THE EFFECT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL AND BUREAUCRATIC STYLES OF LEADERSHIP ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHER SUPPORT SUPERVISION

Kate N. Tibagwa[1], David Onen[2], Joseph Oonyu[3]
[1,2,3]Makerere University, College of Education and External Studies,
Kampala, Uganda

Abstract:

This paper discusses the effect of two leadership styles, namely: transformational and bureaucratic styles of leadership as practiced by head teachers on the quality of support supervision they offer primary teachers in Mid-western Uganda. The study arose as a result of public outcry over the poor quality and limited amount of support supervision teachers in primary schools in that region of the country are offered despite numerous attempts by Government to train school heads in institutional management. The researchers employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey research design where quantitative and qualitative data were collected from 320 teachers and 20 educational administrators using questionnaire survey and interview methods. The data were analyzed with the use of descriptive and inferential statistical techniques as well as content analysis method. The findings of the study revealed that both transformational (B=.365; p=.000) and bureaucratic (B=.250; p=.000) styles of leadership significantly affect the quality of support supervision that head teachers offer teachers. Overall, the study established that, together, the two styles of leadership (R=.671; R^2=.45; Sig. =.000) account for 45 percent variations in the quality of teacher support supervision offered by head teachers, other factors notwithstanding. It was, thus, concluded that any leadership style head teachers employ that involves subordinates in decision-making or brings about change, would have a positive bearing on the kind of support supervision they can offer teachers; and therefore, the researchers recommend that school heads should be conscious of the choice of leadership styles they use while heading a school.

Keywords: head teachers, leadership styles, primary schools, support supervision, teachers

Introduction

The importance of supervision to any field of human endeavor is no longer debatable - even though the mere mentioning of the word supervision often 'sends a chill in the spines' of many would-be supervisees. In education, effective support supervision is applauded - not only for ensuring instructional effectiveness of teachers – but in guaranteeing the efficient functioning of the entire school system. However, the quality and extent of supervision depends, to a large extent, on the way the supervisors take up their responsibilities and the manner in which they interact with their supervisees, other factors notwithstanding. This is why the leadership styles supervisors (especially head teachers) use are believed to significantly relate with the quality of support supervision they can offer teachers. In this study, the researchers focused on investigating the effect of two leadership styles, namely: transformational and bureaucratic styles of leadership on the quality of support supervision head teachers offer teachers in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. The study was instigated by the persistent public outcry over the poor quality and limited amount of support supervision teachers in primary schools in that region were offered despite numerous attempts by Government to train school heads in institutional management. In this section, the researchers present the background to the study, the specific objectives, and research hypotheses.

Historically, Uganda has had a solid school inspection and supervision system (Ssekamwa & Lugumba, 2000). While the Inspectorate Division of the earlier Ministry of Education and the current Directorate of Education Standards (DES) of the current Ministry of Education and Sports took charge of inspecting schools and supervising teachers, at school-level, head teachers were mandated to offer support supervision to the school teachers at both primary and secondary school levels (Ssekamwa & Lugumba, 2000). However, available evidence now shows that the quality of supervision teachers are receiving in most primary and secondary schools in the country is deteriorating. The case of Mid-western Uganda has not been an exception. Yet, head teachers were meant to wow teachers in executing their duties through suitable leadership styles. This prompted the researchers to ask: "What effects do head teachers' transformational and bureaucratic styles of leadership have on the quality of support supervision they offer teachers in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda?" It was the search for answers to this kind of question that prompted the need for this investigation.

This study was underpinned by two leadership theories, namely: the transformational and bureaucratic theories of leadership. The transformational leadership theory (TLT) was developed by Burn (1978) and improved upon by Bass (1985). Originally, the theory was developed for business mode; however, researchers such as Leighwood (1992) and Fullan (2001) developed the theory further and made its

use relevant - including to the field of education. According to Burn (1978), the theory is used to describe a situation when the leader and the follower elevate one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. In fact, the theory is made up of power relations and entails bargaining, trading and compromise between leaders and followers. In this study, the theory was preferred because it combines all the lessons derived from other theories (e.g. trait, behavioural, contingency/situations, bureaucratic, etc.) and adapts them to suit a particular situation. The researchers hypothesized that head teachers who employ the transformational style of leadership generally believe in the application of different styles of leadership that suit particular situations and bring about change or transformation in the school setting. This study was thus intended to verify such a hypothesis.

Second, the study was also modelled on the bureaucratic theory of leadership (BLT). This theory was postulated by Max Weber in the early 1940s. According to Weber (1947), virtually all organisations including schools have the distinctive characteristics of bureaucracy. The theory is based on fixed official duties under hierarchy of authority, applying a system of rules for management and decision making, and technical expertise. According to the theory, the leader is subject to a system of behavioural and technical rules. Behaviour rules define the scope of a leader's behaviour and constrain the conducts of the leader while technical rules control how the work of a leader is to be made (Patty, 2014). The bureaucratic leadership theory is thus characteristic of a leader who goes by the book. In such a case, the leader's followers are expected to conform completely under bureaucratic expectations during work process. In this study, the theory was opted for because the researchers believed in the notion that the school as an organisation is a bureaucracy of some sort; and therefore, head teachers as holders of a coveted position in the school setting were bound to employ bureaucratic styles of leadership. The researchers hypothesized that this style of leadership was a necessary evil for efficient and effective leadership in organisations - including educational institutions.

This study focused on two key concepts, namely: leadership styles, which was the independent variable and teacher support supervision, the dependent variable. Leadership styles, according to Fielder (1967), refer to the underlying need for the leader that motivates behaviour in various interpersonal situations. However, Mullins (2002) defines leadership styles as the way in which the functions of leadership are carried out, the way in which the leader typically behaves towards members of the group. This study borrowed Mullin's definition. In this paper, the researchers looked at the effects of two styles of leadership, namely: transformational and bureaucratic styles of leadership on the quality of support supervision head teachers offer teachers in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. The second variable in the study was quality of teacher supervision. Teacher supervision refers to a comprehensive on-going process

for facilitating teachers' professional growth and development throughout their careers (Danielson, 1996). Alberta Education (2003) defines teacher supervision as the on-going process by which an administrator (in this case, the head teacher) supports and guides teaching. In this study, support supervision of teachers was looked at in terms of the quality and extent of teacher support supervision. The quality of supervision was determined by percentage scores of descriptive statistical judgement by teachers in public primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. Specifically, the researchers borrowed Danielson's model (1996) of supervision whereby support supervision was looked at in terms of the quality of institutional, professional and instructional support supervision of teachers.

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

Study Objectives

The main objective of this paper was to establish the effect of head teachers' leadership styles on the quality of support supervision they offer teachers in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. Specifically, the study aimed at: first, to establish the effect of transformational style of leadership; and second, to find out the effect of bureaucratic style of leadership on the quality of teacher support supervision which head teachers give to their teachers.

Research Hypotheses

The study intended to verify the following hypotheses:
  i.   Transformational style of leadership has a significant effect on the quality of support supervision which head teachers give to their teachers.

ii.   Bureaucratic style of leadership has a significant effect on the quality of support supervision which head teachers give to their teachers.

Literature Review

Many scholars have studied the relationship between styles of leadership (transformational and bureaucratic) and teacher support supervision in different education settings. According to Mullins (2002) and Hesham (2010), leadership styles vary, depending on the character of the leader. Each character has its style, so leadership style can be conceptualised as the way in which functions of leadership are carried out, the way in which the leader typically behaves towards members of the group. Transformational leadership style inspires the followers to trust the leader to perform duties that contribute to the achievement of the organisational goals and perform them at a higher level. In the case of transformational leadership, the leader transforms or changes followers to perform their duties at a higher level of motivation and morality (Bass, 1985). In addition, such leaders have a vision of how good things could be and clearly communicate their vision to their members of staff; and through their enthusiasm and excitement, they infect the followers to enthusiastically support the vision. Besides, transformational leaders influence their members of staff by intellectually stimulating them to become more aware of the problems in their institutions (Bass & Avolio, 1993). They also influence their followers through developmental considerations by showing concern for their followers' well-being and behaviour through which they provide encouragement. In fact, the transformational leader often gives his/her followers opportunities to develop and grow on the job, by acquiring new skills and capabilities, to achieve their full potential (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Such leaders usually gather their followers around a common purpose, mission or vision and provide a sense of purpose and future direction. They also act as role models for their staff and encourage them to question issues that underlie basic assumptions and encourage them to look at these issues from a different perspective. In the context of this study, only a few head teachers could thus qualify to be described as transformational leaders. Many head teachers of the primary schools studied used the transformational style of leadership unknowingly. This knowledge gap could however be bridged through leadership training and couching.

According to Weber (1947), the dominant type of leadership often exercised in work organisations is the bureaucratic leadership style. This, according to Weber's analysis many decades ago, occurs because all organisations - including schools - have the distinctive characteristics of bureaucracy (for example: division of labour and specialisation, impersonality hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations and career orientation). The bureaucratic leader, Weber (1947) says, is subject to a system of behavioural and technical rules. Patty (2014) reiterates that behavioural rules define the

scope of a leader's behaviour and constrain the conduct while technical rules control how the work is to be made. As a result, the bureaucratic leader perceives the position or office as the centre of authority and vigorously applies the same rules and procedure to all staff members. Such administrators strive and seek for conformity and control by use of rewards and penalties designated in the official regulations (Patty, 2014). In that case, followers are expected to conform completely under the bureaucratic expectations during the work process.

There are also studies that have been carried out on teacher support supervision. For example, Rous (2004) studied supervisor's behaviour and how it influences the instructional practices of public primary schools in the US State of Kentucky. The study revealed that although the supervisors studied were knowledgeable, they neglected the teachers most of the time. As such, the lack of contact between teachers and instructional supervisors in her study negatively affected instructional practices. The same study also revealed that most teachers believed that their supervisors' frequent visits and calls were important activities. Although some teachers reported that their supervisors were not seen in the classrooms enough, the researcher observed that teachers were energised whenever supervisors "dropped by" their classrooms and interacted with their students. This was seen as demonstration of supervisor's concern for teachers, students and study programmes. Similar studies conducted in Ghana have shown that frequent visits to classrooms are necessary to improve teachers' time-on-task. Rous (2004) again reported that the supervisors in her study did not have enough time to observe lessons. Teachers in the study acknowledged that when their supervisors offered helpful suggestions on instructional practices, it increased their ability to solve classroom problems. In fact, in the US public schools that were studied, the feedback offered by supervisors was a formal behaviour, and was objective and solely on classroom observation. This scenario was however, different with the case of supervisors in Uganda's primary schools who were found hardly to visit classes due to shortage of funding and staff. This partly could have accounted for the deteriorating quality of support supervision in primary schools in Mid-western Uganda; thus, the genesis of this investigation.

Methodology

This study was approached from the positivist research paradigm, though some aspects of social constructivism and interpretivism were also employed so as to gain a deeper understanding of the issues under investigation. The study specifically employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey design where both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from a total of 350 respondents comprised of 320 teachers, 10 head teachers and 20 educational administrators (District Education Officers [DEOs], Inspectors of Schools [DIS] and Centre Coordinating Tutors [CCTs], and 10 selected

head teachers) using questionnaire survey and interview methods. The design was descriptive because the researchers aimed at establishing the effect of head teachers' leadership styles (transformational and bureaucratic leadership style) on the quality of teacher support supervision of primary school teachers in Mid-western Uganda. It was cross-sectional in nature because the researchers aimed at collecting data from a cross-section of the target population at one point in time. This design would avoid wasting time returning to the field to collect additional data, several times. This version of collecting data rather than the longitudinal version was less time consuming; and in addition, using the survey design would help to generalize the findings obtained from the sampled population to all head teachers, teachers, DEOs, DIS, CCTs in Mid-western Uganda. The study respondents were selected through purposive and random sampling techniques; and data were analyzed with the use of appropriate descriptive (mean, percentage, standard deviations) and inferential (multiple regression technique), statistical techniques as well as content analysis method. In the next section, the results of the study are presented.

Results
This section is divided into two parts, namely: the descriptive statistics on the independent and dependent variables, and verification of research hypotheses.

Descriptive Statistics on Independent and Dependent variables
The researchers sought the views of the respondents on each of the study variables that were investigated. The respondents were given statements on a rating scale with which they were to judge how frequently, rarely, or never their head teachers used particular leadership styles and how they were related to the quality of teacher support supervision. The results showing the respondents' views on the use of head teachers' leadership styles are presented in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of respondents' views on head teacher's use of transformational style of leadership

| Leadership | Scale | School location | | | |
| | | Rural | | Urban | |
		Count	%	Count	%
Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	Never	4	2.2	12	8.7
	Rarely	55	30.6	32	23.2
	Frequently	121	67.2	94	68.1
	Total	180	100	138	100
Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission	Never	2	1.1	3	2.2
	Rarely	44	24.6	20	14.6
	Frequently	133	74.3	114	83.2
	Total	179	100	137	100
Articulates a compelling vision of the future	Never	1	.6	2	1.4
	Rarely	45	25.1	23	16.7
	Frequently	133	74.3	113	81.9
	Total	179	100	138	100
Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved	Never			3	2.2
	Rarely	46	25.7	20	14.4
	Frequently	133	74.3	116	83.5
	Total	179	100	139	100
Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments in place	Never	1	.6	1	.7
	Rarely	49	27.2	18	12.9
	Frequently	130	72.2	120	86.3
	Total	180	100	139	100
Gets me to do more than I expected to do	Never	35	19.4	38	27.3
	Rarely	59	32.8	39	28.1
	Frequently	86	47.8	62	44.6
	Total	180	100	139	100
Heightens my desire to succeed	Never	5	2.8	15	11.0
	Rarely	53	30.1	33	24.3
	Frequently	118	67.0	88	64.7
	Total	176	100	136	100
Increases my willingness to try harder	Never	7	3.9	9	6.5
	Rarely	43	24.0	29	20.9
	Frequently	129	72.1	101	72.7
	Total	179	100	139	100
Discusses who is responsible for achieving performance targets	Never	7	3.9	3	2.2
	Rarely	43	24.0	20	14.4
	Frequently	129	72.1	116	83.5
	Total	179	100	139	100
Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations.	Never	6	3.3	3	2.2
	Rarely	42	23.2	26	18.7
	Frequently	133	73.5	110	79.1
	Total	181	100	139	100

According to Table 1, the majority of the respondents from rural (74.3%) and urban (86.3%) schools reported frequent use of transformational style of leadership by their head teachers. In fact, most respondents from rural schools reported that their head teachers emphasized the importance of having a collective sense of mission; articulated a compelling vision of the future; expressed confidence that the goals would be achieved; and expressed satisfaction when the teachers met expectations. Meanwhile, most respondents from urban schools reported that their head teachers suggested new ways of looking at how to complete assignments in place.

Table 1 also indicates that most teachers from both rural and urban schools reported that their head teachers frequently considered the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. Such consideration was slightly higher in urban (68.1%) than in rural (67.2%) schools. Teachers who thought that their head teacher rarely considered the moral and ethical consequences of decisions made were 30.6 % in rural and 23.2% in urban schools. The rural schools registered a slightly higher value where effects on moral and ethical consequences were not considered when decisions were being made.

On the question of emphasizing the importance of having a collective sense of mission, Table 1 indicates that some teachers who thought that their head teachers rarely emphasized the importance of having a collective sense of mission were 24.6 % from rural and 14.6 % from urban schools. This makes the number of teachers whose head teacher rarely emphasized the importance of having a collective sense of mission to be slightly higher in rural than in urban schools.

On the issue of articulation of compelling vision of the future in their schools, Table 1 reveals that some teachers who thought that their head teacher rarely articulated a compelling vision of the future were 25.1 % in rural and 16.7% in urban schools. This indicates that the number of head teachers who rarely communicated to their teachers was slightly higher in the rural than their counterparts in urban schools.

On whether head teachers express confidence that goals will be achieved, Table 1 reveals that some teachers who thought that their head teacher rarely reassured them on the school's likelihood to meet the set goals were 25.7 % in rural and 14.4% in urban schools. This makes the number of teachers who were rarely assured of achievement of goals, slightly higher in the rural than in their counterparts in the urban schools.

On the question of suggesting new ways of looking at how to complete assignments in place, Table 1 shows that several teachers in rural (72.2%) and urban (86.3%) schools who reported that their head teacher frequently suggested new ways of looking at and completing assignments. This constructive communication was slightly higher in urban than in rural schools. The proportion of teachers who suggested that they rarely received developmental and constructive communication came up to 27.2% in rural and 12.9% in urban schools. The number of teachers who rarely received such

communication from their head teacher was slightly higher in rural than in urban schools.

Table 1 also shows that a few teachers in both rural (47.8%) and urban (44.6%) schools whose head teachers frequently encouraged them to do more than the minimum expected of them. The level of encouragement was extremely low in both rural and urban schools compared to all the remaining aspects of transformational style of leadership. Teachers who reported that their head teachers rarely encouraged them to do more than they are expected to do were 32.8% in rural and 28.1% in urban schools. However, most teachers in rural (64.7%) and urban (67.0%) schools reported that their head teachers frequently enhanced the teachers' wishes for self-actualization. This developmental feedback was slightly lower in rural than in urban schools. The teachers who reported that their head teachers rarely made such developmental encouragement were 30.1 % in rural and 24.3 % in urban schools. This would imply that a big number of teachers in rural schools rarely felt encouraged to develop themselves from their head teachers.

Finally, Table 1 shows that some teachers both in rural (73.5%) and urban (79.1%) schools who reported that their head teachers frequently expressed satisfaction when they (the teachers) met their expectations. The behaviour of being appreciative of teachers' achievements was slightly higher in urban than in rural schools. This suggests that more teachers in urban schools, who met their targets, got to know that their head teachers had noted and appreciated their achievement.

In the process of carrying out the interviews, the DEOs, DIS and CCTs indicated that they believed that many head teachers did not know the genesis of the transformational leadership style and therefore its usage was through trial and error. The above groups indicated that there was a need for the Ministry of Education and Sports to empower head teachers to make appropriate use of this style of leadership through training courses, seminars, workshops and continuous professional development (CPDs) programmes.

Again, the researchers asked the respondents to judge how frequently, rarely, or never their head teacher used the bureaucratic leadership styles and how they were related to the quality of teacher support supervision. The results showing respondents' views on the use of head teachers' bureaucratic leadership style are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of respondents' views on head teachers' use of
bureaucratic style of leadership

Categories		School location			
		Rural		Urban	
	Scale	Count	(%)	Count	(%)
Ensures teachers follow rules and procedures accurately and consistently	Never	1	.6		
	Rarely	19	10.6	17	12.2
	Frequently	159	88.8	122	87.8
	Total	179	100	139	100
Ensures all regular activities are distributed in a fixed way as official duties	Never	1	.6		
	Rarely	27	15.1	19	13.7
	Frequently	151	84.4	120	86.3
	Total	179	100	139	100
Ensure there is division of labour for instruction	Never	3	1.7		
	Rarely	29	16.1	21	15.6
	Frequently	148	82.2	114	84.4
	Total	180	100	135	100
Avoids the spirit of impersonality which is without hatred passion	Never	5	2.8	8	5.8
	Rarely	51	29.0	36	26.1
	Frequently	120	68.2	94	68.1
	Total	180	100	135	100
Spends more time on administrative issues than professional matters	Never	12	6.9	18	13.5
	Rarely	58	33.3	39	29.3
	Frequently	104	59.8	76	57.1
	Total	174	100	133	100

According to Table 2, the majority of the respondents from rural (88.8 %) and urban (87.8%) schools reported frequent use of bureaucratic style of leadership by their head teachers. On the other hand, 10.6 % of teachers in rural schools and 12.2 % in urban schools reported that their head teachers rarely used this style of leadership.

Table 2 also indicates that the use of bureaucratic style of leadership on ensuring that all regular activities are distributed in a fixed way as official duties is slightly higher in urban (86.3%) than in rural (84.4 %) schools - meaning that the head teachers who were rated, in the sample, were distributing regular activities to their teachers in form of official duties, for efficiency in administration. However, 15.1% of teachers in rural and 13.7% in urban schools reported that their head teachers rarely distribute activities in a fixed way as official duties. This meant that some head teachers are rarely distributing activities in a fixed way as official duties. This practice is more prevalent in rural than in urban schools.

On the question of ensuring that there is division of labour for instructional purposes, Table 2 shows that 82.2% of respondents from rural and 84.4% from urban schools reported that it was being used in their schools, because virtually all schools are

bureaucratic by nature. Nevertheless, 16.1% of teachers in rural and 15.6% in urban schools reported that the head teachers rarely ensured division of labour for instructional purposes.

On the issue of the use of bureaucratic style of leadership showing impartiality when interacting with teachers, Table 2 indicates that the use of this style of leadership is much lower in both rural (68.2%) and urban (68.1%) schools. Moreover, 29.0% of the teachers in rural and 26.1% of urban schools, rarely experienced fair treatment from their head teachers. This means that if this kind of attitude to teachers persists, there are likely to be difficulties which could lead to dysfunctional primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. Teachers deserve fair treatment in order for them to perform their duties more effectively.

Table 2 also shows that many teachers from both rural (59.8%) and urban (57.1%) schools rated their head teachers that they spent more time on administrative issues rather than professional matters. This could adversely affect quality and extent of support supervision and cause a decline in instructional effectiveness. However, some 33.3% of teachers in the sample in rural and 29.31% in urban schools reported that their head teachers were rarely making use of bureaucratic style of leadership in their schools. This means, it is not being effectively and appropriately used. This is likely to result in instructional decline leading teachers to lose motivation due to the decline in quality and extent of support supervision and instructional effectiveness to improve performance of pupils.

During the interviews of DEOs, DISs, and CCTs, interviewees indicated that they believed that there were weaknesses in the leadership of primary schools in Mid-western Uganda. One DIS for instance said that:

> "Some head teachers, especially in rural schools follow rules and regulation to the dot at the expense of creativity, innovation and flexibility. As inspectors of schools, we have witnessed some creative innovations and flexibility in some urban schools which enable them to motivate their teachers to perform at a higher level than their counterparts in rural schools."

These suggest that head teachers in rural schools should emulate their counterparts in the urban schools in order to improve instructional effectiveness. Advisably, the DEOs can hold seminars, workshops, conferences, or even meet these head teachers during their head teachers' association meetings. They can arrange education visits to schools which have demonstrated creativity, innovation, and flexibility, both in their districts and outside their districts.

The last part of the descriptive statistics was used to represent respondents' views about the quality of support supervision. Results on this variable are summarized in Table 3 whereby R stands for rural, U for urban, and SD stands for standard deviation.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics on respondents' views on the quality of teacher support supervision

Questionnaire item	Response Category											
	Always (3)		Rarely (2)		Never (1)		Rural		Urban		Total	
	R	U	R	U	R	U	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Providing schemes of work book on time	165	133	14	1	2	5	3.57	.684	3.73	.657	3.64	.678
	91.2%	95.7%	7.7%	.7%	1.1%	3.6%						
Providing lesson plan books	160	131	20	3	1	5	3.54	.711	3.71	.684	3.61	.704
	88.4%	94.2%	11.0%	2.2%	.6%	3.6%						
Giving out pens/pencils	155	132	22	6	4	1	3.41	.789	3.73	.575	3.55	.720
	85.6%	95.0%	12.2%	4.3%	2.2%	.7%						
Giving chalk	172	134	6	3	1	2	3.65	.573	3.78	.549	3.71	.566
	96.1%	96.4%	3.4%	2.2%	.6%	1.4%						
Providing curriculum on time	160	128	18	6	3	5	3.44	.740	3.57	.743	3.49	.743
	88.4%	92.1%	9.9%	4.3%	1.7%	3.6%						
Allocating lessons early	164	129	15	5	2	5	3.40	.689	3.60	.728	3.49	.713
	90.6%	92.8%	8.3%	3.6%	1.1%	3.6%						
Providing a time table	149	117	21	11	8	10	3.28	.844	3.33	.905	3.30	.870
	83.7%	84.8%	11.8%	8.0%	4.5%	7.2%						
Allocating classrooms	162	13	14	4	4	3	3.43	.733	3.68	.639	3.54	.704
	90.0%	94.9%	7.8%	2.9%	2.2%	2.2%						
Providing reference books	133	115	42	18	4	6	3.12	.843	3.35	.866	3.22	.859
	74.3%	82.7%	23.5%	12.9%	2.2%	4.3%						

According to Table 3, majority of the respondents from urban (95.7%) and rural (91.2%) schools reported that they were always sure of getting support from their head teachers. However, teachers in urban schools were enjoying more and better support (overall mean score of 3.73%) compared to their counterparts in rural schools whose overall mean score was only 3.57. This pattern of response was maintained for all the aspects of support supervision.

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

"It is very embarrassing to visit a school and only to find that the release of capitation grants has been delayed. This means, there are no supplies in schools

such as school chalk, books for schemes of work and lesson plans, no pens to mark pupils' books, etc. At one time, I visited a school in a remote area and found that teachers were using pieces of dry cassava to write on the blackboard. Surely, some schools are suffering especially those in remote areas."

All the voices in the text point to one factor – generally poor quality of teacher supervision. This means that the Ministry of Education and Sports and the district local governments should empower the head teachers through training in support supervision if they are to supervise their teachers satisfactorily.

Verification of Research Hypotheses

As a result of the study objectives, the researchers derived two research hypotheses, namely: 1) transformation style of leadership has a significant effect on the quality of teacher support supervision; and 2) bureaucratic style of leadership has a significant effect on the quality of teacher support supervision. To verify these hypotheses, first the hypotheses were converted into null hypotheses and were thus stated as follows: 1) transformational leadership style has no significant effect on the quality of teacher support supervision; and 2) bureaucratic leadership style has no significant effect on the quality of teacher support supervision. Second, the researchers generated indices to measure each of the variables, namely: transformational and bureaucratic styles of leadership; and quality of support supervision from the questionnaire items of each of the variables. Thereafter, the hypotheses were tested with the use of multiple regression technique. The results of the two null hypotheses are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Multiple regression results on the effect of leadership styles on
quality of support supervision

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	.789	.161		4.902	.000	.472	1.105
Transformational style	.365	.035	.483	10.518	.000	.296	.433
Bureaucratic style	.250	.038	.304	6.622	.000	.175	.324

a. Dependent Variable: Quality of teacher support supervision
F - value = 1298   Sig.= 0.000   R = .671 R^2 = 0.45

The results in Table 4, show that the two leadership styles carry positive regression coefficients (Betas). Specifically, the coefficient of transformational leadership style is 0.365 (B=.365) - meaning that other factors remaining constant, a unit increase in transformational style of leadership results into a 0.365 (or 36.5%) improvement in the quality of support supervision, other factors assumed constant. This effect is statistically

significant since the calculated p-value (sig=.000) is less than the critical value of p (sig. =.05). Similarly, the regression coefficient for bureaucratic leadership style is also positive (B=0.250) which also implies that this style of leadership is positively related with the quality of support supervision. It therefore follows that a unit use of bureaucratic style of leadership, results into a 0.25 (or 25%) improvement in the quality of support supervision. The effect of bureaucratic style of leadership is also statistically significant since the p-value obtained (sig. =.000) is equally less than the critical vale of p (sig. =.05). Based on these findings, both null hypotheses were thus rejected and the research hypotheses upheld.

Discussion

The results following the test of hypothesis one show that transformational style of leadership has a statistically significant effect on the quality of teacher support supervision. This implies that the more transformational the head teacher becomes, by considering the moral and ethical consequences of their decisions; articulating their vision of the future; expressing confidence that goals will be achieved; making suggestions and implementing new ways to tackling tasks; encouraging teachers to go the extra mile; motivating teachers' desire and their willingness to try harder; discussing performance targets; expressing satisfaction and appreciation when teachers meet expectations, the higher and better the quality of support supervision offered to teachers. This finding seem to be consistent with that of several other researchers, who also found out that transformational leadership style has a positive effect with many education variables (e.g. Bass & Avolio, 1990; Hukpati, 2009; Asare, 2011). Bass and Avolio (1990) specifically observed that a transformational leader often delegates assignments to followers to provide learning opportunities and coaches them if they need it. This view is supported by Asare (2011) who found out that leadership influence helps colleagues and superior authority to work as a team when they use their knowledge and share ideas as well as suggestions. Franciosi (2012) meanwhile counselled that transformational style of leadership is most appropriate for organizations such as educational systems operating a field characterized by change and innovation including teacher support supervision.

Meanwhile, the results of the test of hypothesis two revealed that bureaucratic style of leadership has a statistically significant effect on the quality of teacher support supervision. This implies that the more bureaucratic the head teacher becomes by ensuring that: teachers follow rules and procedures accurately and consistently; all regular activities are distributed in a fixed way as official duties; there is division of labour for instructional purposes, avoids the spirit of impersonality (hatred or passion), and balancing time on administrative and professional matters, the more and better will be the quality of support supervision offered to the teachers. This finding was, in fact,

similar to what Spillane and Kenny (2012) discovered when they said that bureaucratic and professional logics like teacher support supervision increasingly compete in policy discussions. This, according to the two authors often creates tensions within schools as teachers and administrators (head teachers) struggle to manage these competing logics. However, the model of democratic supervision influenced by Dewey's (1929) theories of democratic and scientific thinking as well as Hosic's (1920) ideas of democratic supervision which advocate for respect for teachers and cooperation in the supervisory process. But according to Sullivan and Glanz (2000), when the head-teacher is bureaucratic, the teacher is recognized as a fellow worker rather than a mere "cog" in a big machine (Supervisor or head teachers) and teachers are made to decide together what and how to teach. Sergiovanni (2009) posits that head teachers who supervise by practicing coaching by "walking around" can make significant impact in helping, in building trust, and learning with their teachers. Other researchers believe that successful supervisors are those who link interpersonal skills with technical skill. Brennen (2008) for instance notes that an effective supervisor is one who links interpersonal with technical skills. She (Brennen) contends that an effective supervisor should be able to build self-acceptance, moral trust, and rapport between the supervisor and supervisee. In that instance, objectivity devoid of personal biases should be the hallmark if supervision is to be effective.

Conclusion

Based on the findings that both transformational and bureaucratic styles of leadership have statistically significant effect on the quality of teacher support supervision, the researchers concluded that the type of leadership styles that are employed during support supervision process have a significant bearing on teachers instructional effectiveness.

Recommendations

Following the findings and the conclusion drawn, the researchers recommend that the head teachers should make use of appropriate leadership styles which suit the situations, needs and development aspirations of teachers as well as needs of the primary schools they are heading.

References

1. Alberta Education (2003). *Teacher Growth, Supervision and Evaluation Policy*. Retrieved from http://education.alberta.ca/teachers/certification/standars/teacher.aspx.

2. Asare, M. A. (2011). *The Effects of Leadership Styles of Heads of Senior High Schools on Teachers' Job Performance in selected schools in the Kumasi Metropolis.* Unpublished Masters to the Institute of Distance Learning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi.

3. Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). *Improving Organization Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership.* Thorns and Oaks, CA, Sage

4. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectation.* Free Press.

5. Brennen, A. M. (2008). *Clinical supervision and case study*. Articles and Resources on Educational Administration and Supervision. Retrieved from http://www.soencouragement.org/clinical-supervision-case-study.htm.

6. Burn, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* Harper and Row in Castle E.B. Report (1963).

7. Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

8. Directorate of Educational Standards (2009). *Annual Report of the Directorate of Educational Standards.* Kampala: Author.

9. Directorate of Educational Standards (2010). *Annual Report of the Directorate of Educational Standards.* Kampala: Author.

10. Directorate of Educational Standards (2011). *Annual Report of the Directorate of Educational Standards.* Kampala: Author.

11. Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of Science of Education*. New York: Liver Right.

12. Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. MacGrall-Hill.

13. Franciosi, S. J. (2012). *Transformational Leadership for Education in a digital culture*. Published on line: In Press Full Text: HTML, PDF (916 KB).

14. Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

15. Glanz, J., Shulman, V., & Sullivan, S. (2006). *Usurpation or Abdication of Instructional Supervision in the New York City Public Schools?* Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Francisco, CA.

16. Hesham, A. (2010) Leadership and its Relationship with Job satisfaction. Proceedings of 3rdAsia –Pacific Business Research Conference 25-26 February 2013, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

17. Hosic, J. F. (1920). *The Democratisation of Supervision of schools and society, 11*, 331-336

18. Hukpati, A. (2009). *Transformational Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Comparative study of Private and Public Tertiary Institutions in Ghana.* Unpublished Masters Dissertation to University of Twente.

19. Leighwood, K. A. (2007). Transformational School Leadership in a Transitional Policy World. In the Josey-Bass Reader. *Educational Leadership* (pp 183-196) San Francisco John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

20. Mullins, L. J. (2002). *Management and Organizational Behavior* (6th Ed.). Pearson Education Limited Edinburgh Gatee, Harlow Essex.

21. Patty, J.W. (2014) Leadership and Bureaucracy. A paper presented at the Leadership in American Politics Conference, University of Virginia. 2014.

22. Rous, B. (2004). Perspectives of Teachers about Instructional Supervision and Behaviour that Influence Pre-school Instruction. *Journal of Early Intervention, 26 (4)*, 266-282, doi; 101177/105381510402600403

23. Ssekamwa,J.C.& Lugumba ,S.M.E. (2000). *Development and Administration of Education in Uganda* (2nd ed.). Kampala: Fountain Publishers

24. Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective*. Boston: Pearson Educational Inc.

25. Spillane, J. P. & Kenny, A. W. (2012). School Administration in a Changing Education Sector: The US Experience. *Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 50*, Iss: 5pp 541-561.

26. Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2000). *Supervision that improves Teaching: Strategies and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

27. Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press.