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Abstract

The focus of this research was to examine how primary and combined school principals in the Ogongo Circuit, Namibia motivated the teaching staff.

The research instrument used to conduct this survey was a questionnaire. A descriptive statistical method was used to analyse the data. The study was confined to primary and combined schools in above-mentioned circuit. I randomly selected five schools and my sample consisted of 25 respondents made up of five principals and twenty teachers. Three critical questions were developed which focused on:

1. The extent to which primary and combined school principals in Ogongo Circuit in Namibia motivate teachers,
2. create a school environment that promotes motivation;
3. strategies used to motivate teaching staff.

The findings of this study were that teachers’ motivation in the sample schools was unsatisfactory, as most of the motivational aspects such as morale rewards and recognition, as well as vision and mission statement were neglected. Principals in the sample schools failed to develop good strategies to motivate teachers. This led to an engagement of teachers in private business during school hours as well as poor time management resulted in insufficient motivation.

The study reveals some of the contributing factors leading to a lack of motivation. These demotivating factors were:

1. Principals’ leadership styles,
2. Teaching in areas or phases where they were not ‘specialized’
3. Poor infrastructures and lack of resources.

The study recommends that principals need to identify the basic needs of teachers and institute measures to ensure that these needs are met. Principals also need to acknowledge job well done and attempt to create a working environment where teachers are motivated to do their best.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

This chapter presents the background and purpose of the study. It discusses the theoretical location of the study; research questions, methodology and presents the structure of the dissertation.

1.1 Background and Purpose of Study

Soon after Namibia’s independence from South Africa in March 1990, the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) took serious steps to improve the country’s educational system. The Ministry published a policy document, *Towards Education for All: A Development Brief for Education, Culture and Training* (1993), which stipulated the major educational goals for the country. The goals were access, equity, quality and democracy. In 1999, the Presidential Commission on Education, Culture and Training (PCECT) was appointed to evaluate the implementation of this policy throughout the country. The Commission found that the only goal that had been met was access. This meant that the number of schools had increased and that many Namibian children now had access to education.

One finding of particular concern to the Commission related to teacher behavior. The findings revealed that throughout the country certain teachers were absent from their schools during working hours. It was found that many teachers spent most of their time in towns doing their own private work. The Commission reported that some teachers set a bad example by being under the influence of alcohol in public. Another disturbing finding of the Commission was the increasing rate of female learners who were impregnated by their teachers. The Commission concluded that the teachers' behavior led to poor learner performance. The findings of the Commission were in line with the findings of a study by Mushaandja (1996) which found that the quality of education in the Ondangwa
Educational Regions in Namibia was very poor. Mushaandja (1996) had found that despite various efforts to improve the quality of education, there were still hindrances to the successful improvement of the quality of education in Ondangwa Educational Regions. Citing the 1994 Ministry of Basic Education and Culture Annual Report, Mushaandja (1996) identified the following problems in the Ondangwa West and Ondangwa East regions as:

(i) Late arrival of teachers and learners at school,
(ii) High rate of female learners impregnated by teachers.

The researcher believed that the behavior of teachers resulted from a lack of motivation, and being engaged in their own private businesses. This prompted the researcher to investigate how Primary and Combined School Principals in Ogongo Circuit (in Ondangwa West Educational Region) in Namibia motivate teaching staff. Focus on motivation was further influenced by Owens’s (2001: 330) description of the concept claimed that:

> Motivation deals with explanations of why people do the things they do. Why, for example, do some teachers regularly come to work and do as little as necessary, whereas others are full of energy and ideas and throw themselves zealously into the job? Why do some principals seem to focus only on the day-to-day operations in the school with no apparent vision of where the school should be headed, whereas others seem to embrace a clear, coherent vision of the school as it ought to be and pursue it consistently over the course of years?...

Further motivation of this study was a direct result of Musaazi (1987:43) who claimed that motivation closely affects work performance and the overall efficiency of an organization.

It is hoped that the findings of this study will bring about an increased awareness and understanding of the importance of principals’ practice in increasing teacher motivation. It is also hoped that the study’s findings will help to improve the quality of education that teachers offer. The study brings to bear available theory and practice on motivation, and adds to the growing body of literature on teacher motivation, particularly as it relates to teachers in the Ogongo circuit.
1.2. Theoretical Location of the Study

The study is to a large extent framed by McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, as cited by Owens (2001). McGregor claims that leaders' beliefs determine the leaders' behaviors towards their subordinates. By implication therefore McGregor’s theory implies that principals who subscribe to Theory X believe that in order to motivate teachers, a principal needs to direct and control the teachers, while principals who subscribe to Theory Y believe that a principal needs to create an atmosphere where all teachers are viewed as real assets.

McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y are regarded as a philosophy that forms the basis for other theories of motivation (Kroon, (1995), cited in Drucker, (1974) and Stoner, (1982). One such theory is Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs that also frames this study. Maslow believes that people's motivation develops through five levels. The first level consists of the physiological needs for life’s basics, such as food, water, sex, and similar inputs which are basic to human survival. The second level, the safety-security, is the need for security, order, shelter, freedom from environmental threats, etc. On the third level, belonging is the need for affection, belonging, etc. The fourth level is the need for self-esteem brought about by issues such as achievement, confidence, recognition, prestige, etc. The highest level is self-actualization which implies the need to reach one’s ultimate goals in life and fulfill one’s own destiny (Riches, 1994).

1.3. Research Questions

The principal objective of the study is to find answers to the following critical questions:

- To what extent do school principals in Ogongo Circuit motivate their teaching staff?
- What strategies do the school principals use to motivate their teaching staff?
- To what extent do the school principals create school environments that promote motivation?
1.4. Research Methods
The study was conducted by means of a survey. The attraction to utilise a survey for this study lay in the capacity of surveys to generalize their findings within a given parameter (Cohen, et al., 2001). The survey was confined to primary and combined schools in Ogongo circuit. The study's data were collected by means of structured questionnaires.

1.5. Limitations of Study
The main limitation of the study was the use of one research instrument, the questionnaires, for collecting data. Although the confidential nature of the instrument gave freedom for the targeted participants to express themselves freely, the instrument did not permit the researcher to probe the respondents' answers. The second limitation was the small scale of the study. The scale was determined by the size of the dissertation and time constraints. Only five schools in the circuit were surveyed. This means that the findings of the study are generalisable only within that context, and not the whole circuit.

1.6. Definition of Terms
The following key terms used in this study are defined in order to avoid ambiguity:

**Circuit:** The circuit is an educational district in which schools are inspected and supervised by a circuit inspector who sees to it that the principals and teachers implement educational policies (Mushaandja, 1996).

**Motivation:** It is the inner desire that makes people willing to work towards desirable results, e.g. good performance of learners.

**Leadership:** It is the unique human ability to guide, direct or influence people in order to achieve the principal goals of an organization (Owens, 2001).
1.7. The Structure of the Dissertation

**CHAPTER 1: Introduction:** gives the study’s background and purpose, theoretical location, research questions and methods. It also gives a brief definition of terms and the structure of the dissertation.

**CHAPTER 2: Literature Review:** discusses literature reviewed for the study regarding teacher motivation.

**CHAPTER 3: Research Design and Methodology** discusses how data was gathered and analyzed.

**CHAPTER 4: Presentation and Discussions** presents the study findings as well as the interpretation of the findings.

**CHAPTER 5: Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations** provides a summary of the findings of the study and outlines the recommendations in relation to the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. Introduction

This chapter presents the literature review that provided an in-depth insight into theoretical issues related to motivation. Although there is a bulk of literature dealing with this topic with regards to other countries, literature available on this topic for the Namibian situation is limited. This chapter will therefore draw heavily on international literature.

The chapter is organised as follows: firstly, it provides the definition of the term “motivation”. Secondly, it deals with the importance of motivation, and thirdly, ends with an exploration of various theories of motivation.

2.1. What is Motivation?

The term "motivation" is derived from the Latin verb *movere*, which means, "to set in motion" (Van der Westhuizen, 1994: 194). Van der Westhuizen defines motivation as the spark that ignites and influences the course of human action. According to Everand and Morris (1985: 24) motivation can be defined as "getting results through people or getting the best out of people". The authors also view motivation as all efforts used by educational leaders to encourage their staff to willingly achieve desired goals to the best of their abilities.

Steyn & Van Niekerk (2002) claim that most definitions of motivation have three components:

- Energising human behavior.
- Directing behavior by creating a goal orientation for the worker.
- Maintaining and supporting behavior.
The authors further define motivation as having to do with the complex forces, incentives, needs, tensions and other mechanisms that energise, channel and sustain human behaviour. Similarly, Kroon (1995) asserts that motivation is that which causes, channels and maintains human behaviour.

2.2. The Importance of Motivation

Brevis, et al., (2002) indicates that motivation is one of the factors that directly affects employees’ performance. This is in line with Musaazi’s (1987) view that motivation is a factor that closely affects performance and overall efficiency of an organization. This implies that the school will not be able to fully realize its goals until pupils, teachers and principals are sufficiently motivated. Lussier (1999) also emphasises that motivation is important because it helps to explain why employees (teachers) behave the way they do.

According to Steyn & Van Niekerk, (2002) the importance of having motivated staff members, is that:

- Motivated employees are always looking for better ways of doing their job.
- Motivated workers are usually concerned about quality.
- Highly motivated workers are more productive than apathetic ones.

The authors further state that educational managers who are aware of the reasons why staff members behave in particular ways have an advantage in facing the challenges and solving problems that teaching is going to face in the coming decades. Recognising the importance of motivation and promoting staff can therefore contribute greatly to the effectiveness of schools and education systems.

Duke (1987) indicates that when immediate supervisors or principals motivate their teachers, teachers carry out their teaching responsibilities with diligence. This is because good performance does not only result from the ability to execute educational policies but is also a function of willingness.
According to Steyn & Van Niekerk (2002), the attitude and behaviors of staff members reflect the level of motivation. For instance, indicators of high motivation include, inter alia:

- Consistently good performance and results;
- Energy, enthusiasm and determination to succeed;
- Willingness to accept responsibility; and
- Show of initiative and ability to work well without supervision.

Principals therefore need keen appreciation of human behavior if they are to provide maximum motivation for their colleagues.

The above indicates that there is a relationship between motivation and leadership. It indicates that leadership is a prime motivator. The study’s view is that principals are supposed to be leaders (Musaazi, 1987) who should use various theories of motivation to help in creating good atmospheres in schools and intensify willingness and ability among teachers.

2.3. Motivation Theories

Steyn & Van Niekerk (2002) claim that theories of motivation devised as an attempt to explain the behavior of employees. The theories, as classified by authors such as Lussier (1999), Kroon (1995) and Brevis, et al., (2002), fall into the following three main groups:

- Content theories which answer the question: What needs do employees have that should be met on the job?
- Process theories that answer the question: How do employees choose behaviour to fulfill their needs?
- Reinforcement theories that answer the question: What can managers do to get employees to behave in ways that help meet organisational objectives?
2.3.1. Content Theories of Motivation

The content theories of motivation focus on the inner needs that inspire people (teachers) to act. These theories suggest that the management can determine the needs of the subordinates by observing their behavior and can predict behavior by being aware of their needs (Kroon, 1995). The content theories include, among others, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, Hertzberg's two-factor theory model and the Acquired Needs Theory.

a) Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

According to Maslow, motivation needs are arranged in five levels from the lowest to the highest level of needs. Maslow used the term Prepotency to describe his view that one cannot be motivated by a higher need until the lower needs are first met, viz:

Level I- Physiological needs. These include primary or basic needs such as shelter, and relief from or avoidance of pain. For example, a principal might help a new teacher satisfy this need by helping the teacher obtain accommodation.

Level II- Safety needs. Once first level needs are satisfied, people get concerned with safety and security needs. For example, to help teachers fulfill these needs principals may inform teachers about life assurance, medical aid schemes as well as investments.

Level III- Social needs. After establishing safety, people look for love, friendship, acceptance, and affection. Principals may help in this matter by encouraging teachers to join Teachers' Unions.

Level IV- Esteem needs. After they meet their social needs, people focus on ego, status, self-respect, recognition for accomplishment, feelings of self-confidence and prestige. To fulfill this need principals' praise or rewards teachers who do a good job.

Level V- Self-actualization needs. The highest level of need is to develop one's full potential for self-fulfillment. To do this people seek growth, achievement and advancement (Lussier: 1999).
b) McGregor Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor’s view is that principals subscribing to Theory X reflect the following assumptions:

- The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it whenever possible.
- The average worker will shirk responsibility and seek formal direction from those in charge.
- Most workers value job security above other related factors and have little ambition.
- Because of this human characteristic of dislike for work, people therefore need to be coerced, or threatened with punishment in order for them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organisational objectives (Owens, 2001: 67).

Steyn & Van Niekerk’s (2002) argument is that Theory X principals view the majority of teachers as having limited abilities while they view themselves as superior. These principals believe that staff members would take advantage of the work situation and have no concept of a fair day’s work. Therefore, principals who subscribed to Theory X use force or punish teachers for them to meet the schools’ objectives.

Principals who subscribe to Theory Y assume that:

- If it is satisfying to them, employees will view work as natural and as acceptable as play.
- People at work will exercise initiative, self-direction, and self-control on the job if they are committed to the objectives of the organisation.
- The average person, under proper conditions, learns not only to accept responsibility on the job but also to seek it.
- The average employee values creativity- that is, the ability to make good decisions- and seeks opportunities to be creative at work (Owens, 2001: 67.)

Steyn & Van Niekerk (2002: 150) argue that principals who subscribe to Theory Y view each staff member as a real asset. The authors go on to say that staff members are therefore seen by these principals as having a definite capacity for growth and
development, and as being creative and accepting responsibility. Steyn & Van Niekerk maintain that such school principals create a working environment where the real potential of every teacher can be tapped.

Lussier (1999) maintains that there is no single universally accepted theory of how to motivate people. Principals may use one or a combination of McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. Steyn & Van Niekerk, (2002), in support of Lussier's opinion, claims that in the case of a teacher who is not performing satisfactorily principals have to provide assistance and close supervision. (The principal is initially a Theory X person.) When the teacher grows and develops, control can be reduced and the teacher can be given opportunities for self-direction and self-control. (The principal becomes a Theory Y manager or leader.)

c) Herzberg's two-factor Theory Model
Contrary to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg argues that motivation is not a single dimension but that it is composed of two separate and independent factors, viz.:

1. Motivational factors (including achievement, growth, recognition, etc.) lead to job satisfaction,
2. Maintenance factors (include work environment, salary and fringe benefits, etc.) play and when not sufficiently present, this can block motivation and can lead to job dissatisfaction (Owens 2001).

The two-factor theory proposes that motivators rather than maintenance factors motivate employees. In 1960 Thomas Sergiovanni replicated Hertzberg’s work. His findings supported the idea that achievements and recognition were very important motivators for teachers, along with other aspects related to job satisfaction, as mentioned above. Sergiovanni advises that principals should ensure that the causes of dissatisfaction are removed and that opportunities for satisfaction are increased. To motivate teachers, principals need to make the teachers' job more interesting and challenging, give them responsibility, provide them with the opportunity for growth, and offer them recognition for a job well done (Lussier, 1999). However, we may not forget that some of the
motivational aspects such as salaries are beyond the principals' capacity. What is more, principals play an essential role in seeing to it that teachers receive their salaries and in making special arrangements if there are any delays.

**d) Acquired Needs Theory Model**

The Acquired Needs Theory proposes that employees are motivated by their need for achievement, power and affiliation. Lussier, (1999) cites McClelland who believed that these needs are based on peoples’ personalities and are developed as people interact with the environment. According to Lussier all people possess the needs for achievement, power, and affiliation, but to varying degrees. This model proposes that when a need is strong, it will motivate the person to engage in behaviours to satisfy that need as follows:

- The need for achievement \((N_{Ach})\) is the need to excel and achieve in relation to a set of standards. Achievers prefer jobs that offer personal responsibility, feedback and moderate risks.
- The need for affiliation \((N_{Aff})\) is the desire for friendly and close interpersonal relationships. People with high N-Aff seek jobs in teaching, social work, and in other helping professions. They tend to have low need for power.
- The need for power \((N_{Pow})\) is the need to make others behave in a way that they would not otherwise have behaved (Brevis, et al., 2002: 352). People with high N Pow prefer to control a situation, others and seek positions of authority and status. They tend to have low need for affiliation.

The above arguments indicate that principals need to be aware that teachers are not set in their ways or behaviours, but can improve their own abilities if an environment is created for them to achieve their own schools’ goals or needs.

**2.3.2. Process Theories**

Process theories focus on external influences or behavior that employees choose to meet their needs. The theories include expectancy, equity, and goal-setting.
a) The Expectancy Theory
The expectancy theory proposes that teachers are motivated when they believe they can accomplish the task and that rewards for doing so are worth the effort. This means that teachers feel confident of achieving a high level of performance if the reward is high (Lussier, 1999 and Law & Glover, 2002).

b) The Equity Theory
Equity theory is defined as ratio between individual input (such as efforts and skills) and the rewards of the task (such as remuneration or promotion) compared with rewards other teachers receive for similar task input (Kroon, 1995). Motivation to act comes about after the person has compared the ratio of input results with the identical ratio of another person. This theory therefore proposes that teachers will be motivated when perceived inputs equal outputs.

c) The Goal-Setting Theory
This theory states that increased motivation and performance occur where people agree on specific and difficult goals and when feedback is given on their subsequent performance (Law & Glover, 2002). The authors suggested that both direct (e.g. time-limited) and indirect (e.g. verbal praise) incentives might increase motivation in this case. In goal-setting theory, feedback is seen as crucial if motivation is to be maintained. The goal-setting theory may therefore be regarded as potentially valuable in education if collegial and collaborative work climates exist and the focus is on participation rather than coercion. In addition, Lussier (1999) supports the above-mentioned authors by saying that the goal setting theory proposes that achievable but difficult goals motivate employees.

2.3.3. Reinforcement Theories
This group of theories proposes that rewards for behavior will motivate teachers to behave in predetermined ways. Types of reinforcement proposed by the theory include:

(i) Positive Reinforcement - which proposes that the offering of attractive consequences (rewards) for desirable performance encourages continued behavior.
(ii) **Avoidance or negative reinforcement** - proposes that negative offerings have negative consequences for performance.

(iii) **Extinction** proposes that withholding reinforcement for undesirable behavior reduces or eliminates that behavior.

(iv) **Punishment** can be used to provide an undesirable consequence for undesirable behavior. For example a teacher who arrives late for classes is punished (Kroon, 1995, and Lussier, 1999).

### 2.4. Conclusion

Van der Westhuizen’s (1994) defines motivation as the spark that ignites and influences the course of human behaviour. It is therefore concluded that the motivation theories such as McGregor’s Theory X, Theory Y, and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs chosen as a framework this study, due to the fact that if principals use one or a combination of all the said theories, then the working environment as well as the teachers’ basic needs might be covered that spark and ignite teachers’ motivation. Steyn & Van Niekerk (2002) claim that principals who are aware of the reasons why teaching staff behave in particular ways have an advantage in facing the challenges. Recognition of the importance of motivation can therefore contribute greatly to the effectiveness of the education system.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0. Introduction
The principal aim of this study is to examine how primary and secondary school principals in the Ogongo Circuit motivate their teachers. This chapter discusses the research design and the data collection and analysis techniques used for this study. The chapter begins with a description of the study site. This is followed by a discussion of the design of the study, the target population and sampling strategy and research instrument. The chapter then discusses the process of the study, namely, the study setting, pilot study; data collection and data analysis.

3.1. The Study Setting
This study was conducted in the Ogongo Circuit in the Ondangwa West Educational Region of Northern Namibia. Schools are far from one another, 15 to 20 km apart. There are 43 schools in the Ogongo Circuit and the majority are primary, combined and junior secondary schools. The circuit has only two senior secondary schools.

3.2. Research Method
The research was conducted by means of a survey. A survey was found suitable because it describes the frequency, distribution of the characteristics of an identified population (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001 and Cohen, et.al. 2001). It was also found suitable for the study because a survey enables the collection of opinions, experiences and attitudes of a large population. This makes it possible to generalise findings. And another outstanding advantage of a survey is that a small sample can be selected randomly from a large population in ways that permit generalisations to be made and applied to the larger population.
Target Population
The population for this study comprised of principals and teachers of lower, upper primary and combined schools in Ogongo Circuit in Namibia.

Sampling Strategy
The simple random sampling technique was used in selecting schools so that all schools stood a chance to be selected (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Several school names were placed into a box and five names of schools were picked randomly, consisting of two primary and three combined schools. Stratified random sampling was used to select teachers in order to maintain equal gender representation. Principals of each school provided a staff attendance register from which names of teachers were randomly selected. The total number of the sample of teachers was 20. In each targeted school four teachers were selected consisting of two males and two females. All principals formed part of the sample by virtue of their status as school “leaders”. Three of the principals were female while two were males. The overall sample size therefore was twenty five.

The Research Instruments
The study was conducted by means of a questionnaire. The instrument was found to be suitable for the study because of its potential for reliability and validity, depending on the way the instrument was designed. Scales were used extensively in the questionnaire because they allowed for a fairly accurate assessment of beliefs and opinions. Therefore, alternate forms of questionnaire items were used such as closed ended Likert scale, and open-ended types of questions to determine the reliability of responses (See appendices A and B). The questionnaire was also suitable because it guaranteed total anonymity, allowing respondents to express themselves freely on issues such as beliefs and feelings on various issues (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Although the researcher had no chance to probe answers given by respondents, the design of the questionnaires was such that it incorporated some in-depth questions. Principals and teachers' questionnaires were based on the same issues in order to get different perspectives on similar motivational aspects.
**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted in one combined and one primary school that were not part of the study sample. Two principals were selected, one male and one female with four teachers, two males and two females voluntarily completing the questionnaires. After completion participants were requested to comment and provide suggestions for improvement of the questionnaires. The pilot study was useful since the researcher was able to identify ambiguities in the research questionnaires and instructions. The questionnaire items that were misinterpreted were then reconstructed. The layout of the questionnaires was also altered.

**Data Collection**

The proposal of the study was drafted in June 2002. It was then sent to the University of Natal's School of Education Higher Degrees Committee and was approved in early July 2002. A letter seeking permission to conduct research in Ogongo Circuit was then written. The researcher delivered the letter personally to the Circuit Inspector of Ogongo Circuit. The inspector accepted the request and wrote a letter to five principals of the sample schools requesting them to give the researcher the necessary co-operation.

When the researcher arrived at the targeted schools, she first visited the school principals' offices, introduced herself to the principals and submitted the permission letter from the Circuit Inspector. At the same time, she explained the purpose of the visit and tried to establish a rapport.

Principals at some of the schools initiated a meeting for the respondents to meet the researcher so that she could explain the purpose of her study. The meetings took place during break times or after school hours to minimize interruptions of regular school activities. The researcher asked principals to distribute questionnaires to the teachers. In this way a feeling of obligation to complete the questionnaires was created in the respondents. The respondents were given three days to complete the questionnaires.
Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to help to analyse data. Frequencies and percentages were used to help answer the research questions and reflect occurrence of particular variables. Tables were used to present data that had been analysed (Tuckman, 1992). Sample schools were given names “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”, and E so that their anonymity could be maintained.

3.3. Conclusion

The chapter discussed the study setting, research methods and procedures used to collect and analyse data and explained how the research instruments were structured and administered.
CHAPTER FOUR

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.0. Introduction

This chapter presents findings on the data collected for a study of how primary school principals in the Ogongo Circuit in Namibia motivate teaching staff. The findings are presented in relation to the study's theoretical framework established in the literature review.

This chapter begins with demographics such as sex, age, academic qualifications, etc. of both groups of respondents (principals and teachers) in the sample schools to determine whether these variables have an impact on motivation.

4.1. Principals' Demographics

As indicated in Table A on page twenty, 60 % of the sample of principals were females and 40 % were males. This data revealed that more females than males occupied position of principal in the primary and combined schools in the Ogongo Circuit. Although, the study was not concerned with gender, the researcher felt that there is an element of imbalance in gender of the principalship positions in the sample schools. Also notable from the principals' demographics was that 40 % of the principals were over 45 years of age; the other 40 % were within the range of 36-45 years of age, and the remaining 20 % fell within the range of 31-35 years of age. Therefore, the data indicated that a large number of principals were mature in terms of age.

Table A also shows that none of the principals had academic qualifications higher than grade 12. Eighty percentage of the principals had grade 12 (STD 10) as their highest qualifications whilst 20 % had grade 10 (STD 8) as the highest academic qualifications. The data revealed that academically the principals were qualified for their posts, since the highest academic requirement for the post of principal in primary and combined Namibian schools is Grade 12 with seven years of teaching experience.
# PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHICS

## TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60 % (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest academic qualifications:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 (STD.10)</td>
<td>80 % (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 (STD.8)</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specify</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest professional qualifications:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HED. PG</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC.</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. TECH</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDSM</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience prior to becoming a principal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years being a principal at current school:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same table on page twenty shows that principals have a variety of professional qualifications. For instance, 20% have a Primary Teacher Certificate (PTC); 20% an Education Certificate Primary (ECP) another 20% a Bachelor of Technology in Educational Management (B.TECH.); 20% a Diploma in Development Studies and Management (DDSM); and 20% did not indicate their highest professional qualification.

All principals had teaching experience before they were appointed to the position of principal. Forty percent of the principals had taught from one to five years; the other 40% had taught from six to ten years and only 20% of them had taught eleven to fifteen years. None of the principals had teaching experience of sixteen years and above, before being appointed to their principal posts. This meant that principals in sample schools were qualified for posts. However, one could conclude that principals were in the positions long enough to know individual teacher’s weaknesses and strengths in order to motivate him or her better.

The principals’ demographics in Table A also show that 40% of the principals had held principalship positions for eleven to fifteen years; the other 40% had spent more than sixteen years at their current positions at the schools, and 20% of the principals had been positioned at the current post for less than five years. The researcher concluded that most of the principals stood a good chance to know their teaching staff well in order to know how to support, motivate and create a conducive atmosphere for the teachers, given the principals’ length of time in their current positions.

4.2. Teachers' Demographics

The numbers of teachers show equal gender balance eight males and females as indicated in Table B on page 22 below. Table B also indicates that 55% of the teachers fell within the age range of 36-45 years of age, while 25% of the teachers were within the range 26-30 years of age, 15% of them fell within the range 31-35 years of age and only 5% of the teachers were above the age of 45 years.
### TEACHERS’ DEMOGRAPHICS

**TABLE: B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40 % (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40 % (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- 25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>25 % (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>15 % (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>55 % (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>5 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest academic qualification:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 (STD 10)</td>
<td>65 % (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 (STD 8)</td>
<td>30 % (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify):</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest professional qualification:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd.</td>
<td>5 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HED.PG</td>
<td>20 % (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP.</td>
<td>20 % (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETD</td>
<td>40 % (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>15 % (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers’ teaching experience:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 months</td>
<td>5 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 year</td>
<td>15 % (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- 10 years</td>
<td>15 % (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- 15</td>
<td>30 % (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 16</td>
<td>35 % (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The age range implies that principals were challenged to motivate different age groups of teachers who perhaps had different motivational interests.

Table B above shows that 65% of the teachers had grade 12 (STD 10) and that 30% only had grade 10 (STD8) as the highest academic qualification whilst 5% did not indicate their highest academic qualification. Teachers teaching grades 1-5 were found to be suitably qualified for those grades. The teachers with grade 10 as their highest academic qualifications and allowed to teach grade 10 classes were not suitable to teach grade 10. Therefore, it is concluded that principals could motivate their teaching staff to upgrade their academic qualifications through staff development initiatives. This could be one way of avoiding poor performance in Namibia schools.

Also shown in Table B is that 40% of the teachers had a Basic Education Teacher Diploma (BETD) which prepared them to teach in grades 1-10; 20% had a Higher Education Diploma Post Graduate (HED.PG.) while another 20% had an Education Certificate Primary (ECP), and only 5% of the teachers had a Bachelor of Education (BEd).

The findings with regards to professional qualifications is that all the sampled teachers had appropriate professional qualifications for their posts. However, 15% did not indicate their professional qualifications. It could be concluded that the teachers who did not indicate their professional qualifications may have had no teaching qualifications or had qualifications of lesser value than required by the Namibian Qualification Authority (NQA). It could also be teachers lacked proper teaching qualifications and therefore were never motivated.

The same Table B shows that the majority of the teachers had considerable teaching experience. For instance, 35% had taught for about sixteen or more years; 30% for eleven to fifteen years; 15% for six to ten years; 15% for one to five years, while only 5% had been teaching for less than five months. One could conclude that teachers with
this range of experience were in a position to assess their principals’ leadership capabilities.

4.3. Findings on whether Principals in the Sample Schools motivate Teaching staff

4.3.1. How Teachers used Time

It is expected that motivated teaching staff should be able to demonstrate a willingness to accept responsibility, exhibit good performance, show initiative and ability to work well without supervision, use time efficiently, etc. The table below shows how principals and teachers in the sample schools perceive the effective use of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 % (6)</td>
<td>24 % (6)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
<td>35 % (7)</td>
<td>32 % (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>80 % (4)</td>
<td>35 % (7)</td>
<td>44 % (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C above indicates that 35 % of the teachers and most of the principals 80 % thought that teachers sometimes used time effectively, arrived on time, attended classes on time and departed from schools at the right time. Another 35 % of the teachers indicated that this occurs often, while 30 % of the teachers indicated that teachers always used time effectively. None of the principals were of this opinion that teacher always use time effectively. This gives the impression that many teachers did not use time effectively. This is in line with Mushaandja’s (1996) findings that teachers and learners in the Ogongo Circuit regularly arrived late at schools. It could also be concluded that principals did not take into consideration Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs where he argues that the physiological needs such as accommodation or distance from work are factors to be considered. This ineffective use of time is one implication that teachers were not highly
motivated. For Steyn & Van Niekerk’s (2002) time utilization is one of the important indicators of motivation.

### 4.3. 2. Schools’ Performance

Table D - Shows whether the Last four Years (1998 -2001) Schools were provided a Reward and Recognition for Outstanding Performance in the Circuit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found that at School A one teacher and principal indicated that in the last four years the school was recognised for outstanding performance in Ogongo Circuit while three teachers at the same school showed that the recognition for outstanding performance given in 1999. At School B three teachers and the principal indicated that no reward or recognition was offered to their school within the past four years, but one teacher pointed out that the school received a reward in 1999. At School C three teachers indicated that their school never received an award. One teacher did not respond to the question. One principal wrote a statement where he said "Nothing of such nature was ever arranged by the Circuit Office or even at school level." At School D all the teachers including the principal indicated that the school had never received an award for the last four years; at School E three teachers and the principal were of the same opinion as that of School D.

Therefore the study found that the majority of the sample schools did not receive awards, especially primary schools. It is likely that the circuit gave awards and recognition for outstanding and good performances to combined schools. At school level principals did not even organise such an occasion of award or recognition of teachers' performance as stated earlier by one principal. Lussier, (1999), and Law & Glover, (2000), indicated in their Expectancy Theory that teachers are motivated when they believe they can accomplish the task, and that rewards for doing so are worth the effort. This indicates that principals must appreciate their teaching staff by offering them verbal thanks or material
incentives, such as T-shirt pens, scarves, rulers or anything labeled with the name of the school.

Bush & West-Burnham (1994) state that teachers work well only when they expect their efforts to produce good performance. This could be interpreted that if sampled schools had vision and mission statements, the morale, which is a synonym for hope, might be also above average and lead to good performance of the teaching staff. Added to that is the fact that teachers get highly motivated if they are involved in setting up of criteria as well as designing vision and mission statements for their schools.

4.3. 3. Morale of the Staff Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
<td>30 % (6)</td>
<td>32 % (8)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
<td>65 % (13)</td>
<td>60 % (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 % (10)</td>
<td>4 % (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 % (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on morale question 60 % of respondents rated the staff members' morale at an average level in sample schools. Table E above shows that 40 % of the principals and 65 % of the teachers rated the morale of teaching staff as average; 40 % of principals and 30 % teachers rated the morale of teaching staff as above-average; while only 5 % of the teachers rated the morale of the teaching staff as being below average. Gorton (1997) refers to morale as a variable that reflects positive or negative feelings about a particular situation. That means that if the morale of the teachers is high, the performance of schools should also be high, which is not the case of the sample schools in this study.
4.3.4. Vision and Mission Statements

As indicated in Table F, below, responses with regards to vision and mission statements contradicted each other. For instance, at School A the principal and three teachers indicated that there was no vision and mission statement while one teacher indicated the opposite. At school B the principal and three teachers indicated that there was no vision and mission statement at the school and one teacher did not respond. Very unique at school C is that the principal and all the teachers indicated that the school had a vision and mission statement.

Table F below, shows that in School D all the teachers indicated that the school did not have a vision and mission statement whilst the principal indicated the opposite. In School E the principal indicated that the school had a vision and mission statement while all teachers were of the same opinion that the school had no vision and mission statement.

TABLE F- Existence of Mission and Vision Statements in the Sample Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOLS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A- Principal Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B- Principal Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- Principal Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- Principal Teachers</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E- Principals Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that most of the staff at the sample schools indicated the absence of either a vision or mission statement. It also seems that teachers and principals lacked a common understanding about vision and mission statements. From this it can be concluded that principals as well as teachers at sample schools were poorly motivated. Principals’ and teachers’ responses to some motivational indicators demonstrated doubt about motivation, e.g. use of time, morale, recognition of teachers’ performance, formulation of vision and mission statements of their schools.
4.4. Findings on Serious Challenges Principals and Teachers Encountered

The sample principals themselves experienced serious challenges leading to demotivation, and they listed them as follows:

- Overcrowded classrooms and poor-discipline among some learners especially the adolescent ones. This was seen to have been a result of educational policy that abolished corporal punishment in Namibian schools.
- Schools' infrastructures- no electricity and telephones, classrooms built with wooden sticks and corrugated iron which led to hot condition and sometimes caused learners to fall asleep especially in summer.
- Poor English communication by some teachers as well as by some learners.
- Some principals are so challenged by some teachers' misbehavior that the principals ended up writing misconduct reports for the teachers.
- Lack of parental involvement in their children's education. Sometimes parents ignored invitations to school meetings. Parents also did not visit learners at schools for them to familiarise themselves with their children's educational progress.
- Principals revealed that sometimes the Ministry of Basic Education also failed to supply enough materials to schools for teachers to execute their duties effectively.

Teachers experienced almost the same challenges as principals. They listed them as follows:

- Lack of teaching aids
- Lack of co-operation between parents and teachers
- Challenges in teaching learners from different cultural backgrounds, especially in lower primary classes where learners where expected to be taught in their mother tongue as required in the educational policy. One teacher wrote that "lack of provision of quality education to learners and achieving equity is one of the major
The above statement could be interpreted to mean that some teachers had no confidence in the success of their own teaching.

- Teaching many subjects was one other demotivating factors for them, and they indicated that some of the subjects were not in their areas of specialization. For instance, one teacher claimed that s/he taught Mathematics in grade 10 while s/he had specialised for lower primary only.

- Teachers also indicated that they got demotivated when they were transferred to other schools due to over staffing problems experienced in many schools.

The above-mentioned facts by both principals and teachers gave a picture of generalised demotivation in school environments.

The next section deals with how principals deal with the situation to motivate their teaching staff.

4.5. Findings on Some Strategies used by Principals to Motivate Teachers

The symbols used on Table G below are as follows: A = Always; N = Never; O = Occasionally; and S = Sometimes. In the table below (page 31), percentages are calculated on a frequency scale.

In responses to the question about the number of times principals help teachers on professional development, (as indicated in Table G on page thirty one) the majority of teachers 65% felt that the principals helped them occasionally, while only 35% of the teachers indicated that their principals always helped them to develop professionally. This is a sharp contrast to principals’ responses, as 80% of the principals indicated that they always helped the teachers develop professionally. Only 20% of the principals indicated they did this on an occasional basis. The findings showed that the majority of the principals (80%) felt they ‘always’ helped teachers to grow professionally by encouraging and motivating them to enroll with recognised educational institutions to
upgrade their qualifications as well as by sending teachers to Staff Development Workshops.

Table G indicates that 65% of the teachers felt that their principals met the teachers' needs in schools. For instance a teacher wrote that, "Our principal collected materials from the circuit office on time". However, 25% of the teachers felt that principals occasionally met their needs while 10% felt that the principals did not meet the teachers' needs. Contrary to this, 100% of the principals indicated that they always helped teachers to better meet the needs of their schools. The large percentages of teachers and principals who felt that 'leaders' met the school material needs indicated that principals met one of the requirement in the Ministry of Basic Education, where principals are expected to ensure that all teaching aids and materials, both physical and human resources, are fully utilised to benefit teaching and learning in schools. Forty percent of the teachers felt that principals always made them aware of teachers' unions; 30% felt that principals did this on an occasional basis, while 25% felt that this never occurred. Only 5% felt principals sometimes encouraged teachers to join teachers' unions. The study found that 60% of the principals felt that they always encouraged teachers to join teachers' unions and 40% felt they occasionally encouraged teachers to join teachers' unions. This gave an impression that principals did their part to encourage teachers to join teachers' unions, where teachers as members of the union would be represented on all issues related to conditions of employment and other matters affecting its members.

This strategy of principals encouraging teachers to join teachers' unions fits well with Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs level three, the social needs where teachers need to be accepted and protected (Lussier, 1999).

Table G indicates that 50% of the teachers were of the opinion that principals occasionally do class visits to observe teaching, and that 35% of the teachers felt that
TABLE G – Some Strategies used to Motivate Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Responses Frequencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Item 13)</td>
<td>35 % (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65 % (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principals (item 12)</td>
<td>80 % (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools’ needs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Item 14)</td>
<td>65 % (13)</td>
<td>10 % (2)</td>
<td>25 % (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Item 13)</td>
<td>100 % (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers’ union:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Item 15)</td>
<td>40 % (8)</td>
<td>25 % (5)</td>
<td>30 % (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Item 14)</td>
<td>60 % (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom visitation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Item 16)</td>
<td>35 % (7)</td>
<td>10 % (2)</td>
<td>50 % (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Item 15)</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Item 21)</td>
<td>65 % (13)</td>
<td>5 % (1)</td>
<td>20 % (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Item 20)</td>
<td>80 % (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of threats:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Item 18)</td>
<td>40 % (8)</td>
<td>30 % (6)</td>
<td>25 % (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Item 17)</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conducive atmosphere</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Item 19)</td>
<td>35 % (7)</td>
<td>15 % (3)</td>
<td>30 % (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Item 18)</td>
<td>60 % (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20 % (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teamwork:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (item 20)</td>
<td>50 % (10)</td>
<td>10 % (2)</td>
<td>15 % (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Item 19)</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40 % (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
principals did this on a regular basis, while 10% indicated principals never visited class and 5% felt that principals sometimes visited them in class. One of the teachers stated that “Nothing after class visit can be motivating”, meaning that in some sample schools principals’ comments were not encouraging or motivating.

Forty percent of the principals pointed out that class visits were done occasionally while the other 40% of the principals indicated that they sometimes visited classes with only 20% indicating they always did so. The way principals and teachers observed the occurrence of classroom visits and assessment done by principals showed that it was not very motivating. Musaazi (1987) mentioned that principals should visit all teachers to assess their teaching techniques, and they should hold meetings with the teachers to discuss ways of improving their performance. However, the discussion should be encouraging and motivating for the teachers.

One other finding of the study was that a large percentage (40%) of the teachers believed that principals never rewarded or acknowledged teachers’ performance or recognized their work. Only 35% indicated that their principals occasionally acknowledged good work, while 20% stated that their principals regularly rewarded teachers for good performance. Only 5% of the teachers were of the opinion that principals sometimes rewarded good work. Forty percent of principals’ responses were in line with the majority of the teachers’ responses that rewards and recognition never occurred at their schools. Twenty percent of the principals indicated “always” and another 20% indicated that rewards were occasionally given while 20% indicated sometimes principals rewarded performance. According to Duke (1987) immediate supervisors or principals should motivate teachers to carry out their teaching responsibilities with diligence by rewarding performance. This is because good performance does not only result from ability to execute educational policies but is also a function of reinforcement.

Table G further indicates that 65% of the teachers were of the opinion that principals always delegated school duties to teachers, while 20% indicated that principals did so only occasionally, whereas, 10% of teachers felt that principals sometimes delegated duties to
teachers. Only 5% indicated that principals never shared responsibilities. A large percentage of principals (80%) were of the opinion that they shared responsibilities with their teachers while 20% felt that they sometimes delegated duties to teachers. It seems that the majority of principals trusted their teachers with responsibility for activities beyond their normal scope of duty and trusted them to work on their own with only a few subscribing to McGregor's Theory X that the majority of teachers have limited abilities and that principals are superior (Steyn & Van Nierkerk, 2002).

Another finding of the study was that a large percentage (40%) of teachers were of the opinion that principals did not force teachers to do their work effectively, because they regarded them as professionals who knew their duties. The same percentage of teachers were found to be of the opinion that their principals used threats to force teaching staff to do their work while only 25% felt that threats were only used occasionally. Five percent of teachers felt that threats were sometimes used. Forty percent of the principals indicated that threats were used occasionally while 20% of the principals said that threats were always used to force teachers to do school work and the other 20% indicated that threats were never used, while another 20% of the principals indicated that sometimes threats were used.

The study revealed that principals sometimes coerced teachers to do their work. That was in line with McGregor Theory X which states that due to the human characteristic of dislike of work people need to be threatened in order for them to put efforts on their work (Owens, 2001).

Table G further demonstrates that 35% of the teachers pointed out that their principals always created a positive environment at their schools. Thirty percent of the teachers indicated that this occurred only occasionally, while 20% said this sometimes occurred. Only 15% of the teachers felt that principals never created a positive atmosphere at the schools. The majority of principals (60%) felt that they always created a favorable atmosphere, while 20% indicated that they sometimes did this, with another 20% indicated that a conducive environment for work was only created occasionally at the
schools. It seems that the average percentage of teachers and principals felt that principals did create a conducive environment at the schools. McGregor's Theory Y maintains that if a good environment is created, teachers not only accepted responsibilities at school but also sought the responsibilities (Owens, 2001).

Table G also indicates that 50 % of the teachers were of the opinion that principals did encourage teamwork at the schools, while 25 % indicated that teamwork was sometimes emphasized. Fifteen percent pointed out that this happened occasionally, and 10 % of the teachers indicated that principals never encouraged teamwork at the schools. On the other hand, 40 % of the principals stated that they always encouraged teaching staff to work as a team. The other 40 % of the principals pointed out that they occasionally encouraged teamwork while only 20 % of the principals indicated that they sometimes did so. In addition, a principal wrote, “I encouraged teachers to work as a team in teaching as well as in upgrading of their study”. One can conclude that motivation of the teaching staff was considered important.

4.6. Conclusion

The study found that principals helped teachers to grow professionally, for instance by encouraging and motivating teachers to upgrade their qualifications as well as by sending them to attend staff development workshops. The study also revealed that principals encouraged teachers to join teachers’ unions where they would be represented on all issues related to conditions of employment and other matters affecting their members.

Furthermore, the study emphasized that the sample principals needed to do more in order to motivate teaching staff. Some theories are only partially practiced, such as content theories where a conducive environment needs to be created. It was found that individual basic needs of teachers were not considered. Furthermore, with process theories such as expectancy theory, principals did not recognise and reward teachers sufficiently for outstanding performance in teaching or extra curricular activities. Similar to the goal setting theory, teachers were not well informed about the vision and mission statements of
school. The insufficient attention to the said theories gave the impression of negative attitudes towards teachers’ motivation.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0. Introduction
This chapter presents a brief summary, conclusion, and recommendations of the study.

5.1. Summary
This study examined how school principals in the Ogongo Circuit in Namibia motivate their teaching staff. This study was prompted by the findings of the Presidential Commission that poor teacher performance as a result of a lack of motivation was contributing to poor educational performance in the country. The critical questions of the study were:

- To what extent do school principals in the Ogongo circuit motivate their teaching staff?
- What strategies do the school principals use to motivate their teaching staff?
- To what extent do the school principals create school environments that promote motivation?

The findings on how principals in Ogongo Circuit motivate teaching staff are as follows:

- Eighty percent of the principals were of the opinion that they helped teachers to develop professionally, while 65 % of teachers indicated principals only did so on an occasionally basis.
- Hundred percent of the principals indicated that they met the schools’ needs always, while 60% of teachers revealed that principals did it on occasionally based.
• Sixty percent of the principals felt they always created a favorable atmosphere while 20% of teachers pointed out that sometimes principals created conducive environment.

• Forty four percent of respondents indicated that sometimes teachers did not used time effectively.

• Sixty percent of respondents rated teacher morale as average.

• Fifty percent of teachers were of the opinion that principals occasionally did class visits. However, sometimes the comments principals made did not motivate teachers.

The study also found that the majority of teachers in the sample schools were demotivated. The issues teachers felt contributed to demotivation include:

• School policies where learners may not be disciplined through corporal punishment.

• Working conditions where, for example, one found that teachers have to teach under the trees or in rooms constructed by corrugated iron and wooden sticks.

• Over-crowded classes causing some learners not to get attention during lessons.

• Lack of recognition for good work, for example, through reward, praise-giving, etc.

• Lack of parental involvement in their children education.

Furthermore, the literature reviewed confirmed the Presidential Commission’s conclusion that poor teacher motivation contributed to poor educational performance of learners at schools. Emerging from the literature review is that schools will not realise their goals fully until learners, teachers and principals are sufficiently motivated (Brevis, et. al. 2002; Mussazi, 1987). Steyn & Van Nierkerk (2002) claim that this is because motivated staff:

• are always looking for better ways of doing their teaching,

• are usually concerned about quality and,

• are more productive than apathetic ones.
Lussier, (1999) Kroon, (1995) and Brevis et.al. (2002) provide motivational theories that might help principals to understand the behavior of teachers. The theories include content theories of motivation that focus on the inner needs that inspire teachers to act the way they do. Process theories answer the question about employee needs that should be met on the job. Reinforcement theories deal with what leaders need to do to get employees to behave in ways that help meet organizational objectives.

When one compares what principals’ practiced at schools and what the scholars theorized about motivation, the study found a big gap. As mentioned previously, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs indicates: physiological needs, the basic needs such as accommodation, which sampled teachers listed, and esteem needs where teachers complained about a lack of praise or reward. Regarding the schools environment, McGregor’s Theory Y theorized that average people under proper conditions learn not only to accept responsibility on the job, but to seek it. However, the study found that principals did not create a conducive environment that brought about this acceptance of responsibility. However, principals also felt that parents did not participate enough in their children’s education, as all stakeholders need to work as a team for better improvement to be seen in schools.

5.2. Conclusion

The study concluded that principals in the sample schools insufficiently motivated the teaching staff. As indicated in the data analysis, vision and mission statements are not communicated to staff and principals’ fail to appreciate teachers’ work. According to Steyn & Van Niekerk, (2002) the attitudes and behaviors of teaching staff reflect the level of motivation, such as initiatives, willingness to accept responsibility and ability to work without supervision. That was not the case with the sample of school teachers in this study.
5.3. Recommendations

5.3.1. Recommendation on motivation

- School principals in the sample schools need to identify the basic needs of teachers and attempt by all means to satisfy these. This is because basic human needs affect human behavior. Principals should know their teachers' needs. Principals need to spend time with teachers, treat them as unique individuals and create opportunities to get to know not only their needs but also their aspirations and frustrations.

- Principals also need to show appreciation for a job well done. This will be of special significance if done in public, and principals who complain about teachers should do so privately.

- Principals can help schools to develop different committees to serve in different aspects of schools, for example science, languages, sport, and cultural committees etc. whereby different teachers share responsibilities.

5.3.2. Recommendations for further research

The findings and conclusions of this study may have raised some research problems for further research. Therefore, the researcher recommends that further research in teacher motivation be conducted so that theories relevant to motivation in Namibian schools can be proved wrong or right and new motivation theories can be discovered.

- A study could be carried out to determine if basic human needs can also influence the teachers' ability and willingness in teaching.

- A research study should also be conducted to investigate whether reward, recognition and appreciation can motivate teachers resulting in them to behaving differently.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Questionnaire for Principals

Dear Respondent

I am a candidate for the Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, in SA. I intend to conduct an educational research study for my dissertation, which is a requirement for my degree. The topic is “A Study of How Primary and Combined School Principals in the Ogongo Circuit in Namibia Motivate Teaching staff” The questionnaire is strictly for the said purpose. In order to maintain your anonymity and help you to answer the questions honestly and to the best of your knowledge, your name is not required. Your responses will be treated with confidentiality.

This questionnaire is designed for primary school principals in Ogongo Circuit.

SECTION A

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DETAILS

Instructions:

- Please check with an (X) in the appropriate box.
- In case of open – ended questions, write in the space provided.

1. Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Age:

| 20-25 |        |
| 26-35 |        |
| 36-45 |        |
| Above 45 |      |
3. Highest academic qualification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 12 (STD 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 (STD 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Highest professional qualification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.Ed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HED/PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Years of teaching experience **prior to becoming a principal**

6. For how many years have you been a principal at your current school?

**SECTION B**

**Instructions:**

The following are questions about teacher performance.

- Please, check with an (X) in the appropriate box.
- In case of open-ended questions write in the space provided.

7. Do teachers use time effectively e.g. when arriving, leaving and going to class on time?

(a) Always  (b) Often  (c) Sometimes  (d) Never  (e) Uncertain

8. In which of the last 4 years has your school been provided a reward and recognition for outstanding performance in your circuit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Never received a reward for the last four years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SECTION C

Instructions:
The following questions are about school principal regarding their duties/responsibilities. Please indicate the extent to which each question characterizes your duties/responsibilities in your school by circling the appropriate response at the right hand side of each question.
In all cases, the symbols below mean the following:

A - Always
N - Never
O - Occasionally
S - Sometimes

9 To what extent does your school help teachers develop professionally? A N O S
10. To what extent do you assist teachers to better meet needs of your school? A N O S
11. Do you encourage teachers to join teachers’ unions? A N O S
12. How often do you visit teachers while they are teaching in classrooms? A N O S
13 How often do you provide rewards and recognition for good teachers performance? A N O S
14. How often do you use threats to get teachers to teach effectively? A N O S
15. To what extent do you promote a positive teaching environment? A N O S
16. How frequently do you encourage teachers to work as a team? A N O S
17. How often do you delegate tasks to teachers? A N O S

SECTION D

Instructions:
- Please answer the following questions as objectively as possible.
- Please check with an (X) in the appropriate box.
- In case of an open-ended question, please write your answer in the space provided.
17. How do you rate the morale of the teachers at your school?

| Above average | Average | Below average |

18. Does your school have a vision and a mission statement?

| Yes | No |

19. Do you help teachers develop professionally? Please motivate your answer?

......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................


......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................

21. Please indicate some of the serious challenges that you encounter in your work.

......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................

Thank you for sparing some of your time to complete this questionnaire.
APPENDIX B: Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear Respondent

I am a candidate for the Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, in SA. I intend to conduct an educational research study for my dissertation, which is a requirement for my degree. The topic is “A Study of How Primary and Combined School Principals in the Ogongo Circuit Motivate Teaching staff”. The questionnaire is strictly for the said purpose. In order to maintain your anonymity and help you to answer the questions honestly and to the best of your knowledge, your name is not required. Your responses will be treated with confidentiality.

This questionnaire is designed for primary teachers in Ogongo Circuit.

SECTION A

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DETAILS

- Please check with an (X) in the appropriate box.
- In case of open-ended questions, write in the space provided.

1. Sex:

   Male

   Female

2. Age:

   20-25

   26-35

   36-45

   Above 45
3. Highest academic qualification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 12 (STD 10)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 (STD 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Highest professional qualification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.Ed.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HED/PG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B

Instructions:

- Please answer the following questions as objectively as possible
- Please check with an (X) in the appropriate box.
- In case of open ended questions, write in the space provided

5. Do teachers use time effectively e.g. when arriving leaving and going to class on time?

(a) Always  (b) Often  (c) Sometimes  (d) Never  (e) Uncertain

6. How do you rate the morale of the staff members at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above average</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Does your school have a vision and mission statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. In which of the last four years has your school been provided a reward and recognition for outstanding performance in your circuit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never received a reward for the last four years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C

Instruction:
The following questions are about school principals. Please indicate the extent to which each question characterises schools principals' duties/responsibilities in your school by circling the appropriate response at the right hand side of each question.

In all cases, the symbols below mean the following:

A - Always
N - Never
O - Occasionally
S - Sometimes

9. To what extent does your principal help teachers develop professionally?

10. To what extent does your principal assist teachers to better meet the needs of your school?

11. Does your principal encourage teachers to join teachers' unions?

12. How often does your principal visit teachers while they teach in the classroom?

13. How often does your principal provide rewards and recog-
tion for good teacher performance? A N O S

14. How often does your principal use threats to get teachers to work effectively? A N O S

15. To what extent does your principal promote a positive teaching environment? A N O S

16. How frequently does your principal encourage teachers to work as a team? A N O S

17. How often does your principal delegate tasks to teachers? A N O S

18. How often does your principal assist teachers to develop professionally? Please explain...


20. Please explain some of the ways your principal motivates teachers to teach effectively...

21. Please indicate some of the serious challenges teachers encounter in education today.

Thank you for sparing some of your time to this questionnaire.
6 September, 2004

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This is to certify the Ms Sussana Herman is a bona fide MEd student at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The degree is part coursework and part dissertation. This is to humbly request that you assist her fulfil the latter by permitting her to undertake research at your institution/district.

Thank you

Yours faithfully

Ms TM Ngcobo
Lecturer: Education Management
Faculty of Education
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Edgewood Campus
Ashwood
3605
Tel: 031 - 2602494
e-mail: ngcobot9@ukzn.ac.za
TO: Ms. SUSANNA HERMAN
UNIVERSITY OF NATAL
DURBAN CAMPUS
SOUTH AFRICA

RE: AN INVESTIGATION INTO EFFECTIVENESS OF THE OGONGO CIRCUIT PRIMARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR PROMOTION TEACHER PERFORMANCE.

The above mentioned is a bona fide Med student of the University of Natal, and she is conducting a research in the above indicated topic.

Thus, all Ogongo Circuit school principals are informed that she is authorised to enter our schools with her questionnaire and consult school principals in order to authorise her to conduct her research to teachers.

School principals are reminded that such activity should not disrupt face to face teaching.

This office hope that you will render assistance to her so that she can gain/collect information she requires.

Looking forward to meet the school principal in Ogongo Circuit.

Yours Sincerely

Mr. B. Nampila
INSPECTOR OF EDUCATION
OGONGO CIRCUIT

cc: 1. Mr. Amushlia A.
    ACTING DIRECTOR

2. Mr. Aipanda I.
    SENIOR INSPECTOR