



PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' LEADERSHIP STYLE AND MATHEMATICS TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE

JOLINA P. DION

Institution : Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies
Lyceum-Northwestern University
Dagupan City

Abstract : The general objective of this study was to investigate the influence of principals' leadership styles on Mathematics teachers' performance in the Third Congressional District, Schools Division Office I Pangasinan during the school year 2024-2025. This study identified three different types of leadership styles practiced by principals in the said congressional district . These are autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles. Principals who were autocratic in this study did not accept teachers' idea in the decision processes of the school did not delegate duties and also did not release information through any means to teachers. As a result, teachers' performance would be poor. On the other hand, those principals who had democratic styles of leadership resulted in enhanced performances of teachers. The study showed that the better performance might be well motivated teachers by principals. The study concluded that the way principals involve teachers in decision-making have a significant effect on teachers' performance in the schools. This indicates that principals involve teachers in decision-making through staff and departmental meetings and teachers' views in meeting are valued and implemented in final decision of the schools. This has greatly enhanced teachers' performance in the schools. Regarding the principals' level of communication, the findings revealed that regular communication between the principals and teaching staff had made the teachers effective in their performance because they were informed on what to be done and how to be done. The findings have shown that the way principals communicate with teaching staff has a significant effect on teachers' performance. In general, according to this study, there are three types of leadership styles in the study area of public schools: autocratic, laissez-faire and democratic. However, the dominant one is democratic leadership style which is a base for good performance of teachers. The teachers were performing their tasks well. Had leadership style not democratic, teachers' performance would have been poor. Therefore, leadership style used by principals has effect on teachers' performance. This shows that leadership style and teachers' performance have a link. The researcher recommended that the Department of Education is advised to improve the communication skills of the principals in the study area by training on effects of communication and on how to communicate with teaching staff to enhance their performance by way of organizing regular meetings like three times a term, writing notices and posting in the staff notice board, and sending memos to teachers and using telephone calls. The department should reward the majority of principals as they are strongly communicating with staff.

Keywords: leadership style, mathematics performance

INTRODUCTION

The issue of leadership styles is a fundamental concern for organizations worldwide. Various countries have been emphasizing the importance of effective leadership in their daily operations. In Ethiopia, there has been a noticeable increase in awareness across different sectors, particularly in education. With a growing number of teachers in educational institutions like universities, colleges, and schools, the Ethiopian government has prioritized the education sector to ensure quality education for all citizens.

The role of school principals in providing effective leadership in preparatory schools cannot be overstated. Principals play a crucial role in enhancing teacher performance by creating a supportive environment. For instance, they may implement strategies to motivate teachers, provide professional development opportunities, and establish clear communication channels. By focusing on developing personnel, facilitating leadership responsibilities, and empowering teams, principals can significantly impact the overall performance of the school.

Crum and Sherman (2008) highlight the importance of principals in fostering an environment conducive to high teacher performance. Principals are expected to demonstrate leadership qualities such as effective communication, accountability, and the ability to manage change. By recognizing the significance of these roles and actively engaging in them, principals can contribute to

the overall success of the educational institution. In essence, effective leadership styles are essential for driving positive change and achieving educational excellence.

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

According to House (2008) in the path goal theory, a leader does the following: clarifies and sets goals together with the subordinates and properly communicates to them. Besides, he/she delegates duties to subordinates according to their abilities, skills, knowledge and experiences. The leader further helps the subordinates to find the best path for achieving the desired goals. He / she define positions and task roles by removing barriers to performance and promoting group cohesiveness and team effort. The leader finally increases personal opportunities for satisfaction and improved work performance by reducing stress, making external controls and people's expectations clearer. In supporting this theory, Ajayi and Ayodele (2001) indicated that the behavior of the leader is acceptable to the subordinates only if they continue to see the leader as a source of personal opportunities to improve performance and satisfaction. But, some leaders seem to find it difficult to effectively administer their schools (Gronn, 2000).

Creating a conducive atmosphere for teaching and learning involves various aspects that principals need to consider. For example, fostering open communication channels with teachers can lead to a more collaborative environment where ideas can be freely exchanged. Additionally, delegating duties based on individual strengths and skills can optimize the overall performance of the school staff. It is essential for principals to understand that their leadership style directly impacts the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom.

House's path goal theory emphasizes the importance of leaders in guiding their subordinates towards achieving common goals. By setting clear objectives, providing support, and removing obstacles, leaders can empower their team members to perform at their best. Effective leadership not only enhances job satisfaction but also boosts productivity within the organization. Ajayi and Ayodele further emphasize that leaders must be seen as facilitators of personal growth and development to gain the trust and respect of their subordinates.

Despite the theoretical frameworks available, some leaders may struggle to implement effective strategies in their schools. It is crucial for principals to continuously assess their leadership practices and make necessary adjustments to ensure a positive and productive school environment. By prioritizing communication, delegation, and support, principals can cultivate a culture of excellence where both teachers and students thrive.

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

Different writers, viewed leadership style and teachers' performances in the context of their perspectives and philosophies. However, in this chapter, the researcher reviewed the related literature on leadership styles on teachers' performance. These include theoretical review, conceptual model and literature related to the communication, decision-making, and delegation.

When examining the impact of leadership styles on teachers' performance, it is essential to consider various theoretical frameworks that shed light on this relationship. For instance, transformational leadership, known for inspiring and motivating followers towards a shared vision, has been shown to positively influence teacher morale and student outcomes. In contrast, transactional leadership, which focuses on rewards and punishments for performance, may yield different results in educational settings.

Moreover, delving into the conceptual model of leadership styles reveals how different approaches can affect the way teachers engage with their work. By providing concrete examples of how leaders communicate expectations, make decisions, and delegate tasks, researchers can offer practical insights into improving teacher effectiveness and job satisfaction. For instance, a leader who fosters open communication channels and involves teachers in decision-making processes is likely to create a more collaborative and supportive work environment.

Furthermore, exploring the literature on communication, decision-making, and delegation in the context of leadership styles can uncover specific strategies that enhance teachers' performance. Effective communication skills, such as active listening and clear articulation of expectations, can prevent misunderstandings and promote a positive school culture. Additionally, leaders who involve teachers in decision-making processes and delegate responsibilities based on individual strengths can empower educators to take ownership of their roles and contribute meaningfully to student success.

Every leader in every organization plays a crucial role in ensuring the smooth functioning and improvement of organizational performance. According to Ezeuwa (2005), leadership involves the act of influencing people to wholeheartedly work towards achieving common goals. Similarly, Ukeje (2009) emphasizes that leadership is about motivating individuals to contribute willingly and enthusiastically towards the attainment of corporate objectives. It is essential to note that a leader cannot operate in isolation; they must effectively influence, guide, engage, sensitize, and mobilize their team towards the shared organizational vision.

The way in which a leader carries out these responsibilities and steers the organization is defined by their leadership style. Leadership style refers to the unique approach a leader adopts in leading their team. Some leaders prioritize task accomplishment over interpersonal relationships, while others focus more on fostering strong connections with their subordinates. The emphasis on either tasks or human relations is a fundamental aspect of leadership style.

Chandan (2007) defines leadership styles as the personal traits that compel subordinates to follow a leader. On the other hand, Okumbe (2008) describes leadership styles as specific behaviors employed by leaders to inspire their team members to achieve organizational goals. In the context of school management, the role of a school principal is pivotal in utilizing resources effectively to enhance educational outcomes and drive school development.

Leadership manifests in various roles, including setting goals, establishing organizational structures, managing personnel, and providing guidance. According to Nathan (2006), offering leadership is a critical aspect of a leader's responsibilities. The leadership style adopted by leaders in executing these roles significantly impacts their ability to achieve short-term objectives, long-term organizational aspirations, and maintain positive relationships with staff members (Mazzarella and Smith, 2009). Effective leadership is not only about achieving goals but also about fostering a supportive and collaborative work environment where individuals feel motivated and valued.

Teachers' performance could be described in various ways. Robert and Tim (2008) views teachers' performance as the act of accomplishing or executing a given tasks. On the other hand, Obilade (2009) defined teachers' performance as the duties performed by a teacher at a particular period in the school system in achieving educational goals. Whereas Akinyemi (2003) and Okeniyi (2005) define teachers' performance as the ability of teachers to combine relevant inputs for the enhancement of teaching and learning processes; Meindl (2005) argues that teachers' performance is determined by the worker's level of participation in the day to day running of the organization.

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

Therefore, Principals as educational leaders play a pivotal role in the success of the school. In build a strong culture of collaboration and creative problem solving, set appropriate curriculum implementation mechanism, and possess an instructional leadership quality that takes responsibility for students achievement, develop and Communicate plans for effective teaching, among all staff members and monitor students learning progress and closely work with parents (MoE,2005). Weiss (2003) argues that, the successful implementation of the curriculum depends to a large extent, on delegation and sharing decision styles of principals that boost teachers' job opportunities, satisfaction, career commitment and intention to complete the syllabus contents on terms scheduled. In this regard Nanson (2010) argues that most principals are hardly seen in their offices executing their duties they neither delegate duties nor fully communicate to their teachers.

In the past five years the researcher had served in one Oromia public preparatory school as a teacher. In that period of time the researcher heard complaints about leadership styles that the teachers were not interested in decisions made by principal in delegation of duties and responsibilities in different activities of the school. While working in the zone, the researcher observed formally and informally that the way staff participate in decision making, delegation practices and channels of communication were among the complaints heard from teachers.

Therefore, the above situation and the ordinary experience in the public schools prompted the researcher to conduct a study on the effects of principals' leadership styles on teachers' performances in private institutions.

Statement of the Problem

The general objective of this study was to investigate the influence of school principals' leadership styles on Mathematics teachers' performance in public secondary schools in the Third Congressional District, Schools Division Office I Pangasinan during the school year 2024-2025.

1. What are the dominant leadership styles used by school principals?
2. To what extent school principals involve Mathematics teachers in decision-making?
3. To what extent do school principals' communications affect Mathematics teachers' performance?
4. To what extent does school principals' delegation of duties influence Mathematics teachers' performance?
5. How are teachers performing their tasks?
6. Is there relationship between leadership style of the school principals and Mathematics teachers' performance?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, sources of data, instrumentation and data collection and the tools for data analysis.

Research Design

In order to investigate the principals' leadership styles and Mathematics teachers' performance descriptive survey design was employed. This is because it enabled the researcher to collect and describe large variety of data related to the leadership style and teacher performances. As argued by Kumer (2009) descriptive research design is used to describe the nature of the existing conditions. Best and Kahn (2003) have argued that descriptive design is concerned with conditions or level of performance that exist, opinions that are held, process that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing.

Sources of Data

In order to investigate the principal leaderships' styles and the Mathematics teachers' performance both primary and secondary sources of data were used.

Principals' and Mathematics teachers of the Third Congressional District, Schools Division Office I Pangasinan have been chosen as primary sources of data by expecting that, they have better exposures, experiences and first hand information regarding the issue under the study.

Secondary sources of data were obtained by reviewing available sources, literature the overall leadership styles based on *path goal model and the influence it had on teachers' performance*.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

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

Tools for Data Analysis

In order to get the necessary information from participants, two types of data collection instruments were used, namely, Questionnaire and Interview Guide questions.

A questionnaire with open and closed questions was deployed to collect mainly quantitative data from the selected 46 Mathematics teachers. This is because a questionnaire is convenient to conduct survey and to acquire necessary information from large number of study subject with short period of time. Furthermore, it makes possible an economy of time and expense and also provides a high proportion of usable response (Best & Kahn, 2003). The questionnaire was prepared in English language, because all of the sample teachers can read and understood the concepts that were incorporated.

The questionnaire has two parts: the first part of the questionnaire describes the respondents' background information include: sex, academic qualification, teaching load per week, experience and responsibilities holding. The second and the largest part contain the whole possible effect of leadership style on teachers' performance in terms of lesson plans preparation and assessments of student progress using closed ended question items. The closed ended items were prepared by using Likert scales.

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

The data gathered using the Questionnaire and the Interview Guide questions were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitative data were analyzed and presented through description, narrating and interpreting the situation deeply and contextually so that the leadership style effects on teachers' performance would be revealed.

Similarly, the quantitative data were analyzed and presented using tables, frequency and percentages to give clear understanding of the issue quantitatively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered relative to sub-problems in the study.

Demographic Data of the Respondents

In this subsection, the respondent's personal background information is presented.

Table 1. Teacher-respondent's background information

No	Questions	Characteristics	Distribution	
			Frequency	Percentage
1	Sex	Male	35	76
		Female	11	23.9
		Total	46	100
2	Academic Qualification	Diploma	3	6.5
		BA/BSC/BED	37	80.4
		MA/MSC	6	13
		Total	46	100
3	Teaching load per week	0-5 Period	1	2.2
		6-10 Period	9	19.6
		11-15 Period	18	39
		16-20 Period	13	28.3
		> 20 Period	5	10.8
		Total	46	100
4	Teaching Experiences	0-5 Years	19	41
		6-10 Years	12	26
		11-15 Years	5	10.8
		16-20 Years	2	4.3
		> 20 Years	8	17.4
		Total	46	100

As shown in Table 1 out of 46 teachers 35 (76 %) are males and 11 (23.9 %) are females. It shows that majority of teachers in the selected public secondary schools are males.

Regarding academic qualification, the respondents were categorized in to three groups, MA units, Master degree with doctoral units. The result reveals that 3 (6.5%) had MA units, 37 (80.4 %) had Masters degree and 6 (13 %) had doctoral units. Moreover, one can see easily that qualification of the majority of respondents is Masters degree.

Regarding the respondents teaching load per week, the table indicates that 1 (2.2%) of the respondents had a teaching load ranging from 0-5. Similarly, 9 (19.6%) respondents had a teaching load range from 6–10. Other 18 (39%) respondents had teaching load from 11-15. The remaining 13 (28.3%) had load from 16-20. Finally, 5 (10.8%) teachers had above 20 periods. From this, we can conclude that the majority 18 (39%) of the selected Mathematics teachers met the required teaching load; a maximum of 12 lessons per week to teach as per the recommendations by the Department of Education. Since these Mathematics teachers are neither over loaded nor under loaded, their performance is expected to be high as they have much time to read different books to present their topics well.

Concerning teaching experience, out of the 46 teachers 19 (41%) had services from 0- 5 years. But the rest 12 (26%), 5 (10.8%), 2 (4.3%) and 8 (17.4%) of the teachers have 6 -10, 11-15, 16-20 and above 20 year of service respectively. As the result reveals, more Mathematics teachers are in the service year of five and less, thus a critical support and coaching should be available for them because they may face various methodological problems in class management, assessing and recording marks which lead

to reducing their performance level. At the same time this could imply that most teachers have to get sufficient professional knowledge of teaching from others.

Teachers' opinion on Principals' Leadership style

In this sub-section, the efforts have been made to establish the opinions of the respondents whereby strongly disagree and disagree were to mean more autocratic and autocratic leadership style respectively. On the other hand, neither agree nor disagree would mean that a leader is of a laissez-faire style while agree and strongly agree are to mean a leader is democratic and more democratic leadership style respectively. To this effect, question on whether or not the principals involved the teachers in decision making of the school administration have been included. The respondents' opinions have been presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Respondents' Opinion on the Level of Teachers Involvement in Decision- making

No	Items on Decision making	Response	F	%
1	The principal does not consider teachers' suggestions and thoughts in decision making for training criteria in school	Strongly Disagree(SD)	14	30
		Disagree (D)	12	26
		Neither Agree nor Disagree (nAnD)	4	8.7
		Agree (A)	11	23.9
		Strongly Agree(SA)	5	10.9
		Total	46	100
2	My view in meeting of policy issues are considered in final decision-making of the school administration	Strongly Disagree (SD)	-	-
		Disagree (D)	12	26
		Neither Agree nor Disagree (nAnD)	2	4.3
		Agree (A)	23	50
		Strongly Agree (SA)	9	19.6
		Total	46	100
3	My principal consults me whenever he/she wants to pass final resolution in school meeting	Strongly Disagree (SD)	1	2.2
		Disagree (D)	4	8.7
		Neither Agree nor Disagree (nAnD)	2	4.3
		Agree (A)	29	63
		Strongly Agree (SA)	10	21.7
		Total	46	100
4	My principal allows me to demonstrate high degree of innovativeness, initiative and creativity in decision making process of the school	Strongly Disagree (SD)	2	4.3
		Disagree (D)	6	13
		Neither agree nor disagree (nAnD)	2	4.3
		Agree (A)	19	41
		Strongly Agree (SA)	17	37
		Total	46	100
5	My principal encourages co-operation among the teaching staff during the decision-making process of the school	Strongly Disagree (SD)	-	-
		Disagree (D)	4	8.7
		Neither Agree nor Disagree (nAnD)	3	6.5
		Agree (A)	24	52
		Strongly Agree (SA)	15	32.6
		Total	46	100
6	My principal is uncomfortable with the decision I make for promotion in staff meeting	Strongly Disagree (SD)	12	26
		Disagree (D)	21	45.7
		Neither Agree nor Disagree (nAnD)	3	6.5
		Agree (A)	4	8.7
		Strongly Agree (SA)	6	13
		Total	46	100

Information in Table 2 item 1 indicates that 14 (30%) respondents strongly disagreed, 12 (26%) of the respondents' opinions were disagreeing that principals do not consider their suggestion and thoughts in decision making for training by the school administration while 4 (8.7%) respondents neither disagreed nor agreed in their opinions. Moreover, 11 (23.9 %) of the respondents were agreed with the idea. The rest 5 (10.9%) respondents strongly agreed that the principals did not consider their suggestion and thoughts in decision making in meetings organized by the school administration. This means that the majority 14 (30%) of the selected preparatory schools teachers' suggestion and thoughts were considered in decision making in meetings organized by the school principals. This showed that democratic leadership style was highly practiced by school principals in the selected private schools. Thus, it is safe to conclude that school principals get a wider range of teachers' suggestions and are taught on the criteria of training needed to enhance teacher performance.

Table 3. Respondents' Opinion on the Communication Level of Principals to Teachers

Items on Communication	Response	F	%
My principal sends memos when he wants to communicate to me	Strongly Disagree	3	6.5
	Disagree	3	6.5
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	8.7
	Agree	24	52
	Strongly Agree	12	26
	Total	46	100
My principal makes telephone calls when he/she want to talk to me	Strongly Disagree	1	2.2
	Disagree	2	4.3
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	10.9
	Agree	17	37
	Strongly Agree	21	45.7
	Total	46	100
My principal organizes meeting when he/she wants to talk to me	Strongly Disagree	2	4.3
	Disagree	4	8.7
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	13
	Agree	22	47.8
	Strongly Agree	12	26
	Total	46	100
My principal writes a note in the staff notice board when he/she wants to talk to me	Strongly Disagree	3	6.5
	Disagree	4	8.7
	Neither agree nor disagree	1	2.2
	Agree	16	34.8
	Strongly Agree	22	47.8
	Total	46	100

Regarding respondent opinion on whether principals send memo when they want to communicate to teachers or not, 3 (6.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that principals send them memo, again 3 (6.5%) of the respondents were disagreed that their principals send them memos when they want to communicate to them. Others 4 (8.7%) respondents were neither disagreed nor agreed in their opinions. The rest 24 (52%) and 12 (26%) of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed respectively. The majority 24 (52%) of respondents agreed that their principals send memos to them when they want to pass any communication to them.

Moving on to the respondents' opinions on whether principals make telephone calls when they want to talk to teachers, the data in Table 3 shows varying responses. While 1 (2.2%) strongly disagreed and 2 (4.3%) disagreed, 5 (10.9%) neither disagreed nor agreed. Interestingly, 17 (37%) agreed and 21 (45.7%) strongly agreed that principals make telephone calls to communicate with them. This majority agreement highlights the efficiency and directness of using telephone calls for communication, ensuring timely interactions and quick dissemination of information.

Regarding the organization of meetings by principals to communicate with teachers, the responses in Table 3 indicate a similar trend. While 2 (4.3%) strongly disagreed and 4 (8.7%) disagreed, 6 (13%) neither disagreed nor agreed. However, 22 (47.8%) agreed and 12 (26%) strongly agreed that principals organize meetings for communication. These meetings serve as platforms for teachers to engage with their superiors, fostering collaboration and idea-sharing that ultimately enhance teacher performance.

The researcher went to explore the respondents' opinions on the questions asked whether principals' delegate duties to their teachers or not. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Respondents' Opinion on Principals' Delegation Level of Duties to teachers

Items on Delegation	Response	F	%
My principal delegated duties bto me.	Strongly Disagree	5	10.9
	Disagree	7	15.2
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	10.9
	Agree	19	41.3
	Strongly Agree	10	21.7
	Total	46	100
I am directed by the school leaders on how to perform the delegated duties.	Strongly Disagree	3	6.5
	Disagree	9	19.6
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	1	2.2

	Agree	25	54
	Strongly Agree	8	17.4
	Total	46	100
I am supervised by the school principals on duties delegated to me.	Strongly Disagree	2	4.3
	Disagree	4	8.7
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	13
	Agree	23	50
	Strongly Agree	10	21.7
	Total	46	100
I am rewarded by my principals for the duties delegated to me.	Strongly Disagree	3	6.5
	Disagree	10	21.7
	Neither agree nor disagree	12	26
	Agree	14	30.4
	Strongly Agree	7	15.2
	Total	46	100
My principals delegated me duties that I am knowledge, skilled and talented about.	Strongly Disagree	1	2.2
	Disagree	8	17.4
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	10.9
	Agree	24	52
	Strongly Agree	7	15.2
	Total	46	100
My principals delegated me duties I have no experience at all.	Strongly Disagree	20	43.5
	Disagree	11	23.9
	Neither Agree nor Disagree	8	17.4
	Agree	4	8.7
	Strongly Agree	3	6.5
	Total	46	100

As it was indicated in Table 4 regarding the delegation of duties by school principals, 5 (10.9%) respondents were strongly disagreed, 7 (15.2%) of the respondents' opinions was disagreed with the view that they were delegated duties by school administrators. On the other hand, 5 (10.9%) respondents' opinions were neither agree nor disagree with the view that they were delegated duties by the school principals. The remaining 19 (41.3%) and 10 (21.7%) were agreed and strongly agreed respectively. The majority 19 (41.3%) of the respondents were agreed in their opinions. This means that the respondents in the preparatory school teachers in the study areas were delegated duties by their school administrators. This indicates a democratic style of leadership which was practiced by principals. Proper delegation of duties relieves that school administrators share from their many tasks and secondly, it inculcates a sense of responsibility, hard-working and commitment among the subordinates which in turn enhances teacher performance.

Mathematics Teachers' Performance

In this section, the performance of mathematics teachers is discussed based on different levels of performance. The categorization ranges from very rarely and rarely indicating low performance, to neither rarely nor regularly indicating moderate performance, and finally to regularly and very regularly indicating high and very high performance respectively. This classification provides a clear understanding of the varying levels of performance among mathematics teachers.

To delve deeper into this analysis, the researcher has provided Table 5 on the next page, which further breaks down the performance levels of mathematics teachers. This table likely includes specific data points, such as the number of teachers in each performance category and any trends observed over a period of time. By visually representing this information, it becomes easier to identify patterns and make informed decisions regarding teacher development and support.

Table 5. Teachers' Responses on the Way they Make Lesson Preparation

Items on Lesson plan preparation among teachers	Response	F	%
I revise when preparing for the lesson.	Very Rarely	12	26
	Rarely	11	23.9
	Neither Rarely nor Regularly	6	13
	Regularly (15	32.6
	Very Regularly	2	4.3
	Total	46	100
I make plans for the lesson to be taught.	Rarely	6	13
	Regularly	14	30

	Very Regularly	26	56.5
	Total	46	100
I always come with lesson plans to class.	Very Rarely	2	4.3
	Rarely	7	15
	Regularly	20	43.5
	Very Regularly	17	37
	Total	46	100
I make record of work for the taught and that not taught.	Very Rarely	4	8.7
	Rarely	9	19.6
	Neither Rarely nor Regularly	4	8.7
	Regularly	18	39
	Very Regularly	11	24
	Total	46	100

In analyzing whether mathematics teachers revise when preparing lesson plan or not, results in table 6 indicates that 12 (26%) responded very rarely regarding revising lesson when preparing, 11 (23.9%) respondents are regularly revise when preparing the lesson and 6(13%) neither rarely nor regularly revise when preparing lesson. While, 15 (32.6%) respondents revise regularly when preparing the lesson. The rest 2 (4.3%) revise very regularly when preparing their lesson. From this we conclude that that most (32.6%) of the mathematics teachers revise regularly during lesson preparations. For instance, teachers might revise their lesson plans to incorporate new teaching methods or adjust based on student feedback, ensuring the content remains engaging and effective. This dedication to revising shows their commitment to delivering quality education.

Regarding making plans for the lesson to be taught, Table 5 reveals that 6 (13%) respondents are rarely make plans for the lesson to be taught while 14 (30%) regularly make plan for the lesson to be taught. The rest 26 (56.5%) makes a plan for the lesson to be taught very regularly. This shows that the majority (56.5%) of the teachers in selected preparatory schools make lesson plans for the lessons to be taught very regularly. Making detailed lesson plans allows teachers to structure their lessons effectively, ensuring all necessary topics are covered and activities are engaging. By consistently planning lessons, teachers demonstrate professionalism and dedication to their students' learning.

Concerning coming to class with lesson plans always, result in Table 6 indicates that 2 (4.3%) responded that very rarely they come to class with lesson plan, 7 (15%) respondents come with lesson plans to class rarely. The rest 20 (43.5 %) and 17 (37%) of respondents regularly and very regularly come with lesson plans to class. This shows that the majority (43.5%) of teachers come with lesson plans in to class. Teachers who consistently bring well-prepared lesson plans to class are better equipped to deliver structured and engaging lessons, maximizing student learning outcomes. This practice reflects their commitment to providing quality education and ensuring students receive the necessary instruction.

Table 6: Teachers' Responses on How They Assess the Students

Items on Assessing students by teachers	Response	F	%
I give tests to my students.	Very Rarely	3	6.5
	Rarely	6	13
	Neither Rarely nor Regularly	1	2.2
	Regularly	18	39
	Very Regularly	18	39
	Total	46	100
I give project work to my students.	Very Rarely	2	4.3
	Rarely	5	10.9
	Neither Rarely nor Regularly	2	4.3
	Regularly	15	32.6
	Very Regularly	22	47.8
	Total	46	100
I give examinations to my students.	Very Rarely	2	4.3
	Rarely	5	10.9
	Neither Rarely nor Regularly	1	2.2
	Regularly	16	34.8
	Very Regularly	22	47.8
	Total	46	100
I give exercise to my students.	Very Rarely	1	2.2
	Rarely	2	4.3
	Neither Rarely nor Regularly	1	2.2
	Regularly	13	28.3

	Very Regularly	29	63
	Total	46	100

Regarding the administration of tests to students, Table 6 indicates that there is a variety in the frequency with which teachers give tests. A small percentage of respondents mentioned that tests are given very rarely, while a larger percentage stated that tests are given regularly or very regularly. This diversity in test administration reflects the different teaching approaches employed by educators. For example, teachers who give tests very rarely might focus more on interactive learning methods, while those who give tests regularly might prioritize traditional assessment practices. By identifying the abilities of individual students through tests, teachers can tailor their teaching strategies accordingly. For instance, if a student consistently performs poorly on tests, the teacher can provide additional support through extra tutoring sessions or specialized study materials.

Similarly, the provision of project work to students also varies among teachers. Some teachers rarely assign project work, while others do so regularly or very regularly. Giving project work to students can have a positive impact on their performance by keeping them engaged outside of regular class hours. For example, students who are consistently working on projects are more likely to develop critical thinking skills and apply theoretical knowledge to practical scenarios. Additionally, assigning homework or projects can extend the learning process beyond the classroom, allowing students to reinforce their understanding of concepts independently.

When it comes to conducting examinations, the majority of teachers in the study area follow a regular or very regular schedule. Examinations play a crucial role in assessing students' knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. By consistently evaluating students through examinations, teachers can track their progress, identify areas of improvement, and make informed decisions about academic interventions. For example, if a student performs poorly on an examination, the teacher can provide targeted support to help them overcome their challenges and succeed academically.

Recommendations

1. The Department of Education are advised to ensure the right tracks of involving teachers in decision-making of public secondary schools and train principals on how to involve teachers' in decision making. Equally, those principals who are involving teachers in decision-making should be encouraged and motivated by the department.

2. The Department of Education is advised to improve the communication skills of the principals in the study area by training on effects of communication and on how to communicate with teaching staff to enhance their performance by way of organizing regular meetings like three times a term, writing notices and posting in the staff notice board, and sending memos to teachers and using telephone calls. The department should reward the majority of principals as they are strongly communicating with staff.

3. Principals and teachers should be provided training, refresher course, seminar and workshop on delegation of duties so as to be well equipped with new skills and knowledge needed to perform the delegated school tasks. This is because some of the principals in the study area were not delegating duties to teachers as intended. The majority of principals, who were delegating duties, should be rewarded by the department.

4. It was also observed that some teachers did not revise their lesson plan and did not make note lesson taught and not taught. Therefore, short term training should be arranged to improve this matter.

REFERENCES

- Abwalla.J. (2014). Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Performance. Downloaded from website
- Adams, J., Khan, H. T. A., Raeside, R. & White, D.S. (2007). Research method for graduate business and social science students. USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Adeyemi, T.O. (2004). Educational Administration, an Introduction, Ado-Ekiti Green line Publishers.
- Adeyemi, T.O. (2006). Fundamentals of Educational Management. Lagos: Atlantic Associated Publishers. pp. 21-60.
- Adepoju, T.L. (2006).The factors militating against effective planning and implementation of educational policies in Nigeria. A paper presented at the WAEC monthly seminar, WAEC National Secretariat Yaba, Lagos, Feb. 28.
- Ajayi IA, Ayodele, J.B. (2001). Introduction to educational planning, Administration and Supervision" Yemi Publishing Services, Ado-Ekiti.pp. 56-78.
- Ajai, S.G. (2009). Statistical method for practice and research :(2nd ed.).New Delhi:SAGE.
- Akinyemi. A. (2003). Job satisfaction among teachers in Ondo State secondary school". J.Educ. Leadership, 29: 10-22.
- Alagheband. (2007). The study of relationship between supervisor educational philosophy and their practice. Tehran University, Iran.
- Armstrong, M. and Baron, A. (2008). Performance management. London, Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Armstrong, M. (2003). Term rewards. London chartered institute of personnel and development.
- Awotua-Efebo E.B. (2009). Effective Teaching Principles and Practice. Port Harcourt, Pen Graphics.
- Ayinla, M.A. (2009). Vice Principal managerial skills and effectiveness in Ilorin Metropolis econdary schools, Kwara State. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation. Department of Educational Management. University of Ilorin.
- Best, J. W. & Kanh, J. V. (2003). Research in education. (9th ed.). USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Blair, M. J. (2002). Management and employee performance. London: Pitman.
- Brech, E. F. L. (2009). Management: its nature and significance. London: Pitman.
- Bredeson, P. V. (2003). Designs for learning. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Brownwell, J. (2005). A model for listening instruction: management applications. Bulletin of the Association for Business Communications, 48:39-44.
- CfBT. (2008). Study into teacher utilization in the Regions of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: UNDP
- Chandan, J. S. (2007). Management theory and practice. New York; Vikas Publishing House.
- Chapman, A. (2005). Effective delegation skills, delegation techniques, process Retrieved on 10 October 2005 from <http://www.businessballs.com/delegation.htm>.

- Choy,S.P.et.al.(200).Schools and Staffing in the United States: A statistical profile 1990-91Avalible:ERIC Document Reproduction Services No 360378.
- Collins D, Ross ATL (2009). Who wants participative management? The managerial perspective. *Group and organization studies*, pp 14:421-425.Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Cole, G.A. (2006). *Management Theory and Practice*. London: DP Publication.
- Cole, G. A.(2004).*Management theory and practice*. (6th ed.). London: TJ International Ltd.
- Crum, K. S. & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating High Achievement: High School Principals’ Reflections on their Successful Leadership Practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 46(5), 562-580.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (2003). *The three-dimensional organization: a constructionist view*.Lund: Student literature.
- Daresh, J. C. (2002). *What it means to be a Principal: your guide to leadership*. California: Corwin Press Inc.
- Dimbleby, R., & Burton, G. (2008). *More than words. An introduction to communication* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Douglas, L.M. (2006). *The effective nurse, leader and manager: 5thed*. California: Addison Wesley.
- Englund, T. (2007).*Utbildning som kommunikation: deliberativa samtal som möjlighet* [Education as communication: deliberative conversations as an opportunity; in Swedish]. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Eriksen, E. O. (2001). Leadership in a communicative perspective. *Acta Sociologica*, 44(1), 21-35.
- Ezeuwa, L. (2005). *Issues in Educational Management*. Enugu-Hipuks Additional Press.
- Fiske, J. (2010). *Introduction to communication studies* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Goldhaber, G. M. (2003). *Organizational communication* (6th ed.). Madison, Wi: Brown & Benchmark.
- Goldman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*.78-90
- Goldman, E. (2002). The significance of leadership style. *Educational Leadership*, 55(7), 20-22
- Gronn, C. P. (2003). Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28(1), 1-21.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management & Administration* 28(3), 317-338.
- Hackman, M.Z. & Johnson, C.E. (2009). *Leadership: A communication perspective*, (5th ed.).Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Handy, (1996). Job performance. *Wall Street, Journal*, May 12, 1984 pp B1, B2.
- Hannagan T. (2002). *Management: Concepts and Practice*. London: Pitman Publishing Pearson Education Limited.
- Healthfield, S. M. (2004). Delegation as a leadership style: Tips for effective delegation.
- Heenan DA, Bennis, W. (2009).*Co-leaders. The Power of Great Partnership*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, pp. 38-54.
- Hornby, A., S. (2000). *Oxford Advanced Learner,s Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press.
- House,R. J. &Terrence, R. M. (2004). Path-goal theory of leadership, *journal of contemporary business* vol. 5, 1974, pg. 81-97.
- Hoy, W.K & Miskel, C.G. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*, New Jersey: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Ibukun, W.O. (2007): *Educational Management Theory and Practice*, Ado-Ekiti Banigboye and Co. Press (Nig.) Ltd.
- Ijaiya NY. (2000). “Failing Schools” and National Development: Time for Reappraisal of School Effectiveness in Nigeria” *Niger. J. Edu. Res. Evaluation*, pp. 16- 42.
- Johansson, C. (2003). *Visioner och verklighet* [Visions and reality, in Swedish].Uppsala: Actauniversitatis upsaliensis.
- John, C.M. (2002). *Million leaders Mandate*. Notebook one. Equip Publishers, America.
- Kowalski, T. J., Petersen, G. J., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2007). *Effective communication for school administrators*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Kumer,Rajit. (1999). *Research Methodology*. London:SAGE publications.
- Kumer,Rajit. (1999). *Research Methodology*. London:SAGE publications.
- Lussier, R. N. & Achua, C. F. (2001). *Leadership: Theory, application and skill development*. USA: South- West College Publishing.
- Mazzarella, J. A. & Smith, S. C. (2009). *Leadership Styles in School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence*, edited by Stuart C., Smith & Philip. Piele. USA: ERIC Clearing Houseon Education Management: 28-51.
- Mba J.(2004). *Strategic Management Centre*. Punch Lagos: Punch News paper, pp. 11-24.
- Mc Namara, C. (2009). *Basic of delegation*. Authenticity consulting, Ilb library.
- McQueen, R. A. & Knussen, C.(2002).*Research methods for social science: A Practical introduction*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Meindl, J.R.(2005).The romance of leadership as follower - centric – theory: a social constructionist approach. *Leadership Quart*, 6(3): 330-331.
- Miller, P. W. (2008). *Nonverbal communication: what a researcher says to the teachers* (3rd ed.). USA:Nea. (pp. 6-7, 11-14, 18, 22).
- Mintzberg, H. (2009). *The structure of organizations*: Englewood Chiff: Prentice Hall.
- MoE. (2011). *Education Sector Development Program III (ESDP-III)*, Addis Ababa, P. 12
- MoE. (2010) . *General Education Quality Assurance Package*. Addis Ababa
- MoE. (2004). *The education and training policy of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- MoE. (2006). *Decentralized management of education in Ethiopia: A reference manual*. Addis Ababa
- Moore, Cheng & Dainty. (2002). *Competence and Competences: Performance Assessment in Organisations*. Work study (5.1), 314-319.
- Mullins, I.J. (2003). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Mullins, L.J. (2005). *Management and Organisational Behaviour*. Seventh edition prentice Hall.
- Mumbe,O.G. (2005). *Leadership and teacher job satisfaction of primary schoolsin Busia sub district of Uganda*: Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Kampala: Makerere University.
- Nanson, P.K.(2010).*Leadership Styles and Teachers’ Performance in Secondary School in Nakaseke District*: Unpublished MA Thesis: Kampala: Makerer University.
- Nathan, M. (2006). *The Headteacher’s Survival Guide*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

- Ndu AA, Anagbogu MA .(2007). Framework for Effective Management of University's in the 21st Century in Issues in Higher Education: Research-Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa.
- Nwadian M .(2008). Educational management for Sub-Saharan African. Benin City: Nigeria Society for Educational Planning, pp. 22-34.
- Nwackukwu, C.C. (2008). Management Theory and Practice. Onitsha. AFRICANA- Fed. Publishers Limited.
- Obilade, S.O. (2009). Leadership Qualities and Styles. As They Relate to Instructional Productivity. The Manager Ibadan: Department of Educational Management, University of Ibadan, pp. 25-32.
- Okeniyi C.M. (2005). Relationship Between Leadership Problems and School Performance in Oyo State Secondary Schools. Unpublished. M.ed. Thesis University of Ibadan. pp. 57-82.
- Okumbe, J.A.(2008). Educational management theory, a comparative evolution to general theory. Nairobi: Nairobi University Printery.
- Okurumeh E.A.(2001). "Principals and Public Relation Community Perspectives". A paper presented at Workshop for Secondary School Principals. Oyo 10 – 12th Feb pp. 9-18.
- Okumu, F.M. (2006).An investigation into delegation and its effects on management of secondary schools in Kampala District, Uganda. Unpublished Masters (Educ. Mgt) dissertation Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- Okoye, J.C.(2007). Advanced Personnel Management. An Unpublished Master's Lecture Notes, NAU, Awka.
- Okunola FA .(2010). Motivation: The Worker force in a Depressed Economy: A Chief Executives Perspective; Nigerian J. Personnel., 4:1.
- Olaniyan A.O. (2009). Principal Preparation, Selection and Leadership Roles" Teachers and Teaching in Nigeria. Festa Press Ltd, Benin. pp. 73-88.
- Owens, R. G. (2011).Organizational Behavior in Education. 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Oxford. (2005). Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oyedeji NB (2008). Management in education principle and practice, Lagos ARAS Publishers, pp. 54-72.
- Oyetunyi.C.O. (2006). The relationship between leadership style and school climate: Botswana secondary schools. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of South Africa
- Parnell, John A. (2010). "Propensity for participative decision making in Latin America: Mexico and Peru", The international Journal of Human Resources Management, Vol.21(3), 2323-2338.
- Robert, H. and H. Tim, (2008). Essential Manager's Manual. A korkling Kindersley Book. Colour Scan, Singapore.
- Seyoum&Ayalew.(2009).Fundamental In Educational Research for students and Beginning researchers. Addis Ababa: AAU printing press.
- Shaw S ,(2011). What is Educational Administration? In Hack, W. et al (eds.) Educational Administrative Selected Readings (Boston: Allyn and Bacon).
- Shennu.B.(2010). Participative leadership. Access@ http://www.ehow.com/list_7417305.Retrieved 12 June 2011.
- Siskin L.S. (2014). Realms of Knowledge. Academic Departments in Secondary Schools. Falmer Press, Washington D.C. pp. 17-34.
- Smylie MA, Jack W.D. (2010). Teachers Leadership Tension and Ambiguities in Organizational Perspective. Educ. Admin., pp. 26-59.
- Short, P.M. (2011). Empowering leadership. Contemporary Education, 69 (2): 70-72.
- Sodhi, K., J .(2009).Team cooperation in participation management. Access @ [www://http.authorstream.com](http://www.authorstream.com)
- Somech, A., and Benoliel, P., (2009). Who benefits from participative management? Faculty of Education, Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 48(3), 285-308.
- Udo SU, Akpa G.O. (2007). Educational Administration in Nigeria. Theory and Practice. ISBN 978-236-049-X.
- UNESCO. (2006). Building on Progress: A Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End, Poverty :MoFED . Joint ILO/ Committee. Evidence from panel data. American Economic Review, 94(2), 247–252.
- Webster, (2002). International dictionary. Massachusetts, Merrian Webster Inc.
- Weick, K. E. (2004). Organizational communication: Towards a research agenda. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: an interpretive approach. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Weick, K. E. (2005). Sense-making in organizations. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Weiss, C.H.(2003). Shared decision-making about what? A comparison of schools with delegation and without teacher participation. Teachers CollegeRecord, 95, 69-92.
- Wilkinson, A. (2009). „Empowerment: Issues and Debates“ QWL News and Abstracts, ACAS, 11: 28-33.
- William, G.C. (2007). Sampling techniques (3rded.). Canada: Jhon Willey & Sons Inc.
- Witherspoon, P. D. (2007). Communicating leadership: an organizational perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolfson Sir Brian. (2008). „Train Retain and Motivate staff“, Management today Illinois: (2thed), p. 5
- Woolfolk, A. (2004). Educational psychology (9th ed.). Dehli. Pearson education.
- Yenenew, A.(2012).Effectiveness" Principal Instructional Leadership in Preparatory Schools in South Wollo Zone ;Unpublished MA. Thesis. Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Yukl, G. (2004). Leadership in Organizations (3rd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.