved (Bogler, 2001). The teachers report greater satisfaction in their work when they perceive their principal as someone who shares information with them, who delegates authority, and who keeps open channels of communication with them (Bogler, 2001). The influence of leadership style on the teachers’ job satisfaction was confirmed by Sancar (2009). He indicated that school principals who are considerate, have a significant and positive effect on the teachers’ job satisfaction. School leaders, who exhibit concern for the welfare of the teachers and other members of the school community, have satisfied teachers.

The above shows that the school principal, specifically, is very important. The teachers’ dissatisfaction with the school head has been found as one of the frequently cited reasons by teachers to be indifferent to their core business of teaching, and of leaving the profession. According to Ahuja (in Jyoti & Sharma, 2006), teachers who work under incapable, inefficient, and indifferent principals reported an increase in their job dissatisfaction. On the other hand, principals who are democratic, generate an open, friendly and cooperative atmosphere that enables teachers to be satisfied and happy (Jyoti and Sharma, 2006).
In accordance with the above, poor leadership decreases job satisfaction. In a survey done with 230 secondary school teachers, Weiqi (2007) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and its influence on teachers’ attrition and work enthusiasm. The results of the overall job satisfaction of secondary school teachers showed that the teachers were generally dissatisfied with school leadership and administration, among others, and this caused them to leave the teaching profession.

The quality of school leadership serves as an important indicator of the teachers’ intent to leave their profession (Ladebo, 2005). It was found that the probability of the teachers leaving their profession negatively correlated with their perceived quality of leadership: if the teachers had a high regard for their leadership, they were less likely to leave the profession (Ladd, 2009). In a study of Hong Kong teachers’ commitment trends, Choi and Tang (2009) found that teachers in late-careers left their profession due to poor leadership qualities, or to increased administrative work. Poor leadership quality resulted in the teachers’ perceptions of a lack of school support, which again resulted in a decreased commitment to the teaching profession. Thus, the quality of school leadership significantly determines the teachers’ satisfaction and commitment, or their intention to leave the profession.

The quality of school leadership also emerged as indicative of student achievement (Ladd, 2009). Principals with admirable leadership qualities tend to increase the teachers’ job satisfaction, and thus their commitment and motivation (Choi and Tang, 2009; Fresco, Kfir, and Nasser, 1997). Moreover, satisfied teachers tend to be more committed to their careers; and committed teachers influence student achievement.

A good number of research works has been devoted regarding the influence of transactional, transformational and laissez faire leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction. Much of the studies indicated that school principals exhibiting transformational leadership style cultivate high teachers’ job satisfaction than transactional and laissez faire styles (Bass, 1998). In some cases transactional leaders were found to be effective than the other two (Bass and Avolio, 1997). These studies verified their investigations in terms of different thematic focuses. The following will take up these issues along with empirical reviews.
Some studies focus on the fact that the more teachers perceive their school principal to be transformational leaders and participative, and the less the principal exhibited transactional leadership styles, the greater were teachers’ job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001). This study focus on general dimension of transformational leadership while others like Bass (1998) indicated that transformational leaders intrinsically foster more job satisfaction, given their ability to impart sense of mission and intellectual stimulation. Other studies (e.g. Emery and Baker, 2007), indicated a different dimension of transformational leadership to explain job satisfaction. According to them, transformational leaders cultivate high teachers’ job satisfaction by motivating their followers to take on more responsibility and autonomy. Others take employees’ performance appraisal as a point of focus and verified that employees who worked for transformational leaders were more satisfied than those whose leaders exhibit transactional leadership (Waldman, Bass, and Einstein, 1987). Still more other researches done by Butler, and Flick (1999) found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and satisfaction taking supervision and trust as a primary point of focus.

Like the differences in the point of focus for analysis, empirical investigations done on transformational leadership differ in contexts and findings. In the study conducted in Israel, principals’ transformational leadership found to affect teachers’ satisfaction both directly and indirectly through their occupation perceptions (Bogler, 2001). In accordance with this, Bogler (2005), in a study on the satisfaction of Jewish and Arab teachers in Israel, investigated the teachers’ perceptions of their occupations and of their principals’ leadership styles. Bogler’s findings showed that the teachers’ perceptions of their occupations and of their principals’ leadership styles significantly and positively correlated with their job satisfaction: their satisfaction significantly and positively correlated with the principals’ transformational leadership style (leaders and followers who inspire for a common objective), and negatively with the principals’ transactional leadership style (leaders and followers have different objectives). He also found (2005:28) that the principals’ transformational leadership styles were significant predictors of the teachers’ job satisfaction, in addition to the teachers’ perceptions of their occupations.

In a very few literatures and empirical investigations transactional leadership is found to be effective considering some of its dimensions. For instance, Shieh et al. (2001) noted that leaders must understand the social environment of the school and must realize the needs of their employees.
To meet these needs, the transactional leadership style is able to set rewards for good performance that in turn provides constructive feedback to the employee (Bass, 1999). This is to say the exchange relationship formed between the teacher and the principals develop more satisfaction to the teachers. Moreover, using transactional leadership, the leader can motivate followers with higher goals instead of immediate self-interest, for achievement and self-actualization rather than safety and security (Murray and Feitler, 1989). Leaders give followers the capacity to develop higher levels of commitment as they relate to the organizational goals of the school (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2000). Some others like Bass and Avolio (1997) support the idea that transactional leadership is effective and proposed a combination both transactional and transformational leadership. This combination according to the studies yield greater amount of effort from followers and in turn results in higher workplace effectiveness and higher teacher job satisfaction. However there is no or little empirical investigation conducted to verify the above fact.

Researchers have consistently reported that laissez-faire leadership styles (neither transformational nor transactional) are the least satisfying and least effective styles of leadership (Bass, 1990b). That is because these leadership behaviors are accompanied by little sense of accomplishment, little clarity, and little sense of group unity (Bass, 1990b).

Evidence from VSO (2008:35) and interviews with Ethiopian teachers indicates that the authoritarian leadership style employed by school directors who have not received any leadership training has a profound impact on teachers’ satisfaction and school effectiveness and, therefore, on the quality of education.

The review of the above literatures shows that there is a growing concern on the influence of transformational, transactional and laissez faire on teachers’ job satisfaction. However, schools, especially private primary schools in developing countries are less explored in the literature. For instance, in Ethiopia there little or no investigation is conducted to examine the influence of these leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary school. In this study; therefore, the influence of the above leadership styles on the job satisfaction of private primary school teachers in Addis Ababa City Administration will be investigated to fill the gap.
CHAPTER THREE

The Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

In chapter three, the research method, research design, source of data, population, sample and sampling techniques, instruments and procedures of data collection, methods of data analysis, pilot testing and the measures to ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments will be indicated and explained.

3.1. Research Methodology

In the empirical investigation, the study followed a mixed-methods approach. This implies that both quantitative and qualitative approaches of gathering and analyzing data were used. A quantitative approach is structured in nature, and the data are interpreted in statistical form, using questionnaires. The quantitative research approach was employed mainly to involve as many teachers and principals as possible and to collect standardized information from the subjects under study, making generalizability possible. This enables the identification of the dominant leadership style and the leadership style that promotes maximum teachers’ job satisfaction in the selected private primary schools. A quantitative approach also maximizes objectivity by using numbers, statistics, structure and researcher control (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993:32), and it facilitates external validity. A questionnaire was used in this research.

The second phase of the empirical study was a qualitative phase. For the qualitative phase interviews were conducted as a follow-up of the quantitative results. The aim is to gain an in-depth understanding of the results from the questions asked in the quantitative phase of the research. Individual interviews were conducted with a sample that was randomly selected from the same group of participants used in the quantitative phase.
3.2. The Research Design

In the research methodology section, it was mentioned that a mixed methods were used in the study. Mixed-methods approaches provide the researchers with additional opportunities to answer a more complete range of research questions, because the researcher is not confined to a single method or approach. Mixed-methods research also enables the researchers to capitalize on the strengths, and to minimize the weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative methods. As outlined by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004:21), the researchers can use the strengths of one method (e.g., the quantitative method) to overcome the weaknesses of the other method (e.g., the qualitative method), or vice versa, when using both methods in a single study. By using words, pictures, and narratives, it is possible to add more meaning to quantitative data. Similarly, numbers can be used to add more precision to words, pictures, and narratives, and this enables generalization.

Leech and Onwuegbuzie (2009:267) indicate that in mixed-methods research, the researcher uses qualitative research methods for one phase of the research, followed by quantitative methods for the second phase of the study, or vice versa. The two phases are thus conducted sequentially. However, they can also be conducted concurrently. For the present study that investigates the influence of leadership style on teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration, the quantitative phase is followed by a qualitative phase. The reason for this is to gain an in-depth understanding of the quantitative results. McMillan and Schumacher (2010:401) identified this as a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design. The primary emphasis was on the quantitative paradigm (this is because there are more research questions dealing with quantitative data), with a secondary emphasis on the qualitative paradigm to investigate the factors influencing the job satisfaction of private primary school teachers of Addis Ababa City Administration.

3.3. Sources of Data

The data was collected from different categories of subjects and the population from each category was selected using simple random sampling. The study sample consists of private primary schools, teachers and school principals in Addis Ababa City Administration. First, private primary schools are the primary concern for the fact that literature gap is evident on the
influence of leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in school settings especially private schools (Leithwood et al., 1999). Second, for the key role they play in ensuring student performance and school objectives, teachers were selected as a data source (Saravia-Shore, 2008). To ensure this role, they need support and motivation that is most often affected by the principal at the school. Furthermore, teachers are normally satisfied with their job if they have a good relationship with the principal(s). Third, principals were considered as a data source because they are particularly responsible to employ a wide variety of leadership styles that guarantee high teachers’ job satisfaction. Principal as educational leader influences teachers and staffs for successful operations of teaching and learning in the school. This implies that the school principals are the most visible and directly accessible representatives of the school who highly influence the job performance of teachers. Thus, teachers' job performance in the school system can positively or negatively be affected by their principals' leadership style (Healy, 1994:64).

3.4. Population, Sample and Sampling techniques

3.4.1. Population

According to the Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau (2013) Educational Statistics Annual Abstract, there are 658 private primary schools found in the ten sub-cites of Addis Ababa City Administration. This relates to 15,134 teachers and 1316 principals. The way private schools structure and function depend on the societies demand, families’ economic background and area of establishment (Seboka, 2003). Thus, the leadership style employed by principals in the schools found in the periphery and center of the city may differ significantly among other factors. Moreover, the status of teachers’ job satisfaction is different from one sub-city to the other.

3.4.2. Sample

From the 10 sub-cities of Addis Ababa City Administration, Arada, Bole, Kolfe-Keranio and Kirkos sub-cites were sampled purposively. This was due to the researcher’s interest to include schools from different corners of the city. Moreover, out of the school population in the selected sub-cities, 2 schools from Arada sub-city, 5 schools from Bole sub-city, 6 schools from Kolfe-
Kerano and 2 schools from Kirkos sub-city were sampled using simple random sampling technique. The variation in the number of sample schools was due to the number of school population in the respective sub-cities. Thus, 15 private primary schools were selected. Of all the teachers in the selected schools, 296 teachers were sampled by the use of simple random sampling. Moreover, all the principals working in the selected schools were sampled; hence 32 principals were sampled from the selected schools.

Table 3.1 Population and Sample of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub cities</th>
<th>Number of schools in each sub cities</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arada</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolfe Keranio</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkos</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>658</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3. Sampling Techniques

Sampling is central to ensure that the generalizations are valid. This is because proper sampling improves the internal and external validity of the measuring instrument (the questionnaires). A sample is a set of target respondents selected from a larger population for the purposes of surveys (Singh, 2007:88). It is a smaller group or subset of the total population (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2007:100). The quality of the research outcome depends, among others, on the size and representativeness of the sample and the sampling strategy used. The samples selected for purposes of analysis should be representative. This is because the sample represents the properties of the whole population in question, so that the results found from the sample are generalizable to the population (Muijs, 2004:38). Out of the various sampling designs, this research used purposive sampling and simple random sampling techniques.

According to C.R. Kotari (2004) purposive sampling procedure can be employed in cases where the researcher select items based on his/her interest to include items favorable to the study. In
line with the recommendations by C.R. Kotari (2004) with purposive sampling, 4 sub-cities (Arada, Bole, Kolfe-Keranio and Kirkos) were sampled to include schools from the center (Arada and Kirkos) and border of the city (Kolfe-Keranio and Bole). Along with the area, the societies economic background, and the demand for private schooling was also considered while selecting sub-cities for the study.

Sample selection for schools and teachers were done by the use of probability sampling because the study is intended to select a representative without bias from the accessible population (Oso and Onen, 2005). This ensured that each member of the target population will have an equal and independent chance of being included in the sample. All the principals in the selected schools were included in the study.

3.4.4. Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection

3.4.4.1. Instruments of Data Collection

3.4.4.1.1. Questionnaires

A self-structured, self-administered questionnaire was used to collect the data from principals and teachers. Cohen et al. (2007: 158) argue that questionnaires encourage the respondents to be honest since they are answered anonymously, and they are more economical than interviews. Moreover it has the ability to solicit information from several respondents within short period of time (Gupta, 1999). Scaled items were carefully designed to generate information of leadership behaviors and job satisfaction of teachers. The scaled items, according to Mcmillan and Schumacher (2001), allow fairly accurate assessment of opinions. The study used two types of self-administered questionnaires designed for principals and teachers.

The questionnaire for principals consisted of three sections (I, II, III). Part I addressed the biographical data and personal characteristics of the principal. These characteristics included gender, age, the principals’ teaching experience and educational qualification. Part II consisted of items that determined the principals’ dominant leadership style. Part III consisted of items that indicate the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction as observed by the principal.

Similarly, the questionnaire for teachers consisted of three parts (I, II, III). Part I solicit general information about teachers that include gender, sex, work experience, educational qualification.
Part II of the questionnaire provides teachers the opportunity to evaluate principals’ dominant leadership style. Part III evaluates the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction in relation to the leadership styles employed by the principal. Both principals’ and teachers’ questionnaires measure opinions by means of a five point Likert scale, as follows: 1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree , 3= neutral 4= agree; and 5= strongly agree.

3.4.4.1.2. Interviews

Face to face interviews were carried out with five teachers. The method used interview guides to capture respondents’ views. This method is preferred due to its flexibility and ability to provide new ideas on the subject (Kotari, 2004). Moreover, it enables to obtain in-depth information about participants’ thought, beliefs, knowledge, reasoning, motivation, and feeling about the issue under study (Johnson and Christensen, 2004).

3.4.4.2. Pilot Testing

Ten private primary school teachers and five principals from a school that was not selected for this study were randomly selected for piloting the questionnaire. The purpose of the pilot study was to check the clarity of the questionnaire items and instructions; eliminate poor wording; check the readability and understanding levels of the research respondents; gain feedback on the time required to complete the questionnaire; gain feedback from the teacher respondents on the suitability of the questionnaire items; gain feedback regarding the appropriate time to conduct the data collection; and identify irrelevant items. Based on the pilot study, the following changes were made to the questionnaire items and the following decisions were made concerning the data collection, namely vague or unclear items were deleted, items having similar concepts or ideas were rephrased and replaced, and irrelevant items were deleted.
3.4.4.3. Validity and Reliability

3.4.4.3.1. Validity

The issue of validity is the most important concept that researchers are required to deal critically with. The design of the measuring instrument must be valid so that the collected data will lead to sound conclusions. If research is invalid (as a result of a poor instrument), then it is worthless (Cohen et al., 2007:133).

Validity is the extent to which the measuring instrument (e.g., a questionnaire) we are using essentially measures the characteristic or dimension we intend to measure (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001:98). This implies, if a questionnaire designed to measure teacher satisfaction measures something else (e.g., achievement), then it is not a valid measure of teacher job satisfaction. In this research validity is addressed with content and face validity.

Content validity, as defined by Cohen et al. (2007:137) is a form of validity that refers to the extent to which the measuring instrument (e.g., test, questionnaire or inventory) shows that it fairly and comprehensively covers the domain or items that it purports to cover. Thus, in the context of the present study, content validity was concerned with the degree to which the designed questionnaire items fairly and accurately represented the main variables (dependent and independent). These variables include leadership styles with their respective dimensions and job satisfaction facets. The content validity was judged by the researcher, his adviser and leadership instructors at Educational Planning and Management department on whether peculiar behaviors of transformational, transactional and laissez faire leadership styles and job satisfaction facets were included in the instruments or not.

Face validity refers to the appearance of the test items. It is where, on the surface, the measuring instrument (test) appears, at face value, to test what it is designed to test (Balnaves and Caputi, 2001; Birmingham & Wilkinson, 2003). In other words, if items are supposed to focus on the dominant leadership, do the items appear to measure that construct? Like content validity, face validity cannot be checked using statistical significance tests. It is based on subjective judgment. In this study the face validity was judged by the researcher, his advisor and experts from
psychology department on how the instrument appears or designed to measure what it intended to measure.

3.4.4.3.2. Reliability

Reliability, as defined by Cohen, et al. (2007:146), is the consistency, dependability and replicability of the measuring instrument over time, and with the same respondents. It is the extent to which the measuring instrument yields consistent and accurate results when the characteristic being measured remains constant (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001:99). In order to determine the reliability of the questionnaire in the study, Cronbach alpha was computed for each of the three main independent variables with their dimensions, and for the job satisfaction obtained from each of three leadership styles. This is a measure of the internal consistency of the questionnaire.

The reliabilities (Cronbach alphas) were as follows:

(a) Transactional leadership- contingent reward= 0.78, Management by exception(active)=0.85 and management by exception(passive)= 0.74
(b) Transformational leadership- Idealized influence= 0.75 , Inspirational motivation= 0.72, Intellectual stimulation= 0.78, and Individualized consideration=0.76
(c) Laissez- fair leadership=0.90
(d) Job satisfaction questioners with all the three leadership styles: Transactional leadership style and job satisfaction facets= 0.64 , transformational leadership style and job facets=0.76 and laissez-fair leadership style and job facets= 0.87

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010:184), a good rule of thumb is that the reliability needs to be 0.7 or higher. This means that in this research all the variables (except one), have reliability values greater than 0.7. However, it is worthwhile to include variables of which the reliability values are less than 0.7. As suggested by McMillan and Schumacher (2010:182), reliability values are highly dependent on the number of items, so alpha value of 0.64 is acceptable for the fact that nine items were included in transactional leadership style and job satisfaction facets.
3.4.4.4. Procedures of Data Collection

After pilot, validity and reliability tests of the instruments were made, the researcher obtained permission for the research from principals of the sampled schools. At each of the sampled schools issues regarding the purpose of the study and data collection by means of the questionnaires and interviews were discussed with the principals. On the agreed dates, the researcher personally administered the questionnaire and interviews to all the teachers at the schools, on condition that they are willing to participate. Upon completion, the researcher collected all the questionnaires, so that a 100 % response rate was secured.

3.4.4.5. Methods of Data Analysis

Information obtained from the questionnaires were regularly coded and updated on a coding framework. The collected data were analyzed by means of descriptive and inferential statistics that included frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations (descriptive statistics) as well as t-tests (inferential statistics). The t-test enabled the testing of significant difference among the responses of teachers and principals. The data was analyzed by using the statistical package for Social Science (SPSS-20). SPSS-20 was used as a data analysis tool because it is latest version. For the information obtained through interviews, the analysis was conducted using Guba and Lincoln’s constant comparative method of analysis (in Leech and Onwuegbuzie, 2007:565).

This was done as follows:

(i) Categorizing and comparing units: The researcher prepared a transcript of the interviews with the participants. Then he carefully read and reread the entire set of data (the transcript). This enabled him to chunk the data into smaller meaningful parts. Following this, the researcher labeled each similar chunk with a code (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007:565). In this way, categories were identified and documented.

(ii) Integrating categories and their properties: After completing the formation of categories and units, comparisons were made with each code so that similar chunks were clearly labeled with the same code. This process enabled the researcher to see whether the chunks were clearly labeled, to integrate the categories, and to reduce their number.

(iii) External coder: An external coder checked the analysis of interview transcripts. This enhanced the trustworthiness of the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. Introduction

In this research study, the specific objectives were to assess the dominant leadership style in practice by principals in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration and the leadership style that promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration. This chapter therefore, will present the results and discussion of the results in order to answer the above-mentioned questions. The results were based on the data that were collected using quantitative and qualitative measures (questionnaires and interviews). In the first section of this chapter the biographical data of the sampled teachers and principals will be provided. The next section presents the results from the quantitative and qualitative data.

4.2. Analysis of the General Information

Table 4.1 and 4.2 illustrates the respondents’ biographical information as determined by questions in part I of the questionnaire. The total number of teachers and principals respondents is 296 and 32 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Biographical data of teachers and principals: Age and Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Biographical data of teachers and principals: qualification and work experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency(f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Frequency(f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 illustrates the following: of the total of 296 teachers and 32 principals, the males were the majority (N=200, 67.6%) and (N=20, 90.6) respectively. It is evident that the population is mainly composed of male respondents. The frequency distribution of teacher respondents by age showed that most of them (N=261, 88.2%) were in the age category 20 to 30 years. However, majority (N=17, 47.2%) of principal respondents were in the age group 31-40. In addition the respondents who belonged to the age group 20-30 and above 50 constituted the second largest group of respondents equally (N=6, 18.8%).

Table 4.2 above shows that the highest academic qualification of teachers respondents was a bachelor’s degree (N=183, 61.8 %). Diploma holders constitute the second larger group of respondents (N=96, 32.4%). Only 17(5.7%) of the respondents hold masters’ degrees. This result shows that, on average, the teachers in the selected private primary schools have a first degree. This is beyond the expectation of the Ethiopian primary education training system that requires teachers who teach in primary schools to have a minimum qualification of at least diploma degree. Similarly majority (17, 53.1%) of the principals’ respondents were degree holders followed by master’s degree holders (10, 31.3%). Diploma holders constitute only 5(15.6%) of the population.
Table 4.2 also indicates that the largest group (N=284, 95.9%) of teachers respondents had 1-10 years of experience as a teacher. The rest 12(4%) of teachers respondent population experienced teaching for above 11 years. Similarly, majority (N=19, 59.4) of principal respondents had, not more than 10 years of experience followed by an experience of above 20 years (N=9, 28.5). Only 4 (12.5%) of principal respondents experienced their job for a range of 11-20 years.

4.3. Results of the Qualitative and Quantitative phase

To facilitate clarity of interpretation, the aggregate mean for each of the three leadership styles, the average mean of teachers and principals’ responses and t-test were calculated. Moreover, frequencies and percentages were also used to identify the leadership style in practice by principals and the leadership style that promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration.

4.3.1. Leadership Style

It was indicated that transactional leadership has three sub variables namely contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive). Similarly transformational leadership constituted four sub variables namely idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Therefore, to obtain a great understanding of the influence of each of variables each were identified and discussed.

Analysis of each of transactional leadership sub variables, transformational leadership sub variables and laissez faire leadership styles follows:

Table 4.3 Mean ratings on transactional leadership dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional leadership</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>t-obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership dimensions</td>
<td>Teachers N=296</td>
<td>Principals N=32</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by exception (Active)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by exception (Passive)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Mean Value ≥4.5 = very high, (3.51-4.51) = high, (2.51-3.5) = moderate, (1.51-2.5) =low and <1.5 =very low at p < 0.05, \( t_{cr} = 1.960, df = 326 \)
A principal with contingent reward behavior clarifies the work that must be achieved and provide a reward. In addition to clarifying the work to be achieved, he/she also provides a reward when teachers do the activities excepted of them and teachers also know that their efforts lead them to a reward. As a result, table 4.3 above depicts respondents view on the status of contingent reward. In relation to this, the mean scores of both principals (4.10) and teachers (3.91) lie in the range (3.51-4.51). Moreover, the average mean score was 4.00.

Furthermore, interviews were made with some teachers and principals concerning contingent reward issues. Accordingly, majority of the teachers in the study area replied that their principal usually provides them with a reward when they met standards. According to the teachers, rewards are given in the form of certificates or praises. For instance, a teacher form school A replied that:

*The principal and the school management usually provides us with a certificate, whenever we properly set out our lesson plan, perform in department and club activities and perform all the school activities according to the standard set.*

In general, contingent reward transactional leadership dimension is the act of providing a reward in exchange for a work well done; therefore, as indicated in table 4.3 and the responses of the interviews made, one can infer that principals in the study area exhibit high contingent reward behaviors following the best achievement of school activities. In order to observe weather there is significant difference between the two independent means, t-test at P<0.05 significant level and 326 degrees of freedom is used. Thus, it was found that the t-test value calculated (1.059) was less than the table value (1.960) indicates there is no significant difference between the means of the two groups.

Transactional leadership can also be expressed in terms of management by exception (active) dimension. Management by exception (active) is a key transactional leadership dimension that dwells on the activity of a principal to actively monitor the work of teachers and constantly acquainting teachers what they need to achieve. It provides a room for immediate remedial actions. Based on the above general idea, questions referring to management by exception (active) ask whether there is continuous evaluation to check whether standards are met or not and the presence of regular information for the activities to be performed.
With regard to the above idea, Table 4.3 presents respondents view on management by exception (active) dimension. Accordingly, the average mean score was 4.31 which is in between 3.51 and 4.51. Furthermore interviews conducted to assess respondents’ evaluation on management by exception (active) dimension indicated that principals actively monitor the work of teachers. For instance a teacher from school C said that:

*We are always in a continuous follow up by the principal. He usually walks by our class. He concentrates on dos and don’ts. He checks our notebooks, lesson plans and overall day to day activities. He usually tells us the record of our day to day activity leads us to promotions and salary increment. The feedbacks we get from the monitoring and evaluation help us to immediately fill our gaps.*

The responses of the interviews show that principals are in a continuous process of monitoring teachers. In general, the overall analyses of the responses of the respondents show that the status of transactional leadership in relation to management by exception (active) dimension is relatively high. This indicates that principals actively monitor the work of teachers and give remedial actions for available gaps. It was also observed that the active and continuous monitoring of teachers’ activity in the study area leads to promotions and praises. Furthermore, the calculated t-value (0.543) was less than the table value of 1.960 at P< 0.05 and 326 degrees of freedom. This verified that there is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and principals.

Management by exception (passive) is a dimension of transactional leadership. Management by exception (passive) refers to principals who intervene in the teaching learning process only when a problem arises. Therefore, some questions were raised to understand respondents view on this dimension of transactional leadership. In light of this, table 4.3 presents respondents view on management by exception (passive) dimension in private primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration.

In this regard, Table 4.3 illustrates the mean value of both teachers (3.41) and principals (3.28). This value is between 2.51 and 3.51. Similarly the average weighted mean (3.34) of the scores was in the same range (2.51-3.51). Moreover, interviews conducted on the same issue verified that majority of the principals in the private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration are rarely passive. Moreover, according to them principals are more of proactive than reactive.
In general, from the mean scores and the responses of the interviews one can deduce that management by expectation (passive) is moderate. From this it is possible to infer that principals do not prefer to use passive management in comparison with contingent reward and management by exception (active) dimensions of transactional leadership. Furthermore, the calculated t-value (0.309) is found to be less than the table t value (1.960) at P<0.05 and 326 degree of freedom indicating no significant differences between teachers’ and principals’ responses.

Table 4.4 Mean ratings on transformational leadership dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational leadership</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>t-obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership dimensions</td>
<td>Teachers N=296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals N=32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike simple exchange and agreement in transactional leadership, transformational leaders provide a vision and a sense of mission, inspire, pride and gain respect and trust through charisma. Transformational leadership has four dimensions like idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Based on the above general idea, Table 4.4 presents the mean scores of the respondents view on each of the dimensions of transformational leadership.

Idealized influence is a leader who is trusted and respected. A leader who maintains high moral standards and teachers seek to emulate him/her. In relation to this, questions regarding the sense of happiness while working with the principal, inspiration and motivation when goals are achieved and articulation of the schools’ strategic vision to stakeholders are raised. In this regard, respondents’ views with the mean scores are presented in Table 4.4. Accordingly, the results in table 4.4 illustrates that the mean scores of idealized influence for both teachers (4.19)
and principals (4.45) is found between 3.51 and 4.51. In addition to the mean scores interviews were conducted. The results of the interviews will follow:

Majority of principal respondents consider themselves as someone highly trusted and respected. According to them they inspire and motivate teachers towards the vision of the school. They repeatedly mentioned their ability to arouse teachers and bring them to follow their mission and vision. However, majority of teacher respondents disagree with above point of view. They critically mentioned that principals are very hard to work with. For instance a teacher from school D said that:

_I have been working in this school for the last four years. The principal is not someone easy going. He doesn’t feel good while working with teachers. He usually concentrates on the task to be performed. During my stay in the school, I haven’t seen the principal creating a vision and mission. He always dwells on the activities on his table. On the school meetings, the schools future direction, objectives and vision are not communicated._

In general, idealized influence behavior is the art of influencing others towards the success of school goals and vision. Though the mean scores are high, the responses from teachers’ interviews indicated that principals are not good enough with idealized influence behavior. From this it is possible to infer that teachers are poorly satisfied with principals’ attitude towards idealized influence. The calculated t- value (1.756) for idealized influence is slightly below the table t- value (1.960) at P<0.05 and 326 degrees of freedom. This is an indicator for statically no difference between the responses of the two groups.

Individualized consideration is principal’s ability to pay special attention to teachers. Principals with this skill treat teachers as individuals but all are treated equally. Individual needs are recognized and assignments are delegated to teachers to provide learning opportunities. In relation to this, three questions particularly on the help to develop oneself, the value given for the thought of each teacher and understanding of individual differences existent in each teacher were raised in order to assess the status of each in the area under the study. As a result, Table 4.4 above indicates respondents view on the status of individualized consideration. Accordingly, the mean scores of teachers (4.03) and the average weighted mean (4.27) are between 3.51 and 4.51. The mean score for principals is 4.52. This value is greater than 4.50.
Interviews were also made with some teachers and principals in the study area. A conflicting point of view is observed from the interviews made. Almost all of the principal respondents revealed that they give due attention to each teachers’ need. According to the principals, their understanding of individual differences creates a conducive environment for teachers’ development. However, majority of the teachers’ respondents consider principals as someone who does not care about teachers’ development and individual need. They repeatedly mentioned that principals don’t understand the skill difference among each teacher. This view is reflected by the following response:

*Teachers in our school are different in their willingness as well their skills. Some of them are so willing that they involve in every activity. They are also eager to learn. Some of them are so talented where little help is required to develop them. Some of our staff members hate feedbacks. The principal does not understand these differences. He usually does things by the book.*

In a nutshell, individualized consideration is principals’ ability to understand individual differences existent in each teacher. With regard to this, principal mean scores and responses from principal interviews indicated that principals individualized consideration skill is very high. However, teachers’ interviews on similar issues indicated that principals don’t treat teachers equitably and don’t create a ground for development. From this one can deduce that the way principals’ carry out individualized consideration skill is poorly exercised and its effects are not noticeable. Furthermore, the independent sample t-test conducted to test whether there is significant difference between the responses of teachers and principals support the idea that there is difference between the scores. This is evident from the fact that the calculated t-value (3.721) is way beyond the table t-value (1.196) at P<0.05 and 326 df.

Inspirational motivation is principals’ ability to emphasize teachers the need to perform well and helps to accomplish the organizational goals. Based on the above idea, three questions were raised regarding issues like expression of what should be done in few words, creating an appealing image about the activities to be done and developing a meaning in the profession of teaching. The mean results of the responses of the above issues of inspirational motivation (Table 4.4) and interviews conducted will be presented below.

The mean score for inspirational motivation for teachers and principals is 3.9 and 4.49 respectively. These values are in between 3.51 and 4.51. Similarly, the average mean is 4.19.
Moreover, principals’ interviews concerning inspirational motivation issues revealed that majority of the respondents in the study area exercise inspirational motivation. Principals believed that they have the ability to strengthen teachers’ responses and explain important ideas in simple ways. According to the principals, teachers perform well due to the appealing image created about what should be done. However, teachers frequently expressed their discontent about principals’ inspirational motivation skills. Majority of teacher interview respondents expressed principals’ ability to inspire is poor. The following is a typical comment from a teacher in school C:

As to me, to inspire means to create a sense great motivation about the activities we perform in the school compound. An inspired teacher is energetic, work with determination and commitment to attain school goals and objectives. An inspired teacher is one who loves teaching profession. However teachers in our school including me are not inspired. We usually work in this school to make a living out of it. I believe the principal should be the real actor to inspire us towards the success of the school objectives and goals. Moreover, he should be the one who initiates us to make a meaning in the profession of teaching. However, he lacks motivation skills.

In general, the ability to inspire is perceived as a unique and energetic expression of the need to perform as a best teacher. In light of this, all the results of the mean scores in Table 4.4 indicate that principals’ inspirational motivation skill is relatively high. In addition to the mean scores principals’ interviews also proves the presence inspirational motivation skill in the study area. However, teachers’ interview indicates that there is a perceived difference between the results and responses of the interviews made. This shows that principals’ ability to inspire teachers is not dominantly practiced and the effect is not remarkably convincing. Hence this could affect teachers’ job satisfaction. Moreover, the calculated t-value (5.077) is above the table t-value (1.196) at P< 0.05 and 326 degrees of freedom indicating the significant differences between the responses of the two groups.

Principals’ transformational leadership style can also be measured in terms of intellectual stimulation. A principal with this skill stimulate teachers’ understanding of the problems and an identification of their own beliefs and standards. To assess this skill, some questions in form of questionnaires and interviews were raised. The questions focus on weather changing environments are seen as opportunities, the availability of a room to change old situations with new ones and on encouragement to rethink ideas that one have never questioned before. As a
result, Table 4.4 above depicts respondents view on the status of intellectual stimulation in the study area. In relation to this, the mean scores of both teachers (3.81) and principals (4.36) are found in the range between 3.51 and 4.51.

Furthermore, interviews were also made with some teachers and principals concerning intellectual stimulation issues. Accordingly, principals in the study area mentioned their strong ability to initiate teachers to create new ways of doing things. According to the principals, due the ground created to try new things, teachers constantly developed their own ways of developing a lesson plan and notes. However, teachers expressed their feeling of dissatisfaction on the way the principal stimulate them intellectually. According to teachers they are not encouraged to create new things; they were usually discouraged while they brought best teaching and planning methods. They frequently described their principal as someone who likes to do things as they are. They said that the principal tend to maintain the status quo.

Therefore, from the mean scores in Table 4.3 and principal interviews one can deduce that intellectual stimulation skill is high in the study area. However, teacher interviews surprisingly show that principals’ ability to encourage followers to try new approaches or methods is relatively low. This indicates that principals’ intellectual stimulation ability in the study area is poorly practiced. Moreover, the independent t-test conducted to check whether there is significant difference between teachers’ and principals’ responses or not indicated significant difference between the two means. This was seen from greater difference between calculated t-value (3.901) and table t-value (1.196) at P<0.05 and 326 df.

Table 4.5 Mean ratings on Laissez-faire leadership style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laissez fair leadership</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Average mean</th>
<th>t-obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers N=296</td>
<td>Principals N=32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership dimensions</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez fair leadership items</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laissez-faire leadership is a passive kind of leadership style. There is no relationship between the leader and the followers. It represents a non-transactional kind of leadership style in which
necessary decisions are not made. In light with the above statement three questions were raised in the questionnaire to assess their status in the area under study. In relation to this, the responses are presented in Table 4.5. Accordingly, the mean scores of both teachers (2.46) and principals (2.21) are found in range between 1.51 and 2.51.

In addition to the mean scores, interviews conducted in the study area indicate the disagreement with the points raised. According to the respondents, they do not prefer to work in a stable environment. They repeatedly mentioned the need for rules and regulations in the school. Most importantly the principal is the key figure in the school actions and decisions as stated by the respondents. From this it is possible to deduce that laissez-faire leadership style is the least preferred and practiced leadership style in the area under study. Moreover, the calculated t-value (0.947) is less than the table t-value (1.196) at P<0.05 and 326 degrees freedom. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the responses of teachers and principals.

### 4.3.2. Leadership style and job satisfaction

The second purpose of the study was to identify the leadership style (transactional, transformational and laissez-faire) that maximizes high teachers’ job satisfaction. To do so, the nine job satisfaction domains like pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, recognition, operating procedure, co-worker, nature of the work and communication (Locke 1976; Smith et al.) are combined with peculiar behaviors of the three leadership styles resulting nine questions. The aggregate mean value, frequencies and percentages results will be displayed in the tables given below.
Table 4.6 Teachers’ mean ratings on job satisfaction statements of transactional leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy if pay correlates with performance</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pleased if benefits matches with commitment</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied if opportunities for promotion is given in exchange for performance</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pleased if the principal actively supervise my work</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied if the principal gives me a recognition for my best achievements</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active monitoring and continuous rewards makes teaching pleasing</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal’s attitude for reward and recognition disturbs my professional relationship with colleagues</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching will be pleasing if best performances are rewarded and recognized</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy if the principal clarify the work to be achieved</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable total</strong></td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: S.A= Strongly Agree, A= agree, D=Disagree, S.D= Strongly Disagree, f (%) = frequency and percentage, X= mean and Std= standard deviation
Transactional leadership is a kind of leadership where the principal communicates with teachers to explain how task must be done and let them know that there will be rewards for a job well done. This is an exchange relationship between teachers and principals. Based on the above general idea, nine questions regarding the combined effects of transactional leadership dimensions and job satisfaction aspects were raised. As a result, Table 4.6 illustrates respondents view on the status transactional leadership and job satisfaction aspects.

In relation to this, majority of teacher respondents agreed with all of the nine statements. Particularly, from the mean value (mean= 4.61) teachers’ job satisfaction is related to benefits obtained in exchange for best performances. In support of the above quantitative data, interviews conducted concerning teachers’ job satisfaction and work aspect issues indicated that in the majority of the schools, benefits and salaries are relatively unsatisfactory in comparison with the work done. This mismatch between salary and work load creates poor job satisfaction. According to teachers, for high job satisfaction it is wise to exchange salaries with job performances. For instance a teacher from school A commented:

*Teachers do not perform equally in the school. Some of us do better where as others perform poorly. For instance, I usually submit my lesson plans, note books in time; I usually submit tests and final examination on time. I am usually punctual. I do the teaching properly. However there are some teachers who are so careless and unwilling. Therefore, I fell greatly satisfied if the school management or principal considers our activities for salary increment schemes.*

In general, the overall analysis of the responses of the respondents shows that the level of job satisfaction in relation to the exchange of benefits and salaries for the job well done is relatively high. This shows that performance oriented salary or benefit increment schemes have a serious implication on teachers’ job satisfaction. Such kind of relationship is evident from contingent reward dimension of transactional leadership.

The other job satisfaction aspect is recognition. In educational institutions, students and teachers are the most important resources. The impact of teachers on student achievements, quality education and educational reforms should be recognized by school administrators, and also by other teachers. Based on the above general idea, the fifth item in Table 4.6 asks the status of teachers’ job satisfaction for recognitions provided. Accordingly, the mean and the percentage responses was 4.56 and 96.3% respectively. Furthermore, interviews made with some teachers
support the idea that teachers need the appreciation, approval and respect of school administrators, and of others. According to them, they feel valuable, functional and important if their best performances were recognized. As repeatedly mentioned by teachers a recognized and appreciated teacher tended to be happy with his/her profession.

In general, the results and responses of the interview show that recognitions considered for the exchange of best performances brought about high teachers’ job satisfaction. This shows that transactional leadership has an influence on teachers’ job satisfaction as far as contingent reward dimension is concerned. In this case the contingent reward exchanged for best performance is recognition by either the principal or school administrators.

In the teaching profession promotion can be realized when teachers receive the opportunity of being appointed as school principals, department heads, supervisors, district officers, or to the next level, by achieving additional educational qualifications. Considering opportunities for promotion as a contingent reward, questions regarding teachers’ job satisfaction were raised. Accordingly, Table 4.6 illustrates views on the status of teachers’ job satisfaction for opportunities given. In relation to this, respondents expressed their agreement for the statement given in Table 4.5.

Moreover, interviews support the idea that opportunities for promotion given in exchange for best performances promote high teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers repeatedly mentioned the need for promotion in accordance with their advancement in performance and educational background. In general, the overall analysis of the responses for this item shows that teachers’ view on promotion aspect of job satisfaction is high. In light of this, it is possible to infer that promotions have a paramount importance for teachers’ job satisfaction especially exchanged for outstanding performances.

The only discontent regarding transactional leadership and job satisfaction aspect is also observed in Table 4.6. This is related to weather principal attitude for reward and recognition disturbs teachers’ professional relationship with colleagues. Regarding this factor teachers’, mean= 2.83) expressed their disagreement with this statement. In relation to this, some interview questions were raised to teacher respondents. Accordingly, majority of the respondents frequently mentioned that so long as rewards are given for best performances, it will not disturb
their relationship with colleagues. According to them, the feeling of poor association with colleagues prevails particularly when poor performances are rewarded. The results and responses of the interview show that respondents view for the last item in Table 4.6 is relatively low. From this it is possible to deduce that relationship with colleagues as an aspect of teachers’ job satisfaction would not be disturbed with the exchange relationship evident from transactional leadership style.

Furthermore, Table 4.6 illustrates that teachers’ job satisfaction in terms of the exchange between pay and performance (mean = 4.43), the active supervision carried out by the principal (mean = 4.25), the active monitoring and continuous rewards (mean = 4.32) and the clarification of work to be achieved (mean = 4.40) are found to be high from the mean results obtained. In addition to the results, the responses from interviews strengthen the fact that transaction between the above mentioned transactional leadership dimensions and job satisfaction facets leads to high teachers’ job satisfaction. In support of the above idea, the aggregate mean value (4.26) found in the range (3.51-4.51) also shows high teachers’ job satisfaction with transactional leadership and work aspects. This implies that transactional leadership can be a core element of teachers’ job satisfaction if excellent executions of important job aspects are followed by rewards, recognitions, promotions and incentive increments.
Table 4.7 Mean ratings on job satisfaction statements of transformational leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy if the school’s strategic vision and future improvements brought better pay</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pleased if benefits are evident from the success of school goals through inspiration and motivation</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy if my promotion rely on innovations and creativity to solve old problems</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pleased if the principal encourages new approaches/methods of teaching during supervision</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied if we are recognized as a team</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of clear goals, innovation and inspirations by the principal makes teaching pleasing</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal’s attitude to pay special attention to each teacher’s need for achievement magnifies my relationship with colleagues</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching will be pleasing if there is strong team spirit and creative work environment</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied if the principal motivate and inspire teachers to commit to their job and vision of the school</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable total</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 presents teachers’ views on the nine statements constituting transformational leadership job satisfaction variables. This table depicts that most of the teacher respondents were satisfied with each of the nine statements. In rank order, out of the nine statements most of the teachers (mean=4.61) were satisfied with the transformational leadership dimension that deals with inspiration and motivation of teachers to the vision of the school.

Furthermore, interviews made with teachers concerning similar issues indicate that teachers fell pleased to work with a principal who can create an appealing image about the job. According to them an inspired teacher is energetic to accomplish the vision of the school. From the results and responses of the interview made, one can infer that the use of inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership brought about high teachers’ job satisfaction in the area under study.

Intellectual stimulation as a dimension of transformational leadership has a role to stimulate innovation and creativity in the work environment. With regard to this, some points related to teaching profession were raised in Table 4.7 in order to assess the level job satisfaction. As a result, Table 4.7 above depicts respondents view on the status job satisfaction from intellectual stimulation and work aspect. In relation to this, the mean value 4.60 expresses teachers’ feeling of job satisfaction. In support of the qualitative data, teachers frequently expressed their opinion on the fact that changing and innovative teaching environment is pleasing. Teachers believed that principals’ ability to try new methods or approaches strengthen their level job satisfaction. From the frequency, means and the responses of the interview it is possible to deduce that intellectual stimulation linked with some aspects of teaching promotes high level of job satisfaction next to inspirational motivation.

Supervision is one of the aspects of job satisfaction. Though the continuous process of supervision teachers can be supported and developed. In relation to this, the item in Table 4.7 provides the extent of job satisfaction if principals encourage new ways of teaching methodologies during supervision. Accordingly majority (mean= 4.58) of teachers expressed their feeling of happiness if principals work with teachers to solve the gap observed during supervision. In this respect, the responses of the interview with teachers strengthen the point. According to the respondents, they like to work with a school principal who regularly supervise their work and provides them with constructive feedbacks. Teachers believed that discussions after supervision promote innovations and creativity in teaching.
In general the results and the responses of the interview indicate that high job satisfaction is evident from intellectual stimulation and supervision work aspect.

Development of school’s strategic vision, future improvements and promotion of innovation and creativity are important elements of transformational leadership. In light of this, the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th and 6th items in Table 4.7 asks whether the success of the above mentioned elements promotes teachers’ job satisfaction or not. Accordingly, the job satisfaction for better pay resulting from success of school goals and improvements (mean= 4.41), teachers’ job satisfaction form benefits earned from success of school goals, (mean = 4.48), teachers’ job satisfaction evident from promotions as a result of innovation and creativity to solve old problems and feeling of satisfaction as a result of recognition as a team (mean= 4.31) and teachers’ job satisfaction as a result of formulation of clear goals ( mean= 4.36) were high from the results obtained. Moreover, majority of the respondents involved in the interview believed that school’s future direction and principals’ ability to encourage innovation and creativity magnifies teachers’ job satisfaction. In general, from the results and responses of the interview one can infer that better pay, benefits and promotions earned from the success of school goals maximizes teachers’ job satisfaction. In addition to this, one can deduce that strong team spirit, innovation and creativity are important factors that influence teachers’ job satisfaction.

Individualized consideration is a dimension of transformational leadership where leaders recognize the needs and desires of each teacher in the school compound. In this respect, teachers were asked whether principal attitude to pay special attention to each teacher’s need disturbs their relationship with colleagues or not. Accordingly, the results in Table 4.7 illustrated the highest mean value (mean =4.15) that expressed relationship with colleagues would be magnified if principals give due attention to each teachers’ need. Moreover, interviews made with teachers concerning similar issues revealed that the main issue in collegial relationship is the concern one had for each teacher’s need. From this one can deduce that the more one understands the differences existent in each teacher’s need in a group, the higher the relationship with colleagues would be. This in turn leads to high teachers’ job satisfaction. Furthermore, the aggregate mean 4.41, a value between 3.51and 4.51 also confirms high teachers’ job satisfaction from transformational leadership and work aspects.
Table 4.8 Mean ratings on job satisfaction statements of laissez-fair leadership style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied if pay do not correlate with performance or evaluation</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pleased if benefits do not relate to criteria and evaluation</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy if promotions should not rely on the principal’s evaluation and follow up</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied if the principal does not involve in the process of supervision</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pleased if I am recognized by my colleagues rather than the principal</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching will be pleasing if there are no rules and regulations set for teachers</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal’s attitude to shy away from decisions strengths my relationship with colleagues</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching will be interesting if the principal does not involve in teachers’ work and decisions</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel satisfied if the principal does not communicate about the school’s actions and decisions</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.058</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laissez-faire leadership style is a kind of leadership style where leadership responsibilities are ignored, and authority unused. A leader displaying this form of non-leadership is perceived as not caring at about other issues. In light of this, some elements of laissez-faire leadership style and job satisfaction aspects were raised in order to assess the strength of teachers’ job satisfaction in the area under study. Accordingly, Table 4.8 above and interviews made depicts respondents’ views on the status of job satisfaction in relation to laissez-faire leadership style. In relation to this, the highest area of discontent is observed from poor communications about school actions and decisions followed by the absence of school rules and regulations. The third area of poor job satisfaction is seen from the item that indicates poor principals’ involvement in supervision. The fourth area of discontent is summarized as non-transaction between pay, benefits and promotions with performance and evaluation. The fifth area of poor satisfaction is related to principal’s attitude not to involve in decisions.

Communication is the life blood of an organization and it has a paramount importance on teachers’ job satisfaction. With regard to this, the item in table 4.8 provides the extent to which job satisfaction is affected by poor communication. Accordingly, teacher respondents expressed their disagreement to the point (mean= 1.55). Similarly, interview respondents replied that poor communication about school actions and decisions lowers teachers’ job satisfaction. Moreover according to teachers communication is an important factor for teachers’ job satisfaction. The more school principals involve teachers in decisions, the highest the level of job satisfaction. In general from the results and the responses of the interview made it is possible to deduce that poor communication resulting from laissez-faire leadership style significantly reduces teachers’ job satisfaction.

The other characteristics of laissez-faire leadership style is the absence of rules and regulations in a school. In this respect, the 6th item in Table 4.8 asks the status of teachers’ job satisfaction in a school environment where there are no rules and regulations. In light of this, Table 4.8 presents respondents view on the issue. Accordingly of teacher respondents (mean= 1.63) expressed their level disagreement to the idea raised. Furthermore, interviews were also made with some teachers to assess the idea that absence of rules and regulations reduces teachers’ job satisfaction. Accordingly, some teachers replied that they feel extremely disturbed to work in a school where
there are tight rules and regulations. Moreover, according to them there will be high teachers’ turnover and absenteeism in such schools. For instance a teacher from school B replied that:

*In our school the rules and regulations are extremely tight. Teachers are controlled in every aspect of their job. This includes personality, punctuality, handwriting, classroom management, etc. There are serious reprimands for those who don’t comply with the rules. Sometimes the transport allowance is deducted for very minor mistakes. Due to this, teachers hate to work in our school. There is high teachers’ turnover that lasts from the beginning of the year to the end. To this end I can say that very tight rules and regulations result in very low level of teachers’ job satisfaction. This will be followed by turnover.*

While others said that they prefer to work in an environment where there are very serious rules and regulations. According to them if a teacher is left free without rules, he/she does not teach properly. Furthermore, according to the respondents it is preferable and pleasing to work in schools where there are some sets of rules that abide all the community of the school. In general, from the results and interviews made one can possibly infer that the absence of rules and regulations in a school has a serious influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.

Laissez fair leadership style can also be explained in terms principals’ attitude not to involve in supervision. Based on the above general idea the 4th item in Table 4.8 asks the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction for a principal who does not involve in supervision. Accordingly, Table 4.8 presents teachers’ views for the idea mentioned above. As a result, Table 4.8 depicts respondents view on the status of teachers’ job satisfaction in relation to poor supervision. The percentage of disagreement is shown with a mean value of 1.82. Moreover, interviews conducted on similar issues proved that teachers don’t prefer to work with a principal who is too lenient in the process of supervision. According to them, teachers need to develop and grow professionally through continuous monitoring and evaluation aided by a system of feedback. In general, from the results and interviews made it is possible to deduce that poor supervision results in low teachers’ job satisfaction. This indicates that supervision has a serious implication on teachers’ job satisfaction.

Laissez- faire leadership style involves non-transaction between aspects of job satisfaction like pay, benefit and promotion with performance. With regard to this, teachers were asked weather such kind of non-transaction brought about job satisfaction or not. Accordingly, from the results of Table 4.8, majority of the respondents expressed their feeling of dissatisfaction and
disagreement with non-transaction of pay with performance (mean= 1.96), non-transaction of benefit with performance (mean=1.82) and non-transaction of promotions with performance (mean=1.99). Furthermore, interview respondents replied that job satisfaction is a function of exchange relationship between some aspects job like pay, benefit and promotions and performance. In general, from the results and interviews made one can infer that non-transaction between such factors like pay, benefit and promotion with performance reduces teachers’ productivity and the turnover to the school will be quite high.

Decision making is considered as litmus paper test for managerial effectiveness. However, a principal with laissez-fair leadership style does not involve in decision making thus his/her efficiency is at stake. With this respect, teachers were asked whether such attitude not to involve in decisions stimulate teachers’ job satisfaction or not (Table 4.8). Accordingly, majority of the respondents from the quantitative data (mean=1.98) and interviews indicated their disagreement and feeling poor satisfaction with the points raised. Therefore, from the results and responses of the interview it is possible to deduce that teachers’ job satisfaction would negatively be influenced with a passive leadership style where authority is unused, decisions were not made and actions were delayed. In a nut shell, the grand total variable mean of 1.95, a value between 1.51 and 2.5 also confirms poor teachers’ job satisfaction from laissez-fair leadership style.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The objective of the study was to examine the leadership style in practice by principals of private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration and to identify the leadership style that promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. In the empirical investigation, a mixed method sequential explanatory design was used. Data was collected from a total of 328 respondents constituting 296 teachers and 32 principals drawn from 15 sample schools in 4 randomly selected sub-cities. The data was collected by means of questionnaire and interviews. The data from the quantitative method was analyzed using SPSS and the data from the qualitative method was analyzed using comparative method. In this chapter therefore, summary of the major findings along with objectives of the study, conclusions drawn from analysis and interpretation of data and recommendations for enhancement of private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration will be made.

5.1. Summary of the Major Findings

5.1.1. The Dominant Leadership Style

The leadership styles under study were transactional, transformational and laissez-fair. Transactional leadership style has three sub variables namely contingent reward, management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive). Transformational leadership style has four sub-variables namely idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.

Out of the three sub variables of transactional leadership, two dimensions namely contingent reward (mean=4.00) and management by exception (active) (mean=4.31) had the highest dominance mean rating (Table 4.3). This was also supported by the qualitative data. However, the data from both the interview and questionnaire revealed that management by exception (passive) dimension was moderately practiced (mean=3.34).

The other major finding reported mainly by principals is the existent of transformational leadership style in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration (Table 4.3). This
finding was seen from the highest mean obtained from all of the dimensions of transformational leadership. However, this finding was not well supported by teachers as indicated by the value of t-test conducted to check whether there exists significant difference between the means of the two groups (Table 4.3). Furthermore, the qualitative data obtained during teachers’ interviews indicated that the practice of transformational leadership and its dimensions were poor in the area under study.

The third major finding with regard to leadership style was seen from laissez-fair leadership style. The results from both quantitative and qualitative data indicated that laissez-fair leadership style was the least preferred and practiced (mean=2.34) leadership style in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration (Table 4.4).

5.1.2. Leadership Styles and Teachers’ Job satisfaction

The second objective of the study was to identify the leadership style that maximizes high teachers’ job satisfaction. Nine job satisfaction facets like pay, benefit, recognition, promotions, relations with colleagues, supervision, operating procedures, nature of work and communication were combined with peculiar behaviors of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles. The major findings of the study were summarized in the following paragraphs.

Regarding transactional leadership, mean value of the respondents (mean=4.61) expressed exchanges between benefits and performance were highly satisfying. This was also supported by qualitative data. The results and responses of the interview revealed that the mean value (mean=4.56) of the respondents agreed on recognitions considered for best performances brought about high teachers’ job satisfaction. Considering opportunities for promotion, the mean score (mean=4.45) of respondents repeatedly mentioned their need for promotion in accordance with their performance and educational background. Moreover, teachers’ job satisfaction in terms of the exchange between pay and performance (mean=4.43) was high. Furthermore, the aggregate mean value (4.26) obtained from transactional leadership dimensions confirms high teachers’ job satisfaction (Table 4.6).

The results of this study with regard to transformational leadership and work aspects showed that inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership yield high teachers’ job satisfaction with a mean value of 4.61. The mean score (mean=4.60) of the teachers surveyed on
job satisfaction expressed their feeling of satisfaction with intellectual stimulation of transformational leadership. In addition, from the results and responses of the interview better pay, benefits and promotions earned from the success of school goals found to maximize teachers’ job satisfaction. Individualized consideration as a dimension of transformational leadership found to upgrade collegial relationship which in turn leads to teachers’ job satisfaction (Table 4.7). Furthermore, the aggregate mean value (4.41) also confirms high teachers’ job satisfaction as a result of transformational leadership.

The mean score of (mean= 1.55) teachers surveyed on job satisfaction were not satisfied with laissez-faire leadership style. Results and responses of the interview expressed poor communication resulting from laissez-faire leadership style significantly reduces teachers’ job satisfaction. The mean value (mean= 1.63) result and responses of the interview indicate that absence of rules and regulations in a school significantly reduces teachers’ job satisfaction. Similarly, the quantitative data and responses of the interview proved teachers’ dissatisfaction on supervision practices. In addition, non-transaction between factors like pay, promotion and benefit with performance reduces teachers’ job satisfaction. Furthermore, the variable mean, 1.95 also confirms poor teachers’ job satisfaction form laissez-faire leadership style.

5.2. Conclusions

The main conclusions of this study will be presented in the next sections:

5.2.1. Leadership Style

Out of the three dimensions of transactional leadership, two dimensions namely contingent reward and management by exception (active) had the highest mean rating and frequency expression from both the qualitative and quantitative data. Regarding transformational leadership a contradictory view point was seen from teachers and principals responses. This was observed from the value of t-test conducted to check significant differences among the two groups and the analysis of the interviews made. The average mean value of Laissez-fair leadership style was rated low. This was also supported by the qualitative data.

The results indicated that transactional leadership style was the most dominant and frequently practiced leadership style, transformational leadership style was the less frequently used and laissez-faire leadership style was the least dominant and practiced leadership style in private
primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. This finding is consistent with As-Sadeq and Khoury (2006) who showed that transactional leadership style was the more frequent than transformational leadership and laissez-fair leadership style was considered as least commonly occurring leadership style and more frequent among leaders with low educational background, and low previous experience. This showed that principals in the study area actively supervise the work of teachers in the school compound and provide them a reward in the form of praises, promotions, recognition, benefits and pay increments in exchange for their best performances. Both the principal and the teacher enter to the transaction because of the expectation to fulfill self-interests and it is the role of the principal to maintain the status quo by satisfying the needs of teachers (Bogler, 2001). The problem to this approach(transactional leadership) was the absence of bond between principals and teachers in any enduring way; therefore, this results in a routinized, non-creative but stable environment as compared to the responsive and innovative environment that transformational leadership brings about (Silins, 1994).

5.2.2. Leadership Style and Teachers’ Job Satisfaction

Teachers’ job satisfaction from transactional leadership style was the result of exchanges between job aspects like pay, benefits, recognitions and promotions with best performances. Moreover, results from job satisfaction aspects related to transactional leadership dimensions indicated that active supervision carried out by the principal promotes high teachers’ job satisfaction. The findings also indicated that active monitoring followed by continuous rewards and the clarification of the job to be achieved promotes teachers’ job satisfaction. Furthermore, the aggregate mean value also confirms the overall success of transactional leadership dimensions in terms of teachers’ job satisfaction.

The practice of transformational leadership results in teachers’ job satisfaction in the study area with excellent developments of school’s strategic vision with strong inspirational motivation skill. Benefits, pay and promotions earned from the success of school goals brought about high teachers’ job satisfaction. Moreover, the results and the interviews made indicated that transformational leadership dimensions like inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration promotes teachers’ job satisfaction.
With respect to laissez-faire leadership style, majority of the respondents agreed on the negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and teachers’ job satisfaction factors particularly on poor communication about school actions and decisions. This means that teachers need to work with a leader who communicates teachers about school actions and decisions. Moreover, teachers’ job satisfaction was promoted with a principal who delegates authority and involves teachers in decision making.

The data on job satisfaction domains above indicated that principals’ leadership style influence teachers’ job satisfaction in the study area. Both transactional and transformational leadership styles were positively influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in the study area. Laissez-faire leadership style brought about poor teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. This implies that a mix of transformational and transactional leadership styles is deemed suitable for leading private primary schools in the study area. This may be possible with a proper dose of transformational and transactional leadership abilities, such as inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration and other ingredients such as active monitoring and evaluation followed by rewards.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations were made:

1. The dominant leadership style practiced in the area under study was transactional leadership style. Findings of the study revealed that the success of transactional leadership style was seen from management by exception (active) and contingent reward dimensions. Therefore, principals need to predominantly design and adopt an active monitoring and evaluation technique followed by a system of reward mechanism.

2. For private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration succeed in today’s fast changing educational environment, it is recommended that they adopt a mix of transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles to maximize teachers’ job satisfaction in the area under study. Therefore, continuous trainings and awareness creating mechanisms were required to acquaint principals and school owners on the area of transformational and transactional leaderships.
3. What is most important for improving teaching and learning in schools is the leadership styles and qualities that the school principals display in their schools. Addressing the factors that negatively affect the job satisfaction and motivation of teachers should be a primary concern of the school principals. The school principals should have quality and participatory school policies in place, and make fair decisions, and they should promote open discussions and the sharing of good experiences between themselves and the teachers.

4. Transactional leadership promotes high teachers job satisfaction when school benefits, pay, promotions and recognitions were exchanged with teachers’ performance in the area under study. Therefore, principals, school owners and strategic planners involved in private primary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration were recommended to design performance related motivation schemes.

5. School principals were recommended to encourage teachers to perform special tasks that would develop their talent and creativity. This would embolden teachers to see the problems within the school from different angles and make them more confident and eager to perform the tasks at hand effectively.

6. School principals need to communicate unambiguously with teachers about their work and responsibilities and make clear what their expectations were in terms of performance and reward, encouragement, recognition, promotion and salary increment which the teachers would receive for performing satisfactorily.

7. The school principals should be given continuous in-service training regarding leadership. It is the responsibility of the education leaders to design training programs for school principals on how to lead others. The education stakeholder leaders can design feedback systems as a means to oversee the leadership systems prevailing in the schools. The teachers could be given the opportunity to anonymously reflect on the type of leadership practices being implemented in their schools. These reflections should then be used to design training for school principals. Moreover, the private school owners should monitor and regularly evaluate whether the learning from the training is being implemented in the schools.
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APPENDIX A
TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire for teachers
This is a questionnaire prepared for Master’s thesis conducted as a partial fulfillment to get
Master of education degree in educational leadership and Management. The research study title
is the influence of leadership style on teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of
Addis Ababa city administration. By the copy of this questionnaire, you have been selected to
participate in the study. You are therefore, kindly requested to answer the following questions
below displaying utmost good faith. The study is purely for academic purpose and all the
information provided will be treated confidential. Your prompt response will be highly
appreciated.

Instruction: please write X mark in the box whenever applicable.

Part I: General information
Name of the school__________________________________________
Sex:                      Male  □    Female □
Age:                    20-30 □   31-40 □   40-50 □   >50 □
Qualification:   certificate □    diploma □    Degree □    Masters □    >    PhD □
Work experience: 1-10 □  11-20 □   >20 □

Part II: The dominant leadership style
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that reflect the extent your
principal exercise leadership style. Indicate your answer by indicating an X for the response of
your choice on the number in the box on the right. The numbers have the following meaning:
1= strongly disagree,  2 = Disagree,  3= neutral      4 = Agree,           5 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptions/item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>The principal clarify the work that must be achieved and provide me a reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>When I do activities expected of me, the principal provides me a recognition or reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>I know that I get a reward for what I accomplish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>Management by exception(Active)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>The principal actively monitor what I do and check weather I met standards or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>The principal get satisfied when I met agreed upon standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>The principal tells me the activities I need to achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>Management by exception(passive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>The principal intervene in my teaching learning process or work when I made a mistake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>As long as I do things right, the principal does not question my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Problems become worse before the principal take action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>I feel good and proud while working with the principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>The principal inspire/motivate me so that I can achieve school goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>I know our school’s strategic vision, objectives and future direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1. The principal tells me what I should and could do in few words

2.2.2 The principal provides an appealing image about what I can do in life/teaching

2.2.3. The principal helps me to find a meaning in the profession of teaching

2.3. **Intellectual stimulation**

2.3.1. When change arise, the principal tells me to see the situation as an opportunity

2.3.2 The principal gives me an opportunity to change old situations with new ones

2.3.3. The principal helps me to rethink ideas that I had never questioned before

2.4. **Individualized consideration**

2.4.1. The principal helps me to develop my self

2.4.2. The principal understands individual differences in the staff and help us accordingly

2.4.3. The principal value my thoughts/opinions

3. **Laissez-fair leadership**

3.1. The principal let me continue working in the same way

3.2. There are no rules and regulations set for teachers and whatever I do is ok with the principal.

3.3. The principal does not involve on my work and decision except it is absolutely essential

---

**Part III. Teachers’ job satisfaction**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that reflect the extent of your satisfaction with your job as a teacher. Indicate your answer by indicating an X for the response of your choice on the number in the box on the right. The numbers have the following meaning:
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = neutral 4 = Agree, 5 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.No</th>
<th>Descriptions/item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Transactional leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>I feel happy if pay correlates with performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>I feel pleased if benefits matches with commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>I feel satisfied if opportunities for promotion is given in exchange for performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>I feel pleased if the principal actively supervise my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>I feel satisfied if the principal gives me a recognition for my best achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Active monitoring and continuous rewards makes teaching pleasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>The principal’s attitude for reward and recognition disturbs my professional relationship with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Teaching will be pleasing if best performances are rewarded and recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>I feel happy if the principal clarify the work to be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Transformational leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>I feel happy if the school’s strategic vision and future improvements brought better pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>I feel pleased if benefits are evident from the success of school goals through inspiration and motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>I am happy if my promotion rely on innovations and creativity to solve old problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>I feel pleased if the principal encourages new approaches/methods of teaching during supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>I feel satisfied if we are recognized as a team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.6  | Formulation of clear goals, innovation and inspirations by the
The principal’s attitude to pay special attention to each teacher’s need for achievement magnifies my relationship with colleagues.

Teaching will be pleasing if there is strong team spirit and creative work environment.

I feel satisfied if the principal motivate and inspire teachers to commit to their job and vision of the school.

**Laissez-fair leadership**

I feel satisfied if pay do not correlate with performance or evaluation.

I feel pleased if benefits do not relate to criteria and evaluation.

I feel happy if promotions should not rely on the principal’s evaluation and follow up.

I feel satisfied if the principal does not involve in the process of supervision.

I feel pleased if I am recognized by my colleagues rather than the principal.

Teaching will be pleasing if there are no rules and regulations set for teachers.

The principal’s attitude to shy away from decisions strengthens my relationship with colleagues.

Teaching will be interesting if the principal does not involve in teachers’ work and decisions.

I feel satisfied if the principal does not communicate about the school’s actions and decisions.

Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX B
PRINCIPAL’S QUESTIONNAIRE

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire for principals

This is a questionnaire prepared for Master’s thesis conducted as a partial fulfillment to get Master of education degree in educational leadership and Management. The research study title is the influence of leadership style on teachers’ job satisfaction in private primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration. By the copy of this questionnaire, you have been selected to participate in the study. You are therefore, kindly requested to answer the following questions below displaying utmost good faith. The study is purely for academic purpose and all the information provided will be treated confidential. Your prompt response will be highly appreciated.

Instruction: please write X mark in the box whenever applicable.

Part I: General information

Name of the school____________________________________________

Sex: Male □ Female □
Age: 20-30 □ 31-40 □ 30-50 □ 50 □ >50 □
Qualification: certificate □ diploma □ Degree □ Masters □ PhD □
Work experience: 1-10 □ 11-20 □ >20 □

Part II: Dominant leadership style

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that reflect the extent you exercise your leadership style. Indicate your answer by indicating an X for the response of your choice on the number in the box on the right. The numbers have the following meaning:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.No</th>
<th>Descriptions/item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Transactional leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td><strong>Contingent reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>I clarify the work that must be achieved to teachers if they want to be rewarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>I provide recognition/ rewards when teachers do the activities expected of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>I tell teachers what they will get for what they accomplish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td><strong>Management by exception(Active)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>I actively monitor the work of teachers to check weather standards are met or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>I am satisfied when teachers meet agreed upon standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>I tell teachers the activities they need to achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td><strong>Management by exception(passive)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>I intervene in the teaching learning process or in other works of teachers when a problem arise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>As long as things are working right in the school, I do not try to change anything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>Problems become worse before I know it and take action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Transformational leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>I make teachers feel good and proud while working with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>I express what we could and should do in few words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>I provide an appealing image to teachers about what we can do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>I help teachers find a meaning in the work of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.</td>
<td><strong>Intellectual stimulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>I encourage teachers to see changing environments as situations full of opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>I give room for teachers so that they change old situations in new ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>I get teachers to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.</td>
<td><strong>Individualized consideration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>I help teachers to develop themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>I value the thought of each teacher in the school compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td>I understand individual differences existent in each teacher and create a supportive environment where each of them can be considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Laissez-fair leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>I am content to let teachers continue working in the same way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>I do not set rules and regulations to teachers whatever they want to do is ok with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>I don’t involve on teachers’ work and decision except it is absolutely essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part III: Teacher’s job satisfaction**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that reflect the extent of teachers’ satisfaction in accordance with the leadership style you exercise. Indicate your answer by indicating an X for the response of your choice on the number in the box on the right. The numbers have the following meaning:
1= strongly disagree,    2 = Disagree,    3= neutral    4 = Agree,    5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.No</th>
<th>Descriptions/item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Teachers feel happy if pay correlates with performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Teachers feel pleased if benefits matches with commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Teachers feel satisfied if opportunities for promotion is given in exchange for performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Teachers feel pleased if I actively supervise their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Teachers feel satisfied if recognition is given for best achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Active monitoring and continuous rewards makes teaching pleasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>My attitude for reward and recognition disturbs teachers’ professional relationship with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Teaching will be pleasing if best performances are rewarded and recognized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Teachers feel happy if I clarify the work to be achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Teachers feel happy if the school’s strategic vision and future improvements brought better pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Teachers feel pleased if benefits are evident from the success of school goals through inspiration and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Teachers feel happy if promotion rely on innovations and creativity to solve old problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Teachers feel pleased if I encourage new approaches/methods of teaching during supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Teachers feel satisfied if they are recognized as a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Formulation of clear goals, innovation and inspirations by the principal makes teaching pleasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>My attitude to pay special attention to each teacher’s need for achievement magnifies teachers’ relationship with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td>Teaching will be pleasing if there is strong team spirit and creative work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.9.</strong></td>
<td>Teachers feel satisfied if I motivate and inspire teachers to commit to their job and vision of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laissez-fair leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td>Teachers feel satisfied if pay do not correlate with performance or evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2.</strong></td>
<td>Teachers feel pleased if benefits do not relate to criteria and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td>Teachers feel happy if promotions should not rely on my evaluation and follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.</strong></td>
<td>Teachers feel satisfied if I do not involve in the process of supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5.</strong></td>
<td>Teachers feel pleased if they are recognized by their colleagues rather than the principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
<td>Teaching will be pleasing if there are no rules and regulations set for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.7.</strong></td>
<td>My attitude not to involve in decisions strengths teachers’ relationship with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.8.</strong></td>
<td>Teachers will be interested if I do not involve in teachers’ work and decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
<td>Teachers feel satisfied if I do not communicate about the school’s actions and decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation
APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW GUIDES FOR PRINCIPALS

Part I:
1. School________________________________________
2. Qualification _________________________________
3. Age___________________________________________
4. Duration of time as principal in years____________
5. Number of teachers in the school______________

Part II:
1. What do you understand about rewards and praises given to teachers? Do you give
   rewards for teachers? If yes, what is the basis for your reward mechanism? What are your
   usual ways of rewarding teachers?
2. How frequently do you clarify the work to be achieved?
3. Is there a system of monitoring and evaluation in your school? If yes, how often do you
   evaluate teachers work? What is the basis for your evaluation? How do you evaluate the
   system of feedbacks?
4. How do you tackle problems? Do you try to give solution before the problem arise or
   after the problem arise?
5. How do you perceive about communication? How often do you communicate about the
   schools’ strategic vision and goals?
6. How do you evaluate the status of trust and respect between you and teachers?
7. How do you explain the diversity existent among teachers? How do you understand
   teachers’ differences in terms of skills, needs and desires? Explain the basic importance
   of understanding teachers’ need and desires in the school.
8. How do teachers perceive about teaching? What are your ways of motivating teachers
   towards the profession of teaching? If present, how often do you perform it?
9. Have you observed teachers engaged in developing their own ways of doing things? How
   do you regard a teacher who has changed old ways of teaching with new ones? How do
   you regard a teacher who has solved a problem?
10. What is the importance of involving teachers in school decisions? How often do you involve teachers in decision making? How often do you involve in changing the working procedure, strategy and system of the school? What new ways of doing things have you tried since your recruitment in the school?
APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW GUIDES FOR TEACHERS

Part I:

1. School__________________________________________
2. Qualification_____________________________________
3. Age____________________________________________
4. Duration of time as principal in years_______________
5. Number of teachers in the school__________________

Part II:

1. Is there a system of reward mechanism in your school? If yes, what are the usual ways of rewards in your school? What is the basis for principals’ reward mechanism? How do you rate your level of job satisfaction if there is continuous reward mechanism in exchange for best performances?
2. Are you satisfied with the salary and benefit you earn from your school? Describe your level of job satisfaction if salary and benefit increments are given to you as a reward for your best accomplishments?
3. How often the principal recognize your best achievements? Briefly explain the level of job satisfaction one may earn for considering recognition as a reward?
4. How often do you receive opportunities for promotion from the school? How do you evaluate your level of job satisfaction if opportunities for promotions are rewarded for outstanding achievements?
5. How do you evaluate the relationship with your colleagues? What will be the status of your relationship with your colleagues if rewards and recognitions are given to your friends?
6. How often the principal evaluate and monitor your work? Explain the relationship between frequent supervision and job satisfaction.
7. Briefly explain the principal’s ability to communicate about school’s strategic vision and goals. How do you evaluate the status of trust between you and the principal? Discuss how principals’ inspirational skill influences your job satisfaction?
8. Does your school develop with its strategic vision over years? Explain your feeling of job satisfaction if school improvement and success of school goals brought you better pay, benefit and promotions?

9. Describe what team spirit mean to you? Evaluate your level of job satisfaction for strong team spirit?

10. How do teachers perceive about the profession of teaching? Evaluate the principal’s ability to create an appealing image about teaching? Explain your level of job satisfaction if principals strongly inspire teachers towards the profession of teaching?

11. Does the principal understand individual differences existent in the school? Is there a ground created to develop, support and treat teachers equitably? Explain weather such conditions promotes teachers job satisfaction or not? Discuss the status of your relationship with colleagues in a staff where teachers are valued and considered?

12. How often principals encourage teachers to try their own ways of doing things? How do principals regard teachers with creativity and innovation? How do principals regard teachers with new ways of teaching methodology? Briefly explain weather innovative and changing school environment promotes teachers’ job satisfaction or not? What is the importance of supervision in innovation and creativity in teaching?

13. How often principals involve in setting rules and regulations? As a teacher, how often do you involve in school actions and decisions? What will be you job satisfaction in cases where the principal does not set rules, the principal does not involve in decisions and supervision?

14. Evaluate your level of job satisfaction in cases where there exists no transaction between job aspects like pay, benefit, recognition… and performance.