Original Research Article

Influence of Principals' Teaching Staff Development on Students' Academic Performance in Kisumu County, Kenya

OKOTH Akinyi Elizabeth[1], YAMBO, John M. Onyango[1*], GETANGE, N. Kennedy[1]

[1]Department of Educational Administration Planning and Economics, Kisii University, Kenya

*Corresponding author: YAMBO, John M. Onyango
Department of Educational Administration Planning and Economics, Kisii University, Kenya

Abstract

Transformational leadership was operationalized as setting direction, staff development, building collaborative cultures, staffing the program, and academic performance as the KCSE mean score of a school for the period 2014 – 2018. The study arose from the fact that, high school principals are working hard yet the academic performance of public secondary schools in Kisumu County has remained generally poor. Between 2014 and 2018, only 26.9% of students from Kisumu County scored at least C+, and the average mean score in KCSE for the period was only 4.23, below 7.0, the cut out entry. At least 65% of the candidates from Kisumu County did not proceed to university education during the period. Several educational stakeholders had linked school leadership to the poor academic performance, but without empirical evidence. The study specifically investigated the influence of teaching staff development on the students' academic performance in public secondary schools in Kisumu County. The study adopted a cross sectional survey research design. The target population consisted of 204 principals, 2,196 teachers, and 13,213 Form Three students. In sampling, Krejcie and Morgan table was used to find 152 principals, 333 teachers and 378 students, from 152 schools. Data was collected using questionnaires, interviews, observation and document analysis, and analyzed using simple linear, simple correlation, and stepwise regression with dummy variables, at .05 level of significance. The study tested specific hypothesis that staff development by principals do not have a significant influence on academic performance. The study found 7 significant associations at $\alpha = .01$, ($\Upsilon_{SDR*DVP} = .594$, p = .000; $\Upsilon_{SDR*BCC} = .476$, p = .000; $\Upsilon_{DVP*BCC} = .719$, p = .000; $\Upsilon = .416$, p =.000; $\Upsilon = .685$, p =.000; $\Upsilon_{DVP*ACP} = .239$, p =.000; $\Upsilon_{BCC*ACP} = .212$, p = .000) and one significant association at $\alpha = .05$, $\Upsilon_{SDR*ACP} =.203$, p = .012. The study found that staff development (good) [F (2,149) = 4.027), p = .020, R^2 adj = .039, t (149) = 2.604, p = .010]. The study recommends that the ministry of education should empower principals with resources that will enable them to empower their teaching staff by training them on various needs that may arise in the society from time to time, and since the society is dynamic continuous provision of resources by the ministry would be ideal.
Keywords: Principals, staff, development, academic, performance, Kenya.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Leaders of Schools are the ones responsible for translating educational goals of a country into practice. According to (Bolthouse, 2013) school principals are key players to success of a school, for they account for both success and failures of a school and as the main moral fiber in a school, all activities in the school revolve around them. They chart the way forward as well as developing teaching staff.

Studies done in Europe have shown that the school principals are the most important factor in the success of a school. For instance, studies by (Rutledge II, 2010)); (Groom, 2013); (Leithwood *et al,* 2012) & (Leithwood *et al,* 2008) found that leadership has a significant effect on the quality of school organization and on pupils' learning. They concluded that for a school to function effectively, it is important that principals portray practices that make them successful. One such practice is transformational leadership where they develop even teaching staff. While the work. While Rutledge II (2010) dealt with the effect of transformational leadership on academic optimism within elementary schools, the current study dealt with the influence of principals' teaching staff development on students' academic performance to fill the research gap.

When a school does not performing well, the blame usually rests on the principal as the leader of the school, hence, Griffith (2014) emphasized this when pointed out that many schools were not performing well

Citation: OKOTH Akinyi Elizabeth, YAMBO, John M. Onyango, GETANGE, N. Kennedy (2022). Influence of Principals' Teaching Staff Development on Students' Academic Performance in Kisumu County, Kenya. *J Adv Educ Philos,* 6(7): 410-418.

410

due to inadequate leadership. Studies by (Foster *et al,* 2019) in Canada also concluded that when school goals are not met, stakeholders first lose confidence in the leadership. The trend has been to blame the school leadership when results are not readily forth coming (Shava *et al,* 2018), This was the foundation of which the leadership of secondary schools in Kisumu County has been questioned on the basis of falling performance and lack of teaching staff development.

Many countries have recognized the role of leadership in educational success and have provided clear indicators of who should be a school principal. According to (Kelley *et al,* 2017) different countries had enacted increased accountability restructuring that had seen increased participation of principals in qualitative changes such as curriculum standards, increased focus on higher-order thinking, high-stakes testing, and accountability for student learning. Regardless of the numerous administrative responsibilities a school principal must perform, the ultimate goal of a school principal has been to provide quality education. Research by (Stronge *et al,* 2018) emphasized that principals, must always make this their top priority. Educational responsibilities are becoming more challenging and demanding because both the government and the public expect a lot from the school principals. Consequently, the principals carry the burden of accountability to the stakeholders on the performance of their schools. In the views of Bush (2009) the quality leadership has a significant effect on school and student outcomes. Hence in the wave of poor performance in schools of Kisumu County, the leadership practice at play is immediately called to question. However, most of the studies on transformational leadership and school leadership have generally been based in western countries with very few in African countries and even fewer in Kenya. This gap is critical especially in view of poor or low academic performance in schools in the region. Transformational leadership style has been advocated as a sure means of improving organizational performance.

Studies done in Africa have pointed out that school leadership plays a crucial role in increasing students' performance. According to (Shava *et al,* 2018), a principal improves school performance by enhancing teaching, learning and defining schools vision and direction. In their view, transformational leadership promotes learner achievement through setting direction for a school. On the same strength, (Nsubuga, 2010) propounded that effective school performance required visionary leadership. A survey of literature depicts transformational leaders as visionary. School principals, who embrace this kind of leadership,

should provide the effective leadership which should be reflected in schools' performance. While the work of (Shava *et al,* 2018) employed focus group discussion to collect data, the current study used in-depth interview schedule, questionnaires, and documentary analysis and observation checklists to collect data to fill the research gap.

The Government of Kenya has implemented measures to improve access and quality in secondary education through the implementation of Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) (GOK, 2012). In addition to these measures, the MOE through Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) continues to strengthen the capacities of secondary school managers (GOK, 2012). The MOE recognizes that principals play a crucial role in provision of quality secondary education. Through KEMI, the MOE has introduced a mandatory one-year diploma course in management of schools for principals (MOE, 2012).

Transformational leadership has several benefits over the conventional models, (Castanheira *et al,* 2011), (Rutledge II, 2010), (Shava *et al,* 2018), but this notwithstanding its application by principals of schools in Kenya has not been exhaustively investigated, especially with respect to setting direction, staff development, building collaborative cultures and staffing the program. The GOK and the public continue to demand that school principals improve students' achievements in the national examinations, the 'how' puzzle is still missing.

In Kenya the work of (Achiyo *et al,* 2020) together with the Kenya Vision 2030 lays a great importance on the link between education and labor market. One of the objectives of secondary education in Kenya is to build a firm foundation for further education and training (GOK, 2012). Further, one of the performance targets of the government is to improve quality of education and training so that Kenya's measurable learning outcomes are in the upper quartile on recognized international standards test by 2017(GOK, 2012). The Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education examination (KCSE) is the yard stick to further education and training. Performance in the KCSE is very significant, because it determines the placement of students into tertiary institutions and universities within or out of Kenya. A student is considered to have performed well if they attain at least a grade C+ (plus). This is the basic grade for university admission. Scores of C plain and C- (minus) are average performance while a grade D and below is poor performance. The letter grades and score points are summarized in Table1.1

Table 1: KNEC Grading Structure

Grade	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	E
Points	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Source: KNEC 2015

From the grade points and based on the minimum subject allowed and other conditions considered, the minimum pass points are 7 x 8 subjects and the maximum 12 x 8 subjects.

In the MOE, National Education Sector Strategic Plan 2018 – 2022, results from students' assessment shows that learning achievements remain quite low. The numbers of students achieving a mean grade of C+ and above has been decreasing. A majority has been scoring grades that cannot allow them proceed to higher education or secure gainful employment despite the government spending billions to subsidize their education (MOE 2019). The 2018 - 2022 strategic plan notes that an efficient and effective secondary education means that all actors are aligned towards the goal of students learning. While the performance in

KCSE has generally been poor across Kenya, there are also significant variations across regions. The performance in KCSE in Kisumu County between 2014 and 2018 stood at the average mean score of 4.23 (Kisumu Country Education Office, 2019). This was still far below the requirements of Kenya Universities and Colleges Central Placement Service (KUCCPS) for transition to universities and colleges. KUCCPS require students to score an average of 7.0 or C+ for placement in the university or 6.0 or C for placement in colleges. Between 2014 and 2018, only 26.9% of students from Kisumu County obtained the minimum KUCCPS's requirements for admission to colleges and universities, leaving out 73.1% of students who are unaccountable in terms of further training. The performance in KCSE for secondary schools in Kisumu County is highlighted in Table 2.

Table 2: Kisumu County KCSE Performance Trend 2014 – 2018

Year	Entry	Mean score	% ≥ C	% < C
2014	9,921	4.6	32.44	67.56
2015	10,970	4.7	37.02	62.98
2016	12,188	3.657	12.42	87.58
2017	12,412	4.025	17.67	82.33
2018	12, 781	4.159	19.16	80.84
	Mean Score	4.23		

Source: County Education Office Kisumu (2019)

Over the period 2014-2018 the mean score dropped from 4.6 to 4.159. This was rather low as compared against the heavy investment in education in the County, and in the country as a whole. Over the period under study most of students (76.258%) did not obtain the minimum grade to for university education. The mass failure has raised questioned on government's hyped plan to achieve 100% transition (Onyango *et al*, 2020).

As (Okewo, 2015) reports, that some schools have been closed after students went on rampage when their schools posted poor KCSE results, and parents accused principals of sleeping on the job. In his assessment, school leadership plays a major role in the poor performance in KCSE. Further as (Onyango *et al*, 2020) reports as a result of poor performance in KCSE, some principals have been transferred from county schools to sub county schools while others have been deployed as assistant teachers. In his opinion, TSC concern was the students and principals were to blame for the poor performance. From the reaction of the public, the MOE, and TSC have acknowledged that school leadership plays a pivotal role in KCSE performance. Schools perform quite differently when they are lead or managed by different personalities. Therefore, it is vital to find out how the practices of leadership of principals' influence students performances.

Statement of the Problem

Key objective of secondary education is building a firm foundation for further education and training which are depicted in the Kenya's Vision 2030 as the key mechanisms for transforming the country into a middle-income economy. However, this dream can only be achieved if learning outcomes in secondary school can enable a critical mass of students to transit to tertiary education. In this regard, the government has heavily subsidized secondary education with Day Scholars learning for free. Other stakeholders and educational development partners have also supported in provision of infrastructure and facilities to schools. Principals have also undergone management courses. Despite these efforts, academic performance of public secondary schools in Kisumu County has remained generally poor. Between 2014 and 2018, only 26.9% of students from Kisumu County score at least C+, which is the minimum entry requirement university admission. The average means score in KCSE examinations in secondary schools in Kisumu County in the period was only 4.23 which is below 7.0, the cut out entry set by KUCCPS. At least 65% of the candidates from Kisumu County did not proceed to university education during the period under study.

Educational stakeholders have blamed principals for the poor academic performance. While the poor performance of secondary schools in Kisumu County is not in doubt, and while several factors would be in play, the influence of leadership style, and

probably the influence of transformational leadership on the performance of schools in Kisumu County had not been investigated. Several theories and general literature have linked transformational leadership style organizational performance, but its influence and educational performance and especially in the context of public secondary schools in Kisumu County has not been empirically investigated. Available studies have by passed this issue yet theoretical evidence point to a positive relationship between transformational leadership and improved performance. This therefore, necessitated a need to establish influence of staff development on the students' academic performance in public secondary schools in Kisumu County.

Staff Development and Students' Academic Performance

Staff development can simply be defined as empowering others through provision of materials and resources to grow and become better persons. The work of (Leithwood, 2010) defines staff development as a practice that encompasses providing individual support, Intellectual stimulation, providing an appropriate model and redesigning the organization. When a staff is developed, his or her focal point should be both in the organization and the people within the organization. Similarly, (Gublin, 2008) defines developing staff as a practice that also involve inspiring people to try new practices, offering personal encouragement, and demonstrating confidence in people's ability to perform at their best. It also includes having the 'pulse' of the school, staff development is the starting point for transforming an organization by instilling in staff a sense of belonging and providing recognition for work in the form of individual praise.

In an investigation on the effect of transformational leadership of principals on student academic achievement in California, (Chen, 2014) used Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) to collect data from principals on five 5 predicators: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act and encouraging the heart, he found NO significant relation between transformational leadership and academic achievement. The current study used questionnaires adopted from Leithwood leadership questionnaire (LLQ), interviews, document analysis and observation to collect data from principals, teachers and students using four practices: setting directions, staff development, building collaborative cultures and staffing the programs advanced by (Leithwood, 2010). Though the two studies were based on transformational leadership, the practices under study were different.

The impact of leadership on students' outcomes was studied by (Robinson *et al*, 2008) in a Meta-Analysis of six studies. They examined the dimension of leadership of promoting and participating in teacher learning and development. The study established that principals who support and participate in professional learning of staff produced the largest effect size on learning outcomes of students. The context of supporting staff in their learning involved staff meetings, professional developments and discussions about teaching problems, however this study explored professional development in terms of intellectual development, innovation and leadership skills, life skills, Delegation, constructive feedback and leadership development. The subjects of this study were principals, teachers and students.

Horn-Turpin (2009) examined the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and teaching efficacy, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as perceived by special education teachers. He found that the more teachers perceive their administrator as supportive, the higher their levels of commitment to their organization. However, his study was restricted to special need teachers and may not be applicable to other category of teachers. Moreover, it did not study academic performance.

In a study by Peter (2016) on the influence of principals' intellectual stimulation on teachers' job commitment in public secondary schools in Athi River, Machakos County found that intellectual stimulation had a positive and significant effect on teachers' job commitment ($p = .000$). While Peter, investigated principals, deputies and teacher, and was concerned with teachers' job commitment, the current study involved principals, teachers and students and was mainly concerned with students' academic performance to fill the research gap..

A study by (Nyagiati *et al*, 2018); (Ndiga, 2013) on perceptions of teachers and students on principals' transformational leadership and students' academic achievement in Nairobi County, established that intellectual stimulation, a variable of transformational leadership and a practice of staff development, had an effect on student academic achievement. She found that students perceived their principals as not having an effect on their academic achievement while teachers perceived their principals as great contributors to academic achievement of students. The study also found that as principals' intellectual stimulation increases so does academic achievement increases. This finding is very important to the present study because it provides a gap, because while that study was conducted in Nairobi, the current study will be conducted in Kisumu. These two Counties are geographically apart and Nairobi County has an urban set up only, Kisumu County has both urban and rural setup.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
This study employed a descriptive cross sectional survey research design. The Target Population According to (Orodho, 2008) a target population is a

hypothetical population from which the data is collected and as put forward by (Oso, 2016) it is the population which the researcher has in mind and to which the study findings are expected to apply. The target population for this study was all the 204 public secondary schools in Kisumu County (County Director of Education, Kisumu County (CDE) (2015) The target population consisted of 204 principals, 2,196 teachers, and 13,213 Form Three students (CDE, Kisumu County, 2015), divided among National, County and Sub-County schools.

The sample consisted of 152 public secondary schools in Kisumu County. The sample was determined according to Krejcie and Morgan Tables of samples, as cited in (Oso, 2016) Krejcie and Morgan. The table recommends a sample of 152 for a population of 204 at 95% level of confidence and 5.0% margin of error. The sample of 152 schools was made of 2 national schools, 22 county and 128 sub-county schools. The respondents were made up of all 152 principals, the number of teachers and students were also selected using Krejcie and Morgan Tables. The number of teachers was 333 teachers while students were 378 students. The study employed in-depth interview schedule, questionnaires, document analysis and observation checklists as the main instrument for data collection. The mixed method for data collection was necessary for triangulation purposes.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION
Staff development is another practice of transformational leadership identified by (Leithwood, 2010). It entails practices where the principal models and offers guidance with the intention of improving

teachers' and students' classroom performance. Teaching staff development was conceptualized as stimulating teachers intellectually, providing them with individualized support and giving them appropriate technical advice by the school principals. Staff development involve practices where a principal encourages and support their followers to grow intellectually, delegate duties, empowers staff to train on life skill issues and has put in place strategies to induct and orientate new members of their group. It was necessary to get opinions of both teachers and students on staff development by a principal and students' academic performance. This information was important in helping the study to ascertain whether principals develop the followers or not. The respondents were requested to respond to the statements in the Likert scale of 5 – 1 where 5 = strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = No Comment, 2 = Disagree and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Teachers were asked to respond to statements on teaching staff development by principals in their schools. Eight statements were used to measure the influence of principals' transformational leadership practice of teaching staff development and students' academic performance. The statements were: the principal encourage teachers to grow intellectually, the principal support teachers development through seminars and workshops, the principal delegate duties, the principal organizes for training on life skills, the principal demonstrate transparent decision making, teachers are assigned mentors, there are strategies for induction and orientation for new members and we are trained on communication strategies. The responses were illustrated in Table 3

Table 3: Teachers' Response on staff development by Principals in Secondary Schools in Kisumu County

Statement:	SA	A	NC	DA	SDA	Mean	SD
The principal encourages us to grow intellectually.	63 (22.0%)	98 (34.3%)	5 (1.7%)	106 (37.1%)	14 (4.9%)	3.31	1.3
The principal Supports our development through seminars and workshops.	48 (16.8%)	130 (45.5%)	14 (4.9%)	87 (30.4%)	7 (2.4%)	3.44	1.16
The principal delegates duties.	57 (19.9%)	167 (58.4%)	11 (3.8%)	48 (16.8%)	3 (1%)	3.79	0.98
organizes for consultation training on life skills	34 (11.9%)	95 (33.2%)	11 (3.8%)	121 (42.3%)	25 (8.7%)	2.97	1.26
The principal demonstrates transparent decision making	15 (5.2%)	93 (32.5%)	8 (2.8%)	145 (50.7%)	25 (8.7%)	2.75	1.15
The principal assigns mentors.	33 (11.5%)	78 (27.3%)	7 (2.4%)	137 (47.9%)	31 (10.8%)	2.81	1.27
The principal Sets strategies for induction and orientation for new members.	42 (14.7%	71 (24.8%)	9 (3.1%)	136 (47.6%)	28 (9.8%)	2.87	1.3
Teachers are continually trained on communication strategies	21 (7.3%)	74 (25.9%)	12 (4.2%)	156 (54.5%)	23 (8.0%)	2.69	1.15

Table 3 illustrated teachers' response on teaching staff development by Principals broken down into: the principal encourages us to grow intellectually had a mean of 3.31 and a standard deviation of 1.3. This result indicates that majority 106 (37.1%) of the teachers disagreed that their principal encourages them

to grow intellectually, this was followed by 98 (34.9%) of the teachers who agreed that their principals encourage them to grow intellectually, it was the lowest at 5 (1.7%) of the teachers who had no comment on the statement. When summed up, the finding showed that most 161 (55.5) of the teachers agreed that their

principals encourage them to grow intellectually. This supports the findings of (Peter, 2016) who found that majority of teachers agreed that their principals encourage them to grow intellectually. It was also noted that a good number of teachers 120 (41.9%) disagreed that their principals encourage them to grow intellectually; this demonstrated that not all principals in Kisumu county encourage their teachers to grow intellectually.

The principal supports our development through seminars and workshops had a mean of 3.44 and a standard deviation of 1.16, This result indicates that most 130 (45.5%) of the teachers agreed that their principal support their development through seminars and workshops, this was followed by 87 (30.4%) teachers who disagreed that their principals support their development through seminars and workshops, it was the lowest at 14 (4.9%) of the teachers who had no comment. This finding indicated that a majority 178 (61.37%) of the teachers agreed that the principal facilitated them through workshops, this results showed that a good number of principals in Kisumu develop their teachers. This finding echoes Horn-Turpin (2009) who established that more teachers perceived their administrators as supportive as so were more committed to their duties.

The principal delegate duties had a mean of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 0.98. This result indicates that majority 167 (58.4%) of the teachers agreed that their principal delegate duties, this was followed by 57 (19.9%) teachers who strongly agreed that their principals delegate duties, it was the lowest at 11 (3.8%) of the teachers who had no comment. From these results was concluded that most principals in Kisumu delegate duties to their teachers thereby developing them to be leaders too. This finding supports (Robinson *et al,* 2008) that principals support professional development of teachers thereby improving learning outcomes.

The principal organizes for training on life skills, had a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 1.26. This result indicates that most 121 (42.3%) of the teachers disagreed that their principal organizes for training on life skills, this was followed by 95 (33.2%) teachers who agreed that their principals organizes for training on life skills, it was the lowest at 11 (3.8%) of the respondents who had no comment on the statement. This result showed that not all principals in Kisumu have organized for their teachers training on life skills to enable them face challenges in the course of their duty. However, this finding differed with the findings from the students' responses where a majority 178 (61.3%) agreed that they are continually being trained on life skills. The teachers and students' views were different on this matter, this could be explained from

the fact that principals perceive students to be still growing up and needs guidance on how to face life challenges while they may not be supporting teachers as they were adults who could fend for themselves. On the fifth statement, the principal demonstrates transparent decision making had a mean of 2.75 and a standard deviation of 1.15.

This result indicates that most 145 (50.7%) of the teachers disagreed that their principal demonstrates transparent decision making, this was followed by 93 (32.5%) teachers who agreed that their principals demonstrate transparent decision making, it was the lowest at 8 (2.8%) of the teachers who had no comment on the statement. We are assigned mentors had a mean of 2.81 and a standard deviation of 1.27. This result indicates that most 137 (47.9%) of the teachers disagreed that they are we are assigned mentors, this was followed by 78 (27.3%) teachers who agreed that they are we are assigned mentors, it was the lowest at 7 (2.4%) of the teachers who had no comment on the statement. This results suggested that a good number of the teachers 168(58.7%) were of the opinion that their principals don't develop them as they do not have mentors to guide them through what the school expects of them. This finding contradicts (Ndiga, 2013) who found that majority of teachers and student perceived their principals to demonstrated individualized support.

There are strategies for induction and orientation for new members had a mean of 2.87 and a standard deviation of 1.3. This result indicates that a good number of the teachers 136 (47.6%) disagreed that there are strategies for induction and orientation for new members in their schools, this was followed by 71 (24.8%) teachers who agreed, it was the lowest at 9 (3.1%) of the respondents who had no comment on the statement. This finding indicated that most of the principals in Kisumu County do not provide strategies for orientation and induction for new teachers in the school. New teachers are left to find out for themselves. However, this finding differed with (Peter, 2016) who established that majority 75.2% of teachers agreed that their principals encouraged knowledge transfer from senior teachers to junior teachers.

Students were also asked to respond to six statements in a reflection of the practices of a principal in staff development. The statements were: The principal leads by example, modeling core values. We are continually being trained on life skills like career guidance, social skills and mental health and adolescence issues. The school organizes innovation and leadership skills for students. The principal acknowledges and celebrate our achievement, the principal keeps encouraging us to be responsible students, we are trained on study and learning strategies. The responses were reported on table 4

Table 4: Students' Response on Developing People by Principals in Secondary Schools in Kisumu County

Statement: The principal,	SA	A	NC	DA	SDA	Mean	SD
Leads by example, modeling core values.	63 (22.0%)	98 (34.3%)	5(1.7%)	106 (37.1%)	14 (4.9%)	3.31	1.3
We are continually being trained on life skills like career guidance, social skills and mental health and adolescence issues.	48 (16.8%)	130 (45.5%)	14 (4.9%)	87 (30.4%)	7 (2.4%)	3.44	1.16
Organizes innovation and leadership skills for students.	57 (19.9%)	167 (58.4%)	11 (3.8%)	48 (16.8%)	3 (1%)	3.79	0.98
Acknowledges and celebrate our achievement.	34 (11.9%)	95 (33.2%)	11 (3.8%)	121 (42.3%)	25 (8.7%)	2.97	1.26
Organizes training on study and learning strategies.	21 (7.3%)	74 (25.9%)	12 (4.2%)	156 (54.5%)	23 (8.0%)	2.69	1.15

Table 4 indicated students' response on staff development on all the sub themes as follows: the principal leads by example, modeling core values had a mean of 3.32 and a standard deviation of 1.29. This result indicates that a good number 106 (36.6%) of the students disagreed that their principal lead by example, modeling core values, this was closely followed by 102 (35.2%) of the students who agreed that their principals lead by example, modeling core values, it was the lowest at 5 (1.7%) of the students who had no comment on the statement. The sentiment was supported by (Groom, 2013) that core values chart a way forward. When summed up, the finding showed that a majority 165(56.8%) of the students agreed that their principals lead by example, modeling core values. This finding supports the expectations of the TSC and MOE on the role of the principals in modeling responsible citizens.

The school organizes innovation and leadership skills for students, had a mean of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.99. This result indicates that majority 167 (57.6%) of the students agreed that their school organizes innovation and leadership skills for students, this was followed by 57 (19.7%) students who strongly agreed that their school organizes innovation and leadership skills for students, it was the lowest at 11 (3.8%) of the students who had no comment. From these results we may conclude that principals in Kisumu organize innovation and leadership skills for students thereby developing them.

The fourth sub themes - the principal acknowledges and celebrate our achievement had a mean of 2.96 and a standard deviation of 1.25. This result indicates that most 123 (42.4%) of the students disagreed that their principal acknowledges and celebrate their achievement, this was followed by 96 (33.1%) students who agreed that their principals acknowledges and celebrate their achievement, it was the lowest at 12(4.1%) of the students who had no comment on the statement. This result showed that not all principals in Kisumu acknowledges and celebrate students' achievement, this could demotivate learners thereby affecting academic performance. On the fifth statement, the principal keeps encouraging us to be responsible students, had a mean of 2.75 and a standard

deviation of 1.15. This result indicates that most 145 (50.7%) of the students disagreed that their principal demonstrates transparent decision making, this was followed by 93 (32.5%) students who agreed that their principals demonstrate transparent decision making, it was the lowest at 8 (2.8%) of the students who had no comment on the statement.

Preliminary analysis found most (39.47%) principal to be good on staff development. Only 2(1.32%) of the principals were found to be poor on teaching staff development. This suggested that most principals of secondary schools in Kisumu County develop their staff. School performance was found to increase with increasing status of staff development, M = 5.416, good, M = 4.094, low. This suggested that staff development by the principal has a significant influence on school performance. This position was sustained by simple linear regression analysis, F (2,149) = 4.027, p = .010. The study found that teaching staff development (DVP-G) was significant predator in the model, t (149) = 2.604, p = .010. The study therefore established that teaching staff development by the principal has a significant influence on school performance, accounting for 3.9% of the variance in school performance, R^2adj = 0.039, p = .020, if other features remain contact. The study also established that school performance on the predicted from staff development using the model P^1 = 4.87 + 0.53DVP-G + ε.

CONCLUSION

The overall aim of the study was to determine the influence of transformational leadership practice on academic performance of secondary schools in Kisumu County. Transformational leadership practice was measured from setting direction, teaching staff development, building collaborative culture and staffing the program. Academic performance was measured from mean score of schools between 2014-2018. The study found that three (3) elements of transformational leadership practice: setting direction [(F (2,149) = 6.306, p = .012)], teaching staff development, [F (2,149) = 4.027, p = .020], and building collaborative culture, [F (2,149) = 2.232, p = .009] to have significant influence on academic performance. However, staffing the program was not significant with academic

performance, F (2,149) =.063. p = .936. The study also found that the elements of transformational leadership practice to be significant when taken together on academic performance, F (8,143) = 2.565, p = .041.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On teaching staff development, the study found that providing staff with individual support, intellectual stimulation and modeling staff expectations have a significant effect on students' performance. But only a few principals were found to be keen on this. The study recommends that the ministry of education should empower principals with resources that will enable them to empower their teachers and students by training on various needs that may arise in the society from time to time, and since the society is dynamic continuous provision of resources by the ministry would be ideal. Such a move will enable the principals to develop their followers.

REFERENCES

- Achiyo, E. O., & Yambo, J. M. O. (2020). Contribution of age on girl child academic performance in Primary schools in Nyatike Sub-County, Migori County, Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Education & Literature,* 1(5), 175-180.
- Bolthouse, J. E. (2013). Transformational leadership: Efforts of culture creation in the K-8 school setting. *Northern Michigan University*.
- Bush, T. (2009). Theories of Educational Leadership and Management. *Los Angeles: sage*, 210P.
- Castanheira, P., & Costa, J. A. (2011). In search of transformational leadership: A (Meta) analysis focused on the Portuguese reality. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 2012-2015.
- Chen, S. S. (2014). *The effects of transformational leadership of principals on student academic achievement*. California State University, Stanislaus.
- Foster, R., & Young, J. (2004). Leadership: Current themes from the educational literature. *The CAP Journal (12)*, *3*, 29-30.
- GOK. (2012). A Policy Framework for Education. Aligning Education and Training to the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and Kenya vision 2030 and beyond, *Nairobi: Government Printer.*
- Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of educational administration*. 42, 333-356.
- Grooms, J. (2013). A Study of the Articulated Leadership Practices of Principals in Relation to the Literature on the Characteristics of High Performing Principals. *Set Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs) Paper 1930.*
- Gulbin, K. M. (2008). Transformational leadership: Is it a factor for improving student achievement in high poverty secondary schools in Pennslyvania?. *United States. Pennslyvania. Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection database*
- Horn-Turpin, F. D. (2009). *A study examining the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on the factors of teaching efficacy, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as perceived by special education teachers* (Doctoral dissertation,Virginia Tech).
- http://www.credoreference.com.ipacez.nd.edu.au/entry.do?id=10428177
- Kelley, C., & Peterson, K. D. (2017). *The work of principals and their preparation: Addressing critical needs for the twenty-first century*. In The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership (2nd ed.); San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kenya National Examination Council. (2015). The Syllabus and Examination Grading Structure. *Mtihani House, Nairobi.*
- Kisumu County Education Office. (2015). Categories of Schools, *Kisumu. Kenya.*
- Leithwood, K., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational administration quarterly*, *44*(4), 529-561.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *48*(3), 387-423.
- Leithwood, K., Baker, E., McGaw, B., & Peterson, P. (2010). (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of education in transformational school leadership.*
- Ministry of Education. (2012). A policy Framework for education and training; Sessional Paper 14 of 2012 GOK.
- Ndiga, B. A. (2013). Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Principals' Transformational Leadership and Students' Academic Achievement in Public Secondary Schools of Nairobi County, Kenya. Nairobi, *The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Doctorate unpublished Thesis.*
- Nsubuga, Y. K. (2010). *Analysis of leadership styles and school performance of secondary schools in Uganda.* A research for Ministry of Education, Kampala, Uganda.
- Nyagiati, N. A., & Yambo, J. M. O. (2018). Examination of Teachers' Attitude towards Open Performance Appraisal on Pupils' Academic Achievement in Public Primary Schools in Serengeti District, Tanzania. *Journal of Advances in Education and Philosophy*, *2*(5), 358-366.
- Okewo, E. (2015). *Schools Closed over KCSE riots;* Nairobi, Kenya. Daily Nation, Thursday March 12th, P9.

- Onyango, C. O., & Ogechi, G. (2020). Influence of National Government Constituency Development Fund on Management of Secondary Schools in Suna West Constituency, Migori County, Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Education and Literature*; 1 (5), 170-174.
- Orodho, J. A. (2008). Techniques of writing research proposal & reports in educational and social science: Maseno.
- Oso, W. Y. (2016). Social science research: Principles and practices. *Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation*.
- Peter, D. N. (2016). *Influence of principals' transformative corporate leadership style on teachers' job commitment in public secondary schools in Athi River Sub County, Machakos County, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Robinson, V. M., 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*, *44*(5), 635-674.
- Rutledge II, R. D. (2010). *The effects of transformational leadership on academic optimism within elementary schools*. *A Dissertation for Doctor of Education University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama*.
- Shava, G. N., & Tlou, F. N. (2018). Principal Leadership and School Improvement, Experiences from South African School Contexts. *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research*, 6(12), 79-95.
- Stronge, J. H., Richard, H. B., & Catano, N. (2018). Qualities of effective principals. *Green Press, Ontario, USA.*