Original Research Article

The correlates of leadership amongst selected secondary school stakeholders in Musoma municipality

[1]**Makewa Lazarus Ndiku,**
*[2] **NgussaBaraka Manjale,**
[2]**Arego Simon**
and
[2]**Kuboja Joshua**

[1]Department of Educational Communication and Technology, University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, Kenya.
[2]University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, Kenya, and Lecturers, School of Education, University of Arusha, Tanzania.

*Corresponding Author Email ngussathe5th@yahoo.com

This study employed survey design to investigate the correlates of leadership in Musoma Municipality Secondary schools. The population was 25 schools from which a sample of 164 school leaders, teachers and non-teaching staff in 10 randomly selected schools participated. Expert judgment ensured validity of the questionnaire and Cronbach's alpha of .863 for Teamwork, .885 for morale of work and .878 for communication were established, implying high reliability. Descriptive statistics determined mean scores and the null hypotheses were analyzed through t-test, ANOVA and Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient. The study established that school leadership is perceived to be effective and there was no significant difference in its perception by respondents categorized according to gender (p = .232), age (p =.201) and nature of school (p = 2.88). A significant difference (p = .002) was found among respondents by their positions of work, school leaders having the highest mean scores as compared to teachers and non-teaching staff. Significant, positive and strong correlations were found between school leadership and teamwork (.729), school leadership and morale of work (.814) and school leadership and effective communication (792). The study recommends that school leaders should mobilize teachers and non –teaching staff regardless of their gender, age and nature of schools to support school goals and objectives. They should also maintain perceived elements of effective leadership in order to raise good perception of teachers and non-teaching staff toward school leadership and in that way participate fully in supporting the fulfillment of school goals and objectives.

Key words: Leadership, morale, communication, teamwork, secondary school, teachers

INTRODUCTION

There are many ways by which leadership can be defined. According to Manu (2000), leadership is an act of imposing one's will upon others in such a manner as to command their obedience, their respect, and their loyal cooperation. He further considers leadership as an essential aspect in organizations. He also brings to view the idea that leadership is a human factor that bonds a group together and motivates them toward a goal. This is a generic way of looking into leadership as a way of bringing people together in any kind of organization, be it school, church, business group or any other type of organization. According to Musaazi (2005), leadership is concerned with the implementation of those policies and decisions which assist in directing activities of organizations toward their specific goals. He also considers a leader as the person who knows the way, shows the way and walks the way. This implies that leaders must be a good example of whatever they preach. They must live according to how they want others, particularly their followers, to live. According to Ojo and Barakatu (2012) ineffective leadership is the source of

organizational underdevelopment while effective leadership reserves the organizational drift and slide to anarchy. Therefore, leadership determines the extent to which organizations can reach their goals and objectives.

Leadership in the work place has widely been researched on and hard evidences indicate that proper leadership can result into desirable behavioral outcomes in school settings (Chirchir et al. 2014; Nyamboga et al., 2014; Osman and Mukuna 2013). Proper leadership, therefore, is assumed as the panacea to get the job done but sadly, sometimes, leadership may be viewed negatively in some instances.

Like any other setting of leadership, school leadership is an important aspect for proper functioning of institutions of learning. The review of related literature and studies has indicated the importance of effective leadership for proper operation of education institutions. Osei-Owusu and Offah (2013), for instance, hold that effective leadership motivates educators in doing their day-to-day activities in a more effective way. Osman and Mukuna (2013) observe that the behavior of school leaders has some immediate influence on the internal structure of the school, which includes instructional practices, organizational structure, climate, and culture. They further maintain that instructional leadership depends upon a set of relationships between school leaders, their beliefs and the surrounding environment of the school. They finally conclude that school leaders' values, experiences and expectations of the community must be taken into account in leadership and decision making.

According to Ndiritu et al. (2014), effective organizations have often been associated with the kind of leadership practice exercised in such organizations. They also argue that secondary school leadership needs to exhibit transformational leadership, which inspires a shared vision in order for schools to succeed in today's changing world.

Pius et al. (2014) argue that educational leaders are expected to provide vision for their schools with inspiration and support for school stakeholders. Studying the leadership experience in Kenya, Nyamboga et al. (2014) indicate the experience in Kenya that many schools that were once effective in academic performance have lowered their standards due to poor leadership while others have greatly improved through effective leadership. This is indicative that the kind of leadership style adopted by a leader determines the nature of performance in national examinations.

Mwaura et al. (2014) stipulated that the quality of education depicted in any school is largely influenced by the quality of leadership exhibited by the school administrator in that institution. They also argue that school leaders, through the application of effective leadership styles, need to influence those who work under them to achieve the institutional goals. The study of Chirchir et al. (2014) established positive correlations between transformational leadership and normative commitment of teachers and between transactional leadership style and affective commitment of teachers. Their study recommends a combination of both transformational and transactional leadership attributes should be used to bring out the best positive influence on teachers commitment.

While leadership is an important ingredient in school operations, it is important for educational stakeholders to get acquainted with its correlates and how their mutual or complementary relationships can affect the process of educational leadership. This study sought to investigate teamwork, communication and morale of work and their place in school leadership. It sought to find out answers to the following research questions:

1.   What is the general perception of school leaders, teachers, and support staff towards various aspects of school leadership?

2.   Is there significant difference in the perception of school leadership among the school leaders, teachers, and support staff categorized according to their gender, age, position of work and nature of school?

3.   Is there significant relationship between school leadership, teamwork, morale of work, and communication among teachers, school leaders and support staff?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

Literature has indicated several variables that work hand in hand with leadership for proper functioning of educational institutions. These include, but not limited to teamwork, communication and morale of work. Intensive literature and studies have been consulted to throw light on these variables and their place in school leadership. The review of related literature and studies has been organized into four subtopics, namely: leadership in school organizations, school leadership and communication, school leadership and teamwork and school leadership and morale of work.

School Leadership and Communication

The concept of communication is quiet diverse, expensive and considered a key factor for social change. Expounding on the subject, Thomas and Fliert (2014) admit that it is complex, yet crucial aspect in getting things done. Communication has, for years, been used as a working tool to bring about radical changes in many organizations. Communication is, by and large, one of the most dominant activities occurring in any work setting. Harris and Nelson (2008) see organizational communication as a fascinating subject that is constantly evolving. They further state that, "communication is both a primary perspective for understanding how organizations function and a guide how we should behave in organizations if we are to advance and enjoy our careers".

Exploring new thinking in communication and social change, Rodriguez (2011) discovers the mismatch between theory and practice with peers, employees and their employers. Thomas and Fliert (2014) observe that "one of the disjunctures that critical scholars have often alluded to is the gap between theory and practice of participatory communication". Simply, it is easily said than done.

Zaremba (2010) has also observed that in contemporary discussion on communication, its importance is often taken for granted, and that its legitimizations are rarely discussed.

In spite of the importance of communication in and to organizations, studying the subject seems to present a paradox for many individuals. On the surface, communication, especially in the non-print areas, might seem to be too simple to really need to be carefully analyzed. Harris and Nelson (2008) note," if employees should be listened to more often, then some type of general directive or meeting should make all supervisors aware of the problem, leaving little reasons to try and examine something so obvious". In other words, without communication there is always a vacuum for anyone to speculate.

Highlighting the diversity of new thinking in communication social change and the ways in which participation and empowerment are making a difference in the lives of people. Studies indicate that interested parties, especially leaders in the field, to reconsider communication as a vital variable for productive meetings and collective decision-making (Lennie and Tacchi, 2013; Dutta, 2011; Dutta, 2012 and Myria, 2015).

Melkote (2000) noting the illustration of Paul Freire (1972) on communication, comments further the fact that if any one were to write a history of participatory communication, the place of key Freirean terms in that history, inclusive of " participation" and "cultural action" as idea, process and praxis, will need to be acknowledged" .

School Leadership and Teamwork

There is broad consensus in the literature about the defining features of teams. Katzenbach and Smith (1993) stated that "... a team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable". In addition, regular communication, coordination, distinctive roles, interdependent tasks and shared norms are important features (Ducanis and Golin 1979; Brannick and Prince 1997).

According to Cohen and Bailey (1999), an employee team is a collection of individuals who are interdependent in the tasks and who share responsibility for the outcomes. Teams enable people to cooperate, enhance individual skills and provide constructive feedback without any conflict between individuals (Jones et al., 2007). Teamwork is an important factor for smooth functioning of an organization and for strengthening leadership.

Teamwork is necessary for all types of leadership, including school leadership (Pfaff & Huddleston, 2003). Team members enhance the skills, knowledge and abilities while working in teams (Froebel and Marchington, 2005). This enhancement brings about unity of purpose in any organizational leadership, school leadership included. Organizational leadership, which emphasizes more on

teams has results in increased employee performance, greater productivity and better problem solving at work (Cohen and Bailey, 1999). Bacon and Blyton (2006) highlighted the two important factors i.e. self-management team and interpersonal team skills. These factors enhance the communication as well as interpersonal relationship between team members and also boost the employee performances. Teamwork is a significant tool of new type of work organization. Teamwork is a precise organizational measure that shows many different features in all types of organizational leadership, including schools (Mulika, 2010).

Regarding professional and organizational development, teamwork in schools is often seen as a way to support organizational leadership processes, i.e. a simultaneous development of individual and organization (Elkjær, 2005; Elkjær and Wahlgren 2006). The ideal is that the constructive experiences leaders acquire during team collaboration should improve school practice and become deeply rooted in the organizational actions (Argyris and Schön 1996).

Studies have indicated that collaboration in teams could be an important resource for workers' professional development and for improving performance (Louis et al., 1996; Louis and Marks 1998; Wilson and Berne 1999; Grossman et al. 2001; Andrews and Lewis 2002; Elwood and Klenowski 2002; Lieberman and Wood 2002; Little 2003; Minnett 2003; Snow-Gerono 2005; McLaughlin and Talbert 2006; Goddard and Tschannen-Moran 2007; Henkin et al. 2007; Hindin et al., 2007; Plauborg et al., 2007).

Teamwork among school teams is important for several reasons: First, teamwork makes teaching more than a process experienced by professionally isolated individuals in their respective classrooms. It enables a professional growth process in which employees work together and share knowledge and expertise (Newmann et al., 2000). Second, team-based organizations are characterized by shared control; opportunities for participation based on knowledge; and enhanced autonomy that allows for better adaptability and continual adjustment (Conner and Douglas, 2005). Third, leadership has become more complex and sophisticated; therefore, effective leadership requires the synergy of employees from different points of view (Porter- O'Grady and Wilson, 1998).

Teams are social systems of two or more people that are embedded in an organization, whose members perceive themselves as such and are perceived as members by others, and who collaborate on a common task (Hoegl, 2005). The total coordinated and cooperative efforts of people who are working together are named teamwork (Karakus and Toremen, 2008). The advantages of team work are taken almost for granted, given the extensive coverage in recent education literature.

In schools, perceptions of team culture may be expressed as the basic assumptions, norms, values, and cultural artifacts that are shared by team members, who influence their functioning at school and play a significant role in enhancing school effectiveness (Engels et al., 2008). Quinn's

(1988) model as applied to the school context reflects the extent to which: (a) the school vision is shared by the team members and they participate in decision making (b) the teachers plan their pedagogical activities according to the school vision in professional teams (c) the team members have an open attitude towards change and (d) the rules and regulations that characterize the school bureaucratic structure make the team members more bureaucratic in their behaviors.

School Leadership and Morale of Work

There are common features in the definition of morale by scholars. Oxford student dictionary (2004) defines morale as how happy, sad, confident, etc. a group of people feels at a particular time. According to Ali (2015), morale is a state of mind which involves feelings and emotions created within each employee. It is often on elusive quality; it involves the attitude and perception towards the job, or environment, team members, mangers and the organization on a whole.

High morale in the workplace is essential to success and is mostly influenced from the top down rather than from the bottom up. It is usually exhibited by confidence, discipline and willingness to perform. Hence, part of effective productivity is directly related to morale of working (Business dictionary). Organizational leadership which emphasizes high morale always gets the most from their workers. That is increased employee performance, greater productivity and better problem solving at the workplace. (Conner 2014; Cohen and Bailey, 1999).

Strong educational management requires a thorough knowledge and application of motivation and job satisfaction to increase employee morale allowing the employees to feel appreciated, and thus working harder (Okumbe, 2004). Regarding professional and organizational development the employee morale in a workplace can depend on many factors, such as work hours, work load, pay and rewards, etc (Conner, 2014). When motivation is down and discretion is low, a teacher's sense of self esteem becomes blurred, resulting in the erosion of professional confidence and consequently lower morale of work (Sergiovanni, 2009). This suggests that motivation, in all its forms is necessary for school leadership to enhance morale of workers.

Motivation is viewed as "those processes within an individual that stimulate behavior and channel it in ways that should benefit the organization as a whole (Miner, 2006) or the forces acting on and coming from within a person that account for the willful direction of one's efforts toward the achievement of specific goals (Middlemist, 2000). With this regard, motivation means three things: the person works hard; the person keeps at his or her work; and the person directs his or her behavior toward appropriated goals (Johns, 2000). In this regard motivation or incentives are the key factors for boosting morale of working at work place. Therefore, heads of schools have to be involved in employees or teachers' lives to let them feel loved and valued not only as employees but also as family members and as human beings (Conner, 2014).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section discusses research design, population and sampling techniques, research instruments, validity and reliability of research instruments, data gathering procedures, and statistical treatment of data.

The present study employed survey research design to investigate on the correlates of leadership factor amongst teachers, school administrators and non-teaching staff across secondary schools in Musoma Municipality. The population of this study was 25 Secondary Schools in Musoma Municipality, from which a sample of 10 schools was randomly selected through systematic sampling procedures. A total of 164 respondents participated in the study by filling the questionnaire. The study employed questionnaire as the major and only instrument for data collection from teachers, school leaders and non-teaching staff across sampled secondary schools in Musoma Municipality. The questionnaire was self-constructed by researchers and it had two major sections namely demographic profile and operational data. The operational data section had four major variables namely: Leadership, Teamwork, Morale of Work and Communication.

Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments

Some strategies were employed to validate and determine acceptable reliability of research instrument. First, through expert judgment, the researchers looked into questionnaire items against research questions and subsequent hypotheses and adjusted them as deemed necessary before the actual data collection. Reliability was conducted and analyzed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The obtained reliability results were as indicated in Table 1. The Cronbach's alpha for Teamwork was .863 while that of morale of work was .885 and communication .878. This implies that the reliability was very high and therefore acceptable.

Data Gathering and Statistical Treatment of Data

Before actual data collection the corresponding author wrote an official letter to Mara Regional Administrative Secretary, requesting for permission to collect data from sampled schools in Musoma Municipality. The Regional Administrative Secretary wrote a letter to Musoma District Administrative Secretary directing him to allow the researchers to collect data in schools within the territory. The District Administrative Secretary wrote a letter to Musoma Municipal Executive Director who wrote a final letter of permission to allow the researchers to collect data from sampled schools.

Upon receiving the permission, the researchers, with the help of one research assistant, moved from one school to

Table 1. Reliability Results

SN	Variable In Question	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alfa
1	Teamwork	6	.863
2	Morale of Work	9	.885
3	School Leadership	6	.866
4	Communication	9	.878

Table 2. Demographic Profile for Research Respondents

SN	Demographic Information	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Gender of Respondents	Male	110	67.1
		Female	54	32.9
		TOTAL	**164**	**100.0**
2.	Age of Respondents	30 and below	75	45.7
		31 to 40	50	30.5
		41 to 50	20	12.2
		51 and above	19	11.6
		TOTAL	**164**	**100.0**
3.	Nature of School	Public	117	71.3
		Private	47	28.7
		TOTAL	**164**	**100.0**
4.	Position of Respondents	School Leaders	18	11.0
		Teachers	118	72.0
		Non-Teaching Staff	28	17.1
		TOTAL	**164**	**100.0**

another to administer the questionnaire for a period of one week. They reported to the Heads of Schools and were given audience to address respondents and collect data from them.

Descriptive statistics was used to determine mean scores in research question number one. The two null hypotheses were analyzed through t-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient.

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents, analyses, interprets and discuss findings with the help of Tables . The findings are discussed with a support of reviewed literature and studies. The section is divided into two parts: Demographic profile for questionnaire respondents and operational information.

Demographic Profile of Questionnaire Respondents

A range of demographic information was sought from questionnaire respondents. These included gender, age, nature of school and position of respondents.

Table 2 indicates demographic profile of questionnaire respondents. The Table indicates that male respondents were 110 (67.1%) while their female counterparts were 54 (32.9%). The age of respondents ranged between 30 and below to 51 and above. Majority of research respondents were 30 years old and below (45.7%); those between 31 and 40 were 50 (30.5%), while those between 41 to 50 were 20 (12.2%) and those of 51 and above were 19 (11.6). This implies that the increment of age reduced the number of respondents. Majority of respondents, that is 117 (71.3%) were from public schools while their counterparts, 47 (28.7%) were from private schools. School leaders were 18 (11.0%), teachers were 118 (72.0%) while nonteaching staff were 28 (17.1%). This implies that teachers outnumbered their non-teaching staff and school leader counterparts. As argued by Chirchir et al. (2014); Nyamboga et al. (2014); Osman and Mukuna 2013), proper leadership can result into desirable behavioral outcomes in school settings. With this kind of situation therefore, schools under investigation can easily work together toward the accomplishment or fulfillment of school goals and objectives.

Operational Information

The researchers sought to find out answers to the following research questions which guided the study:

1.   What is the general perception of school leaders, teachers, and support staff towards various aspects of school leadership?

In order to ascertain general perception of questionnaire

Table 3. Respondents' Perception on Leadership

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
School leaders are committed to organizational goals and objectives	164	1.00	4.00	3.0488	.74145
School leadership accommodates ideas of subordinates	164	1.00	4.00	2.8537	.79294
There is mutual relationship between leaders and working staff	163	1.00	4.00	2.9632	.71050
School leaders always value workers' opinions	163	1.00	4.00	2.7791	.82421
Workers in this school communicate freely	164	1.00	4.00	3.2622	.66335
Supervisors treat employees equitably	163	1.00	4.00	2.7853	.85159
Valid N (listwise)	161				

Table 4. Group Statistics on Leadership Perception by Gender

	What is your gender?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
LEADERSHIP	Male	110	2.9152	.57846	.05515
	Female	54	3.0136	.63436	.08633

respondents toward school leadership, descriptive statistics was employed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Table 3 indicates SPSS printout for analysis.

To ascertain the general perception, the mean score results were interpreted as follows:

3.50-4.00 = Strong Agreement
2.50-3.49 = Agreement
1.50-2.49 = Disagreement and
1.00-1.49 = Strong Disagreement.

The finding indicates that the general mean score of respondents in all aspects of school leadership was between 2.50 and 3.49, meaning agreement. This implies that respondents generally agreed that school leaders are committed to organizational goals and objectives (M =3.05, SD=.741), school leadership accommodates ideas of subordinates (M=2.85, SD =.793), there is mutual relationship between leaders and working staff (M=2.96, SD=.711), school leaders always value workers' opinions (M=2.78, SD=.824) workers in these schools communicate freely to give out their views (M=3.26, SD=.663) and supervisors treat employees equitably (M=2.79, SD=.852).

This is a good indication that school leadership is generally appreciated by teachers, school leaders and non-teaching staff. As argued by Chirchir et al. (2014); Nyamboga et al. (2014) and Osman and Mukuna (2013), proper leadership can result into desirable behavioral outcomes in school settings and proper leadership is the panacea to get the job. Stakeholders' positive attitude toward various aspects of school leadership implied that they can easily work together toward accomplishment of their goals and objectives.

2.   Is there significant difference in the perception of school leadership among the school leaders, teachers, and support staff categorized according to their gender, age, position of work and nature of school?

This research question called for testing of four null hypotheses by the use of t-test and ANOVA:

a.   *There is no significant difference in the perception of school leadership among the school leaders, teachers, and support staff categorized according to their genders.*

The above research hypothesis was analyzed by the use of independent sample t-test because the groups being compared were only two: the males (110) and females (54). Table 4 indicates group statistics between respondents categorized according to gender. The table indicates that the mean score of female respondents (3.01) was a little bit higher than that of their male counterparts (2.92). Both mean scores, however were within the range of 2.50-3.49, denoting agreement, meaning that both had positive attitude toward the school leadership.

Table 5. Independent Samples Test on Leadership perception by Gender

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference		Lower	Upper
LEADERSHIP	Equal variances assumed	.310	.579	-.992	162	.323	-.09843	.09925		-.29442	.09756
	Equal variances not assumed			-.961	97.223	.339	-.09843	.10244		-.30174	.10488

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for Perception on Leadership by Age

LEADERSHIP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
30 and Below	75	2.8467	.56669	.06544	2.7163	2.9771	1.33	4.00
31 to 40	50	3.0247	.63802	.09023	2.8433	3.2060	1.40	4.00
41 to 50	20	2.9667	.63605	.14223	2.6690	3.2643	1.83	4.00
51 and Above	19	3.1228	.53241	.12214	2.8662	3.3794	2.17	4.00
Total	164	2.9476	.59729	.04664	2.8555	3.0397	1.33	4.00

Table 7. ANOVA for Perception on Leadership by Age

LEADERSHIP	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.652	3	.551	1.559	.201
Within Groups	56.500	160	.353		
Total	58.151	163			

Levenes' test for equality of variance in Table 5, however, reads Sig. 579, which is greater than the critical value (.05), which denotes equal variance assumed, leading us to the upper t-test for equality of variance which reads .232. This is greater than the *p-value* denoting the mean difference happens by chance and therefore is not statistically significant.

In this respect, we therefore accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the perception of school leadership among the school leaders, teachers, and support staff categorized according to their genders. This indicates that respondents, regardless of their gender differences, have a positive attitude toward the school leaderships. This implies that school workers, regardless of their gender differences, can work together toward the accomplishment of school goals and objectives.

b.   *There is no significant difference in the perception of school leadership among the school leaders, teachers, and support staff categorized according to their ages.*

The research hypothesis was analyzed by the use of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) because of a multiple number of groups being compared: 30 years and below (75), 31 to 40 (50), 41 to 50 (20) and 51 and above (19). Table 6 indicates descriptive statistics for perception of school leadership by age. The mean score of age groups under investigation have very slight mean differences but all are within the agreement zone (2.50-3.49) denoting agreement. Table 7, further indicates Analysis of Variance with a Sig. of .201, which is greater than the *p-value,* denoting that the mean differences happen by chance and therefore are not statistically significant.

This implies that research respondents, regardless of their age differences, agreed that school leadership can easily mobilize school workers regardless of their age difference to support accomplishment school goals and objectives. When this is effectively done, it will greatly improve the performance of students, which is the major purpose of school existence.

c.   *There is no significant difference in perception of school leadership among school leaders, teachers, and*

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for Perception on Leadership by Position+

LEADERSHIP					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
School Leader	18	3.3704	.38158	.08994	3.1806	3.5601	2.33	4.00
Teacher	118	2.8650	.60902	.05606	2.7539	2.9760	1.33	4.00
Non-Teaching Staff	28	3.0238	.54756	.10348	2.8115	3.2361	2.00	4.00
Total	164	2.9476	.59729	.04664	2.8555	3.0397	1.33	4.00

Table 9. ANOVA for Perception on Leadership by

LEADERSHIP					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.185	2	2.093	6.243	.002
Within Groups	53.966	161	.335		
Total	58.151	163			

Table 10. Group Statistics on Leadership Perception by Position

	Nature of School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
LEADERSHIP	Public	117	2.9744	.57800	.05344
	Private	47	2.8809	.64444	.09400

support staff categorized according to their Positions of work.

This research hypothesis was analyzed by the use of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) because of multiple number of groups being compared: Teachers (118), School leaders (18) and Non-teaching Staff (28).

Table 8 indicates descriptive statistics for respondents' perception of school leadership by their positions of work. The mean score of groups under investigation have some notable differences, the school leaders having the highest mean score (3.70), which denotes strong agreement, followed by non-teaching staff (3.03), which denotes agreement and lastly teachers (2.87) denoting agreement that the school leadership is okay. Analysis of Variance in Table 9 further indicates a Sig. of .002, which is lesser than the *p-value* denoting that the mean difference does not happen by chance and therefore is statistically significant. This implies that school administration highly appreciated the leaderships in schools under investigation while teachers and non-teaching staff moderately appreciated the school administration.

d.   *There is no significant difference in the perception of school leadership among the school leaders, teachers, and support staff categorized according to Nature of school.*

This research hypothesis was analyzed by the use of independent sample t-test because the groups being compared were only two: Public school (117) and private school (47) respondents. Table 10 indicates the mean score

of respondents from public schools (2.97) is slightly higher than that of respondents from private schools (2.88). Table 11 further indicates independent sample t-test for leadership perception by nature of school. The Levene's test for equality of variance is .182 which is greater than the critical value leading us to the upper t-test for equality of means reading .366 which is greater than the critical value meaning that the difference happens by chance.

We therefore accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in perception of school leadership among the school leaders, teachers, and support staff categorized according to Nature of school. This implies that workers from both private and public school have common agreement that the school leaderships are performing well.

3.   Is there significant relationship between school leadership, teamwork, morale of work, and communication among teachers, school leaders and support staff?

This research question called for testing of the following null hypothesis by the use of Pearson product correlation coefficient: *There is no significant relationship between school leadership, teamwork, morale of work, and communication among teachers, school leaders and support staff.*

As seen in Table 12, there are several significant relationships that exist at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), meaning

Table 11. Independent Samples Test for Leadership Perception by Position

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
LEADERSHIP	Equal variances assumed	1.796	.182	.906	162	.366	.09351	.10321	-.11029	.29731
	Equal variances not assumed			.865	77.331	.390	.09351	.10813	-.12179	.30880

Table 12. Correlations of Leadership with Selected Variables

		TEAMWORK	MORALE	LEADERSHIP	COMMUNICATION
TEAMWORK	Pearson Correlation	1	.729**	.701**	.686**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
MORALE	Pearson Correlation	.729**	1	.814**	.735**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
LEADERSHIP	+Pearson Correlation	.701**	.814**	1	.792**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	164	164	164	164
COMMUNICATION	Pearson Correlation	.686**	.735**	.792**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	164	164	164	164
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

there are several variables that correlate with leadership: First, there is a significant, strong and positive relationship between leadership and team work (.729). Because the relationship is positive, it is implied that the more the workers perceive leadership positively, the more they engage into team work. Secondly, there is a significant, strong and positive relationship between leadership and Morale of work (.814). Because the relationship is positive, it is implied that the more the workers perceive leadership positively, the more their morale of work increases. Thirdly, there is a significant, strong and positive relationship between leadership and communication (792). Because the relationship is positive, it is implied that the more the workers perceive leadership positively, the more they consider communication processes to be effective.

This implies that proper leadership is a determinant factor for effective teamwork, good morale of work and proper communication between school leaders and school workers in schools.

Conclusions of the Study

Based on the findings in this study, the following conclusions have been reached:

1.   School leadership can easily mobilize teachers and non –teaching staff regardless of their differences in gender, age and nature of school to support school goals and objectives in order to raise performance of students.

2.   Perception of school leaders is significantly higher than that of teachers and non-teaching staff toward school leadership. Therefore, school administrators highly appreciated the school leaderships while teachers and non-teaching staff moderately appreciated the same.

3.   School leadership has a positive correlation with teamwork, morale of work and effective communication. Therefore, effective leadership is a determinant factor for effective teamwork, good morale of work and proper communication in schools.

Recommendations of the Study

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations have been given:

1.   School leaders should mobilize teachers and non – teaching staff regardless of their differences in gender, age and nature of school to support school goals and objectives. When this is effectively done, performance of teachers, non-teaching staff and students will be higher.

2.   In order to boost teamwork, morale of work and effective communication, school leaders should maintain effective leadership in terms of commitment to organizational goals, accommodation of the ideas of their subordinates, maintaining mutual relationship between leaders and working staff, valuing workers' opinion, communicating effectively and treating employees equitably.

3.   School leaders should maintain and improve their leadership approaches in order to raise good perception of teachers, non-teaching staff and students on school leadership and in that way participate fully in supporting the fulfillment of school goals and objectives.

4.   The correlates of school Leadership as perceived by students is fertile ground for further study.

REFERENCES

Alli V (2015).The cost of low morale and what to do about it. Retrieved from www.barrentrosecom/the-high-cost-of-low- morale-and-what-to-do-about-it/ on 1st November 2015.

Andrews D, Lewis M (2002). The experience of a professional community: Teachers developing a new image of themselves and their workplace. Educ. Res. 44 (3):237-54.

Argyris C, Schön DA (1996). Organizational learning II: theory, method, and practice,Addison-Wesley.

Bacon N, Blyton P (2006). Union co-operation in a context of job insecurity: Negotiated outcomes from team working. Bri. J. Industrial Relations, 44(2): 215-23.

Baltes B, Hernandez D, Collins C (2015). Increasing cultural awareness through a cultural awareness program. J Educ. Res. Pract. 5(1):1-20.

Brannick MT, Prince C (1997). An Overview of Team Performance Measurement', in MT Brannick, E Salas & C Prince (eds) Team Performance Assessment and Measurement, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey.

Castro RG (2013). The relationship of leadership styles and organizational productivity skills to teacher Professionalism. J. Educ. Pract, 4(7):135-142.

Cheloti SK, Obae RN, Kanori EN (20014). Principals' management styles and students' unrest in public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. J. Educ. Pract. 5 (29):29-37.

Chirchir RK, Kemboi A, Kirui W, Ngeno V (2014). Leadership style and teachers commitment in public

primary schools in Bomet County, Kenya. J. Educ. Pract. 5 (39):175-184.

Cohen SG, Bailey DF (1999) what makes team work: group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. J. Manage., 23(3):239-90.

Conner C (2014) Six ways to boost employee morale and performance.Retrieved from www.forbes.com/sites/chery/snappconner/2014/09/11/6-ways-to-increase-employee-morale-and-performance-with.

Conner DS, Douglas SC (2005) Organizationally-induced work stress: The role of employee bureaucratic orientation, Personnel Rev. 34 (2):210-224.

Cushman DP, Kovacici B (2013). Human communication: A rules perspective. In F. L. Casmir (Ed.). Building communication theories: a social/cultural approach. New York and London: Routledge

Ducanis AJ, Golin AK (1979). The Interdisciplinary Health Care Team, Aspen Systems Corporation, Germantown, Maryland.

Dutta MJ (2011).Communicating social change: structure, culture and agency. New York and London: Routledge.

Dutta MJ (2012). Voices of resistance: communication and social change: India: Purdue University Press.

Elkjær B (2005). Nårlæringgårpåarbejde.Etpragmatiskblikpålæring i arbejdslivet. Frederiksberg, Samfundslitteratur.

Elkjær B, Wahlgren B (2006). Organizational learning and workplace learning -similarities and differences. Learning, Working and Living: Mapping the Terrainof Working Life Learning. E. Antonacopoulou. London, Palgrave: pp.15-32.

Elwood J, Klenowski V (2002). "Creating Communities of Shared Practice: the challenges of assessment use in learning and teaching." Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 27(3).

Engels N, Gwendoline H, Geert D, Bouckenooghe D, Aelterman A (2008) Principals in schools with a positive organizational culture. Educ. Stud., 34(3):157-172.

Froebel P, Marchington M (2005). Teamwork structures and worker perception: a cross national study in pharmaceuticals, Int. J. Human Resource Manag., 16(2):256-276.

Goddard YL, Tschannen-Moran M (2007). "A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation of Teacher Collaboration for School Improvement and Student 15 / 16 Achievement in Public Elementary Schools." Teachers College Record 109(4):877-96.

Grossman P, Wineburg S, Woolworth S (2001). "Toward a Theory of Teacher Community." Teachers College Record 103(6):942-1012.

Harris TE, Nelson MD (2008). Applied organizational communication: theory and practice in a global environment (3rded.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Henkin AB, Park S, Singleton CA (2007). "Teacher Teams, Teamwork and Empowerment: Exploring Associations and the Nexus to Change." Int. J. Educ. Reform 16(1): 71-

86.

Hindin A, Morocco CC, Mott EA an Aguilar CM (2007). "More than just a   group: teacher collaboration and learning in the workplace." Teachers andTeaching: theory and practice 13(4):349-76.

Hoegl M (2005) Smaller teams—better teamwork: How to keep project teams small. Business Horizons, 48:209-214.

Ibrahim AH, Orodho J (2014).Strategies applied by the board of management to enhance students academic performance in National Examinations in secondary schools in Mandera County, Kenya. J. Educ. Pract., 5(20):1-12.

Johns G (2000). Organizational behavior; understanding and managing life at work, 5th ed. Reading. MA: Addison – wesley.

Jones A, Richard B, Paul D, Sloane K, Peter F, (2007).Effectiveness of team building in organization. J. Manag., 5(3):35-37.

Karakus M, Toremen F (2008) How our schools can be more synergic: Determining the obstacles of teamwork. Team Performance Manag., 14(5):233-247.

Katzenbach JR, Smith DK (1993). The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization, Harper Business, New York.

Lennie J, Tacch J (2013). Evaluating communication for development: a frame work for social change. London: Routledge

Lieberman A, Wood D (2002). "Untangling the Threads: networks, community and teacher learning in the National Writing Project." Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice 8(3/4).

LittleJW (2003). "Inside Teacher Community: Representations of Classroom Plauborg, H., J. V. Andersen and M. Bayer (2007). Action Learning - Learning in and from practice. Copenhagen, Denmark, Copenhagen University College Press.Practice." Teachers College Record 105(6): 913-45.

Louis KS, Marks H, Kruse S (1996). "Teachers' Professional Community in Restructuring   Schools."American Educational Research J 33: 757-98.

Louis KS, Marks HM (1998). "Does Professional Community Affect the Classroom? Teachers' Work and Student Experiences in Restructuring Schools."

Manu P (2000). Leading without tears (2nd ed). Kampala: Esso Graphix Limited. Talbert (2006). Building School-Based Teacher Learning Communities. New York, Teachers College Press.

Melkote SR (2000). Reinventing development support communication to account for power and control in development. In K. G. Wilkins (Ed.).Redeveloping communication for social change: theory, practice and power. UK: Rowman& Littlefield Publishing, Inc.

Middlemist RD (2000). Experiencing organizational behavior, Belmont, CA: Thomson South-western.

Miner B (2006). Organizational behavior 3: Historical Origins, theoretical foundations, and the future, New York: M.E. Sharpe

Minnett AM (2003). "Collaboration and Shared Reflections

in the Classroom."Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice 9(3): 279-85.

Morreale SP, Osborn MM, Pearson JC (2000). Why communication is important: a rationale for the centrality of the study of communication. J. Association Communication Admin.(29):1-25.

Mulika (2010). The Impact of Teamwork on Employee Performance in Strategic Management and the Performance Improvement Department of Abu Dhabi Police, UAE.

Musaazi JCS (2005). The theory and practice of educational administration. Hong Kong: Macmillan Education.

Mwaura WW, Thinguri R, Mwangi PW (2014). A theoretical and empirical review of the relationship between head teachers' leadership styles and KCPE performance inpublic primary schools in Kenya. J. Educ. Pract. 5 (25):123-129.

Myria A (2015). Strategic communication for sustainable organization: theory and practice. USA: Springer

Ndiritu A, Gikonyo N, Kimani GN (2014). Inspiring a Shared Vision: Getting all the Teachers in theBandwagon. J. Educ. Pract. 5 (5):1-7.

Newmann FM, King MB Youngs P (2000) Professional development that addresses   school capacity: Lessons from urban elementary schools. Ame. J. Educ., 108(4):259-299.

Nyamboga TO, Gwiyo JS, Njuguna W Omwario (2014). A critical review of the leadership styles on the performance of public secondary schools in national examinations in Tana River County, Kenya. J. Educ. Pract. 5 (22):197-221.

Oboegbulem A (2013). Management techniques of head teachers: effectiveness in reducing behaviorproblems. J. Educ. Pract. 4(15):104-107.

Ojo LI, Barakatu BB (2012). Effective leadership: Tool for achieving political Stability and National Development in Nigeria. J. Educ. Pract. 3(2):7-17.

Okumbe JA (2004) Educational management, theory and practice, Narirobi, Nairobi University Press.

Effah B, Osei-Owusu B (2013). Exploring the state of leadership effectiveness of tertiary institutions in Ghana: A study of two tertiary institutions in Kumasi. J. Educ. Pract., 4(16):64-72.

Osman A, Mukuna TE (2013). Improving Instructional leadership in schools through building principals'Capacity. J. Educ. Pract., 4(2):41-47.

Oxford student's dictionary of English (224). Great Britain: Clays ltd.

Pfaff E, Huddleston P (2003). Does it matter if I hate teamwork? What impacts student attitudes toward teamwork. J Mark. Educ. 25:37–45.

Pius K, Mnjokava C, Thinguri R (2014). The paradox of institutional leadership: A critical analysis of myriad predicaments plaguing the school leadership in Kenya. J. Educ. Pract., 5(17):31-34.

Quinn RE (1988) Beyond Rational Management: Mastering the Paradoxes and Competing Demands of High Performance. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rodriguez C (2011). Citizen's media against armed conflict: disrupting violence in Columbia. Columbia: University of Minnesota Press.

Sergiovanni TJ (2009*).   The Principalship. A reflective practice perspective, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sichei SM (2005). Perceptions of the causes of Indiscipline among Secondary School students in Mount Elgon District. Unpublished Master of Education Thesis in Educational Administration, University of Eastern Africa, Baraton. Kenya.

Snow-Gerono JL (2005). "Professional Development in a Culture of Inquiry: PDS Teachers Identify the Benefits of Professional Learning Communities." Teaching and Teacher Education 21: 241-56.

Solomon D, Thesiss J (2013).Interpersonal communication: putting theory into practice. New York and London: Routledge

Thomas PN, Fliert EV (2014).Interrogating the theory and practice of communication for social change: the basis for *a renewal.* Australia: Palgrave MaCmillan

Wilkins KG, Engthel F (2013). The privatization of development through global communication industries: living proof? Media, Culture & Society 35(2):165-181.

Wilson SM, Berne J (1999). "Teacher Learning and the Acquisition of Professional Knowledge: An Examination of Research on Contemporary Professional Development." Review of Research in Education 24: 173-209.

Zakaria NZ, Jizat NA Zakaria N (2015). Leadership Skills among Technical and Vocational Educators. J. Educ. Prac. 6(16):50-55.

Zaremba AJ (2010). Crisis communication: theory and practice. New York: M. E. Sharpe