



SCHOOL HEADS' MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES IN RELATION TO TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE

Mark Denver M. Dantes, EdD., Nora F. Benavides, EdD

Cabetican Elementary School, Lyceum-Northwestern University, Dagupan City, Philippines

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19351523>

ABSTRACT

This study explores motivational strategies used by school heads and their impact on teachers' instructional performance in the Schools Division Office of Pampanga for 2025-2026. Grounded in Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, it examines how school heads' approaches affect teachers' effectiveness and engagement. Using quantitative cross-sectional survey design, data is gathered from teachers and school heads. The study assesses supervisory functions like content knowledge, pedagogy, learning environment, learner diversity, curriculum planning, assessment, community engagement, and professional growth, collectively termed "Highly Practiced." The research evaluates the effectiveness of these functions, rated "Highly Effective" by both teachers and school heads. It focuses on how motivational strategies—recognizing strengths, fostering work-life balance, and professional development—impact job satisfaction and instructional performance. The study emphasizes supportive leadership in motivating teachers and highlights how understanding students' strengths enhances instructional quality. Teachers are encouraged to model curiosity, persistence, flexibility, and collaborative communication. School heads support teachers through inclusive accommodation, diverse resources (including ICT), and constructive feedback, fostering a positive learning environment and improved student engagement. The study underscores the importance of professional development in maintaining high standards. Overall, it provides insights into how school heads' strategies influence teachers' performance, emphasizing effective leadership and supportive supervision in enhancing educational quality in Pampanga. Based on the conclusions, the researcher comes up with the following recommendations: The teachers may know their students' strengths, misconceptions, and how they learn best in the discipline. The teachers may model effective learning skills through their own behavior (demonstrate curiosity, persistence,

flexibility, time management, creativity and collaborative communication). The school heads may assist the teachers on how to design accommodations that do not make some feel like second class citizens.

Keywords: *Leadership; Motivational Strategies; Instructional Performance; School Heads; Teachers*

INTRODUCTION

Republic Act No. 9155, otherwise known as the "Governance of Basic Education Act 2001," became law on August 11, 2001, in accordance with Section 27(1), Article VI of the Constitution. Under the law, each regional office shall have a director, an assistant director, and an office staff for program promotion and support, planning, administrative and fiscal services. The regional director was given the authority to hire, place and evaluate all employees in the regional office except for the position of assistant director, as well as the authority, accountability, and responsibility to determine the organization component of the divisions and districts, and approve the staffing pattern of all employees therein; evaluate all division superintendents and assistant division superintendents in the region; and other functions as may be assigned by the proper authorities.

On the school level, an Elementary School Principal (ESP) was designated as school head for all public elementary schools; and a Secondary School Principal (SSP) for high schools or a cluster thereof. The ESP and the SSP serve as both instructional leaders and administrative managers with the following authority, accountability and responsibility: Administering and managing all personnel, physical, and fiscal resources of the school; Recommending the staffing complement of the school based on its needs; Encouraging staff development; etc.

The instructional supervisory skills of school heads and the teachers' performance are crucial in fostering a culture of excellence, continuous improvement, and student success within educational institutions (Go and Eslabon, 2023). Bacaya, and Callob (2023) revealed that teachers observed school leaders' supervisory roles in schools and even practiced supervision to a great extent. It has an impact on teachers' instructional performance, as teachers performed very satisfactorily in their respective schools. The supervisory roles are significantly related to instructional performance; and there is a positive relationship between the supervisory practices and instructional performance. In relation to this, Encanto (2021) stress that school heads' supervisory functions were found to be effective in developing teacher's performance while barriers in supervisory functions of school heads have no significant effect in the teacher's performance (Encanto 2021). Findings showed that there is no significant correlation between the level of school heads' instructional supervision and teachers' commitment. Msuya and Mwila (2023) revealed that the supervisory practices of school heads play a greater role in the quality of teaching and overall learning achievement of students in secondary schools. The academic achievement of students is impacted by supervisory practices such classroom visits,

teacher mentoring, assessing teachers' pedagogical abilities, assisting teachers in creating lesson plans, and other creative teaching methods.

Believing the introduction is strong, therefore the researcher determined and discussed the relationship between school heads' instructional supervisory function and motivational strategies on work-life balance, job satisfaction and teachers' performance.

Research Questions

This study aimed to determine the relationship between school heads' motivational strategies on work-life balance, job satisfaction and teachers' performance in the Schools Division Office of Pampanga, school year 2025-2026.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following sub-problems:

1. What is the level of practice of key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and school heads as to:
 - 1.1 content knowledge and pedagogy;
 - 1.2 learning environment;
 - 1.3 diversity of learners;
 - 1.4 curriculum and planning;
 - 1.5 assessment and reporting;
 - 1.6 community linkages and professional engagement; and
 - 1.7 personal growth and professional development?
2. Is there a significant difference in the perception of teachers and school heads on the level of practice of key supervisory functions?
3. What is the level of effectiveness of school heads' key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and the school heads' themselves?
4. Is there a significant difference in the perception of teachers and school heads key supervisory function.
5. What are the motivational strategies used by school heads as perceived by the teachers along;
 - 5.1 work-life balance,
 - 5.2 job satisfaction, and
 - 5.3 teachers' performance?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of practice on instructional supervisory functions and motivational strategies of school heads on work life balance, job-satisfaction and teachers' performance?
7. Based on the findings of the study, what matrix can be proposed to enhance the school heads' motivational strategies in relation to teachers instructional performance?

METHODOLOGY

This study used quantitative cross-sectional survey research design. This research design according to Thomas, and Zubkov (2023), involve collecting data at one moment in time. A cross-sectional survey involved collecting data once from the congregation and

doing statistical analysis based only on this one-time data collection. Cross-sectional survey designs involved collecting data at one moment in time (Sullivan & Calderwood, 2016). Moreover, cross-sectional study is used to prove and/or disprove assumptions; not costly to perform and does not require a lot of time; Captures a specific point in time; contains multiple variables at the time of the data snapshot; and the data can be used for various types of research (Foist, 2025).

The total schools are nineteen (19) and the total number of respondents of this study were 134. The researcher used the random sampling to make statistical inferences about a population. For the data gathering instruments, the researcher used the following data gathering instruments or tools: Survey Questionnaire, informal interviews, and SBM data. The statistical tools in the analysis and interpretation of data and hypotheses testing included the following: frequency, percent, mean, t-test and Pearson r. Ethical principles were considered and observed to ensure the welfare of the respondents and uphold their rights and dignity upon conducting of this research.

RESULTS

1. Level of practice of key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and school heads

Table 1 shows the Mean Summary Distribution of the respondents' perception on the level of practice of key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and school heads. Content knowledge and pedagogy have a mean of 4.97. Learning environment has a mean of 4.76. Diversity of learners has a mean of 4.78. Curriculum and planning have a mean of 4.95. Assessment and reporting have a mean of 4.96. Community linkages and professional engagement have a mean of 4.84. Personal growth and professional development have a mean of 4.81. The Overall mean for the level of practice of key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and school heads is 4.87, interpreted as Highly Practiced. This result have relation to Trobst et al. as cited by Jingxian & Copur-Gencturk (2024) observation that teachers' understanding of the subject matter facilitate their pedagogical content knowledge development.

Table 1 Mean Summary Distribution of the Respondents Perception on key instructional supervisory functions

Variables	Mean	Interpretation
content knowledge and pedagogy	4.97	Highly Practiced
learning environment	4.76	Highly Practiced

diversity of learners	4.78	Highly Practiced
curriculum and planning	4.95	Highly Practiced
assessment and reporting;	4.96	Highly Practiced
community linkages and professional engagement	4.84	Highly Practiced
personal growth and professional development	4.81	Highly Practiced
Overall Mean	4.87	Highly Practiced

2. Difference on the level of practice of key supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and the school head themselves

Table 2 shows the difference between the perceptions on the level of practice of key supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and the school heads (19) themselves. The table clearly manifests that there is no significant difference in the perceptions the perceptions on the level of practice of key supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers 115 and the school heads 19 themselves. when grouped according to their group based on $p\text{-value} = 0.07$. It displays an overall $T\text{-value} = 0.14$ which is greater than 0.05 alpha, therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of on the level of practice of key supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers 115 and the school heads 19 themselves when grouped according to the group is rejected. This implies that different groups of respondents have a different perception on the level of practice of key supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and the school heads themselves.

Table 2 T-test on Respondents' Perception of Instructional Leadership

Group	Mean	SD	T	df	Sig	Remarks
Teachers	4.74	.009	1.47	132	0.07	Not Significant
Administrators	4.78	.033				

3. Level of effectiveness of school heads' key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and the school heads' themselves

With regards to the same (the level of effectiveness of school heads' key instructional supervisory functions) the greatest numbers of respondents confirmed the following responses: Daily monitoring of school & visitation to faculties, nooks, offices, etc. (Item 1); Classroom observation (Item 2). It is based on the garnered weighted means of 4.99 (rank 1) and 4.97 (rank 2) respectively. But respondents agreed that Human relations aspect (Item 3) as proven by the 4.19 (lowest rank) as the weighted mean.

Table 3 Level of Effectiveness of the School Heads' Key Instructional Supervisory Functions

	Items	Mean (T)	Interpretation	Mean (HT)	Interpretation
1	Daily classes/monitoring of school & visitation to faculties, nooks, offices, etc.	4.99	HP	5.00	HP
2	Demonstration/Classroom observation	4.97	HP	5.00	HP
3	Human relations aspect	4.19	HP	4.95	HP
4	Maintain classroom management/Supervision and improvement of class instruction	4.96	HP	5.00	HP
5	Perform/delegation of duties and responsibilities	4.94	HP	5.00	HP
6	Provision of school level professional development programs	4.95	HP	5.00	HP
7	Teacher/Staff development	4.92	HP	5.00	HP
8	Assigning of focal persons, committees, etc.	4.88	HP	5.00	HP
9	Creating school wide innovations	4.93	HP	5.00	HP
10	Proposing/Conducting INSETs	4.96	HP	5.00	HP

	Overall Mean	4.87	Highly Practiced	4.99	Highly Practiced
--	---------------------	-------------	-------------------------	-------------	-------------------------

The researcher calculated the overall mean of 4.87 which is interpreted that the level of effectiveness of school heads' key instructional supervisory functions in terms as perceived by the teachers is Highly Effective. On the other hand, the researcher calculated the overall mean of 4.99 which is interpreted that the level of effectiveness of school heads' key instructional supervisory functions in terms as perceived by the school heads' themselves is Highly Effective.

4. Difference on the level of effectiveness of school heads' key supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and school heads themselves

The following are the computed *t*-value and *p*-value as shown in the Table 4. The sequence is based on the sub-variables under Effectiveness of Key Supervisory Functions. Thus, out of seven sub-variables under Effectiveness of Key Supervisory Functions, majority or five obtained a significant level at $p < .05$. namely: learning environment, diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, community linkages and professional engagement, and personal growth and professional development. There are only two sub-variables which obtained not significant levels which are the following: content knowledge and pedagogy, and assessment and reporting. Therefore, there is a significant difference on the level of effectiveness of Key Supervisory Functions as perceived by the teachers and the school heads Themselves. In general, the School Heads themselves had a significant higher means compared to the teachers.

Table 4 T-Test on the Perception of the Teachers and the School Heads on Level of Effectiveness of Key Supervisory Functions

		Mean	t-value	Df	p-value	Significance
content knowledge & pedagogy	Teachers	4.94	-1.58	132	.057	Not Significant
	School heads	5.00				
learning environment	Teachers	4.58	-3.39	132	0.00	Significant
	School heads	4.95				
diversity of learners	Teachers	4.57	-5.14	132	0.00	Significant
	School heads	4.99				

curriculum and planning	Teachers	4.90	-1.88	132	0.03	Significant
	School heads	4.99				
assessment & reporting	Teachers	4.94	-0.97	132	0.16	Not Significant
	School heads	4.98				
community linkages & professional engagement	Teachers	4.71	-4.54	132	0.00	Significant
	School heads	4.98				
personal growth & professional development	Teachers	4.63	4.42	132	0.00	Significant
	School heads	4.99				

5. Motivational strategies used by school heads to their teachers

Table 5 shows the motivational strategies used by school heads to their teachers, the researcher computed mean of 4.78 is obtained under work life balance. Also, the mean of 4.69 is perceived as to the job satisfaction. Finally, the level of motivational strategies used by the school heads to their teachers' performance is perceived as 4.92 (mean). The researcher calculated the overall mean of 4.79 which is interpreted that the school heads highly practiced effective motivational strategies in terms of work-life balance, job satisfaction, and teachers' performance.

Table 5 Motivational strategies used by school heads to their teachers

Variables	Mean	Interpretation
work life balance	4.78	Highly Practiced
job-satisfaction	4.69	Highly Practiced
teachers' performance	4.92	Highly Practiced

6. Relationship between the level of practice on instructional supervisory functions and motivational strategies of school heads on work life balance, job-satisfaction and teachers' performance

The null hypothesis states there is no significant relationship between the level of effectiveness of key instructional supervisory functions and motivational strategies of school heads on work life balance, job-satisfaction and teachers' performance is rejected based on the computed t-values which are clearly not within the critical value at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 6 Relationship between the Level of Practice on Instructional Supervisory Functions and Motivational Strategies of School Heads

Variables	Pearson r	df	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value ($\alpha= 0.05$)	Decision
work life balance	0.75	132	7.32	0.72	H ₀ : reject
job-satisfaction	0.57	132	6.19	0.52	H ₀ : reject
teachers' performance	0.37	132	2.09	0.52	H ₀ : reject

DISCUSSION

This study, conducted in the Schools Division Office of Pampanga during the school year 2025-2026, examined the relationship between school heads' motivational strategies (regarding work-life balance and job satisfaction) and teachers' performance. It assessed the level of practice of key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by teachers and school heads, covering areas like content knowledge, learning environment, curriculum planning, and professional development. The study also determined the level of effectiveness of school heads' supervisory roles and motivational approaches.

The practice of key instructional supervisory functions is generally rated as "Highly Practiced" by both teachers and school heads. Specifically, this included content knowledge and pedagogy (teachers: 4.94, school heads: 5.00), learning environment (teachers: 4.58, school heads: 4.95), and curriculum and planning (teachers: 4.90, school heads: 4.99). No significant difference was found in how teachers and school heads perceived the level of practice of key supervisory functions. The effectiveness of school heads' instructional supervisory functions was rated as "Highly Effective," with an overall weighted mean of 4.87. A significant difference emerged in the perceptions of teachers and school heads regarding the effectiveness of the school heads' key supervisory functions. Motivational strategies employed by school heads were also rated as "Highly Practiced" concerning work-life balance, job satisfaction, and teachers' performance,

each scoring 4.94. The study found no significant relationship between the level of practice in instructional supervisory functions and the impact of motivational strategies on work-life balance, job satisfaction, and teachers' performance.

Conclusions

The researcher compiled the following conclusions.

1. The level of practice of key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and school heads as to the following: content knowledge and pedagogy; learning environment; diversity of learners; curriculum and planning; assessment and reporting; community linkages and professional engagement; and personal growth and professional development are all described as “Highly Practiced”.
2. The level of effectiveness of school heads’ key instructional supervisory functions as perceived by the teachers and the school heads’ themselves is described as “Highly Effective”.
3. The motivational strategies used by school heads to their teachers (as perceived by the teachers) along; work-life balance, job satisfaction, and teachers’ performance is described as “Highly Effective”.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the researcher comes up with the following recommendations:

The teachers may know their students’ strengths, misconceptions, and how they learn best in the discipline.

The teachers may model effective learning skills through their own behavior (demonstrate curiosity, persistence, flexibility, time management, creativity and collaborative communication).

The school heads may assist the teachers on how to design accommodations that do not make some feel like second class citizens.

The school heads may help the teachers on how to show skills in selection, development and use of a variety of teaching and learning resources, including ICT, to address learning goals.

The school heads may provide assistance to the teachers on how to give feedback to students about their learning, which helps with reporting and choosing the right assessments.

The school heads may have a provision to the teachers' Professional development programs reinforce teachers to have portfolios of professional activities as per evaluation scheme.

The school heads may provide the teachers' professional development programs build and refine teachers' professional skills.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Ethical principles were considered and observed to ensure the welfare of the respondents and uphold their rights and dignity upon conducting of this research.

Conflict of Interest was carefully avoided to guarantee that there will be no conflict of interest in the actualization of this study, whereas the researcher will not have interests in the outcome of the research that may lead to a personal advantage and that might therefore, in actuality or appearance, compromise the integrity of the research. The results of this investigation were solely used for academic research purposes. The researcher ensured that there was no conflict of interest in conducting this study in the performance of his duties as a school head or principal in one DepEd public school.

Privacy and Confidentiality was maintained by the researcher by ensuring unauthorized access to data using code names/numbers on research notes and documents, restricting access to survey forms and identifying participant information to the principal investigator and study staff, and securely storing hard copies in a locked cabinet and soft copies on password-protected computers. Data and files will be appropriately disposed in the garbage can after finalizing the manuscript, and the disposal only occurred after disseminating the findings to the target beneficiaries.

Informed Consent was obtained from the respondents. Respondents was advised to actively and voluntarily participate without undue force, ensuring that they are well-informed and have sufficient information regarding the research. The same were assured of utmost confidentiality, and data was only be used for the objectives of the study.

Acknowledgments

The researcher extends heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the following individuals, whose selfless contributions were instrumental in the successful completion of this study:

Dr. Romeo M. Alip, Schools Division Superintendent, Schools Division Office (SDO) of Pampanga for granting approval and endorsement to the researcher to conduct the research undertaking;

The researcher's adviser, for her unwavering patience in providing technical assistance, offering timely and insightful answers to inquiries, and for her invaluable insights and suggestions and encouragement.

Dr. Priscilla R. Castro, Dean of IGPS, for her valuable presence and motivation throughout the study, and to and the members of defense panel, for their constructive criticisms and suggestions that enhanced the research study.

Dr. Lolita L. Molano, Public Schools District Supervisor of Bacolor South District for allowing the researcher to float the questionnaire to the school heads and teachers of Bacolor South District and giving permission to conduct the study.

Dr. Eric Z. Klinefelter, Data Analyst for his unwavering support particularly in terms of the tabulation, presentation of data and the statistical analysis needed for the completion of this study.

Lastly, to the God Almighty for being the source of wisdom, love and courage for the researcher to be able to complete his study.

REFERENCES

- 1987 Philippine Constitution. Section 27(1), Article VI.
- Bacaya M., Callob (2023). School Leaders' Supervisory Roles and Practices to Teachers' Instructional Performance in Public Elementary Schools. IJRP 2023.
- Encanto B. (2021). SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS OF SCHOOL HEADS AND BARRIERS IN DEVELOPING TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE. IIMRJ. Vol. 3 No. 4 2021.
- Foist L. (2025). Cross-Sectional Study Definition, Characteristics & Examples.
- Go D. and Eslabon, (2023). School Heads' Instructional Supervisory Skills and Teachers' Performance. Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends 3(1):13-28.
- Jingxian & Copur-Gencturk (2024). Learning through teaching: the development of pedagogical content knowledge among novice mathematics teachers.
- Msuya L. J. and Mwila (2023). The effect of heads of schools' supervisory practices on learning achievement in public secondary schools in Ubungo municipality, Tanzania. Journal of Educational and Management Studies Volume 13, Issue 1: 01-42; March 25, 2023.
- Republic Act No. 9155, "The Governance of Basic Education Act 2001"
- Sullivan & Calderwood (2016). Surveys: Longitudinal, Cross-sectional and Trend Studies. The BERA/SAGE Handbook of Educational Research: Two Volume Set. SAGE Publications.
- Thomas D., Zubkov (2023). Quantitative Research Designs. Research Gate Publications.

APA Citation:

Dantes, M. D. M., & Benavides, N. F. (2026). SCHOOL HEADS' MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES IN RELATION TO TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4(3), 1583–1594. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19351523>

Corresponding author: markdenver.dantes@deped.gov.ph