



## Effects of Head of Schools' laissez-faire Leadership Style on Teacher's Professionalism in public secondary schools in Temeke Municipality, Tanzania

Clever B Makundi <sup>1\*</sup>, Juliet Ntimba <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1, 2</sup> Department of Education, St. Augustine University of Tanzania, Tanzania

\* Corresponding Author: **Clever B Makundi**

---

### Article Info

**ISSN (online):** 2582-7138

**Impact Factor:** 5.307 (SJIF)

**Volume:** 05

**Issue:** 01

**January-February 2024**

**Received:** 03-12-2023;

**Accepted:** 07-01-2024

**Page No:** 510-519

### Abstract

The focus of this study was to investigate the effect of head teachers' laissez faire leadership styles on teachers' professionalism in public secondary schools in Temeke Municipality with the following specific objectives. First, to find out relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and teachers' performances in public secondary schools. Second, to evaluate the impact of laissez faire leadership style on teaching and learning process in public secondary schools and thirdly, to assess the influence of laissez-faire leadership style towards teachers' attitude in public secondary schools. The sample size of the study was 80 respondents. 77 secondary school teachers were involved in the quantitative part of the study. On the other hand, 3 school heads from three selected Secondary Schools were involved in the qualitative phase of the study. This research applied mixed approach and a case study survey design was employed. The questionnaire was used to collect data from teachers while interview guide was applied to obtain data from the head teachers.

Quantitative analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and presented using frequency distribution tables while qualitative data was analyzed thematic. The study concluded that, there is a negative significant relationship between head teachers' laissez faire and teachers' professionalism. The researcher recommended that success of an organization is reliant on the leader's ability to optimize human resources. Thus a good leader should understand the importance of employees in achieving the goals of the organization.

**Keywords:** Head of Schools' laissez-faire Leadership Style, Teacher's Professionalism

---

### 1. Introduction

According to Kasinga (2010) leadership is essential figure in educational system where success of educational institution depends on the quality of its leadership. At the school, school leaders take a heavy burden of responsibility for their institutions by influencing subordinates to strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the accomplishment of institution goals (Ezeuwa, 2005).

In the same manner, Rad & Yarmohammadian (2006) argued that, leadership styles are not the same all over the world. Leaders in an organization have different type of leadership styles depending on the circumstances and social values and beliefs existing in the institution, and also suitability and effectiveness of a leadership style depend on the operating situation in which a leader matches his/ her leadership style with the task of their subordinates (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2001).

transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 1991). Furthermore, transformational leadership style pays particular attention to the teachers' needs for growth and achievement which led to greater job satisfaction and thus the head teachers who use this style are proactive leaders (Bass, 1990; Weasmer (2002).

Also in Mexico and Taiwan, the autocratic leadership style are very dominant that school decisions are head teacher centered and allows minimum participation of the teachers in decision making. Also majority of schools in South Korea and United States follow democratic style which is based on people oriented and counts on the participatory contribution of the teachers and other

staffs at school (Mgbodile, 2004).

On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership styles refer to the style which allows free contributions of ideas of the subordinates without interference by the leader, and this is most practiced by head teachers in Tetu District in Kenya (Wathika, 2011). Also laissez-faire leadership is based on trust where head teachers give their decision making authority to teachers and non-staffs (Bass and Avolio, 2006). In this type of leadership, head teacher does not exercise strict supervision and control over their teachers because most of the teachers in schools are highly experienced, motivated and qualified individuals and are able to perform their duties by themselves without supervision from head teachers.

Furthermore, Yang *et al.* (2015) stated that laissez-faire style is acceptable in schools if the teachers and students are experts in their subjects where teachers under the control of laissez-faire leaders have the freedom to take responsibility for their actions.

Also, it is argued that laissez-faire leadership is used at schools when teachers are highly skilled, experienced, trustworthy and educated, and have pride in their work and the drive to do it successfully. This leadership style might not be suitable to new employees in the organization because they might lack guidance and end up fall short of achieving their goals.

But most of time, laissez-faire leadership in the school lead to negative consequences and stress in teachers. Also head teachers' laissez-faire leadership styles are not strategy-oriented and do not provide continuous feedback for their teachers and non-staffs, who are regarded as a crucial element of successful teamwork and cooperation at the school. Due to the certain disadvantages provided by the head teachers' laissez faire, teachers and students experience lack of communication, feedback for enhancement and at the end, they may fail to meet school development demands (Barrow, 2004).

In the same line, job satisfaction influence teachers to work hard for performance improvement and school development. But unfortunately, Laissez-faire leadership is the least effective type of leadership styles and encourages the role ambiguity among the teachers in the schools since under the head teacher's laissez-faire, teachers are unmotivated and dissatisfied. (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). This leadership style has been experienced with lower productivity than both autocratic and democratic styles of leadership and with lower teachers' satisfaction than democratic leadership. This is because teachers lack motivation, creativity and sufficient resources and tools in schools.

In schools, teacher's productivity is measured in terms of teaching effectiveness and class room performance (Wenlisky, 2001). In addition to that, schools under head teachers' laissez faire type of leadership experienced poor performance and teachers' job dissatisfaction thereby becoming very difficult to reach school goals and objectives. Teachers appear to be bored and less satisfied with their jobs, occasional truancy, indiscipline and drifting away from the teaching profession.

Furthermore the laissez-faire leadership has regarded as zero leadership because it is non-strategic and therefore is likely to lead to negative consequences in teachers' performance and attitudes especially in developing countries like Tanzania. In order to overcome school problems, different styles are needed for different situations and head teachers need to know when to exhibit a particular approach (Rad

& Yarmohammadian, 2006). In addition to that, Lesomo (2013) stated that school heads did not restrict on the one leadership style since no one style is ideal for every situation. The head teacher needed to understand on how to make work more satisfying for teachers and to overcome challenges for effective performance. In order to improve their teaching work effectively, teachers need to have suitable and good resources, good school environment, satisfaction, recognition and adequately compensated to increase their commitment to their duties as well as sufficient classroom teaching materials.

## 1.2 Study objectives

- To find out relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and teachers' performances in public secondary schools
- To evaluate the impact of laissez faire leadership on teaching and learning process in public secondary schools
- To assess the influence of laissez-faire leadership style toward teachers' attitude in public secondary schools

## 2. Past Literature

Empirical literature review is a comprehensive summary of previous research on a topic. The literature review surveys scholarly articles, books, and other sources relevant to a particular area of research. The review enumerated, described, summarized, objectively evaluate and clarify this previous research. Under this sub section, different articles, books, and other sources relevant to a particular area of research were discussed according to each specific objective.

### 2.4.1 The laissez-faire Leadership Styles and Teachers Performances

Laissez- faire leadership style in educational organization is a very precarious issue to be discussed because it's more crucial to the teacher performance in their work (Nguni, 2005).

In his study, Lutego (2015) revealed that different leadership styles that used by colleges' principal were participative, autocratic and laissez-faire style. In addition to that, Lutego's work found that things like staff obligation, acquaintance, idleness, truancy and conflicts are among the driven factors that contributed to the implementation of particular leadership style. Furthermore, the leadership style used in public school or work places have direct influence on working performance of the staff. Therefore, different leadership styles were needed for different situations in the school site so to improve performance.

Furthermore, Omar (2016) conducted a study on the effect of leadership styles on performance of secondary schools in Wadajir District. The study utilized quantitative approach where it implied that most secondary schools' principals adopted democratic and transformational leadership styles than any type of other leadership style. Also the study found that there is less effect between principals' laissez-faire leadership style and school performances because the principals' laissez-faire failed to make follow up on those they have delegated tasks. This resulted in performance decline because of lack of necessary skills, knowledge, and competence on the side of subordinates to execute the assigned tasks.

In East Tennessee-USA, Schwartz (2017) explored on the relationship between teachers' overall job satisfaction and principal leadership styles. The study results portrayed that,

in *laissez-faire* leadership style teachers are often left without guidance and support from the management thereby bringing negative relationship and hence lack of satisfaction, low performance and lack of motivation on the side of teachers. In the same manner, Imhangbe, *et al.* (2019) investigated the relationship between principals' leadership styles and secondary school teachers' job performance in Nigeria where a correlation designed was adopted for the study. The study findings showed that democratic and *laissez-faire* styles had the most prominent positive influence on teachers' job performance.

Beside this, Dussault, *et al.* (2008) conducted an assessment to test the relationship of principals' Transformational, Transactional and *laissez-faire* leadership with teacher collective efficacy in Canada whereby 487 French Canadian teachers from 40 public high schools were selected as sample. The study results indicated that, there was positive correlation between principals' transformational and transactional while the relationship between *laissez-faire* leadership and teachers' collective efficacy remained negative correlation.

In Pakistan, Ali and Waqar (2013) made a study on the organizational citizenship leadership style among the school teachers. Ali and Waqar's study included 129 individuals having 120 school teachers and 9 school heads. The results demonstrated that organizational citizenship behavior of school teachers was significantly related to leadership styles. In addition to that transformational leadership style was found to be related with high citizenships behaviors followed by transactional leadership style of school head. Also, the study showed that school teachers working under *laissez-faire* leadership exhibited the least organizational citizenship behavior.

Also, Adeyemi (2010) looked on principals' leadership and teachers' job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State (Nigeria). The study found that the democratic style was the most commonly used leadership style among principals of the senior secondary schools. Adeyemi's work demonstrated that teachers' job performance was found to be better in secondary schools having principals using autocratic style of leadership than in schools having principals using democratic or *laissez-faire* leadership styles. Furthermore, the study concluded that *laissez-faire* style should be discouraged among school principals as it could never bring a better job performance among teachers

#### **2.4.2 The Laissez Faire and Teaching and learning process**

In Kenya, Oyugi and Gogo (2019) conducted a study on the influence of principals' leadership styles on students' academic performance in secondary school. The study portrayed that leadership styles are among the determinant factor for academic achievement and learning instrument. Also, the study reveals that in order to improve learning and teaching strategies, principals are required to balance using both democratic and autocratic leadership styles while avoiding *laissez-faire* leadership style.

In the same manner, Adeyemi (2010) found that *laissez-faire* is another common leadership style used by principals of senior secondary schools in Ondo State (Nigeria). Furthermore, the study results revealed that *laissez-faire* teachers have complete freedom in teaching process without interference from the management. Teachers are free to do what they like for instance making decisions, setting goals etc. while the management role is only about supplying

needed materials to the teachers.

However, Schwartz (2017) assessed that, *laissez-faire* is characterized by the absence of teacher's leadership towards their students because there is very limited interaction between teachers and students. Also, the findings highlighted that *laissez-faire* style has always done with little changes because a *laissez-faire* teacher never give feedback about teaching and learning process. *Laissez-faire* teachers make no efforts to meet the needs of their students and are less likely to give attention to their needs also.

In Iran, Mostafi and Mohsemi (2018) examined the effect of class management type on teacher professional development among Iranian EFL teachers. The study found that the *laissez-faire* teachers are not involved in the classroom where things like field trips and special projects are out of question. Also, study indicated that *laissez-faire* teachers had never took the necessary preparation time and sometimes teachers have used the same materials year after year. Also, findings portrayed that through *laissez-faire* leadership, classroom discipline is lacking because teachers lack skills, confidence and courage to discipline students

Similarly, Aruzie, *et al.* (2018) looked on the impact of leadership styles on teaching and learning outcomes in Ghana. The Aruzie's work demonstrated that *laissez-faire* style breeds laziness and laxity among staff because mostly of *laissez-faire* teachers tend to relax and feel that students know what to do. This resulted into teacher's giving room for students to operate within their own mindsets and forget that supervision is very important in the students' learning development.

In the same manner, Nthoki (2017) who stressed on influence of primary head teachers' leadership styles on pupils' academic performance in Kenya. The study concluded that, *laissez-faire* style has negative influence on pupils' performance because majority of *laissez-faire* teachers were lazy and the least productive.

In his study, Milenovic (2015) analyzed the teaching styles of primary school teachers in Serbia. The finding of study implied that teacher style of a course teacher is mainly autocratic while democratic and *laissez-faire* styles are more present in the teaching of class teacher. Also, results argued that through *laissez-faire* style there is minimal involvement of teacher in pupils' learning process hence pupils have complete freedom to choose methods they want for achieving their aims and teachers provide information to the pupils for their work once is needed.

Additionally, Wirba (2015) whose study based on leadership styles of secondary school principal in Cameroon. The study applied qualitative approach with semi structure interview was used to obtain relevant information from respondents. The findings stated that *laissez-faire* style is the hand off style of class management where teacher exercise little control over his students and teacher make little personal contact with students in their studies. The study noticed that *laissez-faire* teachers abandon their responsibilities, delay decisions and make little efforts to help students to satisfy their needs as well as help them to grow academically

#### **2.4.3 The laissez-faire leadership style and Teachers 'attitude in Public Secondary Schools**

Furthermore, Roman (2017) investigated on the teaching strategies used to maintain classroom order. The Roman's work indicated that, the *laissez-faire* strategies for classroom order is characterized by geniality and teacher tolerance of

disruptive behavior where teacher believed in friendly approach to become accepted as a peer of their students. Likewise, teachers using this strategy believe this acceptance is directly related to the gain of students respect toward them and avoid evoking misbehavior from students.

Also, Zinduli, *et al.* (2018) examined on leadership style of secondary school principals in South Africa. The study found that, in Laissez-Faire style teachers advocate minimal supervision and moderate involvement in the instructional process. Teachers stand as supplier of the materials and ideas, and sometimes only participate whenever the need arises. In addition, the study found that laissez-faire teacher seem frustrated and aimless because their students are doing wrong things without realizing it and more worse teachers are not making follow up on students when they are working resulting in poor performance, low productivity and less personal growth.

In South Africa, Shonubi (2012) looked on how leadership and management dynamics contribute to school effectiveness. The results believed that laissez-faire style is applicable in the class room when the teacher believes in the student center teaching style. Also, the study argued that the personal happiness and development that students experience in the classroom are more important than subject contents where a teacher plays supportive role and remains in the background instead of giving much direction in the teaching-learning activities. Furthermore, the findings concluded that laissez-faire style seems bored and unattractive to teachers since students propose classroom rules and procedures as well as make their own decisions on class activities and at the end an informal type of discipline is applied in the classroom. In addition, the study found that when a teacher applies this classroom leadership style to all situations, teaching may not be successful since it has very little learning work

In the same manner, Aruzie *et al.* (2018) stated that laissez faire teachers have little accountability and supervision because they believe that their major role is simply to supply the needed materials to staff. Furthermore, the results had noticed that teachers are just witnessed and refuse to take actions in situations where students behave wrongly that ultimately producing more risking effects by their inactions.

Sadiki (2015) investigated primary school teachers' view about their classroom management behavior in Turkey, Sadiki's study found that, teachers with laissez faire behaviors usually have as less as possible points of contact and their expectations as well as classroom rules are not very clear. Also, the study demonstrated that laissez faire teachers are not consistent and employ the classroom rules very rarely and they don't take good care of lesson preparation and worse enough they are more interested in their own needs rather than learning standards in their classrooms.

Additionally, Mahmood (2007) examined on the least common multiple of teacher leadership styles and its implication for classroom. The findings of the study revealed that laissez-faire teachers seem tired, careless, disappointed

and de-motivated where it is not offering any stimulant and there are no challenges to be overcome because laissez-faire style generates tedious and repetitive work. Also, the study found that laissez-faire style reflects the teacher's incompetence and lack of aptitude that result in lack of cognitive engagement and lack of perseverance.

### 3. Methodology

The study used a mixed research approach in order to obtain relevant and in-depth data that fulfill the objectives as also proposed by Kothari (2004). Kombo and Tromp (2006) added that qualitative research is a form of research that involves description to the obtained data.

By using a mixed methods approach, researcher was able to complement each other and because the strengths of one method was used to offset the weakness of the other. Also, it enabled a researcher to relate particular aspects of behavior to the wider context. Therefore, this study used mixed research approach to enable the researcher to get direct explanations and numerical data such as statistics and percentage on how the leadership styles affect teacher's professionalism.

The target population of the researcher was the three public secondary schools in study setting, 3 head of schools, 77 secondary school teachers. Creswell (2012) defines population as a group of individuals who have the same characteristics. The sample size of the study was 80 respondents. 77 secondary school teachers were involved in the quantitative part of the study. On the other hand, 3 school heads from three selected secondary Schools were involved in the qualitative phase of the study.

The study used purposive sampling to select the heads of secondary schools for semi-structured interview. On the other hand, the study used stratified sampling to identify secondary school teachers. The researcher included 50% of males and females from the study area. Stratified sampling used in order to give equal chance to both male and female teachers.

### 4. Study findings

In this study, the researcher interviewed 3 school heads, and all questions were answered, giving a response rate of 100 percent. In the same line, the researcher distributed a total number of 77 questionnaire papers to students. Out of these, 70 questionnaires were returned completely filled by the students while only 7 questionnaires were incomplete giving a response rate of 91 percent. Thus, according to Morton and Carr (2012), the response will be considered to be enough if it will have a response rate of 70 percent and above.

#### 4.2 Demographic information of teachers (n=70)

The section was interested in finding out the gender, age, and experience and education qualification of the academic staff. The data collected in this respect was analyzed and the results are summarized in the table below (**table no. 4.1**)

**Table 4.1:** Demographic variables of teachers (n= 70)

Variable		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	35	56
	Female	25	44
Age	21-30	22	19
	31-40	38	34
	41-50	12	10

	50 and above	08	8
<b>Highest education Qualification</b>			
	Certificate	00	00
	Diploma	10	13
	Degree	69	86
	Master Degree	01	1
<b>Teaching experience</b>			
	5 Years and below	30	42
	6 – 11 Years	24	34
	12 – and above	16	24
<b>Marital Status</b>			
	Married	52	65
	Single	28	35

Source: Research findings, 2020.

Table 4.1 Demonstrates the finding of participants by age and it revealed that 8 percent of all respondents were in the category of 50 years and above, while 15 percent of respondents ranged between 41-50 years. Respondents between the age of 21-30 were 19 percent. The highest number of respondents by age ranged between 31-40 years and represented 34 percent. These findings point out that majority of the teachers in Temeke Municipality, were very young and energetic to carry out the task of teaching. However, this category of age may lead the young teachers to mishandle the work or if they are not well paid can easily quite to find employment somewhere else with green pastures.

Working experience was significant in this study as it helped to collect respondents' views. Table 4.1 above, portrays the statistical findings of the respondents by work experience. The study revealed that 42 percent of respondents had work experience below 5 years, while 34 percent had work experience between 6-10 years, and teachers who had experience more than 12 years were 24 percent. This shows that, all teachers in selected secondary schools in Temeke Municipality were having enough experience to perform their duties. It is also believed that experienced teachers accumulate competency and become more effective in teaching process.

Working experience in schools with special needs was very important in this study as it helped to collect respondents' views on the challenges of leadership process in these schools.

The study findings demonstrated that all teachers were having experience of teaching in secondary schools and having great experience in leadership. Hence, this implies that details gathered from questionnaires were valid since respondents had experience of working in schools and had managed to handle many challenges in their daily activities. Highest level of education reached was very important to look at this study. The study demonstrated that 13 percent were Diploma holders, while 86 percent were Degree holders and 01 percent was Master Degree holder. This implies that educational qualification is very important in school management and in teaching and learning process since Master Degree holder teachers have enough knowledge, expertise, competency and efficiency in teaching and are able to manage school daily activities when compared to Diploma or Certificate holders.

#### 4.4. Research findings according to the specific objectives and questionnaires.

Based on the background of the study it was necessary for the researcher to identify the effects of head teachers' leadership styles on teachers' professionalism in secondary schools in Temeke Municipality in Tanzania.

##### 4.4.1. Head schools' Laissez-faire leadership style and its effect on teachers' performance.

The study aimed to find out relationship between school heads' laissez-faire leadership style and teacher's performance.

**Figure 4.1:** Shows head schools' Laissez-faire leadership style and its effect on teachers' performance

##### School performance Percentage

Less productivity 30  
Less personal growth 20  
Lack of competence and creativity 15  
Poor academic performance 35

**Total 100**

Source: Research field 2020

Figure 4.1 shows that 30 % of all respondents strongly disagree with head schools' laissez faire style with school and academic productivity at all. This means that, in the classroom there is no follow up of what staffs and students are doing. Therefore, this style of leadership does not give a room for creativity hence people will work by habit and not by instructional or ethical conducts.

In interview, one of school Head says,

*“The main negative is that laissez faire allows firms to do bad things to their workers and their little supervision at classroom and students given power to exercise their duty they want.”*

This indicates that teachers and students at Temeke Municipality have lower commitment and lack of creativity to perform some duties thereby lowering their efficiency and effectiveness.

Also, there little effort and strong cooperation from the school management on support teachers' activities that at end productivity become less. This study agreed with Roman

(2017) who commented that laissez-faire style fails to challenge students to mature well academically since there no strong effort and little supervision on teacher on instruction process.

Also, result shows that, some 20 % of all respondents responded “No” to the question that, laissez-faire style contributes a lot in personal growth in intellectual and academically development. Since it has poor management and supervision to the staffs and students, laissez-faire style lacks clear vision and aimless on reaching intellectual growth because teachers and students decide on their own without clear vision since management are hand off on things done by his subordinates.

#### One of Head of school responded that,

*“At an organizational/institutional level, by being indecisive and uninvolved, it is difficult for us to mature intellectually”.* This means that school’s academic achievement can be attained only if there is good communication between school management, staff and students. Unfortunately, in these schools where research was conducted there is no strong relationship between school managements and subordinates. As a result some are left behind with no support and supervision and hence very difficult to grow academically. This study supported by Nthoki (2017) who claimed that under the laissez –faire style there hand off of principals to their staffs so teachers become unsatisfied with management situation at school that left them back at intellectual. Furthermore, the findings show that 15% claimed that laissez -faire style discourage attainment of creativity and competence level on their activities since management do not interfere on what teachers doing. This reduce morale of work at school because teachers and other staff members remain static and unsatisfied with some activities operated within the school.

#### From the interview one of the teachers said

*“There is no good lesson preparation, no field trips so this style is least creative and competence...”*

This indicates the, almost all teachers at Temeke Municipality lack enough support to raise creativity and competence level in the classroom. Study tours and school projects are not well supported with laissez-faire style of leadership where some of teachers use same materials and notes for so long thereby becoming a hindrance for students and teachers to improve competence and reach creativity. This study concurred with Zinduli *et al.* (2018), who believed that laissez-faire style makes teachers and students become lazy because this system has no follow up of the activities done at the classroom and hence motivation for staff who perform well is too low.

Moreover, results indicated that 35% of participants declared that laissez-faire has negative relationship with school performance. Supervision are very crucial in teaching and learning but unfortunately laissez-faire teachers are not involved in supervising students. Also, teachers have less commitment to fulfill responsibilities which lead to low productivity and at the end performance decline.

From interview one of the head teacher stated that:

*“Performance is not well under laissez-faire style since this style is less creativity and productivity”.*

Hence, it can be said that majority of public secondary schools in Temeke Municipality which are under the laissez-faire style of leadership are not performing well in examinations because administration and teachers in general lack creativity and have no clear vision no how to perform their duties effectively and efficiently as a result performance becomes low.

This study is supported by Wirba (2015), who stated that laissez-faire style results on demonization and disappointment on the side of teachers. They become discouraged and less productive and consequently poor performance occur at national examination level.

#### 4.4.2: Impact of head schools' Laissez-faire on teaching and learning process in public secondary school

The study aimed at finding out the impact of school heads' laissez-faire leadership style on teaching and learning process.

Figure 4.1:

*Shows the impacts of head schools' Laissez-faire leadership style on teaching and learning process*

#### School performance Percentage

Less productivity 30

Less personal growth 20

Lack of competence and creativity 15

Poor academically performance 35

**Total 100**

**Source: Research field 2020**

Figure 4.2 shows that 40% of respondents stated that laissez-faire leadership are negative significant with supervision to the subordinates. It seems that subordinates directed and managed themselves since they are competent and they know how and what to do thus school management remain minimal involvement.

#### From the interview with one of the teachers claimed that:

*“Everything was left in the hands of teachers. School management thought that we are competent and efficient so teachers should decide and do on their ways”.*

This means that, at the organization level, for goals and objectives to be successful, leadership is needed to take its part in supervising organization activities. Unfortunately, at Temeke Municipality, laissez-faire schools have no close personal contact between the teachers and management hence teachers are performing varieties of responsibility without management interference.

This finding of study agreed with Milenovic (2015), who analyzed that through laissez-faire style there is minimal involvement of teacher in pupils’ learning process hence pupils have complete freedom and they choose methods they want for achieving their aims teachers only provide information to the pupils for their work when it is needed.

From the respondent’s side, 35% claimed that laissez faire has narrow chance for class preparation where teachers may use the same notes and materials every year. Also, there is little chance of creativity because there are no projects and study tours something which dwarf staffs and students' competency.

During the interview one of the teachers demonstrated that:

*“Performance is not well, this system is very unattractive and boring because there is no study tour, project and class preparation for teachers”*

This means that laissez faire teachers believe that students have prior knowledge about subjects and there is no need to prepare study tour and even extra studies. This study is supported by **Sadiki (2015)**, who found that teachers with laissez faire behaviors are not consistent and employ the classroom rules very rarely and they don't take good care of lesson preparation and worst enough they are more interested in their own needs rather than learning standards in their classrooms.

Also, 25% of participants responded that school heads' laissez faire have no impact on follow up of activities done by students. Teachers are responsible only for supplying notes to students rather than supervising them effectively in teaching and learning process.

From the interview one of the teachers believed that:

*“Once laissez faire teachers teach, they never check again if students understood or not”*

This implies that laissez faire style at Temeke Municipality has little impact in developing students' talent since there is no follow up over things or works done by students at classroom. This study has got much support from Schwartz (2017) who highlighted that, laissez-faire style has always done with little changes because a laissez-faire teacher never gives feedback about teaching and learning process. Teachers make no efforts to meet the needs of the students and are less likely to give attention to the students to assist their needs.

#### **4.4.3. Head schools' Laissez-faire leadership style and its effect on teachers' attitude**

The study intended to find out relationship between school heads' laissez-faire leadership style and teacher's attitude.

Figure 4.3:

*Shows head of schools' Laissez-faire leadership style and its effect on teachers' attitude*

##### **Teachers' attitude Percentage**

Laziness and frustration 35

Bored and unattractive 30

Disappointment and demonization 25

Less commitment and lack of discipline 10

**Total 100**

**Source: Research field 2020**

Figure 4.3 shows that head of schools' laissez faire style had negative significant with teachers' attitude where 30 % of all respondents claimed that head of schools' laissez-faire encourages laziness and frustration to the staffs and students since majority of head teachers' laissez-faire are not accountable in full in supervising and managing teaching and learning process. They believe that subordinates are fully competent and knowledgeable and they understand what to do.

**From the interview one teacher claimed that:**

*“Laissez-faire style encourage laziness and frustration than creativity because students have freedom to propose classroom rules instead of teachers”*

This means that laissez-faire style denied both teachers and students opportunity of being creative and committed. At Temeke Municipality, majority of teachers are so lazy and careless since they stand as watchdog and they don't follow up on those assignments given to students and once mistakes are done no one is there to give them proper direction. This study concurred with, Nthoki (2017) who stressed that, laissez-faire style has negative influence on pupils' performance because majority of laissez-faire teachers were lazy and tired leading to low productivity.

Moreover, results indicated that 30% of participants declared that laissez-faire style of leadership was bore ring and unattractive because teachers looked tired while students seemed to be frustrated resulting in lack of motivation and support from management.

From the interview one teacher argued that: *“Motivation is key point in teaching and learning, unfortunately this style is not motivating us instead it makes us disappointed”*

This means in order to attain and achieve set goals, teachers needed to be motivated in order to improve their performance. However, majority of head schools' laissez faire failed to be accountable to their subordinates. This study is supported by Nthoki (2017) and Wirba (2015) who claimed that, laissez faire style gives complete freedom to students in making decisions on classroom rules and procedures resulting in their teachers being neglected and bored.

In the same manner, study findings showed that 25% of respondents revealed that teachers and students under laissez faire style are disappointed and de-motivated because head schools' laissez-faire style failed to satisfy and motivate staffs to do their best level by supplying teaching materials and making the working environment to be conducive.

From the interview one among the teachers demonstrated that:

*“It is disappointing us because there is no enough cooperation between teachers and management”*

This demonstrates that, teachers need full support at work in order to bring positive results. Instead, head teachers' laissez faire have never shown support and commitment to the teachers at the end of the day, everything is left in the hands of teachers to decide. This result concurred with Wirba (2015) who claimed that, school management has little efforts to motivate their teachers thus making them unable to meet their academic demands.

Similarly, 10% of respondents concluded that laissez faire style lacks discipline and commitment on performing tasks because head teachers are not committed enough to assist their subordinates. School management have little accountability to shape student's behavior due to their minimal involvement on them.

**From the interview one of the teachers stated that:**

*“Management is not committed well to some responsibilities and there is little effort from the top leaders”*

Consequently, head teachers at Temeke Municipality are less involved in supporting their staff and there is a little cooperation between management and staff which leads to poor educational development. Also, it seems that at classroom, students misbehave since they have full freedom

of doing things that they want even though some of them are wrong but no one can assist to change their behavior. This finding agreed with Shinubi (2012) who argued that, almost students misbehave at the classroom because they have enough freedom of making decision on ways of teaching and learning. Head teachers are not committed well to complete their responsibility by taking actions once students behave wrongly.

## 5. Conclusion

Laissez-faire model of leadership is more an effective style to use when: followers are highly skilled, experienced, and educated; followers have pride in their work and the drive to do it successfully on their own. Also, this leadership style has been associated with lower productivity than both autocratic and democratic styles of leadership and with lower group member satisfaction than democratic leadership.

From this study, it was found that laissez-faire leadership leads to negative consequences in subordinates' performance and attitudes since it has less significant to the academic productivity and creativity to the subordinates. Also, this study revealed that laissez-faire style is the hands off on things done by subordinates and lacks clear vision and aimless on reaching intellectual growth.

In other hand, the results of the study found that head schools' laissez faire style had negative impact on the teachers' attitude where it encourages laziness and frustration to staff and students. Moreover, results indicated that laissez-faire has boredom and unattractive where laissez-faire teachers looked to be tired and frustrated and students are unsatisfied to meet their needs. In the same manner, study findings revealed that teachers and students under laissez faire style are disappointed and unmotivated because head schools' laissez-faire style failed to satisfy and motivate their staff.

## 6. References

1. Ali U, Waqar S. Teachers' organizational citizenship behavior working under different leadership style. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*. 2013; 28(2):297-316.
2. Alhaji S. Relationship between school principals' leadership styles. *Proceedings of the Third Asia Pacific Business Research Conference*; 2013 Feb 25-26; Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. ISBN 978-1-922069.
3. Adepoju TL. The factors militating against effective planning and implementation of educational policies in Nigeria. *WAEC Monthly Seminar*. 1996; 7:13-28.
4. Adeyemi TO. Principals' leadership styles and teachers' job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies*. 2010; 2(6):83-91.
5. Adeyemi TO. The impact of leadership styles on employee performance in Kampala District Council. *Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda*. 2013.
6. Armstrong M. *Term Rewards*. London: London Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development; 2003.
7. Aruzie *et al*. The impact of leadership styles on teaching and learning outcomes: a case study of selected senior high school in the Nkronza Districts of Brong Ahafo Region in Ghana. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*. 2018; 6(12):797-825.
8. Akelele SA. Principals' leadership styles and teachers' job performance in Lagos State public secondary schools. *MEd Thesis, University of Lagos*. 2007.
9. Bailey JM, Dunne MP, Martin NG. Genetic and environmental influences on sexual orientation and its correlates in an Australian twin sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2000; 78(3):524-536.
10. Base BM, Avolio BJ (Eds). *Improving educational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
11. Bass BM. *Leadership and performance expectation*. New York: Free Press; 1985.
12. Bennis W, Nanus S. *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper & Row; 1985.
13. Bishop P. *Nietzsche and Antiquity: His Reaction and Response to the Classical Tradition*. Camden House; 2004. p. 94. ISBN 9781571132826.
14. Bogdan RC, Biklen SK. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon; 1992.
15. Borg WR, Gall MD. *Educational Research: An Introduction*. New York: Longman Inc.; 1998.
16. Brownwell J. A Model for Listening Instruction: Management Applications. *Bulletin of the Association for Business Communications*. 1985; 48:39-44.
17. Burn JM. *Transforming Leadership*. New York, NY: Grove Press; 2003.
18. Bwiruka JF. *Leadership style of lead of teachers' performance in selected secondary schools in Bushenyi District*. Makerere University, Uganda; 2009.
19. Carlyle T. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History*. New York: Fredrick A. Stokes & Brother; 1888. p. 2.
20. Chandan JS. *Management Theory and Practice*. New York: Vikas Publishing; 1987.
21. Chapman A. *Effective Delegation Skills; Delegation Techniques, Process*. Retrieved on 10 May 2016 from <http://www.businessballs.com/delegation.htm>.
22. Cheng YC, Mullins A. *Leadership and Strategy: The Principle and Practice of Educational Management*.
23. Chirchir RK. Leadership style and teachers' commitment in public primary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*. 2014; 5:39.
24. Cole BR. Barriers to implementation of patient safety systems in healthcare institutions: leadership and policy implications. *Journal of Patient Safety*. 2005; 1(1):9-16.
25. Creswell JW. *Educational Research, Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston, MA: Pearson; 2012.
26. Davies J, Wilson S. Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress (electronic version). *Clearing House*. 2003; 73(6):349-353.
27. Dussault M, *et al*. Principals' transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership with teacher collective efficacy. *Psychological Reports*. 2008; 102(2):401-410.
28. Eboka OC. Principals' leadership styles and gender influence on teacher morale in public secondary schools. *Journal of Educational and Practices*. 2016; 7(15):35-32.
29. Evans MG. The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance Journal*. 1970; 5:277.
30. Ezeuwo (2005). *Issues in educational management*. Enugu: Hipuks Additional Press.



31. Fielder FE, House RJ. Leadership Theory and Research, A Report of Progress. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 1988; 19:88.
32. Gall MD, Gall JP, Borg WR. *Educational Research: An Introduction*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.; 2007.
33. Goldman C, Riordan CM, Zhang L. Employees' perceptions of their leaders: Is being similar always better. *Journal of Group Organizational Management*. 2008; 33(3):330-355.
34. Goldman E. The Significance of Leadership Style. *Journal of Educational Leadership*. 2002; 55(7):20-22.
35. Hackman MZ, Johnson CE. *Leadership: A Communication Perspective*. 5th ed. Long Grove: Waveland Press; 2009.
36. Hirsch ED. *The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy*. Third Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company; 2002.
37. House RJ. A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1971; 16:321-328.
38. House RJ. Path-Goal Theory of Leadership. *A Journal of Contemporary Business*. 1968; 5:81-97.
39. House RJ, Mitchell TR. Path-Goal Theory of Leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*. 1974; 3:1-97.
40. Hoy WK, Miskel CG. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. New Jersey: McGraw-Hill Inc.; 2001.
41. Imhangbe OS. How leadership and management dynamics contribute to school effectiveness in South Africa. Department of Education Management and Policy Studies: University of Pretoria; 2012.
42. Lydiah LM, Nasongo JW. Role of the head teacher in academic achievement in secondary school in Vihinga District, Kenya. *Current Research Journal of Social Science*. 2009; 1(3):84-92.
43. Mahmood K. Least common multiple of teacher leadership styles: Implication for classroom. Institute for Educational Development: Aga Khan University; 2007.
44. Milenovic Z. The teaching styles of primary school teachers. Faculty of Teacher Education, Prizren-Leposavic: University of Pristina-Kosovska Mitrovica; 2015.
45. Miller PW. *Nonverbal Communication: What a Researcher Says to the Teachers*. USA: Nea; 1998. 6-22 pp.
46. Mostafi and Mohsemi. The effect of class management type on teacher professional development among Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*. 2018; 5(5):248-265.
47. Mugenda OM, Mugenda AG. *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approach*. Nairobi: Acts Press; 2003.
48. Mullins IJ. *Management and Organizational Behavior*. London: Pitman Publishing; 1993.
49. Mwalala DB. The influence of head teachers' leadership styles on performance in public secondary schools in Taita District. Unpublished MEd Project, University of Nairobi; 2008.
50. Namusonge JA. Basic and Applied Research. *International Journal of Sciences*. 2015; 22.
51. Nguni SC. *Transformational Leadership in Tanzanian Education*. Netherlands: Drukkerij Quick Print BV; 2005.
52. Njuguna FW. A Study of Head Teachers' Leadership Styles and Students' Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Nairobi. An Unpublished Thesis for Award (M.Ed.) Degree at University of Nairobi, Kenya.
53. Northouse PG. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.; 2007.
54. Nthoki MP. Influence of primary head teachers' leadership styles on pupils' academic performance at Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Mbooni Division, Makueni County, Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies*. 2017; 2017.
55. Nwachukwu C. *Management Theory and Practice*. Onitsha: Africana-Fed Publishers Limited; 1988.
56. Oduro GK. *Distributed Leadership in Schools: What English Head Teachers Say About the Pull and Push Factors*. An Unpublished Paper; 2004.
57. Okoye JC. *Advanced Personnel Management*. An Unpublished Master's Lecture Notes, NAU, Awka, Nigeria; 1997.
58. Omari IM. *Concept and Methods in Educational Research; Practical Guide Based on Experience*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press; 2011.
59. Omar AM, Kavale S. The effect of leadership styles on performance of secondary schools in Wadajir District, Mogadishu, Somalia. *Journal Applied Management Science*. 2016; 2(5):52-70.
60. Omeke FC, Onah KA. The influence of principal's leadership styles on secondary school teacher's job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. 2012; 2(9):46.
61. Omolayo B. Effects of Leadership Styles on Job Related Tension and Psychological Sense of Community in Work Organizations: A study of Four Organizations in Lagos State, Nigeria. 2009; 4(2):133-157pp.
62. Onen D. Leadership styles and behavior relationships on employee performance. Handout for postgraduate students. Kampala: Makerere University Printer; 2008.
63. Onen D. Leadership Style and Behaviors Relationship on Employee Performance. Uganda: Makerere University Printery; 2008.
64. Orodho AJ, Kombo DK. *Research Method*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University Open and Learning Module; 2002.
65. Orodho JA. *Elements of Education and Social Sciences Research Methods*. Nairobi: Masola Publisher; 2005.
66. Orodho JA, Kombo D. *Research Methods*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University Institute of Open Learning; 2003.
67. Osabiya B. The Impact of Leadership Style on Employee's Performance in an Organization. Lagos: National Open University of Nigeria; 2015.
68. Osei GM. *Teacher in Ghana; Issues of Training, Remuneration and Effectiveness*. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 2006; 26(1).
69. Owens RG. *Organizational Behavior in Education*. 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall; 1981.
70. Oxford. *Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005.
71. Raina VK, Dhand H. Reflections on Teaching History in the Developing World: An Indian Experience. *International Journal for Social Studies*. 2000; 5:84-88pp.
72. Roman D. *Teaching Strategies Used to Maintain Classroom Order*. Marygrove College; 2017.
73. Sadiki L. Towards a democratic knowledge' turn? Knowledge production in the age of the Arab Spring. *The Journal of North African Studies*. 2015; 20(5):702-

- 721.
74. Schwartz GJ. The Relationship Between Teacher Job Satisfaction and Principal Leadership Styles: The Faculty of the Education Department, Carson-Newman University. 2017.
  75. Shaughnessy J. Research Methods in Psychology. India: McGraw Hill; 2003.
  76. Shonubi OK. How leadership and management dynamics contribute to school effectiveness in South Africa. Department of Education Management and Policy Studies: University of Pretoria; 2012.
  77. Stake RE. Qualitative Case Study: Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2003.
  78. Stogdill RM. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: Free Press; 1974.
  79. Talbert JE, Milbrey WM. Teacher Professionalism in Local School Contexts. International Educational Journal. 1994; 8:123-153.
  80. Tayie S. Research Methods and Writing Research Proposal. Cairo: CAPSCU Publisher; 2005.
  81. Orodho AJ, Kombo DK. Research Method. Nairobi: Kenyatta University Open and Learning Module; 2002.
  82. Orodho JA. Elements of Education and Social Sciences Research Methods. Nairobi: Masola Publisher; 2005.
  83. Orodho JA, Kombo D. Research Methods. Nairobi: Kenyatta University Institute of Open Learning; 2002.
  84. Osabiya B. The Impact of Leadership Style on Employee's Performance in an Organization. Lagos: National Open University of Nigeria; 2015.
  85. Osei GM. Teacher in Ghana; Issues of Training, Remuneration and Effectiveness. Int J Educ Dev. 2006; 26(1).
  86. Owens RG. Organizational Behavior in Education. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall; 1981.
  87. Oxford. Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005.
  88. Oyugi M, Gogo JO. Influence of principals' leadership styles on students' academic performance in secondary schools in Awendo sub-county, Kenya. Afr Educ Res J. 2018; 7(1):22-28.
  89. Portugal E, Yukl G. Perspectives on environmental leadership. Leadership Q. 1994; 5(3-4):271-276.
  90. Raina VK, Dhand H. Reflections on Teaching History in the Developing World: An Indian Experience. Int J Soc Stud. 2000; 5:84-88.
  91. Roman D. Teaching Strategies Used to Maintain Classroom Order. Marygrove College; 2017.
  92. Sadiki L. Towards a democratic knowledge' turn? Knowledge production in the age of the Arab Spring. J North Afr Stud. 2015; 20(5):702-721.
  93. Schwartz GJ. The Relationship Between Teacher Job Satisfaction and Principal Leadership Styles: The Faculty of the Education Department, Carson-Newman University; 2017.
  94. Shaughnessy J. Research Methods in Psychology. India: McGraw Hill; 2003.
  95. Shonubi OK. How leadership and management dynamics contribute to school effectiveness in South Africa. Department of Educ Manag Policy Stud: University of Pretoria; 2012.
  96. Stake RE. Qualitative Case Study: Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2003.
  97. Stogdill RM. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: Free Press; 1974.
  98. Talbert JE, Milbrey WM. Teacher Professionalism in Local School Contexts. Int Educ J. 1994; 8:123-153.
  99. Tayie S. Research Methods and Writing Research Proposal. Cairo: CAPSCU Publisher; 2005.
  100. Tranter S, Percival A. How to Run Your School Successfully. London: Continuum Publishers; 2004.
  101. Ukeje BO. Educational Administration. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.; 1992.
  102. Ukeje BO. The Education of Teachers for a New Social Order. Nigeria: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.; 1999.
  103. URT. Educational Sector Development Programmed (2008-17). Dar es Salaam: MOEVT. Tanzania; 2008.
  104. Vroom VH. Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley Publishing Ltd.; 1964.
  105. Yukl G. Leadership in Organizations. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall; 1994.
  106. Lunenberg FC, Ornstein AC. Educational Administration: Concepts and Practice. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning; 1999.
  107. Mgbodile TA (Ed). Fundamentals in Educational Administration and Planning. Enugu: Magnet Business Enterprises; 2013.
  108. Obi E. Educational Theory and Practice. Enugu: Jomeo Enterprises Nigeria; 2003.
  109. Okafor HC. The relationship between the principal's leadership style and teachers job performance of secondary school in Anambra state. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Nigeria Nsukka; 1991.
  110. Omolayo B. Psychology of human beings at work (An introduction). Ado-Ekiti: Crown House Publication; 2000. pp.12-20.
  111. Schacter J, Thum YM. Paying for high- and low-quality teaching "Economics of Education Review. 2004; 2:411-430. Retrieved October 3, 2005, from [www.elsevier.com/locate/econbase](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/econbase).
  112. Ukeje BO. The education of teachers for new social order the Nigerian teacher.
  113. Wenlinsky H. Teachers' classroom practice and students' performance. How school makes a difference. Retrieved June 25, 2005, from <http://www.etc.org/research/dload/ribr-01-19.pdf>.
  114. Wirba AV. Leadership styles: school perspective in Cameroon. Education Research International. 2015.
  115. Zinduli *et al.* Leadership Styles of Secondary School Principals: South African Cases. Faculty of Educational Sciences, Walter Sisulu University: Int J Edu Sci. 2019; 22(1-3):1-10. DOI: 10.31901/24566322.2019/23.1-3.911.