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Abstract- The study sought to examine the effect of leadership styles on employee motivation—a case of Muhoroni Sugar Company Limited in Kisumu County, Kenya. Specifically, the study aimed to determine how directive leadership style affect employee motivation, assess how participative leadership style affect employee motivation, establish how transformational leadership style affect employee motivation, and examine how transactional leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company. Situational Leadership theories and Full-Range Leadership models underpinned the investigation. Research adopted a descriptive research methodology to evaluate the study variables. A descriptive survey design, aided by self-administered questionnaires and a 5-factor Likert scale were used to collect primary data and eventual analysis of the study. The target population was 785 employees. 102 respondents, representing 13% of target population were selected for investigation. The questions were evaluated using quantitative analysis techniques, specifically Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Regression results were summarized using the Regression model: Y = β0 + β1 X1 + β2 X2 + β3 X3 + β4 X4 + ε. The findings established that directive leadership style had a negative effect on employees’ motivation. Therefore, directive leadership style is likely to worsen performance problem at Muhoroni Sugar Company. Participative leadership, transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles had positive effect on employee’s motivation. Consequently, participative leadership, transformational leadership, and transactional leadership styles are likely to improve levels of employee motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company. Further investigation may be needed to establish reasons for the negative effect of directive leadership style on employees’ motivation. Findings will contribute to the literature on sustainable leadership in the sugar industry. Also, outcomes may enable aligning human resource policy.

Index Terms- Leadership styles, Directive, Participative, Transformational, Transactional, Employees’ Motivation

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Leadership style refers to a method or behavior a leader adopts to provide direction, implement plans, and motivate people to improve organization performance (Kotter, 2001). Major leadership styles include directive, participative, delegative (laissez-faire), transactional and transformational models (Cherry, 2017). A motivated team is critical in ensuring an organizational leader achieves defined objectives since employees create value for society, deliver on performance benchmarks thus ensuring stability and survival of the firm (Nayal, Pandey & Paul, 2021).

Extensive studies have been carried out on effects of leadership styles on employee motivation in the sugar industry in diverse regions, geographical and cultural contexts. Inquiries in Thailand (Srichaipanya, Praditbutagula & Treetipbut, 2020), Indonesia (Soedarto & Sumarsono, 2017), South Africa (Dlamini, Prochess & Singh, 2020), Swaziland (Knowledge, 2016) and Kenya (Wanjala, Awuor & Ngala, 2021) indicate a relationship between leadership styles and motivation.

The Food and Agriculture Organization paints a very favorable outlook for the global sugar industry, and in particular forecasting a growth in Africa’s sugar output projected to increase by thirty six percent (36%) by the end of 2027 over the preceding decade (OECD-FAO Report, 2018-2027). According to the Common Market for East and Southern Africa (COMESA,2019), Africa accounted for six percent (6%) of the total global sugar production in 2018, with COMESA member states accounting for fifty two percent (52%) at 5,288,456 MT of the total African sugar production of 10,078,61 MT. Despite the above favorable industry performance, performance of Kenya’s sugar sector is dismal.

The performance challenges are attributable to low motivation of employees, among other factors (Wachilonga, 2020; Kegoro, Akoyo & Otieno, 2020; Mbithe, Mwabu & Awiti, 2017).
Leadership plays a critical role in empowering people to build sustainable societies by unlocking latent potentials and motivating them to better respond to change. It is imperative for leaders to adapt an organizational style, beneficial to motivational needs of followers, thus enhancing performance (Chiamaka, Stephen & Collins, 2020).

No specific study has been undertaken at Muhoroni Sugar Company focusing on the study variables. A study was therefore necessary to establish the effect of leadership styles on employee motivation. Specifically, to establish effects of directive leadership style, participative leadership style, transformational leadership style and finally transactional leadership on employees of Muhoroni Sugar Company.

Profile of Muhoroni Sugar Company

Muhoroni Sugar Company Limited located approximately 70 km from Kisumu City is engaged in sugarcane growing, processing, and marketing of processed sugar. According to Musco, (2022), Eighty-two-point seven eight percent (82.78%) of the firm’s shares are owned by the Kenya Government, while UKETA Limited and other private shareholders control the remaining seventeen-point twenty-two percent (17.22%). Owing to performance challenges, the company was placed under protective receivership in 2001 with the main objective of preserving the assets while restructuring the Balance Sheet.

Statement of the Problem

Kenya’s sugar sector is performing dismally in an industry that is thriving at regional and global levels. The poor sectoral performance is attributable to employee motivation among other factors (Kegoro, Akoyo & Otieno, 2020). Lawrence (2009) established that low employees’ motivation and demoralized staff explained some of the problems in Kenya’s sugar industry, and specifically at Mumias Sugar Company. The performance problems caused Muhoroni Sugar Company to be placed under protective receivership. This exacerbated job insecurity to already demotivated employees. Erosion of employee motivation negatively influences performance. Extensive research has been carried out globally, regionally, and locally establishing a relationship between leadership styles and employee motivation. Findings reveal that the influence of leadership style on employee motivation may be positive or negative (Mwaisaka, K’Aol & Ouma, 2019).

However, since no evidence was found of specific investigation on the variables of this study on Muhoroni Sugar company, this inquiry sought to investigate the effect of directive, participative, transformational, and transactional leadership styles on employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company in Kisumu County, Kenya.

Objectives of the Study

The General Objective

The study sought to evaluate the effect of leadership styles on employee motivation: A case of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.

The Specific Objectives

1) To determine how directive leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.
2) To assess how participative leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.
3) To establish how transformational leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.
4) To examine how transactional leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.

Research Questions

i) How does directive leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?
ii) How does participative leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?
iii) How does transformational leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?
iv) How does transactional leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?
v) How does directive leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?

Justification of the Study

The sugarcane industry in Kenya accounts for approximately fifteen percent (15%) of Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (KSB, 2014). Relatively, this requires establishing sustainable leadership as envisaged by the Government of Kenya and the United Nations equity debate, enshrined in 2015 blue-print – “people, planet and prosperity” (Kippra, 2018; UNOSD, 2015). In addition, improving motivation of employees through specific leadership styles will assist in aligning human resource policy towards future sustainability of the company.

Scope of the Study

The scope of study was Muhoroni Sugar Company Limited, located approximately 60 km from Kisumu City, within Kisumu County in the Western region of Kenya.

Significance of the Study

Findings of this inquiry will inform applicable leadership styles which are organization-specific for motivating employees in delivering performance objectives in the sugar industry.

Limitations/ Delimitation of the Study

Limitations

Establishing accurate measures of effect of leadership styles on motivation would require extended observation. Periodically, fear of sharing views about an employer tend to undermine participation. Consequently, respondents tended to be guarded regarding the extent of information they could disclose, without attracting executive sanctions.
Delimitation of the Study

Having obtained the Research Permit from the Kenya government (NACOSTI), and considering the firm is quasi-government owned, the researcher channeled the same through the relevant Government pipeline. With approval letters from the Kisumu County Commissioner and Kisumu Director of Education, the researcher received cooperation and support from the company management and staff to collect data.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

This study was guided by the Situational (Contingency), Behavioral, and Full Range theories of leadership as well as theories of employee motivation. The theoretical framework considered the Contingency model originally presented by Fred Fiedler (1967) and the Situational Leadership theory as postulated by Blanchard & Hersey (1970). The Situational model was considered applicable in the sugar sector in that a leader can study the situation and adapt to a leadership style that will lead to greater effort and produce better performance.

In addition, review integrated behavioral leadership studies by Kurt Lewin (1939), Full Range leadership models by Burns (1978) and subsequent studies on transformational and transactional leadership styles by Bass & Avolio (1991). The Full Range Leadership theory was applicable to this study since the leader can stimulate positive change to motivate employees by either transactional or transformational styles.

Theories of employee motivation also underpinned this inquiry. The review considered Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, the two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1959), and theory X and Y (McGregor, 1960). The usefulness of theories of Employee Motivation in this study was that they enabled a scientific basis for measuring and evaluating the study variables. This study focused on effects of leadership styles on employee motivation, which are best explained by theories of motivation.

The following theoretical framework summarizes the theoretical review:

Figure 2.1 Theoretical Framework
Empirical Review

Directive Leadership Style and Employee Motivation

Mwaisaka, K’Aol & Ouma (2019) investigated the influence of directive and supportive leadership styles on employee job satisfaction in commercial banks in Kenya. Study established that directive leadership style positively and significantly affect job satisfaction and enhances employee motivation. However, the study focused on middle level managers in the banking sector, where performance is task-specific and may not be applicable to Muhuroni sugar Company.

Directive leaders set clear performance standards and procedures, provide strict guidance on the roles, and expected tasks and provide clear instructions (Jones & George, 2011, as cited by Mwaisaka, K’Aol & Ouma, 2019).

Similarly, an inquiry was conducted on effects of leadership styles on employee motivation in auditing companies in Ho Chi Minh City of Vietnam (Khuong & Hoang, 2015, as cited by Amah, 2017). Findings established a positive correlation of directive (autocratic) leadership style on employee motivation. Audit is task-oriented, and staff work with strict deadlines. This may explain why employees find motivation in leadership that set clear performance standards on tasks with clear instructions on performance expectations.

Li, Liu & Luo (2018) recommend that by adopting more directive leadership behavior in situations where a task deadline is approaching, the leader is likely to improve team efficiency. Elsewhere, Chukwusa (2018), maintains that leaders should exercise restraint in applying directive or autocratic style because it apparently discourages creative problem-solving in the workplace.

It is therefore imperative that a leader develops self-awareness that informs when this leadership style could prove disadvantageous in achieving desired motivational outcomes. Mwaisaka, K’Aol & Ouma (2019) prefer directive leadership in situations where employees require guidance to effectively accomplish goals and enhance their job satisfaction and motivation levels.

Transformational Leadership Style and Employee Motivation


Hadi & Tola (2019) explain that the employee appreciates the personal caring style of the transformational leader. They add that such a leader inspires positive energy in the employee through charm and charisma. This stimulates innovation and creativity in the workplace. Finally, Hadi & Tola (2019) conclude that charismatic leaders inspire work motivation and can stimulate rational problem solving (intellectual skill) through individualization of subordinates.

Intellectually stimulating leadership generates significant influence on team innovativeness. Moreover, by role-modeling his ideals and beliefs and casting a vision for the desired future, the leader can sustain increased effort over time (Khan, 2017). Because of the positive energy, the employee is motivated and intrinsically increases effort and performance output. Findings of an investigation of transformational leadership in South Korea prove aspects of transformational leadership style encourage innovation. Specifically providing intellectual stimulation, inspiring followers with appealing vision and setting higher expectations help to maintain its effectiveness in organization settings (Gemeda & Lee, 2020).

Alghazo & Al-Anazi (2016) in a study conducted in Saudi Arabia on impact of leadership on employee motivation confirmed transformational leadership positively impacted employee motivation. Srichaipanya, Pradibatuga, Treetipbut (2020) established individualized consideration significantly influenced employee engagement in a sugar manufacturing company in Thailand. Uddin (2019) affirmed transformational leadership certainly impacts both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and recommends creating a work environment that allows employees to flourish. This contributes to improved output.

Participative Leadership and Employee Motivation

Rabbi, Khalid & Khan (2017) observed a strong relationship between participative leadership style and employee motivation. Specifically, Rabbi, Khalid & Khan indicated shared decision-making energized teams to increase effort. Also, Rabbi, Khalid & Khan underscore the need for a leader to actively encourage and support the team to realize desired goals. Efficiency and potential of a leader significantly impact the motivational levels of the team.

Aunga & Masare (2017) inquired the effects of leadership styles on primary school teachers in the Arusha region of Tanzania. Results revealed sharing decision-making with teachers increased motivation and improved performance. Making major decisions without stakeholder participation tends to be demoralizing. This vents out in activism and protests evident in trade unionism.

According to Wilson (2020), benefits of participative style include encouraging involvement, variety of opinions, inclusivity, dedication, synergy, motivation, and fulfillment. However, it is possible culture could be influencing findings as demonstrated by Al-Sada, Al-Esmael, & Faisal (2017) in another study related to the educational sector in Qatar, which established that a supportive culture significantly influenced job satisfaction. Similarly, supportive culture invigorated organizational commitment, job satisfaction and work motivation.

However, a supportive cultural research context of Qatar and sense of faith-respecting community, probably impact work ethics. Likewise, religious philosophy could necessitate closeness and self-efficacy (Villani, Sorgente, Lanello & Antonietti, 2019). Nevertheless, unique moments exclude shared responsibility for decisions. For example, in crisis situations leaders need to assume control to forestall indecision. Besides, organizations with consistent company processes and quality procedures, must habitually maintain strategic focus. These discourage participative style ((Pirtle, 2019).

Transactional Leadership and Employee Motivation
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Transactional leadership rewards or disciplines a follower, depending on performance metrics (Avolio, Walumbwa and Weber, 2009, as cited by Khan, 2017). The relationship between the employee and the leader is perceived as an exchange of values. Transactional leaders reinforce constructive employee behavior by offering “contingent rewards”. Conversely, they apply “management by exception” to deter undesirable employee behavior (Gemeda & Lee, 2020). The leader also places strong emphasis on standard operating procedures and rules in this exchange process.

Almer, Djamhur & Iqbal (2017) considered the effect of leadership style on employee motivation and performance in Russian financial institutions. Findings established a strong relationship of transactional leadership style on employee motivation. According to Sougui, Bon, Mahamat & Hassan (2016), transactional leaders attempt to meet the current needs of the subordinates through bargaining and exchanging value. The study, however, points out that transactional leaders expect followers to attain agreed-upon goals without encouraging personal development or initiative to grow into leadership roles. Lee (2020) asserts that transactional leadership style is suitable in the context of performance contracting. Lee explains that transactional leadership style can enhance the motivational effect of performance management because role clarity is greatly emphasized in public sector performance. Gemeda & Lee (2020) reasoned that whereas transactional leadership style positively affects motivation, organizational leaders should apply a mix of both transactional and transformational leadership styles rather than adopting a single style. It is therefore incumbent upon the leader to consider the situation and the assigned task as explained in the situational leadership theory.


Conceptual Framework

Figure 2.2 presents a diagrammatic illustration of the relationship between the independent variables under investigation, namely, directive leadership, participative leadership, transformational and transactional leadership styles, and their influence on employee motivation, being the dependent variable.
**Figure 2.2 Conceptual Framework**

- **Directive leadership**
  - Clear instructions
  - Performance indicators
  - Works with Deadlines
  - Reviews outcomes vs goals

- **Participative leadership**
  - Consultations
  - Joint decisions
  - Teamwork
  - Shared responsibility

- **Transformational leadership**
  - Personal attention
  - Inspires motivation
  - Considerate and caring
  - Stimulates problem-solving

- **Transactional leadership**
  - Rewards achievement
  - Penalizes poor performance
  - Std Operating procedures
  - Rule-oriented

- **Employee Motivation**
  - Increased effort / output
  - Greater persistence
  - Low absenteeism
  - High job satisfaction
III. ANALYSIS OF STUDY FINDINGS

Introduction
This chapter presents the analysis of study findings.

Regression Analysis
Regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of independent variables (Directive Leadership Style, Participative Leadership Style, Transformational Leadership Style, and Transactional Leadership Style) on the dependent variable (Employee Motivation). The results of the regression analysis are presented in Tables 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10.

Table 4.8
Regression Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.556a</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.73799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Transactional leadership style, Participative leadership style, Transformational leadership style, Directive Leadership style

The results in Table 4.8 show that the R square is 0.310 which implies that transactional leadership style, participative leadership style, transformational leadership style and directive leadership style explain 31% of employee motivation while the remaining 69% is explained by factors not covered in this research. The 0.556 R value shows that there is a strong relationship between employee motivation and the predictor variables (Transactional leadership style, Participative leadership style, Transformational leadership style and Directive Leadership style).

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine the strength of the overall regression model. The results are as shown in Table 4.9

Table 4.9
ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>23.211</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.803</td>
<td>10.655</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>51.740</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74.952</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Transactional leadership style, Participative leadership style, Transformational leadership style, Directive Leadership style

The analysis reflects an F-value of 10.655 with a p-value of 0.000 indicating that the overall regression model is significant at 10% significance level hence the joint of the independent variables (Transactional leadership style, Participative leadership style, Transformational leadership style and Directive Leadership style) is significant in predicting employee motivation. This indicates that the variations in the dependent variable can be explained by the predictors. Further evaluation of the regression coefficients was conducted to determine the strength and direction of relationships. The results are presented in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10
Regression Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>90.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>1.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive leadership style</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative leadership style</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership style</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership style</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Motivation

Table 4.10 presents the regression results on the effect of individual predictor variables on the dependent variable. The coefficients indicate the increase in the value of employee motivation for each unit change in the predictor variables.
four predictor variables namely, transactional leadership style, participative leadership style, transformational leadership style and directive leadership style are the factors that predict employee motivation. The evaluation generated the following regression model:

The linear regression model: $$Y = 1.046 - 0.004X_1 + 0.116X_2 + 0.177X_3 + 0.475X_4 + \varepsilon$$

Where, $$Y$$ = Employee Motivation.

$$X_1$$ = Directive Leadership style, $$X_2$$ = Participative leadership Style, $$X_3$$ = Transformational leadership Style and $$X_4$$ = Transactional leadership Style.

1.046 = Constant, -0.004 = Effect of Directive Leadership style on Employee Motivation, 0.116 = Effect of Participative Leadership style on Employee Motivation, 0.177 = Effect of Transformational leadership Style on Employee Motivation and 0.475 = Effect of Transformational leadership Style on Employee Motivation.

According to the regression model, holding all other variables (transactional leadership style, participative leadership style, transformational leadership style and directive leadership style) constant at zero, predicts that employee motivation would be 1.046. The results show that directive leadership style had a negative effect on employee motivation with a p value of 0.979. This finding implies that a unit change in directive leadership style decreases level of employee motivation by 0.004 units when holding other factors constant. Therefore, directive leadership style is likely to worsen performance problem at Muhoroni Sugar company.

Additionally, the regression model reveals that participative leadership style had a positive effect on employee motivation with a p value of 0.393. This result implies that a unit change in participative leadership style increases level of employee motivation by 0.116 units when holding other factors constant. Therefore, participative leadership style is likely to improve the level of performance of employees of Muhoroni Sugar Company.

The results further show that transformational leadership style had a positive effect on employee motivation with a p value of 0.125. This result implies that a unit change in transformational leadership style increases level of employee motivation by 0.177 units when holding other factors constant. Consequently, transformational leadership style is likely to improve level of performance by employees of Muhoroni Sugar Company.

Finally, the findings show that transactional leadership style has a significant positive effect on employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company with p value of 0.000. This result implies that a unit change in transactional leadership style increases level of employee motivation by 0.475 units when holding other factors constant. Therefore, transactional leadership style is likely to improve level of performance by employees of Muhoroni Sugar Company.

Based on the regression analysis, the researcher concluded that directive leadership style significantly affects employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = -0.004$$, p-value = 0.979), participative leadership style significantly affects employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = 0.116$$, p-value = 0.393), transformational leadership style significantly affects employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = 0.177$$, p-value = 0.125) and that transactional leadership style affect employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = 0.475$$, p-value = 0.000).

### Summary of the Findings

The research sought to address four objectives and answer four related questions. This summary presents the findings with the aim of addressing the above objectives and questions.

i). Objective one sought to determine how directive leadership style affect employees’ motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company. Regression analysis established that directive leadership style negatively affects employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = -0.004$$, p-value = 0.979). Therefore, directive leadership style is likely to worsen performance problem at Muhoroni Sugar company.

ii). Objective two aimed to assess how participative leadership style affect employees’ motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya. Regression analysis on the data determined that participative leadership style significantly affects employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = 0.116$$, p-value = 0.393). Therefore, participative leadership style is likely to improve the level of employee performance at Muhoroni Sugar company.

iii). Objective three sought establish how transformational leadership style affect employees’ motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya. Regression analysis on the data concluded that transformational leadership style significantly affects employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = 0.177$$, p-value = 0.125). Therefore, transformational leadership style is likely to improve the level of employee performance at Muhoroni Sugar company.

iv). The fourth objective was to examine how transactional leadership style affect employees’ motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya. Regression results established that transactional leadership style significantly affects employees’ motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company ($$\beta = 0.475$$, p-value = 0.000). Consequently, transactional leadership style is likely to improve the level of employee performance at Muhoroni Sugar company.

Overall, the regression analysis, with R square = 0.310 established that at least 31% of factors that affect employee’s motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company may be explained by leadership styles.

The research deduced the following linear regression model summarizing the relationship between the predictor variables and employees’ motivation:

$$Y = 1.046 - 0.004X_1 + 0.116X_2 + 0.177X_3 + 0.475X_4 + \varepsilon$$

Where, $$Y$$ = Employee Motivation.
X₁ = Directive Leadership style, X₂ = Participative leadership Style, X₃ = Transformational leadership Style and X₄ = Transactional leadership Style.

These findings on participative leadership style, transformational leadership style and transactional leadership styles confirm studies by Aunga, D. A., & Masare, O. (2017); Al-Haj, A. (2017), Alghazo, A. M., & Al-Anazi, M. (2016); Khuong, M. N., & Hoang, D. T. (2015; and Mwaisaka, D.M., K’Aol, G., & Ouma, C. (2019). However, the observation of negative regression in the relationship between directive leadership style and employees’ motivation is non-normative. It may point to the unique situation of the organization being in protective receivership and may be a silent protest to orders and strict directions.

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations from the research conclusions.

Summary
The study sought to investigate the effect of leadership styles on employees’ motivation: a case of Muhoroni Sugar Company in Kisumu County, Kenya. It specifically aimed to:

i) To determine how directive leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.

ii) To assess how participative leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.

iii) To establish how transformational leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya.

Conclusions
Research focused on investigating the effect of leadership styles on employees’ motivation: a case of Muhoroni Sugar Company in Kisumu County, Kenya.

The study determined that 31% of the employee motivation is attributable to leadership styles while the remaining 69% can be explained by other variables not covered by this research.

Research Questions
The research aimed at answering the following research questions:

i. How does directive leadership style affect employee’s motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?

ii. How does the participative leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?

iii. How does transformational leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?

iv. How does transactional leadership style affect employee motivation of Muhoroni Sugar Company, Kisumu County, Kenya?

The researcher deduced the following conclusions:

i. that directive leadership style had a negative effect on employee motivation with a p value of 0.979. This finding implies that a unit change in directive leadership style decreases level of employee motivation by 0.004 units when holding other factors constant. Therefore, directive leadership style is likely to worsen performance problem at Muhoroni Sugar company.

ii. that participative leadership style had a positive effect on employee motivation with a p value of 0.393 on the regression model. This result implies that a unit change in participative leadership style increases level of employee motivation by 0.116 units when holding other factors constant. Therefore, participative leadership style is likely to improve the level of employee performance at Muhoroni Sugar company.

iii. that transformational leadership style had a positive effect on employee motivation with a p value of 0.125. This result implies that a unit change in transformational leadership style increases level of employee motivation by 0.177 units when holding other factors constant. Therefore, transformational leadership style is likely to improve the level of employee performance at Muhoroni Sugar company.

Finally, the regression results show that transactional leadership style had a significant positive effect on employee motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company at a p value of 0.000. This implies that a unit change in transformational leadership style increases level of employee motivation by 0.475 units when holding other factors constant. Therefore, transactional leadership style is likely to improve the level of employee performance at Muhoroni Sugar company.

Recommendations
From the study findings, the researcher suggests the following recommendations:

i) Management of Muhoroni Sugar Company should be cautious in applying directive leadership style because it is likely to demotivate employees in their work performance, worsen those aspects of performance problems that are attributable to motivation.

ii) Management of Muhoroni Sugar Company may consider using more participative leadership styles and encourage greater participation and teamwork in major decisions affecting staff in efforts to improve performance levels, since style positively affected motivation.

iii) Management of Muhoroni Sugar Company should encourage greater use of transformational leadership style as a way of improving employee performance. Researcher recommends showing greater interest in team members, strengthening
personal relationships, and care for staff welfare while striving to help staff find meaning in their work.

iv) Management may apply transactional leadership style in efforts to improve performance levels of employees of the Company. However, assessment of the situation should be done, and care taken to avoid being perceived as manipulating motivation. Whereas clarifying performance expectations and investigating deviations both scored high, the leaders did not score well in appreciating accomplishments and rewarding performance. Praise and recognition are alternative methods of rewarding performance where financial rewards are not possible.

Suggestions for Further Research

The researcher recommends further study to establish why directive leadership style was found to have a negative regression on employee motivation at Muhoroni Sugar Company. Also, more elaborate studies need to be conducted on organizations in distressed financial situations to generate findings that may be generalized in similar situations.
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