

Relationship between Principals' Leadership and Teachers' Motivation

Saw Sandar Win Htut¹ & Phue Ei Khin²

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between the principals' leadership and teachers' motivation at selected basic education high schools in Myingyan Township. All senior, junior, and primary school teachers (N=319) from the selected basic education high schools in Myingyan participated in the study. Data for this quantitative study were collected using Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X which classified the leadership styles of principals as "Transformational Leadership", "Transactional Leadership" and "Laissez-faire Leadership". In addition, Teachers' Self-Motivation Survey was used to assess the following factors of teachers' motivation: "Motivation by Current Principal", "Motivation by Transformational Principal", "Motivation by Transactional Principal" and "Motivation by Laissez-faire Principal". Descriptive statistics, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Pearson product moment correlations were used in analyzing data. The results of this study indicated that teachers from selected high schools perceived that their principals mostly practiced transformational leadership ($\bar{X}=4.01$). And they perceived that they were highly motivated by transformational principal ($\bar{X}=4.26$). Then, there were positive relationships between principals' leadership and teachers' motivation. To be exact, it was found that transformational leadership was positively and moderately related to teachers' motivation ($r=.478, p=0.01$). And a positively and low correlation was found between transactional leadership and teachers' motivation ($r=.367, p=0.01$) and between laissez-faire leadership and teachers' motivation ($r=-.239, p=0.01$). Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that principals' leadership is important for teachers' motivation in selected high schools.

Keywords: principals' leadership, teachers' motivation

Significance of the Study

Leadership is described as the ability to enlist, mobilize, and motivate others to apply their abilities and resources to a given cause (Eyal

¹ Lecturer, Department of Educational Theory, Sagaing University of Education

² Senior Teacher, Myingyan Township

& Roth, 2011). In education, it illuminates the ways in which principals influence teachers and persuade them to devote their utmost efforts to tasks that promote their goals. The leadership style of the principal of the school has an impact on the teachers in their work in general and the teacher's perception of the teaching profession in particular. The effective educational leader is one who has the ability to enhance student learning through the motivation of teachers, staff and students (Daley, Guarino & Santibanez, 2006, cited in Hardman, 2011). Moreover, principals have a critical role in creating a positive and an open atmosphere for the teacher to be organized and goal oriented. (Friedman, 2004, cited in Wasserman *et al*, 2016). The more the leader is attentive and answers the personal needs of the followers, the higher their motivation at work will be and this encourages them to solve the problems that arise and increases their participation (Avolio *et al.*, 2004, cited in Gilbar, 2015).

On the other hand, teachers play a very important role in the learning process of students who idealize teachers and try to copy them. Teachers' actions and behaviors are related to their beliefs, perceptions, assumptions and motivational levels. Teacher motivation refers to a teacher's desire and attitude to work and participate in pedagogical processes within the school environment. (Ofoegbu, 2004, cited in Gilbar, 2015). Therefore, schoolteacher motivation is an important factor to ensure that the teachers do all they can, so that students receive the best outcomes. The motivation of teacher is very important as it directly affects the students. Moreover, school principals have to keep in mind that teachers who do not have job satisfaction and are de-motivated may weaken educational programmes (Snowden and Gorton, 2011, cited in Eyalet *al*, 2010).

The relationship between principal leadership and teacher motivation is related to the attempt to better understand principals' impact on school performance (Leithwood and Mascall, 2008, cited in Eyalet *al*, 2010). School principal can influence teacher motivation through increased levels of trust, shared decision-making, support and vision which are all characteristics of transformational leadership. Expanding the authority of the teacher and assigning tasks strengthens the teacher's feeling of responsibility and therefore increases his motivation and his willingness to devote himself to the work (Avidav-Unger & Friedman, 2011, cited in Eyalet *al*, 2010). Therefore, the relevance of job satisfaction and motivation are very serious to the long-term growth and development of any educational system.

By keeping in view the importance of principal leadership and teacher motivation, the present study is designated to investigate the effect of principal leadership behavior on teacher motivation at different tasks. Although it is likely to have shortcoming and weakness, the researcher believes that this study will help principals and teachers from basic education high schools in the development of a better understanding and appreciation of the importance of principal leadership and teacher motivation which is vital for implementation of the educational objectives.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between principal's leadership and the level of teacher's motivation at basic education high schools in Myingyan Township. Specific purposes of this study were-

- To examine the leadership as perceived by the principals themselves
- To examine the principals' leadership rated by teachers
- To explore the differences in leadership by the perception of principals and the perception of teachers
- To explore the teachers' motivation as perceived by teachers themselves
- To investigate the relationship between principals' leadership and teachers' motivation
-

Theoretical Framework

(i) Principals' Leadership

For the purpose of this study, the Full Range Leadership (FRL) model as described by Bass and Riggio (2006, cited in Gilbar, 2015) was used in the framework. This model includes four components of transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence attributed, idealized influence behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration), two components of transactional leadership behaviors (contingent reward, management-by-exception active, management-by-exception passive and laissez-faire behaviors).

Transformational leadership is a leadership that creates positive change in the followers whereby they take care of each other's interests and act in the interests of the group as a whole. Transformational leaders are charismatic and motivate employees by inspiring them, consider them individually, and stimulate their intellectual needs. In order to provide teachers, transformational principal must go beyond self-interest for the good of the group, emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission, express confidence that goals will be achieved, get others to look at problems from many different angles and treat teachers as individuals rather than just as a member of a group.

Transactional leadership is a process of exchange of transactions between the leaders and the followers (Northhouse, 2010). Transactional leaders are transactional who specify tasks and monitor performance to achieve the tasks by providing a reward system. In transactional leadership, the principal provides teachers with assistance in exchange for their effort, focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards and wait for things to go wrong before taking action.

Laissez-faire Leadership implies that someone in the position of a leader does not fulfill leadership responsibilities and practically does not engage or involve in any meaningful transactions whatsoever. This leader does little or nothing to affect either the followers or the outcomes of their behaviors. In laissez-faire leadership, the principal fails to interfere until problems become serious, avoid getting involved when important issues arise and making decision, and delay responding to urgent questions in school settings.

(ii) Motivation

There are many competing theories, which attempt to explain the nature of motivation. These theories are all, at least, partially true, and all help to explain the behavior of certain people at certain times. In this study, Self Determination Theory developed by Deci & Ryan (2000) was based for teachers' motivation. Self Determination Theory was based on competence, relatedness, and autonomy, all of which were essential for growth and were intrinsic motivators (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Central to the theory is the important distinction between two types of motivation – intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Ryan and Deci (2000) proposed that intrinsic motivation was highly valued because it produced and enhanced performance. Through the SDT model, Ryan and Deci (2000) proposed that

extrinsic motivation could lead to motivation for less interesting work. Thus, extrinsic motivators may satisfy a need but do not foster the degree of internalized motivation embodied in autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Definitions of Keys Terms

The terms used throughout the current study are identified below for clarity and understanding.

- **Leadership**-Leadership refers to the ability to enlist, mobilize, and motivate others to apply their abilities and resources to a given cause. (Eyal & Roth, 2011)
- **Teacher Motivation**- Teacher motivation refers to a teacher's desire and attitude to work and participate in pedagogical processes within the school environment. (Ofoegbu, 2004, cited in Gilbar, 2015)
-

Related Literature

Principal Leadership

According to Yukl (2010), leadership is a deliberate process of a person to emphasize a strong influence on others to guide, create a structure, as well as facilitate activities and relationships within a group or organization. Thus, leadership of a principal in a group should be able to exert influence, capabilities and activities to influence others around them in order to implement responsibilities as a member of the organization to achieve educational goals. They must be able to encourage and motivate their staffs to accept the initiative and to provide the necessary resources and support for the staff to successfully improve students' achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004).

Finnigan (2010) identified four areas in which the principal motivated teachers. The four areas identified are;

- instructional leadership,
- principal support for change,
- teacher-principal trust and
- inclusive leadership

In education, principals play a pivotal role in leading their school in a positive and, one can hope, an academically successful manner. Teachers and staff tend to feel more comfortable if their principal understands their role in the school and will respond to the principal if they are motivated and inspired. So, it is important to understand different leadership styles employed by principals, especially when it comes to directing teachers and making major decisions that affect the school. If a principal is to shift the educational paradigm in a school, he or she must exude these characteristics in order to foster change. Similarly, McBer (2000, cited in Ismail, 2012) found that leadership styles are greatly influenced by the emotional intelligence of each leader, and include attributes such as: being coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetter, and coaching. These six emotional intelligences allow a principal to lead the school with soul and not merely guide teachers as if they were robots.

Vroom (1979) refers to leadership styles as a particular behavior applied by a leader to motivate his or her subordinates to achieve the objectives of the organization. The three leadership styles that used in this study are transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership.

Teacher Motivation

Motivation is one of the most important factors for improving the performance of teachers in performing their duties so as to get maximum results and the achievement of a goal expected. Motivation among teachers is an essential factor for improving the effectiveness and achievements in the classroom and at school (Ololube, 2006). Teachers are motivated when they perceive that their leaders are knowledgeable, strong and goal-oriented but at the same time, flexible, encouraging, supportive helpful and create very close relationship with them (Flores, 2007, cited in Admassie, 2017). Wegge (2000, cited in Eres, 2011), argued that principals who possess transformational leadership qualities motivate teachers to participate in decisions. Indeed, transformational leadership increases motivation of employees (Park & Raniney, 2008). Teacher motivation is based on intrinsic factors and that true job satisfaction is based on higher order needs (Sylvia and Hutchinson, 1994, cited in Mark, 2015). Offering additional extrinsic motivation has even been found to undermine the intrinsic motivation of teachers (Deciet *al*, 1999, cited in Mark, 2015). The major extrinsic factors that affect teachers' motivation may include attractive remuneration, student discipline, good working conditions, favorable

educational policies and high occupational status (Chiresha & Shumba, 2010).

Intrinsic motivators, for teachers, are those factors that relate to the internal desires for personal and professional development and retain teachers to work in educational settings (Claeys, 2011). Intrinsic factors, according to Burton (2012, cited in Admassie, 2017), that tend to make tasks more interesting, enjoyable and psychologically rewarding can be classified as: (1) achievement (2) recognition (3) work itself (4) responsibility (5) advancement (6) possibility of growth.

Motivation takes part in an important role for teachers because it helps to achieve the target in an efficient way. If in schools, the teachers do not have sufficient motivation then they are less competent which directly influence the students and the education system. Teachers' motivation in schools is important as it positively contributes to the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process. Positive work motivation of teachers promotes students' achievement, students' study and academic success and students' social, emotional and intellectual development.

The Effect of Principal Leadership on Teacher Motivation

School principals have a crucial effect on the total climate of the school and the motivation of teachers and they are the key figures in raising teacher morale and commitment (Evans, 1997). Studies that focus on specific factors of principal leadership found inviting leadership that focuses on compassion and respect for the individual through collaboration and mutual respect and transformational leadership traits have a positive correlation to teacher motivation. According to Evans (1997) principals can increase or decrease stress level of teachers based on the handling processes they employed. To sum, from the above discussion, researches indicated that principal leadership practice plays a vital role in motivating teachers. Studies' results asserted that leadership behaviors, based on the type of behavior the leader manifested, may have positive or negative association with teacher motivation.

Moreover, principal leadership affects student outcomes (i.e. students' rates of attendance, achievement, graduation, and college enrollment) indirectly, by creating the conditions that support teachers' ability to teach and students' learning rather than directly (Robinson *et*

al.,2008). According to Porter *et al.* (2010, cited in Eyal& Roth, 2010), these conditions include high standards for student learning, rigorous curricula, quality instruction, a culture of learning and professional behavior, connections to external communities, and performance accountability. Principal leadership showed a small to medium indirect effect on students' achievements through school climate, school mission, and teachers' job satisfaction (Hallinger, 2003). Scholarly writings have linked the aforementioned conditions with increased teacher motivation to exert extra effort in teaching, to investigate better ways of teaching, to try new theories of learning and new instructional strategies, and to adopt educational reforms (Geijselet *al.*,2003, cited in Eyal & Roth, 2010). Thus, teachers' engagement and motivation has been studied mostly as a mediating factor between school leadership and students' learning (Hallinger and Heck, 1998, cited in Eyal& Roth, 2010).

Method

This study is designed to explore the relationship between principals' leadership and teachers' motivation at selected high schools in Myingyan Township. A descriptive statistical design was utilized in this study. Data were collected by using two questionnaires (Questionnaire for Principals and Questionnaire for Teachers) in order to investigate the effect of principals' leadership on teachers' motivation at different tasks.

Instrumentation

In Questionnaire for Principals, "*Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5 X (MLQ)*" containing 36 items developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) was utilized. In Questionnaire for Teachers, two instruments: the "*Teachers' Self-Reported Motivation Questionnaire*" containing 15 items developed by Price (2008) and "*Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5 X (MLQ)*" containing 36 items developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) were employed. These instruments have five point Likert scales, ranging from 1-not at all, 2-once in a while, 3-sometimes, 4-fairly often and frequently and 5-frequently, if not always.

Procedure

In order to obtain the content validity for questionnaires, expert review was conducted to four experienced educators who had special knowledge with this area, from the Department of Educational Theory.

Next, Pilot Study was conducted 2 principals and 91 teachers representing two high schools in Sagaing Township on December 5th and collected after 10 days. The coefficient of correlation for Principals' Leadership was .94 and .89 for "Teachers' Motivation". For the main study, questionnaires were distributed to principals and teachers from 6 Basic Education High Schools in Myingyan on December 11th and 12th and collected them after lasting one week. Although 6 questionnaires for principals and 325 questionnaires for teachers from selected high schools were distributed, all principals and 319 teachers (98.26%) completed the questionnaires.

Findings

Table 1. Mean Values for Principals' Perception on their Leadership

Dimensions of Principals' Leadership	School						Total (n=6)
	A (n=1)	B (n=1)	C (n=1)	D (n=1)	E (n=1)	F (n=1)	
Transformational Leadership	4.70	4.25	4.35	4.30	4.95	4.65	4.53
Transactional Leadership	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.33	3.94
Laissez-faire Leadership	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

(1-2.33 = less frequently practice, 2.34-3.67= moderately practice, 3.68-5= most frequently practice)

Table 1, shows the mean values of principals' perception on their leadership. According to the respondents' perceptions, the total mean value on transformational leadership was 4.53. Besides the total mean values on transactional and laissez-faire leadership were 3.94 and 1.00. Among the six selected high schools, School E had the highest mean value of 4.95 in transformational leadership. School F had the highest mean value of 4.33 for the transactional leadership according to respondents' perception. In addition, laissez-faire leadership of all schools had the mean value of 1. When comparing the mean values of leadership for selected schools, principals from all schools A, B, C, D, E and F, perceived that they mostly

practiced transformational leadership and transactional leadership than laissez-faire leadership.

Table 2. Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Perception on their Principals' Leadership

Schools		Principals' Leadership		
		Transformational	Transactional	Laissez-faire
A (<i>n</i> =70)	Mean	4.09	3.70	1.23
	<i>SD</i>	0.55	0.46	0.63
B (<i>n</i> =57)	Mean	4.12	3.57	1.46
	<i>SD</i>	0.80	0.77	0.10
C (<i>n</i> =55)	Mean	4.14	3.64	1.45
	<i>SD</i>	0.77	0.63	0.89
D (<i>n</i> =41)	Mean	3.94	3.69	1.48
	<i>SD</i>	0.65	0.44	0.74
E (<i>n</i> =42)	Mean	3.67	3.43	2.17
	<i>SD</i>	0.64	0.48	1.05
F (<i>n</i> =54)	Mean	4.08	3.41	1.17
	<i>SD</i>	0.55	0.47	0.29
Total (<i>n</i> =319)	Mean	4.01	3.57	1.49
	<i>SD</i>	0.66	0.54	0.61

(1-2.33 = less frequently practice, 2.34-3.67= moderately practice, 3.68-5= most frequently practice)

Table 2 shows the mean values and standard deviations of teachers' perception on their principals' leadership. According to the respondents' perceptions, the total mean value on transformational leadership was 4.01. And the total mean values on transactional and laissez-faire leadership were 3.57 and 1.49. Among the six selected high schools, School C had the

highest mean value of 4.14 in transformational leadership. School A had the highest mean value of 3.7 for the transactional leadership according to the respondents' perception. In addition, laissez-faire leadership of School E had the highest mean value of 2.17 among the six selected high schools. When comparing the mean values of leadership for selected schools, teachers from all the schools A, B, C, D, E and F perceived that their principals mostly practiced transformational leadership than the other two leadership styles.

Table 3. Comparison of the Mean Values for Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions on "Principals' Leadership"

Leadership Styles	Principal (N=6)	Teachers (N=319)	Means Differences
Transformational Leadership	4.53	4.01	0.52
Transactional Leadership	3.94	3.57	0.37
Laissez-faire Leadership	1.00	1.49	-0.49

According to Table 3 "Transformational Leadership" was mostly practiced leadership style, "Transactional Leadership" was moderately practiced and "Laissez-faire Leadership" was less frequently practiced leadership according to the perspectives of all teachers and principals themselves from all high schools.

Accordingly, comparing the principals' and teachers' mean scores on principals' leadership, the teachers' ratings were lower than the principals' rating in transformational and transactional leadership styles. However, the teachers' ratings were greater than the principals' ratings in laissez-faire leadership styles. The greatest mean difference was found in "Transformational Leadership" and the lowest mean difference was found in "Laissez-faire Leadership" among three leaderships.

Table 4. Mean Values and Standard Deviation for Teachers' Motivation Perceived by Teachers'

Dimensions of Teachers' Motivation	School						All Schools (n-319)
	A (n=70)	B (n=57)	C (n=55)	D (n=41)	E (n=42)	F (n=54)	
Motivation by Current Principal	3.94 (0.36)	4.13 (0.71)	4.15 (0.54)	4.15 (0.47)	4.01 (0.43)	4.10 (0.45)	4.08 (0.49)
Motivation by Transformational Principal	4.05 (0.27)	4.36 (0.65)	4.15 (0.59)	4.46 (0.47)	4.33 (0.66)	4.22 (0.36)	4.26 (0.5)
Motivation by Transactional Principal	3.77 (0.36)	3.93 (0.74)	3.82 (0.72)	3.84 (0.54)	3.96 (0.58)	3.96 (0.43)	3.88 (0.56)
Motivation by Laissez-faire Principal	2.61 (0.96)	2.64 (1.02)	2.78 (0.89)	2.71 (1.29)	2.63 (0.87)	2.72 (1.13)	2.68 (1.03)

1-2.33=Low Motivation, 2.34-3.67=Moderate Motivation, 3.68-5=High Motivation

According to Table 4, the responses of teachers from selected Education High Schools, they had high levels of motivation in these dimensions; "Motivation by Current Principal" "Motivation by Transformational Principal" and "Motivation by Transactional Principal". However, the mean value for "Motivation by Laissez-faire Principal" of the teachers was 2.68. It implies that the teachers from the selected Basic Education High Schools were moderately motivated by laissez-faire principal.

Based on the teachers' ratings, it was found that the School C and School D were the highest and the School A was the lowest in "Motivation by Current Principal" among selected schools. Again School D had the highest level and School A had the lowest level in "Motivation by Transformational Principal" among selected schools. Moreover, teachers from School E and School F had the highest level and School A had the lowest level in "Motivation by Transactional Principal" among selected schools. Then, School C had the highest level and School A had the lowest level in "Motivation by Laissez-faire Principal" among selected schools.

Table 5. Relationship between Principals' Leadership and Teachers' Motivation

	Transformational Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Laissez-faire Leadership
Teachers' Current Motivation	.478**	.367**	-.239**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

According to Table 5, principals' transformational leadership was significantly related to teachers' current motivation of schools ($r = .478$, $p < 0.01$). This correlation implied that a significant and moderate relationship existed between principals' "Transformational Leadership" and "Teachers' Current Motivation" of schools. Unfortunately, there was statistically significant but low relationship between "Transactional Leadership" and "Teachers' Current Motivation" ($r = .367$, $p < 0.01$) and between "Laissez-faire Leadership" and "Teachers' Current Motivation" ($r = -.239$, $p < 0.01$).

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendation

Discussion and Conclusion

According to the perceptions of principals' self-rating, it was found that the principals from all high schools mostly practiced transformational leadership. When comparing the dimensions of principal leadership, "*Transformational leadership*" was the most frequently practiced in all leadership dimensions in selected high schools. However, principals from all high schools mostly practiced in two leadership dimensions; "*Transformational Leadership*" and "*Transactional Leadership*". It can be interpreted that principals from all high schools mostly practiced in arousing strong emotions, serving as a coach, teacher and mentor and helping teachers to look at old problems in a new way and they are able to arouse, excite and inspire teachers to put out extra effort to achieve educational goals. This finding can be supported by the explanation (Bass 1985) that organizational members are "transformed" by becoming more aware of the importance of their tasks and by being helped to transcend

their own self-interest for the sake of the organization's mission (cited in Wright, *et al*, 1992).

According to the perception of teachers, it was found that principals from all high schools mostly practiced transformational leadership. When comparing the dimensions of principal leadership, "*Transformational leadership*" was mostly practiced in all leadership dimensions in selected high schools. However, principals from all high schools moderately practiced in "*Transactional Leadership*". It can be interpreted that principals from all high schools mostly practiced in developing the consciousness of teachers, aligning them towards the educational mission and vision and motivating them in implementing the vision. This finding can be supported by the explanation Cherry, (2014) that transformational leaders tend to be emotionally intelligent, energetic, and passionate. They are not only committed to helping the group achieve its goals but also to helping group members fulfill their potential (cited in Tresea, 2013).

When studying the mean score of principals' leadership rated by principals and teachers, it was found that the teachers' ratings were lower than the principals' ratings in the transformational leadership and transactional leadership dimensions. However, teachers' ratings were higher than principals' ratings in laissez-faire leadership. According to the mean values, it was found that principals in selected schools more frequently practiced laissez-faire leadership than their perceptions on laissez-faire leadership. This finding can be supported with the explanation of Lord, Brown and Freiberg (1999) that leadership is a process which is perceived differently by teachers and how the leadership is accepted by teachers is related to the implicit leadership perception of teachers (Kenney, Blascovich and Shaver, 1994; Engleand Lord, 1997). The presence of a harmony between implicit leadership perception and the leader and that it provides the trust and motivation between subordinate and superior relationship has been proven through scientific research (Epitropaki and Martin, 2004). In this context, it may be said that the implicit leadership perceptions of teachers are not compatible with the leadership behavior of school principals.

When studying the mean score of teacher motivation rated by teachers themselves, it was found that the teachers from all schools had high levels of teacher-motivation in almost dimensions. According to the perceptions of teachers' rating, it was found that the teachers from all

schools possessed high teacher motivation levels in these dimensions of teacher motivation; “*Motivation by Current Principal*”, “*Motivation by Transformational Principal*” and “*Motivation by Transactional Principal*”. But, teachers from all schools possessed moderate level in “*Motivation by Laissez-faire Principal*”. It can be said that teachers from all schools had high levels of teacher motivation under the principals who possess transformational leadership qualities. This finding can be supported with the explanation of Wegge (2000, cited in Eres, 2011), that principals who possess transformational leadership qualities motivate teachers to participate in decisions. Indeed, transformational leadership increases motivation of employees. (Park & Raniney, 2008)

Finally, based on the research findings, there was statistically significant but moderate correlation between principals’ transformational leadership and teachers’ current motivation ($r=.478$, $p<0.01$). Then, it was found statistically significant but low relationship between principals’ transactional leadership and teachers’ current motivation ($r=.367$, $p<0.01$). Similarly, there was statistically significant but low relationship between principals’ laissez-faire leadership and teachers’ current motivation. Therefore, it can be concluded that leadership styles of principals had an influence on teachers’ motivation. This finding can be supported with the explanation of Johnson (2007, cited in, AlFahadet *al*, 2013) that educational process is to achieve its goals; it needs teachers with high motivation. At the same time, teachers need support to increase their satisfaction and motivation and this will come about through principals’ effective leadership style.

Recommendation for Further Research

This study explored the relationship between principals’ leadership and teachers’ motivation in selected basic education high schools in Myingyan Township. Therefore, further studies are needed to be expanded the connection between principals’ leadership and teachers’ motivation to promote the quality of education in other townships. Besides, there is a need for further research including variables such as educational background of principals and teachers, intelligence and other personal characteristics.

This study examined principals and teachers from Basic Education Schools. Thus, further studies are needed to conduct in Basic Education Middle Schools and Basic Education Primary Schools. Moreover, further studies for principals’ leadership should be assessed by the perception of the

parents, community and other administrators (e.g. TEO, ATEO, etc.). Further research should be made for the schools in other states and regions to be able to represent the principals' leadership styles in Myanmar extensively and deeply.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my profound gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Saw Pyone Naing (Rector, Sagaing University of Education), Dr. Myat Myat Thaw (Pro-rector, Sagaing University of Education) for their permission to carry out this study.

Second, I want to express my sincere thanks and deep respect go to Dr. Daw Khin Mar Yee (Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Theory, Sagaing University of Education) for her tremendous assistance and criticisms towards the completion of this study.

I would like to express my gratitude to external supervisor Dr. Daw Htay Khin ((Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education) for her expert guidance, critique, comments and invaluable timely advice to complete this study.

I recognize and appreciate the encouragement to all my teachers and colleagues from the Department of Educational Theory for their unceasing support.

References

- AlFahadet *al*, (2013).*The Relationship between School Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Achievement Motivation*.Proceedings of 3rd Asia-Pacific Business Research Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.Retrieved on December 5, 2017 from [https:// wbiworldconpro .com/ uploads/ Malaysia conferences2013/ management/444-Heba.pdf](https://wbiworldconpro.com/uploads/Malaysia_conferences2013/management/444-Heba.pdf)
- Admassie, S.Z. (2017). *Principal Leadership Practices, Teacher Motivation, and Student Achievement in Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa City Government*.Department of Educational Planning and Management,College of Education and Behavioral Studies Addis Ababa University.Retrieved on December 2, 2017 from <http://etd.aau.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/16920/1/Shimelis%20Zewdie.pdf>
- Appolline, A.T. (2015).*Motivational Strategies used by Principals in the Management of Schools.The Case of some Selected Secondary Schools in the Fako Division of the Southwest Region of Cameroon*.Autumn term 2015, Department of Education, University of Jyvaskyla.Retrieved November7, 2017 from <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/4987/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-201512043909>

- Balyer, A. (2012). Transformational Leadership Behaviors of School Principals: A Qualitative Research Based on Teachers' Perceptions. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4 (3), Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey. Retrieved November 7, 2017 from <http://www.iojes.net/userfiles/article/iojes-949.pdf>
- Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher Motivation and Job Satisfaction: A Study Employing the Experience Sampling Method. Retrieved November 8, 2017 from <https://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~jus/0303/bishay>.
- Chiresha, R. & Shumba, A. (2010). *Teaching as a profession in Zimbabwe: Are teachers facing a motivation crisis?* Pretoria: University of South Africa. Retrieved January 7, 2017 from <http://miejrs.in/ojs/index.php/mjestp/article/viewFile/46/46>
- Eres, F. (2011). Relationship between Teacher Motivation and Transformational Leadership Characteristics of School Principals. Ankara, Turkey. *International Journal of Education*, ISSN 1948-5476 2011, Vol. 3, No. 2: E4. Retrieved on December 7 from <http://macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ije/article/download/789/738>
- Evans, L. (1997). Understanding teacher morale and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. Retrieved on November 29, 2017 from <http://scholarcompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?>
- Eyal, O., & Roth, G. (2011). Principals' leadership and teachers' motivation self determination theory analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, Retrieved November 9, 2017 from <https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.essr.net/~jafundo/mestrado-material-itgikhnls>
- Finnigan, K. S. (2010). Principal leadership and teacher motivation under high-stakes accountability policies. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*. Retrieved on September 7 from <https://urresearch.rochester.edu/fileDownloadForInstitutionalItem.action;jsessionid=8A6CA05A82A2B9680C5130523EDE8399?itemId=21292&itemFileId=69303>
- Gilbar, C.R. (2015). *Principals' Leadership and Teacher Motivation; A Study of the Relationship in the School Reform Era*. Retrieved November 11, 2017 from <https://www.google.com/url?q=http://digitalshowcase.lynchburg.edu/cgi/viewcontent>.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading Educational Change: Reflections on the practices of instructional and transformational Leadership. *Cambridge journal of Education*, Retrieved on November 27, 2017 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248999383-Leading-Educational-Change-reflections-on-the-practice-of-instructional-and-transformational-leadership>

- Hardman, B.K. (2011). *Teacher's Perception of their Principal's Leadership Style and the Effects on Student Achievement in Improving and non-improving schools*. University of South Florida. Retrieved November 11, 2017 from <http://sholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent>.
- Ismail, M.R (2012). *Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Leadership Styles and How They Impact Teacher Job Satisfaction*. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado. Retrieved on November 18, 2017 from <https://dspace.library.colostate.edu/bitstream/handle/10217/67461/Ismail-colostate-0053A-10997.sequence=1>
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S. & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved on October 27, 2017 from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/How-Leadership-Influences-Students-Learning.pdf>
- Mark, A. (2015). *Factors Influencing Teachers' Motivation and Job Performance in Kibaha District, Tanzania*. Master Thesis, University of Tanzania. Retrieved on November 7, 2017 from <http://repository.out.ac.tz/1413/1/Mark-Agnes-DESSERTATION-24-11-2015.pdf>
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Retrieved on November 7, 2017 from <http://orange.turnwheel.com/northouse-leadership-theory-and-practice-pdf.pdf>
- Ololube, N. (2006). *Teachers Job Satisfaction and Motivation for School Effectiveness and Assessment*. University of Helsinki, Organizational Culture and Climate, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved on December 27, 2017 from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED496539>
- Park, S.M., & Rainey, H. (2008). Leadership and public service motivation in US Federal Agencies. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 109-142. Retrieved November 11, 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10967490801887954>
- Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Retrieved on November 27, 2017 from <http://donnaelder.wiki.westga.edu/file/view/The+impact+of+leadership+on+student+outcomes+an+analysis+of+the+differential+effects+of+leadership+types.pdf>
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Classic definitions and new directions*. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, University of Rochester. Retrieved November 7, 2017 from <https://mmrg.pbworks.com/f/Ryan,+Deci+00.pdf>

- Sudrajat, J. *et al* (2015). Supervision, Leadership, and Working Motivation to Teachers' Performance. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)* Volume 3, Issue 6. Retrieved November 12, 2017 from <https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijmsr/v3-i6/18>
- Teresa.J(2013). *Influence of Headteachers Leadership Styles on Employees in Secondary Schools Access to Their Rights in Nandi East Kenya*. University of Nairobi. Retrieved on December 15, 2017 from <http://eap.uonbi.ac.ke/sites/default/files/cees/education/eap/LEADERSHIP%20STYLES.pdf>
- Vroom, V.H. (1979). *Work and motivation*. New York:
- Wasserman *et al*, (2016). Relationship between the Principal's Leadership Style and Teacher Motivation. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. Vol. 15, No. 10. Retrieved November 13, 2017 from <http://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/download/760/>
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations (7th edition)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Retrieved on December 25, 2017 from [http://ebooks.narotama.ac.id/files/Leadership%20in%20Organization%20\(7th%20Edition\)/Cover%20&%20Table%20of%20Contents%20-%20Leadership%20in%20Organization%20\(7th%20Edition\).pdf](http://ebooks.narotama.ac.id/files/Leadership%20in%20Organization%20(7th%20Edition)/Cover%20&%20Table%20of%20Contents%20-%20Leadership%20in%20Organization%20(7th%20Edition).pdf)