

Influence of Leadership Styles of School Leaders and Teacher's Work Motivation to Teaching Performance

Wendelyn E. Caong¹ and Gina Fe G. Israel²

^{1,2}University of Mindanao, Tagum City, Philippines

Abstract— The research main purpose was to reveal if leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation significantly influences teaching performance. In this study, the respondents were the 397 public elementary school teachers teaching in Maco North District and Maco South District for School Year 2021-2022. This research used quantitative design with a non-experimental method utilizing a correlational technique with regression analysis. The Mean, Pearson-r, and Regression Analysis were the statistical tools employed in analyzing the data gathered. The study revealed a very high level of leadership style of school leaders in terms of recognition, participation, diversity, and openness. It also showed the very high level of teacher's work motivation regarding achievement, affiliation, and power. A very high level of teaching performance in terms of quality work, accuracy, initiatives, work ability, and communication skills as revealed on the findings of the study. Also, the result of the study confirmed principal's leadership style and teaching performance has significant relationship. The study confirms that work motives of teachers also contribute to teaching performance.

Keywords— MAED – Educational Management, Leadership styles of school leaders, teacher's work motivation, teaching performance

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main problems the education sector has been trying to solve over the years is relative to teaching performance. Ever since teachers have been an essential internal factor in students' achievement. Thus, the low results in the student's academic achievement would also link to teaching performance. The negative impact of a teacher's low performance would affect the student's achievement and the whole institution. Quality education is affected when the performance of teachers is not good. According to Zubaidah et al. (2021), the low performance of teachers leads to low effectiveness in the demonstration of teaching.

Teaching performance is essential, especially in the lives of students. The education sector should consider immediate actions in identifying the factors that constitute teaching performance. Every institution should identify the underlying factors that negatively affect teaching performance. According to Astuti et al. (2020), the quality of education as a benchmark of success is shown by teacher performance. Indeed, the problems of teaching performance need solutions and treatments to give quality service to the institution and school children.

Teaching performance is a connective effort. School leaders' duties should be evident in educational leadership to activate motivation in enhancing teachers' performance. Accordingly, highly motivated teachers

perform better in the teaching and learning process. Moreover, school leaders should also be concerned with elevating teachers' motivation and performance to support teaching quality professionally and wisely (M.H. Maruapey, 2016).

Teaching performance does not rely on the teachers alone. The management must provide vital support in motivating employees to achieve high performance to meet the organization's expectations. Undeniably, school leaders can inflict significant energy sources on achieving the objectives of school education. If the school wants the teachers to perform their duties with high teaching performance, it should apply organizational (leadership) and psychological factors (motivation) (Andriani et al., 2018).

The researcher has not found a study on the influence of leadership styles of school leaders and teachers' work motivation on teaching performance. Thus, the urgency to conduct this study. Most of the published studies only focused on leadership styles and/or motivation, which are the study's independent variables. It did not reveal direct influence of leadership style and work motivation in empowering teaching performance. The focus of this study is to determine which domain in leadership style and work motivation predicts empowering teaching performance among the teaching personnel of Maco District. The educational sector could utilize the findings of this research to improve and develop ways to

improve teaching performance by highlighting appropriate approaches and determining needs.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study is a quantitative non-experimental research design using causal effect with regression analysis to describe the impact of the relationship between variables. The descriptive correlation method was an appropriate tool to depict the state of specified situations as drawn and investigated at the time of the study. Correlational research has to construct relationships among variables to the particular population and interpret the relationship between them with minimal effort. According to Curtis et al. (2016) and Seeram (2019), correlational research provides an understanding and association of predictive outcomes between the variables.

This descriptive research gathered quantitative data on the situation of the phenomenon. The procedures include data gathering from the target respondents through responding to the questionnaires. The answered surveys from respondents provided quantitative data for interpretation. The research emphasizes the determination of the factors that contributed to teaching performance of Maco North and Maco South District teaching staff through the leadership style of school leaders and teachers work motivation.

The context of elementary school teachers of Maco North and Maco South District of Maco, Davao de Oro will benefit the relevance of the outcome of the research. The applicability of the findings was limited only by the scope and sample. Meanwhile, there could be common features, the relevance of the result. The research outcomes are relevant to the context of Maco South and Maco North Districts of Maco, Davao de Oro elementary school teachers. The scope and the sample limited the possibility of the general applicability of the findings. Accordingly, while there could be standard features, the results may not have an overall relevance to another structure.

The inclusion criteria that made the respondent qualified to participate in the study were: an elementary school teacher of Maco South and Maco North District, Maco, Davao de Oro; and an employed and in-service classroom teacher at the present school year 2021-2022. In contrast, the exclusion criteria are: not an elementary school teacher of Maco South and Maco North District, Maco Davao de Oro; and not an employed and or in-service classroom teacher of the present school year

2021-2022. In the selection of respondents' cluster sampling was used. For Maco South 11 schools out of 16 schools were chosen, while out of 21 schools in Maco North District 13 are chosen to represent the entire population. A population is a group of individuals who have the same characteristics (Creswell, 2012). There were 397 teachers out of 462 teachers selected in Maco South and North Districts. This population is selected since the teachers are employed for the school year 2021- 2022. Also, their number of years in teaching and position varies, which can contribute to better information in the study. Respondents can decline to participate in the investigation during the survey, especially when frightened. Shown below are the respondents of the study who are elementary teachers for the school year 2021-2022.

The researcher used a questionnaire suited to the context of collecting data on the independent variables and dependent variables. The questionnaire's content was a result from the correlated literature in the study. The internal and external validators validated it to ensure the appropriateness of the content. The questionnaire contained the respondent's demographic information.

The respondents answered three sets of questionnaires for the two independent and one dependent variables.

The influence of leadership styles of school leaders to teaching performance with indicators, namely, recognition, participation, diversity, and openness was in the first set of questionnaires. The questionnaires used was adopted and modified from the standard Teac-Q instrument from the study of Teachers' Expectations of Educational Leaders' Leadership Approach and Perspectives on the Principals: Identifying Critical Leadership Paradigms for the 21st Century.

The original questionnaire was modified to contextualize items to fit the school setting. The original items were simplified and paraphrased to gain a better understanding from the respondents. It also undergone validity and reliability testing. The respondents were asked to rate the leadership styles of school leaders through five-point Likert Scale anchored at (5) Always; (4) Often; (3) Sometimes; (2) Seldom; and (1) Never.

After the simplification and modification of adopted questionnaire, it was validated by internal and external validators. It also underwent validity and reliability testing. Then, the researcher secured and sent a letter

seeking permission from the Schools Division Superintendent to conduct the study recognized by the division office. The division office responded with certification letter and was handed to the public school's district supervisors and all school administrators for approval. Instruction and orientation were given by the researcher to the respondents for accuracy and guidance purposes in responding to the questions. The responses were tabulated, analyzed and interpreted with utmost confidentiality. Lastly, the gathered data were endorsed to the statistician for computation, tabulation, and analysis.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Leadership Styles of School Leaders

The Table 1 shows the results of leadership styles of school leaders, the overall mean score of the variable is 4.61 which is very high with standard deviation of 0.42. Very high-level result could be interpreted as the very high response of the respondents in the indicators of the first independent variable which are recognition, participation, diversity, and openness. The result of the subsequent mean scores from the highest to lowest indicators: 4.66 or very high for recognition; 4.60 or very high for participation and openness; and 4.58 or very high for diversity indicated the total mean score.

Table 1: Level of Leadership of School Leaders

Indicator	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Recognition	4.66	0.43	Very High
Participation	4.60	0.46	Very High
Diversity	4.58	0.48	Very High
Openness	4.60	0.47	Very High
Overall	4.61	0.42	Very High

The indicator recognition got highest mean score of 4.66 with a standard deviation of 0.43, described as very high. In the appended Table 1.1 the respondents have observed the following order of importance : a mean of 4.77 encouraging teachers and staff to continue professional schools, interpreted as very high; a mean of 4.72 for commending teachers and staff who demonstrate commitment and dedication to teaching, interpreted as very high; a mean of 4.70 promoting modeling of successful practice, described as very high; a mean of 4.68 in taking interests in the staff members opinions, described as very high; a mean of 4.67 opening to be trained in the fundamentals of strategic planning, interpreted as very high; a mean of 4.66 taking

interests in the opinions of the staff members, described as very high; a mean of 4.65 which is giving recognition to teachers and staffs who produce spectacular results, described as very high; a mean of 4.62 identifying and promoting successful practice of other schools, described as very high; a mean score of 4.59 in making effort to keep staff motivated through giving rewards for a job well done, described as very high; and, a mean score of 4.58 analyzing problems of teachers and staff to create context specific strategies to meet standards of excellence, which is described as very high.

The indicators participation and openness got the second highest mean. Openness has a mean score of 4.60, and a standard deviation of 0.47, determined as very high. Shown in Table 1.4 indicated the order of respondents responses: a mean of 4.70 for trying to connect his/her own ideas with teachers and staff members, described as very high; a mean of 4.63 in promoting the value of learning from the successful practices of other schools, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.61 enrolling to courses that strengthen strategic planning and school management, described as very high; a mean score of 4.60 showing willingness in listening to issues and constructively responds and proposes solutions and also responding positively to staff members even when there is disagreement, identified as very high; a mean score of 4.59 showing willingness to accept criticism, described as very high; a mean score of 4.59 showing willingness to accept criticism, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.57 giving emphasis on learning best practices of other institutions to enhance internal school operation, described as very high; lastly, a mean score of 4.56 for demonstrating care for the needs of the staff members and leading the development of strategic planning, also described as very high.

Consequently, Participation has second- highest mean with standard deviation of 0.46, described as very high. The Table 1.2 shows that the respondents have preferred the following order : a mean score of 4.70 encouraging staff members to join training workshops, described as very high; a mean score of 4.68 allowing teachers to grow in the organization through participation of trainings, determined as very high ; a mean score of 4.65 showing respect to staff members by recognizing strength and accomplishments, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.62 encouraging camaraderie among staff members and creating work environment that make teachers comfortable and excited , described as very high; a mean score of 4.58 creating condition for staff

members to participate in decision making and creating an exciting work environment that encourages teachers and staff to join and participate, identified as very high; a mean score of 4.53 responding positively to staff members even when there is disagreement, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.51 ensuring low performing staff member receive support to improve, described as very high; finally, a mean score of 4.50 professional judgement of teachers and staff members, described as very high.

Lastly, the indicator diversity got lowest mean score of 4.58 with a standard deviation of 0.48, described as very high. Presented in Table 1.3 is the data revealed from respondents response in following order: a mean score of 4.64 acknowledging and showing care for the different needs of teachers and staff members, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.61 listening to issues in which there are diverse opinions and promoting collective responsibility, identified as very high; a mean score of 4.60 promoting collective responsibility, indicated as very high; a mean score of 4.59 encouraging diversity of perspectives, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.58 for understanding the different ideas, needs, capacities, and skills of teachers and staff members, described as very high; a mean score of 4.57 utilizing the diverse strengths of staff members in the operation of school, in addition to their primary competencies, showing willingness to subject his/her position to the collective wisdom of teachers and staff members, and advocating justice for all teachers regardless of culture differences and employment status, described as very high; a mean score of 4.53 for deferring from other staff on matters on which they are more knowledgeable, which is very high; and a mean score of 4.51 establishing work routines that caters to different capacities and skills of teachers and staff members; described as very high.

Level of Teacher's Work Motivation

The overall mean score of variable teacher's work motivation is 4.32 with a standard deviation of 0.46, determined as very high.

This is presented in Table 2, the very high level result could be related on the very high rating the respondents gave in the indicators in terms of achievement, affiliation, and power. The result was from the mean score of highest to lowest indicators: 4.49 or very high for achievement; 4.39 or very high for affiliation; and 4.10 or high for power.

Table 2: Level of Teacher's Work Motivation

Indicator	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Achievement	4.49	0.43	Very High
Affiliation	4.39	0.50	Very High
Power	4.10	0.68	High
Overall	4.32	0.46	Very High

56 liking to have things done just right, described as very high. a mean score of 4.55 for feeling any job should be done thoroughly if you do it at all, giving priority on important work when I am on hectic schedule, and working hard to earn a living, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.52 looking for ways of doing things better and faster, described as very high; 4.49 seeking feedback on how well they a mean score of 4.44 enjoying challenging work, which is very high performs, with description equivalent as very high; a mean score of 4.47 feeling satisfied in giving the best in the field of work, described as very high, a mean score of 4.44 enjoying challenging work, with a descriptive equivalent as very high; a mean score of 4.43 making effort to keep others motivated, described as very high; and, a mean score of 4.21 enjoying competition with others, described as very high. The indicator affiliation has the second- highest mean, it resulted with a total mean score of 4.39 with a standard deviation of 0.50, with a descriptive equivalent of very high.

The appended Table 2.2 shows the result of the indicators from the highest to lowest mean: a mean score of 4.47 looking for other means in order to meet my work expectations, with descriptive equivalent as very high; a mean score of 4.46 feeling motivated in telling others what to do in order to improve our works, described as very high; a mean score of 4.44 for liking whenever their colleagues tell their problems because they know I can help them, described as very high; a mean score of 4.42 for giving importance to the opinions of others to improve my work and my personality, described as very high; a mean score of 4.40 making initiative to solve issues and conflict with other/colleagues, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.39 choosing hobbies that I can share with other people, described as very high; a mean score of 4.35 drawing attention to their self, described as very high; a mean score of 4.33 liking to be with group of people rather than myself, described as very high; a mean score of 4.30 liking to have the responsibility of directing the

work of others, interpreted as very high; and, a mean score of 4.28 giving importance on the expectation of others about me, described as very high. The indicator power has lowest mean score of 4.10 with a standard deviation of 0.50 with a descriptive equivalent as very high. As presented in the Table 2.3 the respondents have experienced the following order: a mean score of 4.2The achievement indicated the highest mean score of 4.49 with a standard deviation of 0.43 which determined as very high.

As shown in the Table 2.1 the responses of teachers are as follows: a mean score of 4.59 setting a goal, no matter how difficult that he/she will eventually achieve it, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.8 getting others agree with ideas and proposals, described as very high; a mean score of 4.15 for seeing job titles have meaning and significance, described as high; a mean score of 4.14 feeling confident when directing the works of others, interpreted as high; a mean score of 4.13 liking to lead others on activities, revealed as high; a mean score of 4.12 enjoying opportunities to influence others, described as high; a mean score of 4.10 for giving importance on opportunities that helps in becoming widely known, which is described as high; a mean score of 4.09 for taking their colleagues on their wing and mentor them, which is described as high; a mean score of 4.03 for winning others on their side in an argument, which is described as high; and a mean score of 3.99 for enjoying opportunities to exercise control over an organization or group and liking possessions and properties that are impressive to others, which is described as high.

Level of Teaching Performance

In the variable teaching performance overall, mean score is 4.55 with a standard deviation of 0.40. The Table 3 shows the result of the gathered data of all indicators in this variable.

The very high rating is the result of interpreted data from the very high response of teachers to indicators, work quality, work accuracy, initiative, ability, and communication skills.

The total average score was acquired from the gathered data from indicators, arranged from highest to lowest mean score: 4.62 or very high for communication skills; 4.58 or very high for the ability; 4.55 or very high for quality; 4.53 or very high for accuracy; and 4.49 or very high for initiative.

Table 3: Level of Teaching Performance

Indicator	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Quality	4.55	0.44	Very High
Accuracy	4.53	0.44	Very High
Initiative	4.49	0.46	Very High
Ability	4.58	0.43	Very High
Communication Skills	4.62	0.43	Very High
Overall	4.55	0.40	Very High

The communication skills have highest mean score of 4.62 with a standard deviation of 0.43, with a descriptive equivalent of very high. The data revealed from the Table 2.5 shows that teachers have manifested the following order of priority: a mean score of 4.65 interacting to students individually and teaching students to work cooperatively toward academic goals, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.64 encouraging and promoting appropriate classroom participation to shy students in the class, described as very high; a mean score of 4.63 promoting respect for cultural diversity in classroom, described as very high; a mean score of 4.62 encouraging creativity and self-expressions among students, described as very high; a mean score of 4.61 giving advice particularly to troubled students and beginning the lesson with activities to reinforce collaboration among students, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.59 incorporating students learning needs and learning interests in my teaching and helping students develop their ability to make decisions, described as very high; a mean score of 4.57 talking to student's previous teacher to gather information about the students, described as very high.

The indicator that has second- highest mean is ability, has a mean 4.58 with standard deviation of 0.43. As shown in the Table 3.4 the responses has the following order of priority: a mean score of 4.65 acknowledging students' positive behavior, descriptive equivalent as very high; a mean score of 4.64 adjusting teaching to the level of my students, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.61 trying to be a role model for the students and responding to students learning needs, determined as very high; a mean score of 4.57 advocating rational or conscious understanding in teaching and explaining clearly the content and topics to students, described as very high; a mean score of 4.56 modeling teaching through thinking aloud or showing final product expected to students, with very high description equivalent; a mean score of 4.55 providing students

with learning activity most of the time and monitoring regularly the students during independent/ group work, described as very high; and, a mean score of 4.51 processing and prompting questions to determine the level of understanding of the students, described as very high.

The quality posted the third highest indicator with an average score of 4.55 and a standard deviation of 0.44, descriptive equivalent as very high. The Table 3.1 reveal the following order of priority from respondents; a mean score of 4.62 preparing teaching plans, described as very high; a mean score of 4.61 collaborating with their colleagues, described as very high; a mean score of 4.60 participating actively in school related activities and school planning, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.56 for managing in planning their work so that it will be done on time and setting clear behavioral expectations for classroom activities, described as very high; a mean score of 4.55 teaching carefully the lessons according to my teaching plan, as very high; a mean score of 4.53 knowing how to set right priorities in work, described as very high; a mean score of 4.52 articulating objectives of the lesson and relating classroom objectives to lesson, interpreted as very high; and, a mean score of 4.50 for keeping in mind the results they have to achieve in work and having the ability to separate main issues from side at work, as very high.

The accuracy ranked as fourth indicator with an average score of 4.53 with a standard deviation of 0.43. It is shown in Table 3.2 the result according to the answers from respondents : a mean of 4.59 planning work in teaching in most desirable way, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.57 establishing good cooperation with class management and clarifying the details of the teaching plan and other tasks, revealed as very high; a mean score of 4.56 completing the details of the teaching plan and tasks, description equivalent as very high; a mean score of 4.55 following procedures, processes, and practices in carrying-out their teaching tasks, described as very high; a mean score of 4.54 ensuring to have necessary resources like instructional media in delivering my teaching plan and tasks, described as very high; a mean score of 4.52 monitoring and checking their teaching plan to ensure completeness of teaching tasks, interpreted as very high; a mean score of 4.49 giving actual and contextual case in teaching, described as very high; a mean score of 4.48 establishing procedures, processes, and practices in carrying-out their teaching tasks, described as very high; lastly, a

mean score of 4.43 producing work free from error, has a descriptive equivalent as very high.

Lastly, initiative got low mean score of 4.49 with a standard deviation of 0.46, under descriptive equivalent as very high. Presented in Table 3.3 reveals that the teachers have manifested the following order of priority: a mean of 4.57 taking challenging work tasks, when available and coming up with creative solutions to new problems, described as very high; a mean score of 4.56 starting new tasks when old ones are done, described as very high; a mean score of 4.54 submitting themselves to trainings to improve their teaching, interpreted as very high ; a mean score of 4.51 trying to do new things in teaching and working in keeping their job skills up to date, as very high; a mean score of 4.48 actively looking for ways to improve their performance at work, described as very high; a mean score of 4.46 filing up student's achievement and school documents, as very high; a mean score of 4.43 doing more in what is expected of them, described as very high; finally, a mean score of 4.41 looking for new challenges in their job, descriptive equivalent as very high.

Significance on the Relationship between Leadership Styles of School Leaders and Teacher's Work Motivation to Teaching Performance

Relatively, determining whether the leadership styles of school leaders and teachers' work motivation have a significant relationship with teaching performance considered as one of the main courses of this research. The Pearson-r was utilized to investigate the correlation between variables to see if there were any significance on the variables. Hence, shown in Table 4 were analyzed and interpreted results of the significant relationship between leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation to teaching performance.

The consolidated data confirms that independent variables, leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation, were positively related to teaching performance. The r-value of 0.572* with a p-value of 0.001 and a coefficient of determination of 0.3272, shows a correlation. This tells a significant relationship of leadership styles of school leaders to teaching performance. This means that when the school leadership style of school leaders is high, then the teaching performance is also high.

Furthermore, the gathered outcomes revealed that teacher's Work Motivation significantly related to

Teaching Performance. The r- value of 0.739* with a p-value of 0.001 and a coefficient determination of 0.5461, shows a positive correlation.

This reveals significant relationship among teacher's work motivation to teaching performance. This means that when teacher's inspiration influences teaching performance.

Table 4: Significance on the Relationship between Leadership Styles of School Leaders and Teacher's Work Motivation to Teaching Performance

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	r- value	r-squared	p- value	Decision
Leadership Styles of School Leaders	Teaching Performance	0.572*	0.3272	0.001	H ₀ is rejected
Teacher's Work Motivation		0.739*	0.5461	0.001	H ₀ is rejected

*P<0.05

The table clearly shows that the hypothesis stating the non-significant relationship between leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation to teaching performance was rejected. This means that the variables of the study have significant relationship.

Regression Analysis on Leadership Styles of School Leaders and Teacher's Work Motivation to Teaching Performance

In appended Table 5 shows regression analysis on leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation to teaching performance.

The computed F- ratio of 263.638 and a p- value of 0.001 reveals that when taken as a whole, two independent variables significantly predict the dependent variable of the study.

As a matter of fact, R- value 0.756*, indicated a positive relationship between leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation to teaching performance.

As summarized, R² 0.572, showing 57.2% teaching performance is discussed by leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation. Other variables not discussed in the study could be accountable to remaining percentage.

Table 5: Regression Analysis on the Influence of Leadership Styles of School Leaders and Teacher's Work Motivation to Teaching Performance

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t- value	p- value	Decision
	B	SE	Beta			
(constant)	1.402	0.150				
Leadership Styles of School Leaders	0.189	0.039	0.201*	4.892	0.001	H ₀ is rejected
Teacher's Work Motivation	0.527	0.035	0.618 *	15.021	0.001	H ₀ is rejected

Dependent Variable: Teaching Performance
R= 0.756* R²=0.572
F-ratio= 263.638 P-value= 0.001

Furthermore, leadership styles of school leaders have beta of 0.201* and p-value of 0.001; teacher's work motivation has 0.618* beta with a p-value of 0.001. The two variables show less than 0.05 level of significance, therefore, the variable teaching performance can be predicted by leadership styles of school leaders and teacher's work motivation.

Regression Analysis on the Influence of the domain Leadership Styles of School Leaders to Teaching Performance

Revealed in Table 6 is regression analysis on the influence of domain leadership styles of school leaders to teaching performance. The computed F- ratio of 52.329 with p- value of 0.001, this reveals that the variable leadership styles of school leaders predicts teaching performance. As revealed R- value is 0.590*, telling relationship on leadership styles of school leaders to teaching performance. The total R² is 0.348, meaning 34.8% is made accountable in leadership styles of school leaders in predicting teaching performance . Other percentage could be attested from other variables not discussed in the study.

Table 6: Regression Analysis on the Influence of the domains of Leadership Styles of School Leaders to Teaching Performance

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t- value	p- value	Decision
	B	SE	Beta			
(constant)	2.222	0.182				
Recognition	-0.065	0.061	-0.071	-1.066	0.267	Do not Reject H ₀
Participation	0.157	0.067	0.182*	2.331	0.020	H ₀ is rejected
Diversity	0.204	0.078	0.246*	2.629	0.009	H ₀ is rejected
Openness	0.213	0.088	0.251*	2.431	0.015	H ₀ is Rejected

Dependent Variable: Teaching Performance
R=0.590* R²=0.348
F- ratio= 52.329 P- value= 0.001

Regression Analysis on the Influence of the domain Teacher's Work Motivation to Teaching Performance

On the other hand, table 7 is the regression analysis on teacher's work motivation to teaching performance. The table shows a computed F- ratio of 244.409 and a p-value of 0.001, which means that the two independent

variables can significantly predict teaching performance when taken as a whole. The R- value is 0.807*, indicating a positive relationship between leadership styles of school leaders and teacher’s work motivation to empowering teaching performance. The overall R² is 0.650, indicating that 65% of the teaching performance is discussed by teacher’s work motivation. The remaining percentage is accountable to other variables not included in the study.

Table 7: Regression Analysis on the Influence Of the domains Of Teacher's Work Motivation to Teaching Performance

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	p-value	Decision
	B	SE	Beta			
(constant)	1.295	0.125				
Achievement	0.380	0.043	0.412*	8.874	0.001	H ₀ is rejected
Affiliation	0.360	0.041	0.452*	8.664	0.001	H ₀ is rejected
Power	-0.006	0.022	-0.011	-0.281	0.779	Do not Reject H ₀

Dependent Variable: Teaching Performance

R= 0.807* R²=0.650
F-ratio= 244.409 P-value= 0.001

IV. CONCLUSION

Looking to the result of the research objectives, researcher concluded the very high level of leadership styles of school leaders was. Also, the level of work motivation of teachers showed very high descriptive. The level of teaching performance was very high as well. The study revealed both the leadership styles of school leaders and teachers’ work motivation have a significant relationship to performance of teachers in teaching. However, indicator recognition of leadership styles of school leaders is not significant among the domains presented. Also, in teachers’ work motivation, power is not significant among the domains presented. Lastly, when taken as a whole, both leadership styles of school leaders and teacher’s work motivation have predictive ability to teaching performance.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher came up with several recommendations on teaching performance, this is a result of the profound consideration implications of findings and conclusion of the study.

First, to maintain the very high level of leadership styles of school leaders, they may encourage teachers and staff to continue improving themselves by pursuing post-graduate studies and sending them in trainings that could help them improve in their field. The leaders may include the teachers in making enhanced school improvement plan which is concerned on developing

project proposal for the school. This would give encouragement and opportunities to them and make them feel that they belong to the institution and are recognized.

Second, to maintain a very high level of teacher’s work motivation, the teacher may desire to achieve the set goals no matter how difficult it is. They may look for ways to complete their tasks, including making outlines and planning the processes to meet the expected work. This may be possible by submitting themselves to training, especially pedagogical enhancement train. This is an enabling opportunity for additional learning, healthy competition within self and with peers.

Third, to maintain a very high level of teaching performance, the teachers may establish communication by interacting with students individually, especially in discussing performance. Plan their work and enhance their teaching skills by applying relevant teaching strategies that cater to the learners' deferring needs. These strategies may include acknowledging students’ positive behavior for a job well done. Teachers may also seek improvement opportunities and develop career plans because the job demands relentless education.

Fourth, school leaders may give clinical support in the teaching-learning process to identify their teachers' capacities. School leaders may promote a working environment with recognition for everyone in accomplishing the diversified task at hand. The teachers should feel that they are an asset to the institution by providing a culture of support and appreciation and that no teacher is left behind.

Lastly, school leaders and teachers should show a willingness to new approaches and submit themselves to training, especially on enhancement programs for teachers and school leaders to equip them with their highly valued tasks. School leaders with teachers may establish a conducive working environment by creating mutual accountability in deciding concerns about teaching performance, student performance, and school performance. Further, the researcher recommends that future researchers design studies in line with the topic identified in the research.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Researchers would like to extend their gratitude and appreciation to all the persons behind the validation of survey questionnaire, panel of examiners, statistician, grammarian, Division of Davao de Oro, Maco North and

South District Heads and public elementary school teachers, and to those people who helped and encouraged them to finish this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amtu, O., Siahaya, A., & Taliak, J. (2019). Improve Teacher Creativity Through Leadership and Principals Management. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal.*, 23(1), 1–17.
- [2] Arman, Thalib, S. B., & Manda, D. (2016). The effect of school supervisors' competence and school principals' competence on work motivation and performance of Junior High School teachers in Maros Regency, Indonesia. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(15), 7309–7317.
- [3] Aunga, D. A. O., & Masare, O. (2017). Effect of leadership styles on teacher's performance in primary schools of Arusha District Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 4(4), 42–52. <https://www.journalissues.org/IJEPRR/%0Ahttps://doi.org/10.15739/IJEPRR.17.006>.
- [4] Doeze Jager, S., Born, M., & Van der Molen, H. (2017). Self-Other Agreement Between Employees on their Need for Achievement, Power, and Affiliation: A Social Relations Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.16993/sjwop.29>
- [5] Dokony, H. A. I., Singh, J. S. K., & Arumugam, T. (2020). The influence of leadership behaviors based on the path-goal theory towards employees' satisfaction in a developing nation. A study in the telecommunication sector in N'djamena, Chad. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(2), 1324–1336. <https://doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V24I2/PR200432>
- [6] Eyal, O., & Roth, G. (2011). Principals' leadership and teachers' motivation: Self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(3), 256–275. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111129055>
- [7] Fitria, H. (2018). The influence of organizational culture and trust through the teacher performance in the private secondary school in Palembang. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 7(7), 82–86.
- [8] Granero-Gallegos, A., Gómez-López, M., Baena-Extremera, A., & Martínez-Molina, M. (2020). Interaction effects of disruptive behaviour and motivation profiles with teacher competence and school satisfaction in secondary school physical education. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17010114>
- [9] Ingsih, K., Astuti, D., Suhana, S., & Ali, S. (2021). Improving teacher motivation and performance through communication, work discipline, leadership and work compensation. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 20(1), 1–16.
- [10] Wachira, F. M., Gitumu, M., & Mbugua, Z. (2017). Effect of Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Job Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Kieni West Sub-County. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 6(8), 72–86. www.ijhssi.org
- [11] Tukiyo, T., Nurkamto, J., Siswandari, S., & Gunarhadi, G. (2019). Primary Schools Teachers' Motivation and Performance Improvement Gained through the Principals' Leadership 3.0 Policy Implementation. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.21-12-2018.2282767>
- [12] Sehar, S., & Alwi, K. K. (2019). Impact of Head Teacher's Leadership Style on Teacher's Job Satisfaction and Work Motivation. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 13(1), 1–18. [https://doi.org/10.29270/jbs.13.1\(2019\).043](https://doi.org/10.29270/jbs.13.1(2019).043)
- [13] Zubaidah, R. A., Haryono, S., & Udin, U. (2021). The effects of principal leadership and teacher competence on teacher performance: The role of work motivation. *Quality - Access to Success*, 22(180), 91–96.