

**Principals' Participative 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 participative leadership style on motivation of teachers in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya counties, Kenya. Correlation survey research design was adopted for this study. 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 participative 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. Participative leadership style was the strongest predictor as indicated by its estimated standardized regression weight ( $\beta = 0.496$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ). The estimated standardized regression weights show the relative importance of participative leadership style predictor in the model. This predictor accounts for about 32% of the variance in teacher motivation in both Nyamira and Siaya counties ( $R^2 = 0.322$ ). Based on these findings it was concluded that the teachers in public secondary schools in both Nyamira and Siaya counties prefer a participative oriented style of leadership.

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

**Introduction**

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). They argued 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' participative 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' participative 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 explains the participative 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 participative leadership style enables teacher motivation and learner performance in Nyamira and Siaya counties.

### **Methodology**

The study employed a correlation survey 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. The independent variable also known as predictor or explanatory variable in this study was the principals' participative leadership style while the dependent variable was teacher motivation. 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. Stratified random sampling was employed to select 19 schools from Siaya County and 19 from Nyamira County. 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.

Internal consistency reliability of the instruments was gotten by computing Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) 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.

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

This study was to investigate the relationship between participative leadership style and teacher motivation in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya counties.

The principals in the study were requested to respond to a number of statements regarding participative leadership styles using a 5 point Likert rating scale.

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

	Participative leadership behavior	SA		A		U		D		SD	
		f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)
1	I involve my teachers in decision making.	21	67.74	5	16.13	1	3.23	3	9.68	1	3.23
2	I facilitate teachers when attending workshops and trainings.	24	77.42	7	22.58	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	I trust teachers to use good judgment in decision making.	25	80.64	4	12.90	0	0	1	3.23	1	3.23
4	We share ideas and information as a staff before arriving at a decision.	26	83.87	4	12.90	0	0	1	3.23	0	0
5	I ensure all teachers understand their roles in school.	25	80.65	4	12.90	0	0	1	3.23	1	3.23
6	I encourage staff initiatives.	27	87.09	3	9.68	0	0	1	3.23	0	0
7	I recognize teachers who do well.	30	96.77	1	3.23	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	I show concern for the well-being of my teachers.	28	90.32	2	6.45	0	0	1	3.23	0	0
9	I share responsibility with my teachers.	27	87.09	3	9.68	0	0	1	3.23	0	0
10	My teachers are sometimes self-directed.	20	64.51	3	9.68	1	3.23	5	16.13	2	6.45
11	Teachers are given time-frames within which they should finish the assigned tasks.	25	80.65	2	6.45	0	0	3	9.68	1	3.23
12	Teachers assess progress in goal attainment regularly.	24	77.42	3	9.68	0	0	2	6.45	2	6.45

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

Table 1 shows principals' views to their participative leadership styles. Most 21(67.74%) of the principals strongly agreed that they involve teachers in decision making.

The results of the current study concur with those by Wangai (2015) which reveal that participative leadership style involves teachers in discussions and gives teachers' ownership of decisions made in the school. Further, it was revealed that the results of the current research were in agreement with Atsebeha (2016) which reveal that a principal who employs participative leadership assists the teachers to share their thoughts and experiences with others to contribute in the decision-making and motivates staff to contribute in diverse undertakings. Most principals 21 (67.74%) were consistent with Amedome (2018) findings that majority of heads gave orders only after extensive consultation with teachers as a result their policies faced little opposition during the implementation stages.

Further, the findings of the study show majority 24 (77.42%) of the principals strongly agreed that they facilitate teachers when attending workshops and training while no principal disagreed or strongly disagreed that they don't facilitate teachers to attend workshops and trainings. The results of the current research are in agreement with Ibukun (1997) that the main duty of the principal is to create a favorable environment for the staff for them to be free to attend workshops where they gain current trends which can bring desired changes in students.

Majority 25 (80.65%) of the principals trusted that teachers use good judgment in decision making process. This concurs with the study by Koopman and Winderson (1998) which indicate that principals practice this style when they involve their subordinates in joint decision making or shared roles. The study revealed that when principals practice participative type of leadership, they consult with teachers for ideas and take their ideas seriously when making decisions that affect their schools. Aldag (2001) concludes that participative leaders share decision making with the group. This motivates the teacher to work even more hard. Also, consistent with the results of the findings of the current study is the work of Mendinyo et al. (2017) which reveal that good administrators should encourage the participation of teachers and parents in the decision making process.

This study shows that majority 26 (83.87%) of the principals strongly agreed that they share ideas and information as a staff before arriving at a decision. The findings indicate a common participative leadership practice in seeking teachers' opinions before making decisions, which concurs with Path Goal theory that a participative leader involves the followers in making decisions (Vijayaragan, 2008). On the other hand, most 25(80.65%) of the principals ensured teachers understood their roles in school. Negron (2008) asserts that as a way of recognizing teacher's participative leaders consult with them about decisions and take their suggestions into account, opinions, shares tasks, involve them in planning, execution stages and incorporates their proposals into decision-making prior to making final decisions.

The results of the current study concur with Kuloba (2010) and Kinyua (2018) who established that head teachers who consulted the key stakeholders in their decision-making were more successful in their work and performance in their schools as this makes teachers more motivated.

The finding of the study shows that majority 27(87.09) of the principals strongly agree that they encourage staff initiatives. This is a common participative leadership practice with principals listening receptively to teachers' ideas and initiatives and seeking teachers' views on tasks to be performed. These findings were in agreement with Amedome (2018) who notes that occasionally school principals have to define challenging goals for the teachers to contribute. They should know how to inspire teachers to explore new ways to increase and develop their work continuously. Through staff initiative teachers will gain skills and confidence in their work. Further, Grant (2011) asserts that juniors can provide viable inputs into successful leadership of school when supported and empowered. The study further



shows that principals who listen to teacher's initiatives either individually or during staff meetings helped them to identify and solve the school problems (Sancar, 2014).

Almost all principals 30 (96.77%) strongly agreed that they recognize teachers who do well. Similar results were reported in Masuku (2011) and Wachira (2017) studies which revealed that principals held end of term meetings to reward teachers orally or through writing to those teachers who have achieved set targets. Equally, in these meetings, the principals seek clarifications, review teachers' progress in achieving set targets and identify obstacles hindering performance for the purposes of finding solutions. Unlike in Butcher (2014) study which reported that the principals found time to meet individual teachers, in the current study, principals' creation of time to meet individual teachers was a least common participative leadership behavior. Equally, the findings of the current study contrasted Wangai (2015) study that found that a small percentage 2.38% of the principals in public secondary schools in Nairobi County practiced participative leadership, which made most of their teachers demotivated.

This study reveals most principals 27 (87.09%) strongly agreed that they shared responsibility with teachers. A great number of 24 (77.42 %) of the principals strongly agreed that teachers assess progress and goal attainment regularly. The principals who demonstrate participative leadership style have their teachers more motivated. Teacher involvement in decision making determine the institution's undertakings such as supervision and managerial affairs. The findings of the current study were found to be consistent with those that reveal that there is reason for the staff to be involved in decision-making and ruled out geographical central differences for belongingness and affiliation which come with being involved in decision-making. Further, a total of 28 (90.32%) principals said they showed concern for the well-being of their teachers. Unlike in Kasimu (2016) study which found that some managers did not help their employees when they had work related problems, and this demotivated them.

The Teachers' Service Commission Act (2012) explains the role of the principal as a lead educator in a regulated school system. Principals' failures to properly implement participative approach that is general consultation, empowerment, combined decision-making and proper involvement, together with consultative methods i.e. approval of followers' sentiments and thoughts in goal settings and duty assignments in planning school roles directly decrease teacher motivation (Brown, 2003). The hierarchical decision-making by principals in school is a challenge as they demotivate.

The findings concurred with Zaidman, Amichai-Hamburger and Zchwartz (2012), Joo (2011) studies which established that when team leaders solicit different ideas from the team members there is improved team outcomes and high level of motivation. Awan, Zaidi and Bigger (2008) suggests that principals need to involve teachers to increase their motivation. Jacobs (2010) say that most of the juniors have elementary ability and correct kind of involvement produces both high autonomy and increased intrinsic motivation. Naturally, teachers are more committed to subsequent activities from their decision making and improved royalty to one another as well as are dedicated to the decision outcomes (Spreister, 2005).

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

**Table 2. Teachers' views regarding participative leadership styles of their principals (N=256)**

	Participative leadership behavior	SA		A		U		D		SD	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	My principal provides complete freedom to teachers.	129	50.39	93	36.33	5	1.95	9	3.52	20	7.81
2	My principal lets teachers do what is expected of them.	192	75	10	3.91	8	3.13	20	7.81	26	10.16
3	My principal facilitates teachers attending of workshops and trainings.	197	76.95	45	17.58	1	0.39	5	1.95	8	3.13
4	My principal provides teachers with all teaching-learning resources.	131	51.17	100	39.06	4	1.56	9	3.52	12	4.69
5	My principal delegates tasks to teachers without directing them.	89	34.77	92	35.94	11	4.29	43	16.79	21	8.20
6	My principal allows teachers to access set goals regularly.	201	78.52	21	8.20	2	0.78	20	7.81	12	4.69
7	My principal does not give time frames to teachers to finish the assigned tasks.	11	4.29	15	5.85	1	0.39	178	69.53	51	19.92
8	My principal allows teachers to set their own future goals.	147	57.42	78	30.47	3	1.17	20	7.81	8	3.13
9	I feel motivated to teach and attain better results.	201	78.52	31	12.10	1	0.39	20	7.81	3	1.17
10	My principal acknowledges each teachers effort towards attainment in school goals.	97	37.89	88	34.38	8	3.13	21	8.2	42	16.41
11	My principal is open to criticism by teachers.	89	34.77	95	37.10	8	3.13	43	16.79	21	8.20

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

Most 129 (50.39%) of the teachers strongly agreed that their principal provides complete freedom to teachers. Bass (1990) observes that participative leadership is one in which the leader gives freedom to the staff and this leads to independence of workers. Furthermore, he observes that this leadership is organized on consensus, consultation, delegation and improvement and has subordinates who are highly motivated.

The findings show that majority 192 (75%) of the teachers strongly agreed that their principal lets them do what is expected of them. In response to further probing on how a principal lets them do what is expected of them, one teacher explained:

*We always meet with the principal and come up with what is supposed to be done. Then the principal will leave us do what is expected of us. Most of the expectations are agreed upon by all teachers.*

Again most 197 (76.95%) of the teachers strongly agreed that their principals facilitate teachers' attending of workshops and trainings. Further probing sought to establish the level of facilitation that teachers receive to attend workshops, a teacher clarified:

*The principal normally supports the teachers when going out for any seminar or workshop. He does so by giving the fare, lunch and registration fee which may be required.*

This finding agrees with Leithwood and Anderson (2010) study who found that better performing schools facilitate teachers and everyone concerned about the matters of performance in attending trainings and workshops while it focuses on school goals, policies and strategies to emphasize unity of purpose. Lawler (2003) emphasizes that training the staff and giving them right and current information is fundamental to creating organizational effectiveness and success.

A great number 131 (51.17%) of the teachers strongly agreed that their principals provide teachers with all teaching-learning resources. In focus group discussion, some teachers agreed with the view that principals normally provide teachers with teaching and learning materials. One teacher noted:

*The principal ensures all the materials that students require for learning and teachers for teaching are all available at any time. The principal is ready at all times to provide books, revision materials, charts for teaching and learning.*

This finding concurs with Masuku (2011) and Sancar (2014) studies who observe that when teachers are consulted when making teaching and learning schedules and timetables they become comfortable.

The study finding showed that most 201 (78.52%) of the teachers strongly agreed that their principals allow teachers to assess set goals regularly while a few 11 (4.29%) of the teachers strongly agreed that the principals do not give time frames to teachers to finish the assigned tasks while majority of them 178 (69.53 %) disagreed.

In focused discussion groups, teachers further revealed that their principals need things to be done very fast without minding how heavy it is and the time required to finish the work. Asked to explain why the principal does not give timeframes to teachers to finish the assigned tasks, one teacher noted:

*The principal always feels that we have a lot of time but we don't utilize the time well.*

These findings indicate that participative approach happens when an administrator seeks to include organization employees to petition their ideas and consider their recommendations before making decisions (Chen and Tjosvold, 2006). The results of the research showed that the principals who practiced participative leadership styles embraced consultation and power sharing.

The findings in Table 2 concurred with those of Clark (2000) who argue that participative leadership approach is characterized by involvement, empowerment, combined decision making and power sharing. The findings concluded that participative principals consulted their teachers, sought their ideas and opinions and integrated their inputs into schools' decisions. It was found that participative leadership style was most effective in leading to higher teacher motivation hence student achievement.

Hannagan, (2002) in his study found where principals do proper delegation of tasks to teachers relieves them from their many jobs and secondly instill a sense of duty, hardworking and obligation among the teachers which in turn enhances their motivation. Therefore, this finding agrees with the study that, majority 92(35.94 %) of the secondary school teachers in the study area are directed by their principal on duties delegated/assigned to them.

Participative principals communicate and reinforce the teachers' morale by creating a shared sense of values among the teachers where by 97 (37.89%) strongly agreed and 88 (34.38%) agreed that the principal acknowledges each teachers' effort towards attainment of school goals.

On focus group discussions, the teachers were asked to clarify how the principal acknowledges teachers' efforts towards attainment of school goals, one teacher noted and said:



*The principal congratulates teachers who have done their job well before other teachers. In some cases, our principal can do a letter to appreciate one who has met the set goals.*

The findings were consistent with the findings with the study by Achua (2001) on motivation and performance of primary school teachers when allowed free reign towards attainment of school goals. Lussier and Aacha (2010) study revealed that participative leadership approach is effective when staff are highly motivated and competent they can receive acknowledgement of their efforts from their leader and from local parents, if they are involved in decision making procedure and if they are motivated to attain better results. These study findings revealed that schools where teachers are not involved in decision making and the governance of the school they behave as if they do not belong to the school. Therefore, majority of the teachers do not do their best to possess sense of commitment and devotion to the school. Still, the study findings revealed that through meetings every teacher had an equal chance to contribute his/her views.

The study hypothesis determined if principal's participative leadership styles had a significant impact on teachers' motivation ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

**H0<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between participative leadership style of principals and teachers' motivation in Nyamira and Siaya public secondary schools.**

Regression analysis tested the relationship between principals' participative leadership styles and teachers' motivation. The independent variable was principals' participative leadership styles. The dependent variable was teachers' motivation. Table 3 presents model fitness for the relationship between principals' participative leadership and teachers' motivation.

**Table 3. Model fitness for the relationship between principals' participative leadership styles and teachers' motivation**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.496 <sup>a</sup>	.327	.322	23.065

The results in Table 3 presented model fitness used in explaining the relationship between leadership styles of principals and teachers' motivation. The Adjusted R square of 32.2 % shows that principals' participative styles explain a modest 32.2 % of teachers' motivation. Other factors not included in the model explain 67.8 % of teachers' motivation.

**Table 4. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the relationship between principals' participative leadership styles and teachers' motivation**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	45825.865	1	45825.865	78.800	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	107640.522	322	386.283		
	Total	153466.387	323			

The result on Table 4 indicates that the model was statistically significant. This was supported by an F statistic of 78.800 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than 0.05 significance level. Therefore, at the 99.5% confidence level a statistically significant relationship existed between principal's participative leadership styles and teacher's motivation,  $P < 0.05$ . The results implied that principals' participative leadership styles are a good predictor of teachers' motivation.

**Table 5. Regression of Coefficients for participative leadership styles**

Model		Beta( $\beta$ )	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	0.496	21.856	.000
	Participative leadership styles		9.702	.000

The independent variable, participative leadership styles had a strong positive impact on teacher's motivation with ( $\beta = 0.496$ ). At the 99.5% confidence level there was a statistically significant relationship since the P-value (0.000) was less than 0.05 level of significance. The corresponding t-statistic 9.702 was greater than the critical t statistic ( $t_{cal} [9.702] > t_{crit} [1.96]$ ). Thus the null hypothesis was rejected. The conclusion was participative leadership styles have a significant relationship with teachers' motivation. Quantitatively, a unit change in principals' participative leadership styles would lead to a 0.496 units change in teachers' motivation.

These findings concur with Yukl (2010) study which found that principals using a participative leadership style create harmony through involvement but these principals also anticipate a higher level of quality and self-direction. It further stated that principals should have time to listen and share ideas with their teachers. Similarly, Sinani (2016) established that participative leadership style had a positive and significant relationship on teacher motivation. Robinson, Lloy and Rowe (2008) conducted a study to examine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the principal's participative leadership behavior and teacher motivation. The findings revealed that leadership style clearly impacted on teacher motivation and a positive relationship and teacher motivation was evident in several areas. In the current study, while concurring with the positive impact of participative leadership on teacher motivation, it was noted that teachers anticipated larger participation in decision making than presently provided.

### Conclusion

This study concluded that participative leadership behaviour practised by principals in public secondary schools in Nyamira and Siaya counties encouraged hierarchical decision making by the principals in the schools. The formal school leadership structures are not removed when principals practice this leadership style. The final decision rests with the principal and management team. The study foresees the need to mitigate principals' dominance in school activities and programs by not only encouraging teachers to be involved in decision making but also allowing them in implementation of the final decisions. It is logical, therefore, to conclude this style had lowest teacher motivation.

### References

- Achua, (2001). Leadership effectiveness. A study of constituent factors. *Journal of Management Research*.
- Adeyemi, T. O. (2010). Principals' leadership styles and teachers job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State Nigeria. *International journal of Educational Administration*, 2(6), 83-91.
- Aldag, R. J. (2001). *Organizational behavior and management: an integrated skill approach*. U.S.A. South Western Press.
- Alessandro, S., Castro, M., Ray, S. & Vereline C. (2004). *An Examination of Leadership Styles and Teacher Motivation*. St John's University.

- Amedome, N.S. (2018). The Influence of Leadership in school. A Case study of Senior High school in Hohoe Municipality of Ghana. *Academy of Educational leadership Journal*, 22(2).
- 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.
- Awan, R., Zaidi, N.R. & Bigger, S. (2008). *Relationships Between Higher Education Leaders a Subordinates in Pakistan: a path- Coral approach*.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational administration quarterly*, 37(5), 662-683.
- Brown, B. B. (2003). *Employees' organizational commitment and their perception of supervisors' relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviors*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- 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*.
- Brown, M. (2012). *Motivational factors as determinants of performance among business students in the SHS, in the Cape Coast Metropolis*. University of Cape Coast, South Africa.
- 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.
- Chen & Tjosvld (2006). Participative leadership by American and Chinese Managers in China; Role of Relationships. *Journal of management studies*.
- Clark, B. R. (2000). *Collegial Enterprenenialism in proactive Universities change*.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Marrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). London, New York. Rutledge.
- 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.
- Hannagan, T. (2002). *Management concepts and practice*. London Pitman Publishing Pearson Education limited.
- 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.
- House, R. J. & Mitchell, T. R. (1994). Path-Goal theory of leadership. In F. Luthans (Ed.), *Contemporary readings in organizational behaviour*. New York: McGraw hill.
- Ibukun, W. O. (1997). *Educational Management: Theory and Practice*. Lagos Greenland Publishers.

- Jacobs, G. E. (2010). *Relationship between distributed leadership as practiced by principals and the organizational commitment of teachers*. PhD Dissertation, Southern University. Georgia.
- 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.
- Johnson, T. L. (2007). *The impact of Principal Leadership Styles on Teacher Motivation and Job Satisfaction*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Joo, Y. H. (2011). *The Structural Analysis of the Effects of Distributed Leadership of Teacher Professionalism*. A dissertation presented to University of Texas, Austin. December, 2011.
- Kasimu, P. (2010). *The influence of employee perception of the leaders' Path-Goal leadership behaviours on organizational commitment: A case study of East African Breweries limited*. Unpublished M.ed Thesis. United States International University. Africa, Nairobi
- Kinyua, N. R. (2018). *Headteachers' Leadership styles on KCSE performance in Embu East Sub-County, Kenya*. Unpublished Masters Project, Nairobi. Kenyatta University.
- Koopman, P. L & Wierdsman, A. F. M. (1998). Participative management. In P.J. Doentu, H. Thierry, & C. J. De-wolf (Eds.), *Personnel psychology: handbook of work and organizational psychology* (Vol., 3 pp., 297-324). Hove, UK psychology press.
- Kuloba, N.P. (2010). *Leadership styles and teacher performance in secondary schools in Nakaseke District*. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- Lawler, E.E. (2003). *Treat people right. How organizations and individuals can propel each other into virtuous spiral of success*. John Wiley and sons, Inc. San Francisco.
- Leithwood, K. & Reihl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership Philadelphia: Laboratory for student success*. Temple University.
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2010). *Leadership* (4th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning: Mason, USA.
- 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.
- Mendinyo, R.O.K et al. (2017). Leadership styles of secondary school principals and teachers' job satisfaction in Yenagoa, local government area of Bayelsa State Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Research Methods in Education (JOSR-JRME)*.
- National Teachers Organization, South Africa. (2003). National professional teachers' organisation of South Africa. Naptosa. Retrieved from <https://www.naptosa.org.za/>
- Negron, D. (2008). *A case study examining the relationship of the path-goal theory leadership styles to profits in EL Paso, Texas, Rent-A-Center store*. (Doctoral dissertation). Capelle University. Retrieved from Pro Quest dissertations and this database.
- 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>.
- Oduor, A. (2015). Shocking study on teachers' job satisfaction rating. Nairobi standard News Paper pg. 1 Col.1.
- Pongoh, S. (2008). The effect of principal leadership and achievement motivation on teaching competence of public teachers in Monado city Indonesia. *Journal of Education and practice*, 5(1). [www.iiste.org/journal.php](http://www.iiste.org/journal.php).

- 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.
- Robinson, M. J., Lloyd, C.A. & Rowe, K.J. (2008). The impact of leadership on Student outcomes, an analysis of the different effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration quarterly*, 44(5), 635-74.
- Sagie, A., Zaidman, N., Amichai-Hamburger, Y., Te'eni, D., & Schwartz, D. G. (2002). An empirical assessment of the loose-tight leadership model: quantitative and qualitative analyses. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 303-320.
- 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.
- Sinani, F. (2016). *The effects of participative leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Ankara: Pegem. A publication.
- Spreister, G. (2005). A role for organizations in sustainable peace. *At the 2005 National Academy of management Meetings, August 7-10, Hawaii*.
- 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>.
- Vijayaragan, G.I. (2008). *High performance leadership*. Mumbai. Himalaya Publishing House.
- Wachira, T. (2017). *Relationship between Headteachers' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in public primary schools in Kenya. A case study of Nakuru County*. Unpublished PhD Thesis Degree in Education of Maasai Mara University.
- 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).
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*. Seventh edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.