

Principals' Directive Leadership Style and Motivation of Teachers in Public Secondary Schools in Nyamira and Siaya Counties, Kenya

Rabago Zachariah, Dr. George Onyango and Prof. Grace Bunyi
Department of Educational Management, Policy & Curriculum Studies,
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Abstract. The objective of the study was to determine the effect of directive leadership style on motivation of teachers in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya counties, Kenya. Correlation research design was adopted. The target population of the study was 371 principals, 3,166 teachers and 2 TSC county directors. Simple random sampling was used to select both schools and participants in the study. The study utilized Path Goal theory which supports directive leadership style. Data was collected using Leadership Questionnaire for Principals (LQFP), Motivation Questionnaire for Teachers (MQFT), Focus Group Discussion for Teachers (FGDFT) and interview Schedules for TSC county directors. Piloting of the instruments was done in six randomly selected public secondary schools. Instrument reliability was done by split-half method followed by Cronbach's Alpha formula. The principals' and teachers' questionnaires gave an average of $\alpha = .70$ which met the threshold of adequate consistency. Instrument validity was determined through appraisals of experts. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically while quantitative data was analyzed employing descriptive and inferential statistics. Data analyzed was presented using tables, frequencies and percentages. Directive leadership style was the strongest predictor as indicated by its estimated standardized regression weight ($\beta = 0.431$, $p < 0.000$). The estimated standardized regression weights show the relative importance of directive leadership style predictor in the model. This predictor accounts for about 16.7% of the variance in teacher motivation in both Nyamira and Siaya counties ($R^2 = 0.167$). Based on these findings it was concluded that directive leadership style least motivate teachers.

Key words: Principals, Directive leadership Style, Teacher Motivation, Public Secondary Schools, Nyamira County, Siaya County, Kenya

Introduction

Education in the contemporary times places great emphasis on quality teaching where quality teaching is not possible in the absence of a teacher (Pyne, 2014). Studies have consistently shown that a teacher plays a critical role in the entire teaching and learning experience (Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation, 2013; Johnson, 2012). Teachers prepare young people as future members of society to take care of themselves and their own prospective families while contributing to the intellectual, social and economic growth of the country (Sautelle et al., 2015). Since quality is important and has merits for investing in education, there is need to pay attention to principals' leadership styles and how they impact on teacher motivation. For students to receive high quality education regardless of any sanctions there is need to have high quality principals to motivate teachers (Finnigan, 2010).

Teachers must be retained in the teaching profession to ensure quality teaching (Adeyemi, 2010). To boost achievements of a learning institution, the school principal always assumes very vital roles among them providing appropriate leadership (Northouse, 2013). A continuous challenge for institutional principals is employing quality leadership styles that have highest impact on teacher motivation, a vital and important precept of all school accomplishment (Alessandro et al., 2004).

How efficiently the principal performs his roles has been a stuff of concern to many educationists (Lynch, 2012). This has prompted a claim that public schools and school

organizations have no capacities to enable them respond to increased demands that face instructional institutions (Elmore, 2000). Dale and Beach (1980) note that leadership is the procedure of influencing people to act for the achievement of specific objectives. Cole (2004) considers leadership as a dynamic development whereby some individual compels others to contribute towards the understanding and attainment of the group goals.

Further, Armstrong (2003) characterizes leadership as influence; process and appropriate authority obtained by a leader to adequately alter the organization through the direction of human resources ending at the attainment of desired purposes. A leader should provide guidance, actualize plans and motivate people. While motivation is something that inspires a person to action and makes him or her to continue with the cause of action already initiated. Principal leadership style affects all schools' learning conditions including teacher motivation (Hezibola, 2008; Studies in United States education department, 1997; Bogler, 2001) in Montreal, Canada confirmed that teachers' motivation is strongly connected to participation in decision-making and influence over school policy. Findings by the National Teachers Organization of South Africa (2003) testified that 65.5% of teachers were disappointed with inappropriate leadership styles.

Katzell and Thompson (1990) describe motivation as the situations and procedures that account for arousal, direction, scale and maintenance of determination. Motivation has a part to change and strengthen the need of every member of the institution to work efficiently and competently in his/her position (Richard, 2014). The teacher motivation in a school set up is shown by factors such as low absenteeism, less job stress, prolonged stay at work and active contribution to their institutions (Lynch, 2012). Further, motivated teachers are continually eager to spend greater amount of their time and even resources in their schools. The current study sought to validate whether the principals' leadership styles in Nyamira and Siaya counties are responsible for the teachers' low motivation.

Appropriate school leadership comprises a mixture of multiple leadership approaches. Eliophoton (2014) observes that appropriate school leadership practiced by principals' influence and motivate their teachers by providing meaning and purpose of teaching and inspire their teachers by recognizing and rewarding their achievement. According to Leithwood and Sun (2009) principals should be in charge over all that takes place inside the school setting such that their teachers may be motivated. They asserted that the school principals affect teachers' motivation, by way of thinking, planning, commitment and well-being. According to Day, Sammons, Hopkins, Harris, Leithwood and Elearnor (2010) the principals' timing, ordering and combination of leadership styles are different from school to school but the vision and values are the same. The current study sought to find whether the principals' directive leadership styles in Nyamira and Siaya counties affects teachers' motivation.

According to Ngoben (2004), schools that lack effective leadership do not perform well. In Indonesia, Pongoh (2008) noted that the principal as an administrator in the school must have a concern in the ability of teachers. S/he must continue to inspire them to develop their teaching proficiency because a teacher is a valuable asset for the school in helping students to achieve the best learning achievement.

Oduor (2015) observed that close to a half of the Kenyan teachers want other jobs while 45% would like to abandon teaching. This implies that out of 300,000 Kenyan teachers under TSC, 135,000 would wish to quit the teaching profession. This shows how teachers are not motivated in their job stations. Okello (2017), on the other hand, observed that in Homa Bay county, between 2013 to 2015, over 1,354 teacher transfers were granted out of over the 7,000 requests. They cited several reasons varying from family ties to conflicts between them and the principals.

Examining reasons prompting secondary school teacher transfer requests in Suba District, Ariko and Simatwa (2011) established that 52.0% of the teachers there requested for transfers due to their head teachers' management style while 63.3% of teachers did not like the way their principals treated them. Oduor (2015) points out factors contributing to low teacher motivation in Kenya as poor working surroundings, poor management styles, lack of appreciation of teachers by the community, lack of promotion, heavy amount of work, poor school policies, supervision and poor human relations. School principals being the managers of the schools where these discontented teachers work, need to recognize suitable leadership styles that could entice teachers to actively embark on their duties for better students' success.

This study has examined the relationship between principals' directive leadership styles and teachers' motivation in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya counties. The study was anchored on Path Goal theory by House (1996) which deals with leadership and motivation. The theory directive oriented leadership styles. According to the theory, leadership is a procedure in which leaders select specific behaviors that are best matched to the employees through their path in the realization of their daily work goal. This current study determined how an existence or non-existence of directive leadership style achieves teacher motivation and learner performance in Nyamira and Siaya counties.

Methodology

The study employed a correlation research design. Applying the correlation research design qualitative and quantitative data was collected at the same time; data was analyzed independently and then combined during interpretation. There was need to establish the relationship between principals' leadership practices and teacher motivation in Nyamira and Siaya public secondary schools. Correlation research design provided an opportunity for the researcher to explain the degree of association or relationship between principals' leadership styles and teachers' motivation.

The independent variable also known as predictor or explanatory variable in this study was the principals' leadership styles while the dependent variable was teacher motivation and age, gender, qualification, length of stay and experience as intervening variables. The target population for this research was composed of 371 principals, 3,166 teachers and 2 TSC county directors from 371 secondary schools of which 186 were from Nyamira County and 185 from Siaya County. The principals were targeted in this study because they are entrusted with responsibility of making decisions as regards to day to day administration of schools with little interference from the school managers. The respondents for the study were 38 principals from the two counties, 19 principals from Nyamira and 19 principals from Siaya. There were 323 teachers of which 163 were from Nyamira and 160 from Siaya. There were two TSC county directors, one from each county. Stratified random sampling was employed to select 19 schools from Siaya County and 19 from Nyamira County. According to Gall et al. (2009) stratified sampling ensures that acceptable representation of the categories of population is included in the sample. In this research, the strata included sub counties in the counties. In Nyamira County the 19 schools were four (4) schools from Manga, three (3) from Nyamira South, four (4) from Nyamira North, four (4) from Borabu and four (4) from Masaba North sub counties. Equally, from Siaya county the schools were three (3) from Alego, four (4) from Bondo, three (3) from Gem, three (3) from Rarieda, three (3) from Ugenya and three (3) from Ugunja sub counties.

Simple random sampling technique was considered ideal for the selection of the schools from the stratum as it ensured an equal chance to all the schools in the stratum to be part of the research sample. Schools from each stratum were selected for the sample while ensuring the selection of each one school did not affect the selection of another school.

This was done by selecting one school at a time, with replacement as postulated by Cohen (2009) and Mugenda and Mugenda (2003). Schools in each stratum were written on small pieces of paper of equal sizes which were then folded uniformly. The papers were then picked at a time with a school name recorded and immediately replaced before picking the next school. The picking continued until 19 schools from each county were selected for the sample.

Reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument produces consistent outcomes after repeated trials. Further, it is seen as the level of consistency that the instrument or procedure shows (Best and Kahn, 2006). In order to test the validity and reliability of the research instruments a pre-test was carried out in Nyamira and Siaya counties public secondary schools with six (6) teachers and six (6) school principals respectively.

In this research, internal consistency reliability of the instruments was gotten by computing Cronbach's alpha (α) using SPSS. An internal consistency refers to what level do the items of the subscale "hang together." It reflects on whether all items in the subscale measures the same underlying construct and the most accurate pointer of internal consistency is Cronbach's alpha Coefficient. The Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was calculated to examine the reliability of the questionnaire with specific reference to its internal consistency. It is the commonly used statistic for evaluating internal consistency which reflects reliability statistics. It indicates the magnitude to which the various items of the sub-scales measure the constructs of the indicators. The researcher computed the reliability for multi-item opinion items for all the subscales in the principal and teacher questionnaires. Given that the items of each sub-scale in both principal and teacher questionnaires were the same, a combined test of internal consistency was performed using all the respondents. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) posit that a reliability coefficient of above + 0.60 is adequate.

A total of 3,539 participants were targeted for the study (371 principals, 3166 teachers) from 371 public secondary schools and 2 TSC county directors from Nyamira and Siaya counties. 19(10.22%) public secondary schools from Nyamira and 19(10.27%) Siaya counties were randomly selected for the study while 323(10.12%) teachers from the two counties were randomly selected for the study and served with motivation questionnaires for teachers (MQFT). The 2(100%) TSC county directors were interviewed using interview schedules.

Findings

In this chapter, statistical data collected using research questionnaires are presented. The findings obtained from the data findings are presented. The presentation and discussion is organized according to the objective of the study which was: To determine the relationship between principals' directive leadership styles and teacher motivation in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya counties, Kenya.

This study was to determine the relationship between principals' directive leadership style and teacher motivation in Nyamira and Siaya counties, Kenya. The principals in the study were requested to respond to a number of statements regarding directive leadership styles using a 5 point Likert rating scale.

Table 1. Principals' views of their use of directive leadership styles (N=31)

	Directive leadership behavior	SA		A		U		D		SD	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	I make the decision based on my ideas on the way things should be done.	8	25.8	4	12.9	5	16.13	6	19.35	8	25.81
2	I do not consider suggestions made by the staff.	1	3.23	5	16.35	1	3.23	3	9.68	21	67.74
3	I get information from teachers and then make decision on my own.	19	61.29	4	12.90	2	6.45	2	6.45	4	12.90
4	I don't share problems with teachers individually so that I get ideas and suggestions before I make a decision.	3	9.68	4	12.90	3	9.68	2	6.45	19	61.29
5	I tell my teachers what has to be done and how to do it.	15	48.39	6	19.35	2	6.45	1	3.23	7	22.58
6	I don't provide teachers with relevant information I possess and then teachers have a responsibility to solve the problem.	17	54.84	6	19.35	2	6.45	5	16.45	1	3.23
7	I closely monitor the teachers to ensure they are performing correctly.	12	38.71	6	19.35	7	22.58	2	6.45	4	12.90
8	I don't ask for teachers' ideas and input on upcoming plans.	15	48.39	5	16.13	6	19.35	2	6.45	3	9.68
9	When things go wrong and I need strategies to run the process I don't call a meeting and get the advice of the staff.	16	51.61	7	22.58	5	16.13	2	6.45	1	3.23
10	I don't allow the staff to set priorities with my guidance.	18	58.06	6	19.35	4	12.90	1	3.23	2	6.45
11	I don't allow teachers to set own goals in their teaching.	20	64.52	5	16.35	3	9.68	2	6.45	1	3.23

Note: **SA** - Strongly Agree, **A** - Agree, **U** - Undecided, **D** - Disagree **S.D** - Strongly Disagree

The findings from Table 1 revealed that 8 (25.8%) of the principals' strongly disagreed and 8 (25.8%) equally strongly agreed with the statement that they make decisions based on their ideas on the way things should be done. This is in line with Bunni (2005) where directive approach involves an administrator who gives staff tasks including what is anticipated by them, how the job is to be completed, duration for the job accomplishment and that the administrator sets clear standards of achievement, makes rules and regulations clear to staff. Observations made from responses were in agreement with Kasimu (2016) that managers guide their employees in following standards, rules and guidelines.

Northouse (2013) and Jones and George, (2011) observe that directive leadership has clear anticipations, informs juniors their roles, offers precise plans and schedules, clarifies, sets clear rules, regulations and sets standards of performance on what should be done and how to do it and how it should be done and timelines when it should be completed.

The table equally revealed that majority 21 (67.74%) of the principals strongly disagreed with the statement that they do not consider suggestions made by the staff. The majority 19 (61.29 %) of the principals strongly agreed with the statement that they get information from teachers and then make decisions on their own. The aspect identified in the Path Goal Theory as a major characteristic of directive leadership. According to Mbiti (2007) principals are tasked with directing teachers based on their decisions by maintaining professional ethics which require them to adopt leadership styles which fit the school situation and motivate their teachers. As a leader the school principal has to make firm concerns about the current situation before deciding the leadership behavior to employ. The administrator's behavior should differ from one situation to another and therefore leaders are expected to consider the situation and choose on the right leadership approach. The findings of this study revealed that principals' who use directive leadership style should get information from teachers, make proper decisions, clarify anticipations and give precise direction to complete the desired anticipations based on standards and school rules.

The study found that 21 (67.74%) of principals strongly disagreed that they do not consider suggestions made by their staff. The findings of this study were found to be consistent with the Path Goal Theory which clarifies how an administrator can offer support to staff on the Path to follow to attain goals by employing specific leadership behavior. As the theory suggests different leadership behaviors have diverse kind of influence on juniors' motivation. This is more likely to make the school to succeed in setting achievable goals together with the professional staff.

The study finding show that majority 17 (54.84%) of the principals strongly agreed and 6 (19.35%) agreed that they provide teachers with relevant information they possess and then teachers have a responsibility to solve the problem. This finding agrees with The Teachers Service Commission (TSC) Act (2012) Section 69 which outlines the responsibilities of principals among them is to give information to teachers on matters of professional practice at the school level being the key component of a principal's leadership demands.

Majority 15 (48.39%) of the principals strongly agreed that they ask for teachers' ideas and input on upcoming plans while 1 (3.23%) disagreed. The findings reveal that the majority 18 (58.06%) of the principals strongly agreed that they allowed the staff to set priorities with their guidance. Serrel (2011) views leadership as sharing of priorities with proper guidance from principals. Robinson (2008) asserts that leadership is framed as performance of a particular task set by teachers but guided by the principal.

Majority 20 (64.52%) of the principals strongly agreed to the statement that they allow teachers to set their own goals in teaching. The findings of this study were found to contrast with those by Robin (2012) which found out that Path Goal theory is where the major role of an administrator is to set and clarify goals with the sub-ordinates and then support them to find the best path for achieving the goals by eliminating foreseeable obstacles.

Shavan's (1986) study reveals that the more the school succeeds in sharing and setting achievable goals together with the professional staff, the more it can anticipate greater investment on their part and identification of a personal commitment to fulfill its institutional policy.

Distributing leadership is a critical task to school leadership effectiveness (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). The study found that most responses agreed on tasks being allocated on the expertise of the individual 18 (58.06). The implication of these findings is that teachers desired tasks where they are led or directed. This could further mean that teachers lack capacity of autonomy towards task performance. The findings of the research showed that directive leadership approach is employed where the administrators are fully in charge of their schools or where there was a need for direct communication between the principal and teachers.

When the teachers are empowered they have the assurance that they are valued as reliable, and this not only inspires them but also encourages them to take initiatives in their pursuit of teaching and learning process. The results of the study revealed that principals 15 (48.39%) ask for teachers' ideas and inputs on upcoming plans in form of delegation of power and responsibilities mainly to only a few privileged members of staff. The teachers who are not delegated power and responsibility are demotivated. Pongoh (2008) agrees that a prime task of principals is to exercise leadership in the school, which motivates teachers, and this is likely to be translated into actions and tangible solutions for academic improvement.

The findings of this research revealed that principals who applied directive leadership style encouraged staff to face challenges and attain great performance aspects which motivate some teachers as they struggle to attain the set challenges and please their principals. The findings concurred with a study conducted by Sagie (1996) who agreed that directive leadership approach encourages staff to face challenges and attain great performance. When teachers are allowed to face challenges themselves they are likely to be motivated on their own because they have used their professional competencies to attain the expected performance. Where the majority of the staff members are young and inexperienced that is have inadequate skills, Hersey and Blanchard (2003) agree that motivation to get the job done requires directive leadership style.

The teachers in the study were asked to respond to a number of statements regarding directive leadership styles offered by the principals.

Table 2. Views regarding use of directive leadership styles by their principals (N=256)

	Directive leadership Behavior	SA		A		U		D		SD	
		f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)
1	My principal gives us directions the way things should be done.	100	39.1	15	5.9	13	5.1	8	3.1	120	46.9
2	My principal is strict, he or she insists on observation of the stipulated regulations and procedures.	55	21.48	15	5.86	5	1.95	35	13.7	146	57.0
3	My principal gives orders which should be obeyed by all teachers.	125	48.83	13	5.08	12	4.69	10	3.90	96	37.5
4	My principal has direct supervision over us.	85	33.26	75	29.23	10	3.91	45	17.6	26	10.2
5	My principal does not consult me or other teachers in decision making.	145	56.64	31	12.11	22	8.59	13	5.08	15	5.86
6	My principal doesn't have confidence in teachers.	165	64.45	60	23.44	11	4.30	7	2.73	15	5.86
7	My principal sets targets for the school alone.	91	35.54	61	23.83	59	23.0	40	15.6	45	17.5
8	My principal controls all decision making in school.	70	27.34	92	35.94	66	25.7	8	3.13	20	7.81
9	Teachers don't make decisions in the absence of the principal.	101	39.45	25	9.77	51	19.9	31	12.1	45	18.7

10	My principal makes sure the set goals are attained in time.	135	52.73	37	14.45	32	12.5	25	9.77	27	10.5
11	My principal doesn't listen or support teachers who don't agree with him.	127	49.61	53	20.70	43	16.8	28	10.9	5	1.95

Note: **SA** - Strongly Agree, **A** - Agree, **U** - undecided, **D** - Disagree **S.D** - Strongly Disagree

Table 2 shows majority 120 (46.86%) of the teachers strongly disagreed with the statement that my principal gives them directives on the way things should be done, while 100 (39.06%) agreed. Masuku (2011) findings observes that teachers tended to relax if the principals relaxed in reminding teachers the school expectations and directives on how things should be done. In focus group discussion, the researcher sought a clarification about the regulations and procedures teachers were given. One teacher explained:

We have laid down regulations and procedures followed for completing schemes of work preparation, and even deadlines for handing over our lesson plans every week. This becomes helpful when teaching and monitoring whether learning takes place. It also ensures uniformity in learning. However, we find it very tiresome in preparation of the documents.

The study findings agree with Sancar (2014) and Wango and Gatere (2012) researches that staff be prompted to keep set rules and regulations, a behavior that Vijayaran (2008) observes as a main aspect of directive leadership style. The findings were also in line with Butcher (2014) research which noted that in addition to verbally reminding teachers on some directives, principals in Arkansas schools gave teachers procedural manuals on directing them on how various activities within the school are done.

The findings of the study revealed that 146 (57.03%) of the teachers strongly disagreed with the statement that my principal is strict, s/he insists on observation of the stipulated regulations and procedures. In focus group discussion, the researcher sought a clarification about how the principal becomes strict on some issues. One teacher explained:

The principal gives clear rules and regulations which must be followed at all times. He does not keep following teachers and has confidence that we will meet the performance targets without being constantly reminded. But the work becomes too heavy especially when performance targets become hard to achieve. We don't like some of the rules and regulations. Many teachers become discouraged.

This finding concurred with Northouse (2013) observation that in Path goal approach, that an administrator should be able to understand stipulated regulations and procedures and remove obstacles that hinder the attainment of set targets. Directive leadership is associated with authoritarian and legitimate power that employs high levels of strict direction, command and close supervision. However, the results of the study showed that principals who embrace directive leadership styles at times do not maintain clear channel of communication between them and their teachers. This is why some teachers remain undecided in the study. They do not delegate authority that permits teachers to participate in policy making.

The findings reveal that a total 145 (56.64%) of the teachers strongly agreed with the statement that my principal does not consult the other teachers in decision making while 127 (49.61%) of the teachers strongly agreed with the statement that my principal doesn't listen or support teachers who don't agree with him. At the focus group discussion teachers were asked to elaborate on how their principal does the consultation and one teacher explained;

Our principal does not consult much from the teachers; he has a group of teachers he can ask about some issues affecting the school.

Northouse (2013) observes that teacher participation in decision making improves the morale of teachers as they are always willing to be involved or consulted by principals in school matters. However, this was not being done in the two counties. A total of 165 (64.45%) of the teachers strongly agreed with the statement that my principal doesn't have confidence in teachers. Principals are encouraged to develop confidence in the teachers. This will assist in bringing the staff together hence achieve school goals easily.

The findings of the study reveal a total 135 (52.73%) of the teachers strongly agreed with the statement that my principal makes sure the set goals are attained in time. This finding agrees with Vijayavan (2008) who observes that teachers should be left to set their own goals and the principal's role is reminding teachers to follow them and try to achieve them while motivating them.

The findings of the study reveal most 165 (64.45%) of the principals who embrace directive leadership styles do not maintain a clear channel of communication between them and their teachers, while a total 145 (56.64%) of the principal do not consult teachers in decision making. Therefore, they do not delegate authority that permits teachers to participate in policy making. These high responses of 145 (56.64%) of principals not consulting teachers in decision making were consistent with Mutune, Onyango and Olembo (2018) findings that headteachers in primary Catholic schools in Nakuru and Nairobi counties applied frequently directive leadership practices when dealing with school processes. At the focus group discussion teachers were asked to elaborate on how their principal communicates to the staff and one teacher remarked;

I don't expect my principal to come to the staffroom to communicate and pass important decisions made in the school. We meet once in a week after assembly where he tells us his expectations and we exactly follow that decision. He will go on and say once responsibility is given, it is up to the teacher to find out how to do it. The principal will not come and show you how to do it. You have been trained to be a teacher.

This is supported by Johnson (2012) who concludes that principals must communicate goals, align resources with goals and fix problems to motivate teachers. This increases self-esteem and output. Subordinates are motivated through good mutual working relationship with management showing interest, recognition, security and sense of belonging (Locke, 1976). According to Charlton (2000) principals who use stern control measures are likely to face student and teacher confrontation and rise in indiscipline because both are likely to protest against dictatorial measures applied.

Olando (2003) argues that there has been an exodus from the teaching profession to better paying jobs. This exodus might be attributed to principal's directive leadership as it is indicated by the views given by the teachers in the study area. There have been times when teachers had to stage open protests to voice their displeasure about head teachers' managerial incompetency. This situation has often led to low morale among teachers (Brown and Owusu, 2014). The teacher should be provided with an enabling environment to produce desired results by the school principals. Owiti (2016) quoting Charlton (2000) states that the use of strict control measures by head teachers is liable to encounter students and teachers' opposition and teachers are more likely to protest against tyrannical actions because they are demotivated by this leadership style.

However, in both Nyamira and Siaya counties, a good number of the teachers 101(39.45%) claimed that setting of school goals and making of decisions affecting the schools was the docket of the principal while over 80 percent of teachers claimed that their principals do not have confidence in them hence compromising teacher motivation and students' performance. This revealed there was directive leadership style used where the principals are fully in charge of their schools or where there was a need for direct

communication between the principal and teachers. The results of the current study were in contrast with Saleem, Aslam, Yin and Rao (2020) study that revealed that directive leadership had a significant level on teacher motivation. Further, they had observed that in non-western culture, directive approach was helpful for inspiring teacher motivation.

This concurs with Northouse (2013) findings, which reveal that directive principals set standards of performance and define clear rules and regulations for subordinates. The findings of the current study concur with those by Wangai (2015) which reveal that directive leadership was not preferred by experienced teachers while it is useful to inexperienced teachers seeking direction. Also, the findings were found to be consistent with the study findings by Atsebeha (2016) which reveal that a school administrator that employs directive leadership approach and makes educational values clear to the teachers, inspires the teachers to work according to the set plans and involves the teachers in continuous professional advancement increases motivation.

However, analysis of data showed that the use of directive leadership by principals does not motivate teachers in Nyamira and Siaya Counties. The findings are in conformity with Olaniyan (1997) who opined that principals who practice directive leadership style do not maintain clear channels of communication between them and their teachers. Directive leadership style promotes a one-way process of communication; decisions are speedily taken without necessarily obtaining approval from followers (Lekia & Emmanuel, 2018). In this regard, there is need for principals in public secondary schools to develop a channel of communication when giving directives to their teachers so that they get motivated.

The study also sought to determine if the principals' directive leadership style had any significant relationship with teachers' motivation ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Regression analysis examined the relationship between principals' directive leadership style and teachers' motivation. The independent variable was directive leadership style. The dependent variable was teacher motivation. Table 3 presents the model fitness on the relationship between principals' directive leadership and teachers' motivation.

Table 3. Model Fitness on the relationship between principals' directive leadership and teachers' job satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.431 ^a	.167	.164	21.77442

The result in table 3 indicates that 16.4% of teachers' motivation is explained by directive leadership practices. According to Muijis (2004) in Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) an adjusted R of between 0.11 and 0.3 is a modest effect. A total of 83.6 % of teachers' motivation was determined by other factors not included in the model.

Table 4. Analysis of Variance on the relationship between principals' directive leadership style and teachers' motivation

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	29938.863	1	29938.863	51.830	.000 ^b
Residual	239952.968	322	523.747		
Total	242946.843	323			

Table 4 indicated that the model was statistically significant, principals' directive style had a significance relationship with teachers' motivation $F(1,322) = 51.830$, $p < 0.05$ at 99.5%

confidence level. The results implied that the principals' directive leadership styles had significant relationship on teachers' motivation.

Table 5. Regression of coefficients for directive leadership styles

Model	Beta(β)	T	Sig.
(Constant)		11.736	.000
Directive leadership styles	0.431	8.387	.000

At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant relationship since P-value was (0.000), which was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding t statistic was 8.387 was greater than the critical t statistic ($t_{cal} [8.387] > t_{crit} [1.87]$). Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was that directive leadership styles of the principals have significant relationship with teachers' motivation. Quantitatively, a unit change in principals' directive leadership styles would result in 0.431 change in teachers' motivation.

These findings agree with Abbasi and Mohammadi (2013) study which agreed that when staff members feel involved, their personal needs are likely to align with the institutions' needs which can increase productivity, indicating teachers' motivation. The study further establishes that directive leadership practice motivated teachers to work harder in order to accomplish the institutional objectives. Similarly, the finding affirms earlier studies by Atsebela (2016) which reported a positive relationship between principal directive leadership style and teacher motivation. In contrast to the current study which found a statistically significant relationship between principals' directive leadership practice and teachers' work motivation. Bell, Chan and Nel (2014) study directive leadership had no significant impact on organizational culture and teachers' job satisfaction or motivation. Mulwa (2013) study, found that directive leadership had a negative influence on teachers' motivation.

Conclusions

This section focuses on conclusions anchored on the findings by objectives that guided the study. According to Cohen et al. (2011) a conclusion serves to summarize and bring together the main ideas covered in writing. Further, they give a final comment or judgment about a particular study. This study sought to explore relationship between principals' directive leadership styles and teacher motivation in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya Counties.

After a careful analysis of the relationship between principals' leadership styles and teacher motivation in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya counties, the study concluded that there are various leadership practices that motivate teachers. It was found out that the principals' leadership styles had far reaching effects on teacher motivation.

This study concludes that directive leadership style practiced in secondary schools by principals' had an impact on teachers' motivation in Nyamira and Siaya Counties, it was found out that majority of teachers preferred to be given directives on how to do duties by their principals. However, teachers lack self-drive in active participation in the assigned duties and responsibilities because of the guidance and control provided by their principals. The style lacks adequate framework to determine the competencies required to provide effective leadership which may lead to high teacher motivation. Therefore, it is logical to conclude that directive leadership style least motivates the teachers.

References

- Abbasi, H. & Mohammadi, (2013). Relationship between physical education teachers in secondary school in Western province of Iran. *Asian journal of management and science and education*.
- Alessandro, S., Castro, M., Ray, S. & Vereline, C. (2004). *An Examination of Leadership Styles and Teacher Motivation*. St John's University.
- Ariko, O.C. & Simatwa, W.M. (2011). Factors influencing Secondary school teacher transfer requests in Suba District Kenya. Analytical Assessment, Department of Educational Management and foundations. Maseno University. *Educational Research*, 2(7), 1270-1280.
- Armstrong, M. (2003). *Handbook of human resources management practice* (3rd ed., pp. 321-346).
- Atsebeha, J.A. (2016). *Principals leadership styles and their effects on teachers' performance in Tigray Region in Ethiopia*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of South Africa.
- Bell, C. Chan, M. & Nel, P. (2014). The impact of participative and directive leadership on organizational culture. An organizational development perspective. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(23).
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational administration quarterly*, 37(5), 662-683.
- Brown, M. & Owusu, A.A. (2014). *Influence of head teachers' management styles on teacher motivation in selected senior high schools in the Sunyani Municipality of Ghana*.
- Bunni, O. (2005). Effect of leadership style on job-related tension and psychological sense of community in work organizations. A case study of Four organizations in Lagos state, Nigeria. *Bangladesh e-Journal of sociology*, 4(2).
- Butcher, A. C. (2014). *The relationship between leadership and improving achievement status in secondary schools. A multiple-site case study*. Theses and dissertations. 2341 <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/2341>.
- Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation (2013). *Great Teaching, Inspired Learning: What does the evidence tell us about effective teaching?* Sydney: Department of Education and Communities, New South Wales.
- Charlton, G. (2012). *Human habit of highly effective organizations*. Pretoria; Vanschatk Publishers.
- Cohen, L., Manion L. & Marrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.). London, New York. Rutledge.
- Cole, G. (2004). *Management Theory and Practice* (6th Ed). London: community on Equal Education.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., Leithwood K., Qing G., & Eleanor B. (2010). *10 strong claims about successful school leadership*. National college for leadership of schools and children service UK.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a New Structure for School Leadership*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 432 800.
- Finnigan, K.S. (2010). Principal leadership and teacher motivation under high stakes accountability prices. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 9(2), 183-202.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (2003). *Management of organizational behavior. Utilizing Human Resources* (6th ed.). New York. Prentice Hall Inc.
- Hezibola, B. (2008). *A quantitative Evaluation of the reformulated 1996 Path Goal Theory of work unit leadership via structural Equation modeling*. Doctoral Dissertation University of Edinburgh.

- Johnson, S. M. (2012). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of Teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. *Teacher college record*, 114(10). 1-39.
- Jones, G. & George, K. (2011). *Contemporary Management*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Katzell, R. A. & Thompson, D. E. (1990). Work motivation: Theory and practice. *American psychologist*, 45, 144-153.doi:10.1037/003-066x.45.z.144.
- Leithwood, K. & Sun, J.P. (2009). Transformational school leadership effects on schools teachers and students. In W.K Hoy & M.D.I Paola (Eds.), *Studies in school improvement* (1-22). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.
- Lekia, N. & Emmanuel, N.K. (2018). Principals' leadership styles and motivation of teachers in government secondary schools in Port Harcourt local government area. *Nigeria International Journal of Innovative Education Research*, 6(3) 47-59.
- Lynch, L. M. (2012). Responsibilities of today's principals: Implications for principal preparation programs and principal certification policies. *Rural special Education quarterly*, 31(2), 40-47.
- Masuku, S. (2011). *The instructional leadership role of the high school head in creating a culture of teaching and learning in Zimbabwe*. University of South Africa.
- Mbiti, M. D. (2007). *Foundations of School Administration*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, A.G. (2003). *Research methods; Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Revised edition 2003 Africa Centre for technology studies (ACTS) Press Nairobi.
- Mulwa, A.S. (2013). The influence of principals', teachers' and students' attitudes on readiness to adopt e-learning in secondary schools in Kitui District, Kenya. *European scientific Journal, esj*, 9(5).
- Mutune, M.S. Onyango, G. & Olembo, J. (2018). The head teacher's directive leadership practices in Nakuru and Nairobi Catholic private primary schools. *International Journal of Research and innovation in Social Science (IKRISS)*, ii, July 2018/ISSN 2454-6186.
- National Teachers Organization, South Africa. (2003). National professional teachers' organisation of South Africa. Naptosa. Retrieved from <https://www.naptosa.org.za/>
- Ngobeni, E.T (2004). *The role of leadership in motivating teachers in the Zeerust District South Africa*. Retrieved on March 2013, 2014 from <http://www.libsev.5.tut.gc.az>.
- Okello, M.L. (2017). *Secondary school principals' motivational rewards on retention: Case of secondary school teachers in Homabay County Kenya*. Unpublished PhD Degree, Rongo University.
- Olaniyan, O. (1997). Can African Music Enhance Socio-Political and Economical Development in Nigeria? In Olufemi Olaoba (Eds.), *African Notes* (Vol. 29. Nos. 1&2). Ibadan: Institute of African Studies, University of Ibadan.
- Owiti, B. O. (2016). *Influence of principals leadership styles on students discipline in Kikuyu sub county, Kenya*. Unpublished Masters project. University of Nairobi.
- Pyne, C. (2014). A quality education begins with the best teachers, says Christopher Pyne. *Sydney Morning Herald* (18 February; online). Retrieved from: <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-opinion/a-quality-educationbegins-with-the-best-teachers-says-christopher-pyne> (accessed 28 June 2020).
- Richard, B. (2014). *The effect of motivation on employee's performance. Empirical evidence from Brong Aghato Education Directorate*. Master of Business Administration Thesis. KNUST School of business.

- Robin, (2012). *Path Goal Theory of leadership encyclopedia of Group processes and intergroup relations* (Ed. John, M. Levine and Michael A. Hogg.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAG 2009, 36-37, SAGE reference online. Web.30 Jan. 2012
- Robinson, V.M.J., Lloyd, C. & Rowe, K.J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: an analysis of the differential effects of leadership type. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.
- Sagie, A. (1996). The effects of leader's communication style and participative goal setting on performance and attitudes. *Human performance*, 9, 51-64.
- Sauces, S. (2011). Taking the reins: The effects of New leaders status and leadership.
- Saleem, A. Aslam, S, Yin, H. & Rao, C. (2020). Principal leadership styles and teacher job performance: viewpoint of middle management: sustainability Article. Correspondence: Safrazmian@nenu.edu.cn(S.A); reocm506@nenu.edu.cn(C.R)
- Sancar M. (2014). *State school principals perceived leadership behaviours in relation to English Language and other subject area teachers' job satisfaction in TRNC*. Phd Thesis. Eastern Mediterranean University. North Cyprus.
- Sautelle, E., Bowles, T., Hattie, J. & Arifin, D. N. (2015). Personality, resilience, self-regulation and cognitive ability relevant to teacher selection. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(4), 54–71,
- Serrel, P. (2011). Distributed leadership an accelerator for organizational culture change: <http://uk.linkedin.com/pub/paul/Serrel/22/bab/42b>, 22nd February 2011.
- Shavan, S. (1986). The school as an organization, a systematic approach. *Psychology and counselling Education*, 48-75.
- Teachers service commission (2018). Career progression Guidelines for teachers Nairobi. Government printer.
- Teachers Service Commission of Kenya (2015). Code of Regulations for Teachers. Nairobi.
- U.S Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative services, (1997). IDEA Final Regulations; An overview, Retrieved August 5, 2008. From <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/policy/IDEA/OVERVIEW.DOC> .
- Wangai, M.M. & Kyalo, M.P. (2015). Gender Bias in the recommendations and appointment of teachers to administrative positions in Nyandarua central sub-county, Kenya. *International journal of humanities and social science*, 5(1).
- Wangai, N. (2015). *Principals' Leadership Behavior and Teachers Job Satisfaction in public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya*. Nairobi. Unpublished PhD Thesis Kenyatta University.
- Wango, G.M. & Gatere, A.W. (2012). *School finance management: Fiscal management to enhance Government and accountability*. Nairobi: The Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.