

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307923862>

# Head Teacher's Leadership Styles and the Quality of Teacher Support Supervision

Article · September 2016

CITATIONS

5

READS

1,630

3 authors, including:



David Onen

Makerere University

43 PUBLICATIONS 70 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Joseph Oonyu

Makerere University

46 PUBLICATIONS 185 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Career guidance and counselling in Uganda [View project](#)



PhD research [View project](#)

## Head Teacher's Leadership Styles and the Quality of Teacher Support Supervision

1,\* Kate Norah Tibagwa  
[tibagwakatenorah@yahoo.com](mailto:tibagwakatenorah@yahoo.com)  
Makerere University, Uganda

2, David Onen  
[donenotoo@cees.mak.ac.ug](mailto:donenotoo@cees.mak.ac.ug)  
Makerere University, Uganda

3, Joseph Oonyu  
[joonyu@cees.mak.ac.ug](mailto:joonyu@cees.mak.ac.ug)  
Makerere University, Uganda

\* Correspondent

### Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between head teacher's leadership styles and the quality of support supervision offered to teachers in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. The study was driven by the need to establish the largely and widely held belief that school heads make a difference on instructional effectiveness of teachers through effective leadership and the kind of support supervision they provide teachers in their schools. The researchers employed a correlational cross-sectional survey design in which both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from a study sample of 320 teachers and 20 educational administrators using questionnaire survey and interview methods. The data were analysed with the use of descriptive and inferential statistical techniques as well as content analysis method. Study results revealed that both people-oriented, and task-oriented styles of leadership have statistically significant correlation ( $r = .566$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and ( $r = .536$ ,  $p = .000$ ) respectively, with the quality of teacher support supervision. But laissez-faire style of leadership has a statistically weak correlation ( $r = .117$ ,  $p = .057$ ) with the quality of teacher support supervision. The researchers thus concluded that the type of leadership styles that school heads use have a bearing on the quality of teacher support supervision. Consequently, it was recommended that school heads should make use of appropriate leadership styles to suit situations, needs and developmental aspirations of teachers as well as the needs of the primary schools they serve.

**Keywords:** Leadership, leadership styles, teachers, support supervision, primary schools

### 1. Introduction

One key behaviour head teachers can practice to improve the quality of instruction in school is effective professional interaction with teachers. This interaction is best regarded as support supervision. Nonetheless, the quality and extent of support supervision teachers are provided seem to depend, to a large extent, on the kind of leadership approach a given head teacher uses, other factors notwithstanding. This paper looks at a study that investigated the correlation between head teacher's leadership styles and the quality of teacher support supervision in primary schools in Mid-

western Uganda. In this section, the researchers present the background to the study, the study objectives, and research hypotheses.

Although Uganda gained independence from the British in October 1962, it was not until 1925 when the government of the time, for the first time, set up a department of education (Ssekamwa, 1997). Prior to that period, Uganda's formal education was entirely in the hands of religious organisations who founded various primary schools in the different parts of the country (Education Policy Review Commission [EPRC], 1989). The leaders of those schools were mainly people with integrity and dedicated to their work, right from institutional, professional and instructional aspects of staff supervision. Ssekamwa (1997) says that the school heads then, motivated their teachers, and at the same time supervised them in teaching to improve their performance. However, since the 1970s, the economic, social and political civil strife that the country experienced left incredible negative effects on the country's entire education system including the support supervision teachers receive (EPRC, 1989).

This study was underpinned by the behavioural and contingency situational theories advocated by Fiedler (1967). The behavioural theory shows that most leaders' behaviour is involved in either consideration for people (people-oriented) or initiating structure or work (task-oriented). The contingency or situational theory states that effective leadership is dependent upon the situation. The theory further states that leadership effectiveness is determined by both the personal characteristics of the leader and by the situation in which leaders find themselves. The researchers investigated the people-oriented and task-oriented styles of leadership within the behavioural theory paradigm; while laissez-faire style of leadership was approached from the contingency or situational paradigm. The people-oriented leaders care about the subordinates such as teachers, and they are concerned about how they (workers) feel and what they think about their work. On the other hand, task-oriented leaders make sure that work gets done, and the subordinates such as teachers perform their duties of teaching to enhance learning to take place without placing emphasis on what the workers feel at work. Laissez-faire leadership meanwhile is aligned with the contingency or situational theory. Laissez-faire leadership style is characterised by usually deliberate abstention from direction or interference, especially with individual freedom of choice and action. Lewin along with researchers like Lippitt and White (cited in Mullins, 2002) recognised laissez-faire leadership as requiring the least amount of managerial oversight. They affirm that successful laissez-faire leaders typically work with people who (i) have strong skill, extensive education or experience, (ii) are self-motivated and driven to succeed on their own, (iii) have proven records of achievement on specific projects, and (iv) are comfortable working without close supervision. In the study, the researchers assumed that the head teachers of the primary schools in Mid-western Uganda could be employing at least one of the three leadership styles which could be related to the quality of support supervision they provide their teachers.

In this study, there were two key concepts, namely: leadership styles and teacher support supervision. Leadership styles refer to the underlying need for a structure for the leader that motivates behaviour in various interpersonal situations (Fiedler, 1967). Mullins (2002) on the other hand defines leadership styles as the way in which the functions of leadership are carried out, the way in which the leader typically behaves towards members of the group. This study adopted Mullin's definition where leadership style was looked at in terms of the way in which the functions of leadership are carried out, and how the leader typically behaves towards members of the group. In this paper, the researchers looked at people-oriented, task-oriented and laissez-faire styles of leadership. The second variable in the study was quality of teacher supervision. Teacher supervision refers to a comprehensive on-going process for facilitating teachers' professional growth and development throughout their careers (Danielson, 1996). Alberta Education (2003) defines teacher

supervision as the on-going process by which an administrator (in this case head teacher) supports and guides teaching. In this study, the supervision of teachers was looked at in terms of quality of teacher support supervision. The quality of supervision was determined by percentage scores of descriptive statistical judgement by teachers in public primary schools in Mid-western Uganda.

Contextually, the study was carried out in Mid-western Uganda in the districts of Hoima, Masindi, Kiryandongo, Kibale and Kagadi (Bunyoro kingdom). There are several educational administrators in each of these districts including centre coordinating tutors who are attached to primary teachers' training colleges in the region. Head teachers are the instructional leaders in their schools, implying they provide support supervision to their teachers. In practice however, the case of primary schools in Mid-western Uganda, the reports of the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) for 2009, 2010 and 2011 reveal that teachers in the region do not seem to get adequate and quality support supervision. This could be attributable to the laxity of head teachers as instructional leaders in those schools. The researchers believed that if head teachers of primary schools in the region appropriately selected their leadership styles, it could serve to enhance the quality of support supervision they offer to their teachers; and consequently, it would improve the academic performance of pupils.

### 1.1 Study objectives

The main objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between head teachers' leadership styles and the quality of support supervision of teachers in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. Specifically, the study aimed at: first, to establish the relationship between people-oriented style of leadership; second, find out the relationship between task-oriented style of leadership; and third, find out the relationship between laissez-faire style of leadership, and the quality of teacher support supervision head teachers provide in the primary schools.

### 1.1 Study Hypotheses

The study was intended to verify the following research hypotheses:

- (i) There is statistically significant relationship between people-oriented style of leadership and the quality of support supervision which head teachers provide their teachers.
- (ii) There is statistically significant relationship between task-oriented style of leadership and the quality of support supervision which head teachers provide their teachers.
- (iii) There is statistically significant relationship between laissez-faire style of leadership and the quality of support supervision head teachers provide their teachers.

## 2. Literature Review

A number of studies have been carried out on teacher support supervision especially outside Uganda. Many of the studies have examined the perceptions of teachers, principals (head teachers), departmental heads and education officers about supervision practices in schools. Some of these studies examined the supervision beliefs of heads (e.g. Yimaz, Tadan, Ouz, 2009), others (e.g. Bays, 2001; Blasé & Blasé, 1991; Glanz, Shulman, & Sullivan, 2006) examined how supervisors provide supervision and how they promote teaching and learning (Bays, 2001). Some studies have examined supervisor behaviour that influence practice (e.g. Rous, 2004) and working relationship between supervisors and teachers (e.g. Holland, 2004). Another study examined the perceptions of participants and how they perceive instructional supervision in terms of strengths and weaknesses (Ayse, 2002). The study by Ramrattah (2011) in particular assessed administrator's perceptions and practice of supportive supervision. Another study by Baffour-Awuah (2011) examined teachers' and head teachers' perspectives about how they experienced and conceptualised instructional

supervision. But, while there have been several studies surrounding the issues of teacher support supervision, none of them was conducted in Uganda or investigated the relationship between head teacher's leadership styles and the quality of support supervision that is provided to teachers in primary schools. Hence, this study was conducted to fill this knowledge gap.

### 3. Methodology

This study was mainly approached from the positivist research paradigm, though some elements of interpretivism were also employed to enable a thorough analysis of the issues that were investigated. The study, specifically employed a correlational cross-sectional survey design where both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from a total of 350 respondents comprised of 320 teachers, 10 head teachers, and 20 educational administrators (District Education Offices [DEO], Inspectors of Schools [DIS] and Centre Coordinating Tutors [CCTs], and 10 selected head teachers) using questionnaire design and interview methods. The design was correlational because the researchers aimed at establishing correlation between head teacher's leadership styles (people-oriented, task-oriented and laissez-faire leadership style) and the quality of teacher support supervision of primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. It was cross-sectional in nature because the researchers aimed at collecting data from a cross-section of the target population to avoid wasting time returning to the field to collect additional data that would make the process rather time consuming and costly. In addition, using the design would help to generalise the findings obtained from the sampled population to the targeted population of all head teachers, teachers, DEOs, DIS and CCTs in Mid-western Uganda. The study respondents were selected through purposive and random sampling techniques; and data were analysed with the use of appropriate descriptive (mean, percentage, SD) and inferential (T-test, Pearson Correlation Techniques) statistical techniques as well as content analysis methods.

### 4. Results

The purpose of the study was to establish the correlation between three head teacher's leadership styles (people-oriented, task-oriented, and laissez-faire) and the quality of support supervision of primary school teachers in Mid-western Uganda. In this section, the researchers present the results of the study.

#### 4.1 Biographic Data

The researchers obtained information on the background characteristics of respondents. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1  
Distribution of respondents by background characteristics

Categories	School location				
	Rural		Urban		
	Count	%	Count	%	
Age (yr)	20 – 30	79	43.6	45	32.4
	31 – 40	76	42.0	72	51.8
	41 – 50	22	12.2	19	13.7
	51 and above	4	2.2	3	2.2
Sex	Male	89	49.2	66	47.5
	Female	92	50.8	73	52.5

Marital status	Married	138	76.2	103	74.1
	Single	40	22.1	33	23.7
	Divorced	3	1.7	2	1.4
	Other	0	0.0	1	.7
Education	Grade III Certificate	117	64.6	69	49.6
	Diploma (Primary)	50	27.6	63	45.3
	Diploma (Secondary)	3	1.7	4	2.9
	Diploma (Teacher Education)	2	1.1	0	0.0
	Degree	3	1.7	3	2.2
	Student teacher	3	1.7	0	0.0
	S. VI leaver	3	1.7		
Length of period in school	Less than 1 year	33	18.2	24	17.3
	1 to 3 years	57	31.5	37	26.6
	4 to 5 years	32	17.7	25	18.0
	5 years and above	59	32.6	53	38.1

Table 1 shows that the largest number of respondents (51.8%) drawn from urban schools were aged between 31 – 40 years. While 42.0% of the respondents in the same age bracket were drawn from rural schools. This suggests that data were collected from mature and experienced teachers; thus, raising the validity and reliability of the study. Second, the results in Table 1 indicate that 52.5% of respondents in urban and 50.8% in rural schools were females; suggesting that there could be more female teachers in primary schools than their male counter-parts. In terms of marital status, results show that the majority of respondents (76.2%) in rural and urban schools (74.1 %) were married. This indicates that the number of female married teachers is slightly higher in rural than in urban schools. In terms of teacher qualification, Table 1 shows that, the majority of respondents (117 or 64.6%) in rural and urban schools (69 or 49.6%) were Grade III teachers. Respondents holding Diploma (primary) qualification were 50 (or 27.6) and 63 (or 45.3%) in rural and urban schools respectively. This implied that the majority of the study respondents meet the minimum requirements for teaching in primary schools in Uganda. Finally, Table 1 reveals that majority of respondents in rural (59 or 32.6%) and urban schools (53 or 38.1%) had worked in their current schools for over five years. This suggests that the information obtained in the study should be valid and reliable since it was gathered from those with sufficient experience about the institutions.

#### 4.2 Descriptive Statistics on Independent and Dependent variables

The researchers sought the views of the respondents on each of the study variables that were investigated. Respondents were given statements on a rating scale with which they were to judge how frequently, rarely or never their head teacher's leadership styles were used and how they were related to the quality of teacher support supervision. The results are presented in tables 2 to 4.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics of respondents' views on the use of people-oriented style of leadership

Leadership	Scale	School location			
		Rural		Urban	
		Freq	%	Freq	%
Shows that he/she is concerned with the welfare of his/her staff	Never	7	4.0	4	2.9
	Rarely	44	25.0	25	18.2
	Frequently	125	71.0	108	78.8
	Total	176	100	137	100
Indicates good relationship with his/her teachers	Never			1	.7
	Rarely	23	13.1	18	13.1
	Frequently	153	86.9	118	86.1
	Total	176	100	137	100
Develops his/her teachers to do a good job	Never	1	.6	3	2.2
	Rarely	35	19.7	20	14.4
	Frequently	142	79.8	116	83.5
	Total	178	100	139	100
Shows concern about how his/her teachers feel or what they think	Never	3	1.7	4	2.9
	Rarely	52	29.4	19	14.0
	Frequently	122	68.9	113	83.1
	Total	177	100	136	100
Treats me as an individual rather than a member of a group.	Never	43	24.0	29	21.6
	Rarely	60	33.5	37	27.6
	Frequently	76	42.5	68	50.7
	Total	179	100	134	100

According to Table 2, majority of the respondents (153 or 86.9%) from rural, and 118 (or 86.1%) from the urban schools reported frequent use of people-oriented style of leadership. Moreover, the use of this style of leadership placed much emphasis mainly on good relationship with staff. On the issue of concern for staff welfare, Table 2 shows that both respondents from rural (125 or 71.0%) and urban schools (108 or 78.8) reported that their head teachers frequently showed concern for their welfare. However, 44 (or 25.0%) respondents from rural and 25 (or 18.2%) from urban schools reported that their head teachers rarely showed concern for their welfare. This implies that head teacher's concern for their staff welfare is lower in rural than in urban schools. On the question of developing teachers to do a good job, teacher respondents from rural (142 or 79.8%) and urban (116 or 83.1%) schools reported that their head teachers were developing them to do a good job. Table 2 shows that 35 (or 19.7) respondents in rural and 20 (or 14.4%) in urban schools reported that their head teachers rarely developed them to do a good job. This means that the number of head teachers who emphasise staff development is lower in rural than in urban schools. On whether head teachers were showing concern about how teachers feel or what they think about their job, more respondents in urban (113 or 83.1%) than in rural (122 or 68.9%) schools answered in the affirmative. On the question of treating teachers as an individual rather than a member of the group, as many as 76 (or 42.5%) respondents from the rural and 68 (or 50.7%) teacher respondents in urban schools reported that their head teachers treat them as individuals rather than as a group.

This can be interpreted that teachers in urban schools were likely to be treated fairly as individuals than those in rural schools. This means, such head teachers look at only the group but forget that each individual in the group has individual needs. Despite the frequent use of people-oriented style of leadership throughout the primary schools in Mid-western Uganda, the number of teachers who thought that this style of leadership was rarely being used cannot be ignored.

During interview, DEOs, DIS and CCTs revealed that the use of people-oriented style of leadership was more effective in urban than rural schools. In fact, one interviewee for instance said, Head teachers are supported by the parents of their schools to ensure that teachers' unwritten needs have a fair treatment. They use simple formulas like caring, communicating to them, listening to their problems, knowing the teachers individually and rewarding them. While the head teachers in the urban schools creatively use this style of leadership, their counterparts in the rural schools lack this skill and are never backed up by the parents. This demotivates teachers because they are not recognised and not even appreciated.

This point of view was shared by many respondents. In addition, different respondents were indeed concerned with the application of the people-oriented style which they believe would improve the supervision of teachers in primary schools in Uganda.

The researchers also collected respondents' views about the use of task-oriented leadership style in primary schools. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics on respondents' views on the use of task-oriented style of leadership

Leadership	Scale	School location			
		Rural		Urban	
		Count	%	Count	%
Involved in staff needs.	Never	86	48.3	71	52.2
	Rarely	50	28.1	26	19.1
	Frequently	42	23.6	39	28.7
	Total	178	100	136	100
Motivates the teachers to perform their duties	Never	10	5.6	6	4.3
	Rarely	57	31.8	39	28.1
	Frequently	112	62.6	94	67.6
	Total	179	100	139	100
Assigns each teacher specific tasks to allow teaching and learning to take place.	Never	42	23.5	17	12.4
	Rarely				
	Frequently	137	76.5	120	87.6
	Total	179	100	137	100
Specifies the importance of having strong sense of purpose	Never	2	1.1		
	Rarely	46	25.6	27	19.7
	Frequently	132	73.3	110	80.3
	Total	180	100	137	100
Talks enthusiastically about what need to be accomplished	Never	4	2.2	5	3.7
	Rarely	41	22.8	21	15.6
	Frequently	135	75.0	109	80.7
	Total	180	100	135	100

According to Table 3, the majority of the respondents (76.5%) from rural and 87.6 percent from urban schools reported frequent use of task-oriented style of leadership, meaning that the use of this style in urban schools was slightly higher than in rural schools. As regards the question of motivating teachers to perform their duties, the head teacher's use of task-oriented style of leadership in both rural (62.2%) and urban (67.6%) schools were reported to be frequent, with motivation seemingly better in urban than in the rural schools. According to Table 3, teachers from both rural (76.5%) and urban schools (87.6%) reported that their head teachers frequently assigned each teacher a specific task to allow teaching and learning to take place. This individualised task setting was slightly higher in urban than in rural schools. Table 3 indicates that some teachers from both rural (73.3%) and urban (80.3%) schools reported that their head teachers frequently specified the importance of having a strong sense of purpose. The emphasis on having a sense of purpose was much higher in urban than in rural schools. However, some teachers in rural (25.6%) and urban schools (19.7%) reported that their head teachers rarely offered them such advice. Table 3 also reveals that teachers from both rural (75.0%) and urban (80.7%) schools reported that their head teachers frequently talked enthusiastically about the task at hand and defined the goals that needed to be attained. However, this type of communication and encouragement was slightly higher in urban than in rural schools. Teachers who reported that they rarely received such encouragement were 22.8 percent in rural and 15.6 percent in urban schools.

During interview, one of the DEOs lamented that,

It is a pity some of our head teachers especially in rural schools do not put much emphasis on having a strong sense of purpose. As a result, pupils from many schools do not get any first grade at the end of primary leaving examinations. As a leader, these head teachers are answerable to some extent for the poor performance in their schools.

However, in yet another interview, one interviewee observed that,

Some head teachers motivate teachers to perform their duties. This produces good results especially when this style of leadership is appropriately used with people-oriented style of leadership. However, due to the precarious situation in many schools - which is not very favourable, many head teachers tend to apply only task-oriented style of leadership to get the work done. They are not bothered about what the teachers think or feel about their job. Teachers with such head teachers refer to them as autocratic leaders. This kind of leadership demotivates the teachers.

These findings match with what have been widely written about leadership. According to different literature, autocratic leadership does not allow any group inspired decisions. In such scenario, the leader alone determines policy and assigns tasks to members without consulting with them. In the case of head teachers, the teachers carry out the directives of the head teachers without question. Any grumbling about the leader's actions or orders is met with force. The leader decrees what shall be done and those being led have no choice but to accept it. The leader is always aloof from the group. This kind of leadership uses coercive methods to the teachers. Of course, this is a poor and dangerous way of leading people.

The researchers further collected respondents' views about the use of laissez-faire leadership style in primary schools. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4  
Descriptive statistics on respondents' views on the use of laissez-faire style of leadership

Leadership	Scale	School location			
		Rural Count	%	Urban Count	%
Is present when he is needed	Never	10	5.5	12	8.7
	Rarely	46	25.4	17	12.3
	Frequently	125	69.1	109	79.0
	Total	181	100	138	100
Likes making decisions	Never	4	2.2	9	6.6
	Rarely	52	28.9	24	17.5
	Frequently	124	68.9	104	75.9
	Total	180	100	137	100
Likes getting involved when important issues arise	Never	8	4.5	9	6.5
	Rarely	34	19.0	13	9.4
	Frequently	137	76.5	116	84.1
	Total	179	100	138	100
Quick in responding to urgent decisions	Never	10	5.6	9	6.5
	Rarely	46	25.6	18	12.9
	Frequently	124	68.9	112	80.6
	Total	180	100	139	100
Doesn't wait for things to go wrong before taking action	Never	6	3.3	9	6.5
	Rarely	26	14.4	9	6.5
	Frequently	148	82.2	121	87.1
	Total	180	100	139	100

According to Table 4, the majority of respondents in both rural (82.2%) and urban (87.1%) schools reported that their head teachers frequently use laissez-faire style of leadership. However, the use of laissez-faire was slightly higher in urban than in the rural schools. With regard to whether head teachers were often available at school, fewer teachers in rural (69.1%) than urban (79.0%) schools reported that their head teachers were often available on school premises whenever needed. On the issue of making decisions, results in Table 4 show that respondents from both rural (68.9%) and urban (75.9%) schools revealed that their head teachers frequently liked making decisions; but the number of those who refuted this made up 25.4 % in rural and 12.3% in urban schools. On the issue of making a quick response to urgent decisions, Table 4 indicates that some teachers both from rural (68.9 %) and urban (80.6 %) schools reported that their head teachers made a quick response to urgent decisions. The head teachers in urban schools however made quicker responses to urgent decisions than their counter-parts from rural schools. Those teachers who reported that their head teachers rarely responded to urgent business were 25.6 percent in rural and 12.9 percent in urban schools. Table 4 also reveals that most teachers, both in urban and rural schools reported variations in the level of the head teachers' use of positive laissez-faire style of leadership. The use of this style of leadership was slightly lower in rural than in urban schools, in almost all aspects of leadership constructs.

During interview, one of the interviewees revealed that, Head teachers are very much aware of laissez-faire style of leadership. They know its negative effect on any leader who practices it. What they do not understand is that their carefree attitude to work is a symptom of laissez-faire style of leadership. I think use of

either conscious or unconscious laissez-faire style is detrimental to support supervision.

Head teachers should desist from the use of this leadership style in their schools.

Another interviewee however said that, “the use of a bit of laissez-faire style of leadership is desirable especially if the head teacher allows teachers to make certain decisions regarding what they do as professionals”. This is probably what Mullins (2002) refers to as positive laissez-faire style of leadership. This style of leadership can enhance innovation and creativity amongst employees including teachers.

The last part of the descriptive statistics was used to represent respondents’ views about the quality of support supervision. Results on this variable are summarized in Table 5 whereby R=rural, U=urban and SD=standard deviation.

Table 5

Descriptive statistics on respondents’ views on the quality of teacher support supervision

Questionnaire item	Response Category											
	Always (3)		Rarely (2)		Never (1)		Rural		Urban		Total	
	R	U	R	U	R	U	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Providing books for schemes of work on time	165 91.2 %	133 95.7 %	14 7.7%	1 .7%	2 1.1%	5 3.6%	3.5 7	.684	3.7 3	.65 7	3.6 4	.678
Providing books for lesson plans on time	160 88.4 %	131 94.2 %	20 11.0 %	3 2.2%	1 .6%	5 3.6%	3.5 4	.711	3.7 1	.68 4	3.6 1	.704
Giving out pens/pencils on time	155 85.6 %	132 95.0 %	22 12.2 %	6 4.3%	4 2.2%	1 .7%	3.4 1	.789	3.7 3	.57 5	3.5 5	.720
Giving chalk	172 96.1 %	134 96.4 %	6 3.4%	3 2.2%	1 .6%	2 1.4%	3.6 5	.573	3.7 8	.54 9	3.7 1	.566
Providing a copy of the curriculum on time	160 88.4 %	128 92.1 %	18 9.9%	6 4.3%	3 1.7%	5 3.6%	3.4 4	.740	3.5 7	.74 3	3.4 9	.743
Allocating lessons to teach early	164 90.6 %	129 92.8 %	15 8.3%	5 3.6%	2 1.1%	5 3.6%	3.4 0	.689	3.6 0	.72 8	3.4 9	.713
Providing a time table	149 83.7 %	117 84.8 %	21 11.8 %	11 8.0%	8 4.5%	10 7.2%	3.2 8	.844	3.3 3	.90 5	3.3 0	.870
Allocating classrooms to teachers	162 90.0 %	13 94.9 %	14 7.8%	4 2.9%	4 2.2%	3 2.2%	3.4 3	.733	3.6 8	.63 9	3.5 4	.704
Providing teachers reference books	133 74.3 %	115 82.7 %	42 23.5 %	18 12.9 %	4 2.2%	6 4.3%	3.1 2	.843	3.3 5	.86 6	3.2 2	.859

According to Table 5, majority of the respondents (95.7% of respondents from urban and 91.2% from rural schools) reported that they were always sure of getting support from their head teachers. However, teachers in urban schools were enjoying more and better support (overall mean score of 3.73%) compared to their counterparts in rural schools whose overall mean score was only 3.57. This pattern of response was maintained for all the aspects of support supervision.

During interviews with DEOs, DIS and CCTs, different opinions were expressed regarding the support supervision that were given by the head teachers of primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. One interviewee, a CCT for instance observed that, “sincerely speaking, schools should be given reference books to help teachers in their work. And they should be given timely” Another interviewee, a DIS however, observed that, “it seems the life-span of some reference books in schools has expired because some books are in pieces (torn) or it is mishandling of them that is causing them to wear away?” (Sic). One DIS meanwhile said,

It is very embarrassing to visit a school and only to find that the release of capitation grants has been delayed. This means, there are no supplies in schools such as school chalk, books for schemes of work and lesson plans, no pens to mark pupils’ books, etc. At one time, I visited a school in a remote area and found that teachers were using pieces of dry cassava to write on the blackboard. Surely, some schools are suffering especially those in remote areas. All the voices in the text point to one factor – generally poor quality of teacher supervision. This means that the Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports and the district local governments should empower the head teacher through training in support supervision if they are to supervise their teachers satisfactorily.

#### 4.3 Test of Research Hypotheses

This study was based on three research hypotheses stated earlier in the introduction to this paper. To test the three hypotheses; first, the hypotheses were converted into null hypotheses. Therefore, the tested null hypotheses were stated as follows: 1) there is statistically no significant relationship between people-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision; 2) there is statistically no significant relationship between task-oriented style of leadership and quality of teachers support supervision; and 3) there is statistically no significant relationship between laissez-faire style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision. Second, the researchers generated indices to measure each of the variables, namely: people-oriented, task-oriented and laissez-faire styles of leadership as well as quality of teacher support supervision from questionnaire items of each of the variables. Thereafter, the hypotheses were tested with the use of the Pearson correlation coefficient technique. The results of the first null hypothesis are presented in Table 6.

Table 6  
Correlation between People-Oriented Style of Leadership and Quality and Extent of Teacher Support Supervision

		People-oriented style	Teacher support supervision
People oriented style	Pearson Correlation	1	.566(**)
	Sig (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	320	320
Teacher support supervision	Pearson Correlation	.566(**)	1
	Sig (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	320	320

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

Table 6 shows that the value of the correlation between people-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision was 0.566, implying that the two variables are positively correlated. This implies that the more people-oriented the leader becomes, the better the support supervision head teachers' offer to the teachers. The significant value of this correlation was 0.000 which was less than the level of significance, 0.05; and this led to the rejection of the null hypotheses ( $H_0$ ) which states that "there is statistically no significant relationship between people-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision" and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis ( $H_A$ ) that states that "there is statistically a significant relationship between people-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision", other factors notwithstanding.

The second null hypothesis that was tested was stated as "there is statistically no significant relationship between task-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision". The results of the test of the second null hypothesis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7  
Correlation between task-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support Supervision

		Task-oriented style	Teacher support supervision
Task-oriented style	Pearson Correlation	1	.536(**)
	Sig (2-tailed)		.000
	N	320	320
Teacher support supervision	Pearson Correlation	.536(**)	1
	Sig (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	320	320

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

Table 7 shows that the value of the correlation between task-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision was 0.536, implying that the two variables are positively correlated. This implies that the more task-oriented the leader becomes, the better support supervision head teachers' offer to the teachers. The significant value of this correlation was 0.000 which was less than the level of significance 0.05, and this led to the rejection of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) as stated above and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis ( $H_A$ ) that states that "there is

statistically a significant relationship between task-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision” other factors notwithstanding.

The last null hypothesis that was tested was stated as “there is statistically no significant relationship between laissez-faire style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision”. The results of the test of the last null hypothesis are presented in Table 10.

Table 8

Correlation between laissez-faire style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision

		Laissez-faire style	Teacher support supervision
Laissez-faire style	Pearson Correlation	1	-.117(*)
	Sig (2-tailed)		0.057
	N	320	320
Teacher support supervision	Pearson Correlation	-.117	1
	Sig (2-tailed)	.057	
	N	320	1

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

Table 8 shows that the value of the correlation between laissez-faire style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision was -0.117, implying that the two variables are negatively correlated. This implies that the less laissez-faire the leader becomes, the better the quality of support supervision head teachers’ offer to the teachers. However, the significant value of this correlation was 0.057 which was greater than the level of significance, 0.05, and this led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) as stated above and the rejection of the alternative hypothesis ( $H_A$ ) that states that “there is statistically a significant relationship between laissez-faire style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision,” other factors notwithstanding.

## 5. Discussion

The first objective of this study was to find out the relationship between people-oriented style of leadership and quality of support supervision head teachers give to their teachers in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. The study found out that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between people-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision. This implies that the more people-oriented the leader becomes, the better support supervision head teachers’ offer to the teachers. This finding appears to concur with that of several scholars. Frankline and Ken (1992) cited in Mullins (2002) for instance, concluded that people-oriented style of leadership is particularly important when leading people of the same culture (e.g. school), by greeting the workers personally when they start work consolidated the relationship and improved performance. Similar views have been expressed by researchers including Colmer (1988), Mumbe (1995), Ruremeire (1999) as well as Mullins (2002) and George and Jones (2002) who maintain that integration and consideration dimensions of leader behavior such as being warm, caring and sensitive to the subordinate’s needs and ideas tends to lead to good team work and creative collaboration which will enhance support supervision. In the study, the researchers established that dimensions of consideration leader behaviour such as concern for welfare of staff, good relationship with teachers, developing teachers to do a good job, showing concern about how teachers feel, or what they think and treating teachers as an individual rather than a member of a

group served as a reminder to the study respondents that they are valuable in their organization. Unfortunately, some head teachers rarely or never showed that kind of behavior to their teachers.

The second objective of this study aimed at finding out the relationship between task-oriented style of leadership and quality of support supervision head teachers give to their teachers in primary schools. The study results revealed that there was a significant relationship between task-oriented style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision. This implies that the more task-oriented the leader becomes, the better the support supervision head teachers' offer to the teachers. This finding was similar to what Faisal et al. (2011) found out that task-oriented behavior of educational leaders has impact on performance of educational leaders and institutional performance especially in providing quality support supervision.

The last main finding of this study was that there is statistically no significant relationship between laissez-faire style of leadership and quality of teacher support supervision implying that the less laissez-faire the leader becomes, the better the quality and extent of support supervision head teachers offer to the teachers. This finding was in agreement with proven empirical studies by many researchers such as Faisal et al. (2011), and Ozuruoke, Ordu, Pac, Abdulkarim, and Musa (2011) that laissez-faire style of leadership had negative correlation with many educational variables. No wonder many educationists discourage the use of this leadership style in schools.

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

On the basis of the above study findings and the discussion that ensued, the researchers concluded that the type of leadership styles that are employed by school heads, have a bearing on quality of teacher support supervision head teachers offer to their staff. Consequently, it was recommended that school heads should make use of appropriate leadership styles to suit situations, needs and developmental aspirations of teachers as well as the needs of the primary schools they serve.

## 7. References

- Alberta Education (2003). *Teacher Growth, Supervision and Evaluation Policy*. Retrieved from <http://education.alberta.ca/teachers/certification/standards/teacher.aspx>.
- Ayse` B. C. (2002). *School-based Supervision at Private Turkish School: A Model of improving Teacher Evaluation. Leadership and Policy in Schools* 1 (2), 172-190.doi: 10.1076/1pos.1.2172.5397.
- Baffour-Awuah, P. (2011). *Supervision of Instruction in Public Primary Schools in Ghana: Teachers and Head teachers' Perspectives*. A Ph.D. Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Studies of Mudoch University.
- Bays, D. A. (2001). *Supervision of Special Education Institution in Rural Public Schools Districts: A Grounded Theory*. Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of the Virginia, Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teacher Development: Teachers' Perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 349-378
- Colmer, S. H. (1988). A Perspective on Behaviour check lists. *Educational Psychology*, 8, 117-121.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- DES (2009, 2010, 2011). *Directorate of Educational Standards*. Kampala: Author.
- EPRC (1989). *Education Policy Review Commission Report*, MOESTS printed by UPPC, Entebbe, Uganda.
- Faisal, A., Azeem, M., Aysha, F., Amina, F., Saleem, F., & Nadeem, R., (2011). Impact of Educational Leadership on Institutional Performance in Pakistan. *Journal of public administration and governance*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Macro think Institute).
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: MacGrall-Hill.
- George, M. J. & Jones, R. G. (2002). *Organizational Behavior* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed). Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Glanz, J., Shulman, V., & Sullivan, S. (2006). *Usurpation or Abdication of Instructional Supervision in the New York City Public Schools?* Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Francisco, CA.
- Mumbe, O. G. (1995). *Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction in Primary Schools in Busia Sub-district of Uganda*. Master of Education dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

- Mullins, L. J. (2002). *Management and organizational behavior (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. Pearson Education Limited Edinburgh Gate, Harlow Essex.
- Ozuruoke, A. A., Ordu, Pac, Abdulkarim, & Musa, (2011). Leadership Style and Business Educators' Job Performance in Senior Secondary Schools in a changing Environment. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, Vol. 1 P.3 October.
- Ramrattan, N. (2011). *Assessing administrators' perceptions and practice of supportive supervision*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10133/3153> (Date 2011).
- Ruremire, B. G. (1999). *Instructional leadership and academic standards in secondary Schools*. Master of Education dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- Ssekamwa, J. (1997). *History and development of education in Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Yimazi, K., Tadan, M., & Ouz, E. (2009). Supervision Beliefs of Primary School Supervisors in Turkey. *Educational Studies*, 35(1), 9-20, doi:10.1080/03055690802288502.