International Journal of Sustainability and Advanced Integrated Research
Volume 2, Issue 2 (April-June 2026) | ISSN: 3107-7854
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijsair.V2.I2.181

Effectiveness of Secondary School Heads' Leadership Approaches in Enhancing Teacher Motivation and Promoting School Success in the Province of Sorsogon

Alili G. Perez
Master of Arts in Education, Specialization in Educational Administration, Bicol College, Daraga, Albay, Philippines

Publication history: Received: March 19, 2026; Revised: March 27, 2026; Accepted: April 05, 2026
Email of Corresponding Author: aliliperez1988@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined how the leadership approaches of school heads influence teacher motivation and school success in selected public secondary schools in the Province of Sorsogon. It was anchored on Instructional Leadership Theory, Transformational Leadership Theory, Distributed or Shared Leadership Theory, Self-Determination Theory, Path-Goal Leadership Theory, and the Leadership–Motivation–School Success Integration Theory. Using a descriptive–quantitative–correlational design, the study gathered data from 344 respondents from twenty-four selected public secondary schools in the First and Second Congressional Districts and Sorsogon City during Academic Year 2024–2025. Convenience sampling was employed, and data were collected through a survey questionnaire covering leadership approaches, teachers' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and indicators of school success. Descriptive and inferential statistics, including frequencies, means, rankings, correlation, and t-test, were used in the analysis. Findings showed that Distributed Leadership was the most prominent leadership approach, while Instructional Leadership and Digital / E-Leadership were less emphasized. Teachers in the 1st Congressional District demonstrated the highest levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and the same district also showed the strongest learner, teacher, and overall school performance. The study found a significant positive relationship between school heads' leadership approaches and teachers' intrinsic motivation, but no significant relationship with extrinsic motivation and school success. Based on these findings, the study recommended strengthening instructional and digital leadership, sustaining collaborative leadership practices, enhancing teacher motivation programs, and providing continuous leadership development for school heads. The study is directly aligned with SDG 4: Quality Education and also relates to SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions through its focus on effective school governance and educational improvement. Its sustainability impact lies in supporting educational, institutional, and governance sustainability by identifying leadership practices that can strengthen teacher engagement, school management, and long-term school effectiveness.

Keywords: Distributed Leadership; Educational Leadership; Instructional Leadership; Intrinsic Motivation; Public Secondary Schools; School Heads; School Success; Teacher Motivation

1. Introduction

This study examines how the leadership approaches of school heads influence teacher motivation and school success in the Province of Sorsogon. It is grounded in the view that school leadership is a major determinant of instructional quality, teacher engagement, professional collaboration, and organizational improvement, particularly as educational leadership continues to move from rigid hierarchies toward more collaborative, participatory, and empowering approaches. The manuscript frames leadership not merely as administration but as a strategic and human-centered force that shapes teaching practice, professional growth, and institutional effectiveness.

In the evolving landscape of education, school leaders are expected to go beyond routine administration and actively shape teaching, learning, and school improvement. Leadership models such as instructional, transformational, and distributed leadership emphasize mentorship, professional support, innovation, shared responsibility, and continuous improvement, and research has shown that effective school leadership contributes significantly to improved teaching practices, teacher motivation, and overall school performance (Leithwood et al., 2020). The manuscript further situates teacher motivation within the fulfillment of autonomy, competence, and relatedness, while also stressing the leader's role in clarifying goals, removing obstacles, and providing support for professional success.

The reviewed literature consistently shows that instructional leadership remains a strong predictor of teacher motivation, engagement, self-efficacy, and school effectiveness. Ahmad et al. (2024), He (2024), Demirdag (2021), Balatero and Bauyot (2024), General and Pua (2024), Sariakin (2025), Magdaraog (2023), Fernandez and Tagadiad (2024), and De Leon (2023) collectively indicate that supervision, mentoring, constructive feedback, recognition, and context-sensitive

instructional support strengthen professional commitment, instructional competence, and innovation among teachers. These studies suggest that instructional leadership functions not only as a managerial mechanism but also as a motivational force that supports reflective practice, collaboration, and continuous professional growth. The literature also affirms the strong motivational value of transformational, digital, and ethically grounded leadership. Kriswanto and Santosa (2025), Berkovich and Hassan (2022), Chinouan and Piatanom (2025), Saeed and Kang (2025), Yu et al. (2024), Kaya (2024), Wang (2024), Flores and Zacarias (2024), Sinclair (2025), Long (2025), Buenvinida and Ramos (2022), Anong (2024), and Villanueva and Sarmiento (2023) show that leaders who inspire, empower, provide vision, support innovation, and foster trust improve teachers' intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, resilience, autonomy, and commitment. In parallel, shared or distributed leadership is presented as a collaborative model that strengthens teacher agency and collective responsibility. Lin et al. (2022), Yang (2024), Nadeem (2024), Crum (2024), Bastasa and Guhao (2024), and Ramos (2023) indicate that when leadership is shared, teachers become more engaged, innovative, and committed to school improvement. Across the broader synthesis, the literature points toward integrative leadership models that combine instructional clarity, transformational inspiration, and collaborative participation. Caballero and Bantulo (2024) and Mendoza (2023) emphasize empathy, consistency, and shared vision as central motivational mechanisms. Arlita et al. (2022) highlights the importance of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, consistent with Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Studies further suggest that leadership affects school success directly and indirectly through teacher motivation and engagement (Kriswanto & Santosa, 2025; Zeng & Cheah, 2025), while digital leadership may also support academic performance (Chaidir, et al., and Mahdani, 2024).

The study is situated within a broader international and national concern regarding the implementation of collaborative and learner-centered leadership. Although global education systems increasingly value such approaches, many contexts continue to report burnout, declining motivation, limited recognition, insufficient administrative support, and centralized decision-making structures that weaken teacher participation and school improvement. In the Philippines, this concern is particularly relevant because leadership and management are identified as important components for strengthening teacher competencies and instructional performance (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). At the regional level, teacher motivation across Southeast Asia remains challenged by limited professional development opportunities, inadequate recognition, and inconsistent leadership support (SEAMEO, 2022). Within this context, the Province of Sorsogon provides an important local setting for examining how leadership approaches operate under varying socio-economic and administrative conditions, especially since limited empirical evidence exists on how contemporary leadership approaches collectively influence teacher motivation and school success in this locale (Harris & Jones, 2019).

The study is anchored on five complementary theories and an integrative study paradigm. Instructional Leadership Theory explains how school heads improve teaching and learning through goal clarification, curriculum alignment, monitoring, feedback, and professional support; this view is articulated through Hallinger (2003) and reinforced by Leithwood et al. (2020). Transformational Leadership Theory explains how leaders motivate teachers through vision, trust, ethical guidance, individualized support, and professional empowerment, with its educational relevance emphasized in contemporary work including (Leithwood et al., 2020; Sun & Leithwood, 2021). Distributed or Shared Leadership Theory argues that leadership emerges through collaboration and shared accountability rather than being concentrated in one individual, drawing from Spillane (2005), Gronn (2002), and Leithwood et al. (2006). Self-Determination Theory explains teacher motivation through the fulfillment of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000), while Path-Goal Leadership Theory underscores the leader's role in clarifying paths, providing support, and removing barriers to performance (Northouse, 2021; Robbins & Judge, 2023). These theoretical lenses are consolidated in the Leadership–Motivation–School Success Integration Theory by Perez (2026), which posits that school success emerges from the dynamic interaction between school heads' leadership approaches and teachers' motivation. In this framework, leadership shapes the organizational, professional, and emotional conditions of the school; teacher motivation functions as the central mediating mechanism; and improved motivation supports better instructional practice, collaboration, learner outcomes, and overall school performance. The framework is also contextually appropriate because Filipino values such as pakikipagkapwa, malasakit, and bayanihan align with collaborative, supportive, and inspirational leadership.

Although instructional, transformational, distributed, ethical, and digital leadership have each been examined in prior studies, the manuscript argues that limited empirical evidence exists on how multiple contemporary leadership approaches collectively influence teacher motivation and school success in local Philippine contexts, particularly in the Province of Sorsogon (Harris & Jones, 2019). This gap justifies a broader analysis of leadership approaches practiced by school heads, together with their relationship to teachers' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and to school success in terms of learner performance, teacher performance, and overall school performance. The rationale of the study is therefore to generate empirical evidence that can inform leadership development, strengthen school improvement initiatives, enhance teacher support systems, and guide an intervention plan responsive to local educational conditions.

The study aligns most directly with SDG 4 – Quality Education because it focuses on leadership practices that improve teaching quality, teacher motivation, professional development, and school performance. It also aligns with SDG 8 –

Decent Work and Economic Growth through its concern for teacher motivation, job satisfaction, recognition, and supportive working conditions; SDG 9 – Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure through its inclusion of digital or e-leadership and innovation in school management; and SDG 16 – Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions through its emphasis on effective school governance, participatory leadership, ethical practice, and evidence-based institutional improvement.

The study contributes to educational sustainability by identifying leadership practices that can sustain teacher engagement, instructional quality, and student learning over time. It supports institutional and governance sustainability by generating evidence that may improve leadership development, school management, collaborative culture, and policy formulation. It also contributes to innovation and digital sustainability by recognizing the role of digital leadership in contemporary schooling, and to socio-professional sustainability by highlighting how leadership affects teacher well-being, motivation, commitment, and retention. In this sense, the study has multidisciplinary relevance because it links leadership, motivation, organizational development, school governance, and educational innovation within one integrated framework for long-term school success.

Consistent with its rationale, the study examines the leadership approaches practiced by school heads across instructional, transformational, shared, transactional, servant, distributed, managerial, strategic, moral, participative, authentic, adaptive, learning-centered, cultural, empowering, and digital or e-leadership dimensions; determines the status of teachers' motivation in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic factors; assesses school success through learner, teacher, and overall school performance; analyzes the relationship between leadership approaches, teacher motivation, and school success; and uses the findings as the basis for a proposed intervention plan.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study utilized a descriptive–quantitative–correlational research design. The descriptive component was used to portray the characteristics, conditions, and leadership practices observed in the selected school settings. As explained in the manuscript, descriptive research aims to describe trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population through structured instruments such as surveys or questionnaires (Creswell, 2018). The quantitative approach was appropriate because the study relied on numerical data and statistical procedures to determine patterns and relationships among variables; accordingly, quantitative research allows researchers to examine relationships among variables in a systematic and objective manner (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). The correlational dimension was used to determine the degree and direction of relationships among leadership approaches, teacher motivation, and school success without manipulating the variables, consistent with the use of correlational research in educational settings (Cohen et al. (2018)). Overall, this design allowed the researcher to describe leadership effectiveness, assess teacher motivation and school success, and determine whether significant relationships existed among these variables.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in twenty-four selected public secondary schools in the First and Second Congressional Districts and Sorsogon City in the Province of Sorsogon. These schools were categorized as small, medium, and big to reflect differences in school size, student population, facilities, and program offerings. The locale was selected because the schools actively implemented leadership practices relevant to the study, had diverse teaching staff, and maintained collaborative school environments suitable for examining teacher motivation and school performance. The study was limited to these public secondary schools during Academic Year 2024–2025.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The study identified school heads and teachers from the twenty-four selected public secondary schools as respondents. School heads were described as sources of information on the leadership approaches they practiced, the strategies they used to motivate teachers, and their perspectives on school success indicators. Teachers, meanwhile, provided data on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, perceptions of leadership practices, and factors contributing to school success. The respondent listing in the manuscript shows a total of 344 participants across the selected schools.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study employed convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling technique in which participants were selected based on accessibility and availability during the data collection period. The sampling discussion specifically emphasized teachers who were readily available, willing to participate, and had direct experience working under school heads who implemented various leadership approaches such as instructional, transformational, and shared leadership. This method was considered appropriate because it enabled efficient data collection despite constraints in time, resources, and access. The manuscript states that the sample size was considered sufficient to represent the teacher population in the selected schools and to capture their perceptions and experiences regarding leadership approaches, teacher motivation, and school success.

2.5 Research Instrument

The primary research instrument was a survey questionnaire designed to gather teachers' perspectives on school heads' leadership approaches, teacher motivation, and school success. The instrument covered leadership practices, including instructional, transformational, shared, and other leadership forms; teacher motivation, particularly intrinsic and extrinsic factors; and school success outcomes, including student performance, teacher effectiveness, professional development, and retention. Most items were measured using a Likert scale, while some open-ended questions were included to capture additional insights. The questionnaire was intended to generate standardized and comparable data for understanding how leadership practices influence teacher motivation and overall school effectiveness. The methodological flow in the manuscript also indicates preparation of the instrument and validation as part of the research process.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Data gathering began with the preparation of letters and formal requests for permission to conduct the study in the selected schools. Official correspondence was sent to school authorities, after which informed consent was secured from the participants. The study then proceeded with the distribution and collection of structured questionnaires. The manuscript states that the researcher systematically documented each step of the process to maintain accuracy, consistency, and compliance with ethical protocols. The overall procedure followed the sequence of preparation of letters, preparation and validation of the instrument, distribution and collection of questionnaires, and data analysis and interpretation of results.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The collected data were systematically organized, examined, and interpreted using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive treatment included frequencies, rankings, and percentages to identify the leadership approaches most and least practiced by school heads. The manuscript also operationally defines data analysis as involving descriptive statistics such as means, percentages, and standard deviations, together with inferential procedures such as correlation or regression, guided by the IPAIL method. In the results-related statistical treatment, the study further used correlation and t-test analysis to determine the significance of relationships between school head leadership approaches and teacher motivation as well as school success. These techniques enabled the researcher to identify patterns, trends, and relationships aligned with the study objectives.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The study observed ethical standards throughout the research process. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was secured from all respondents. Confidentiality and privacy were protected during data collection, and the manuscript explicitly states compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 and research ethics. It also notes that when respondents refused to participate, alternative participants were sought to maintain the sample size while still adhering to ethical requirements.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Leadership Approaches Practiced by School Heads

3.1.1 Leadership Approaches in the Province of Sorsogon and Sorsogon City

Across the province and city, Distributed Leadership obtained the highest total frequency of 332 and ranked first, followed by Strategic Leadership with 321 and Servant Leadership with 313. The least emphasized approaches were Instructional Leadership with 302, Moral / Ethical / Cultural Leadership with 300, and Digital / E-Leadership with 297. These results show that collaborative and strategic leadership practices were the most visible across the study areas. The findings suggest that school heads generally emphasized shared responsibility, long-term planning, and teacher support more than direct instructional supervision, moral-cultural guidance, and technology-oriented leadership. The manuscript interprets this pattern as evidence that administrators focused more on organizational management and coordination than on direct teaching supervision or digital leadership. This interpretation is supported in the chapter by Ahmad et al. (2024), who emphasized that instructional leadership behaviors significantly predict teacher motivation and performance.

3.1.2 Leadership Approaches in the 1st Congressional District

In the 1st Congressional District, Distributed Leadership ranked first with a frequency of 154, followed by Shared/Participative Leadership with 153 and Instructional Leadership with 152. The lowest-ranked approaches were Adaptive/Learning-Centered/Empowering Leadership with 142 and both Moral/Ethical/Cultural Leadership and Digital/E-Leadership with 139. These results indicate that the district strongly favored collaborative, participatory, and instructional leadership practices. The chapter explains that this pattern reflects shared decision-making, teamwork, and stronger involvement of teachers in planning and school governance. At the same time, the relatively low ranking of adaptive, moral-cultural, and digital leadership suggests that these areas remained less emphasized. The discussion links these results to Balatero and Bauyot (2024), noting that instructional supervision, mentoring, and recognition can strengthen teacher motivation, instructional quality, and school success.

3.1.3 Leadership Approaches in the 2nd Congressional District

In the 2nd Congressional District, Distributed Leadership also ranked first with a frequency of 154, followed by Strategic Leadership with 147 and Servant Leadership with 145. The lowest-ranked approaches were Shared/Participative Leadership and Transactional Leadership, both with a frequency of 132. These findings show that school heads in this district leaned more toward distributed, strategic, and service-oriented leadership. The discussion in the manuscript interprets these results as evidence that school heads valued collaboration, planning, and teacher welfare, but placed less emphasis on direct instructional leadership and participative routines in daily practice. It further argues that stronger collaboration, professional growth, and positive school climate can enhance teacher motivation and school effectiveness, consistent with General and Pua (2024), He (2024), and Sariakin (2025).

3.1.4 Leadership Approaches in Sorsogon City

In Sorsogon City, Managerial Leadership ranked first with a frequency of 25. Instructional Leadership, Shared/Participative Leadership, Distributed Leadership, Strategic Leadership, and Digital/E-Leadership each obtained a frequency of 24, while Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Moral/Ethical/Cultural Leadership, and Adaptive/Learning-Centered/Empowering Leadership each recorded 22. Servant Leadership ranked lowest with a frequency of 20. These results show that managerial leadership was the most dominant approach in the city. The study interprets this as evidence that school heads in Sorsogon City prioritized organizational management and administrative efficiency while still demonstrating moderate instructional, collaborative, strategic, and digital leadership. However, the lower ranking of servant and relational leadership indicates room for strengthening more teacher-centered approaches. The discussion relates this to Magdaraog (2023), Fernandez and Tagadiad (2024), and De Leon (2023), which the chapter cites to show that instructional and supportive leadership enhance teacher engagement, self-efficacy, motivation, and school effectiveness.

3.2 Teachers' Motivation

3.2.1 District Comparison of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

The ranking of motivational levels showed that the 1st Congressional District ranked first in both intrinsic motivation ($\bar{x}$ = 3.62) and extrinsic motivation ($\bar{x}$ = 3.61), both interpreted as Strongly Agree. The 2nd Congressional District ranked second, with both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation at 3.17, interpreted as Agree. Sorsogon City ranked third, with intrinsic motivation at 3.13 and extrinsic motivation at 3.14, also interpreted as Agree. These results indicate that teachers in the 1st Congressional District showed the strongest overall motivation, while the 2nd Congressional District and Sorsogon City remained positively motivated but at comparatively lower levels. The chapter explains that the stronger motivation in the 1st Congressional District reflects more effective leadership practices that foster professional satisfaction, recognition, autonomy, and engagement. It also notes that intrinsic motivation remained slightly stronger than extrinsic motivation across most areas, suggesting that teachers were more strongly driven by professional fulfillment and meaningful teaching. The discussion is anchored on Self-Determination Theory and supported by Kaya (2024) and Wang (2024), which the chapter cites in linking supportive and empowering leadership with stronger teacher motivation.

3.2.2 Motivation in Sorsogon City

In Sorsogon City, teachers showed a high level of motivation in both intrinsic and extrinsic domains, with intrinsic motivation averaging 3.13 and extrinsic motivation averaging 3.14, both classified as Agree. Teachers reported stronger internal motivation when leaders demonstrated transformational, shared, strategic, and managerial leadership. Extrinsic motivation was also strengthened by recognition, career opportunities, resource support, and clear expectations. Among the leadership-related factors, distributed or participative leadership received the highest extrinsic motivation score of 3.28, interpreted as Strongly Agree. The study interprets these findings to mean that teachers perform best when internal satisfaction is complemented by external recognition and support. It recommends balancing ethical, participative, and transformational leadership with concrete recognition, resources, and career development opportunities. The discussion also reiterates that integrative leadership models grounded in relational harmony, cooperation, and collective responsibility help sustain teacher morale and commitment.

3.3 School Success

3.3.1 Learners' Performance

In terms of learners' performance, the study compared National Achievement Test results and student awards in academic and sports competitions across the 1st Congressional District, 2nd Congressional District, and Sorsogon City. In the 1st Congressional District, School 5 recorded 31 student awards, School 1 had 30, and School 7 had 13. In the 2nd Congressional District, School 8 obtained 121 student awards, School 6 had 53, and School 4 had 11. In Sorsogon City, School 1 obtained 19 student awards. The chapter also noted that schools with the highest number of awards did not always have the highest NAT rankings, indicating that test performance and awards reflected different dimensions of learner achievement. The research explains that school success should not be measured only through standardized testing because student awards also reflect participation, talents, and broader learner development. It therefore interprets learner success as multi-dimensional and influenced by leadership, teacher motivation, and collaborative culture. This interpretation is

supported in the chapter by recent studies (Kriswanto & Santosa, 2025; Zeng & Cheah, 2025; Chaidir, Shabri, & Mahdani, 2024), which emphasize that effective leadership enhances teacher engagement and contributes to stronger student and institutional outcomes.

3.3.2 Teachers' Performance

For teachers' performance, the chapter used IPCRF ratings and teacher awards. In the 1st Congressional District, the top three schools in IPCRF ratings were School 6 with 4.87, School 2 with 4.80, and School 1 with 4.72, while School 1 recorded the highest number of teacher awards with 3. In the 2nd Congressional District, Schools 5 and 7 shared the highest IPCRF ratings at 4.87, followed by School 11 at 4.82, while School 5 obtained the highest number of teacher awards with 2. In Sorsogon City, School 1 recorded 19 teacher awards. The findings also showed that higher IPCRF ratings did not always correspond to more awards. The chapter interprets these findings by treating teacher performance and recognition as complementary indicators of school success. High IPCRF ratings reflect strong instructional performance and professional responsibility, while awards signify external recognition of excellence and innovation. The discussion links this to leadership characterized by empathy, consistency, and shared vision, citing Caballero and Bantulo (2024), Mendoza (2023), Arlita et al. (2022), Kriswanto and Santosa (2025), and Zeng and Cheah (2025).

3.3.3 Overall School Performance

For overall school performance, the chapter used school awards as indicators of institutional achievement. In the 1st Congressional District, School 10 recorded the highest number of school awards with 3, followed by Schools 4 and 6 with 1 each. In the 2nd Congressional District, School 10 obtained 4 awards and School 6 had 1. In Sorsogon City, no school awards were available in the table. The chapter's overall summary later stated that the 1st Congressional District achieved high levels across learners', teachers', and overall school performance, while the 2nd Congressional District and Sorsogon City attained moderate to high success. The study interprets these patterns as evidence that stronger leadership practices are associated with better school performance, particularly in the 1st Congressional District. At the same time, it notes that the 2nd Congressional District and Sorsogon City still had areas for improvement, especially in learner outcomes and organizational effectiveness. This supports the study's view that school heads play a critical role in creating environments conducive to learning and professional growth.

3.4 Relationship Between Leadership Approaches, Motivation, and School Success

3.4.1 Leadership Approaches and Intrinsic Motivation

The chapter reported a strong positive relationship between school head leadership approaches and teachers' intrinsic motivation. The computed correlation coefficient was r = 0.83 and the computed t-value was 4.45, which exceeded the tabulated t-value of 2.58 at 1% significance. The manuscript therefore rejected the null hypothesis for this relationship and concluded that leadership significantly influenced teachers' internal drive, commitment, and satisfaction in teaching. The discussion explains that supportive, collaborative, and professionally affirming leadership enhances teachers' passion for teaching and sense of fulfillment. It further connects this result with previous literature, specifically (Hallinger, Liu, & Piyaman, 2017), (Gunter, 2016), and (Hattie, 2018), which the manuscript cites in emphasizing the motivational value of school leadership, instructional support, and teacher collaboration.

3.4.2 Leadership Approaches and Extrinsic Motivation

For extrinsic motivation, the chapter reported a computed r-value of 0.03 and a computed t-value of 0.09, both below the tabulated t-value of 2.58. Based on this result, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating no significant relationship between school head leadership approaches and teachers' extrinsic motivation. The manuscript thus concluded that extrinsic motivation, such as rewards, incentives, and external support, was not significantly explained by leadership approaches alone. The discussion states that extrinsic motivation may be influenced more strongly by institutional policies, available resources, and broader support systems than by leadership practices alone. It then interprets the result through Path–Goal Leadership Theory and Self-Determination Theory, noting that while leadership can provide direction, rewards, and support, external motivational conditions also depend on factors beyond the immediate behavior of school heads.

3.4.3 Leadership Approaches and School Success

The manuscript contains an internal inconsistency in this subsection. One part of the chapter reported that school success had a computed r-value of 0.09 and a computed t-value of 0.09, both below the tabulated t-value of 2.58, and therefore concluded that there was no significant relationship between leadership approaches and school success. However, another subsection later reported mean scores of 3.48 for leadership and 3.36 for school success, with a computed correlation coefficient of r = 2.86 and a t-value of 2.78, leading to a conclusion of a significant positive relationship. Despite this inconsistency, the final chapter conclusion states that school head leadership approaches significantly influenced teachers' intrinsic motivation but had no significant effect on extrinsic motivation and school success, meaning the study's closing interpretation favored the non-significant result for school success. The manuscript therefore partially rejected and partially accepted the general null hypothesis and recommended stronger leadership for intrinsic motivation together with broader systemic support for school outcomes.

3.5 Proposed Intervention Plan

The study came up with an intervention activity plan titled "Elevate and Inspire: A Strategic Intervention Plan Linking Teacher Motivation to Enhance School Success Outcomes." The plan was designed in response to the finding that teacher competence was high but that variability still existed in motivation, engagement, and instructional support across the selected secondary schools in Sorsogon. It identified the need to enhance both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, improve leadership practices, and strengthen learning environments in order to achieve more consistent school success outcomes. The intervention was scheduled from February 1, 2026 to June 30, 2026 and targeted secondary school teachers, school administrators, and staff from selected schools in the 1st and 2nd Congressional Districts and Sorsogon City. Its major strategies included professional development workshops, recognition programs, collaborative planning sessions, mentorship programs, and monitoring and feedback systems. The stated goals were to strengthen teacher motivation, improve instructional quality and learner outcomes, enhance leadership practices, and promote a collaborative and sustainable school culture.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study concluded that school heads in the selected public secondary schools in Sorsogon generally practiced collaborative and strategic leadership approaches, with Distributed Leadership emerging as the most prominent, while Instructional Leadership and Digital / E-Leadership were less emphasized. Teachers, particularly in the 1st Congressional District, demonstrated strong intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and the schools showed moderate to high levels of success, with the 1st Congressional District obtaining the strongest performance across learner, teacher, and overall school indicators. The study further concluded that school head leadership approaches significantly influenced teachers' intrinsic motivation but had no significant effect on extrinsic motivation and school success, indicating that while leadership strengthens teachers' internal drive and professional commitment, external motivation and school outcomes may depend on broader support systems; thus, the null hypothesis was partially rejected and partially accepted.

Based on the findings, the study recommends strengthening instructional leadership through classroom supervision, mentoring, and professional development; enhancing digital leadership by investing in digital literacy, e-learning integration, and educational technology; and sustaining collaborative leadership through Distributed and Shared Leadership practices that promote teacher empowerment and participative decision-making. It also recommends implementing teacher motivation programs that support both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, prioritizing learner-centered interventions especially in the 2nd Congressional District and Sorsogon City, and providing continuous leadership development for school heads with emphasis on transformational, adaptive, and technology-driven leadership skills to support balanced and effective school management.

The study was limited to twenty-four public secondary schools in the First and Second Congressional Districts and Sorsogon City in the Province of Sorsogon during Academic Year 2024–2025. It focused only on the leadership approaches of school heads, teachers' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and selected school success indicators, and did not include schools outside the identified districts or private schools in the province. In addition, learner performance data were limited to what was accessible during the data collection period, so the findings are applicable only within the specific contextual and temporal boundaries of the study.

Compliance with ethical standards

The study was conducted in accordance with institutional ethical standards and accepted research protocols, with formal permission first secured from the concerned school authorities prior to data collection; all participants were properly informed of the nature and purpose of the research, their participation was entirely voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and confidentiality and privacy of all information gathered through the structured questionnaires were protected throughout the study in full compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 and established research ethics.

REFERENCES

Adlawan, M. M., & Quines, L. A. (2025). Instructional leadership of school heads, workplace spirituality and school climate: A causal model on teacher engagement in public schools. *European Journal of Education Studies, 12*(2).

Ahmad, M., Nazir, M., & Malik, M. (2024). The influence of instructional leadership on teacher motivation in private schools. *International Journal of Educational Management, 38*(2), 145–160.

Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 945–955. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945

Anong, L. P. (2024). Influence of transformational leadership on teachers' motivation in public elementary schools in Davao Oriental, Philippines. *New Ideas in Humanities and Social Sciences Education (NIJSE Journal).* https://nijse.org/index.php/home/article/view/139

Arlita, R., et al. (2022). Enhancing school effectiveness by implementing identified and intrinsic motivation among primary school teachers. *Frontiers in Education.*

Balatero, E. M., & Bauyot, R. L. (2024). Leadership strategies and teacher motivation in public senior high schools in Panabo City. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 12*(1), 45–59.

Balatero, M. F. T., & Bauyot, M. M. (2024). Enhancing teacher motivation: Leadership strategies in Panabo City public senior high schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 50*(7), 286–299. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i71463

Bastasa, R. E., & Guhao, E. G., Jr. (2024). Principal leadership, political skills, and teacher empowerment: A path model analysis on school climate among public schools. *European Journal of Education Studies, 11*(2). https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/5576

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S

Berkovich, I., & Hassan, T. (2022). Principals' digital instructional leadership during the pandemic: Impact on teachers' intrinsic motivation and students' learning. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 52*(4), 934–954. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221113411

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications.* George Braziller.

Buenvinida, P. L., & Ramos, A. (2022). Transformational leadership practices of school heads and performance of city schools in the Division of Laguna, Philippines. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences, 8*(2). https://grdspublishing.org/index.php/people/article/view/711

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* Harper & Row.

Bush, T. (2020). Transformational leadership in education: What remains valid? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 48*(5), 757–769.

Caballero, M. E., & Bantulo, R. A. (2024). Principals' school management styles and motivations of teachers toward school performance in the Alabel District, Sarangani. *European Journal of Education Studies, 11*(4). https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/5937

Caldwell, B. J. (2006). *Re-imagining educational leadership.* ACER Press.

Capillanes, M. J. A. (2025). School heads' instructional leadership on teachers' work performance. *GEO Academic Journal.*

Chaidir, C., Shabri, M., & Mahdani, M. (2024). The impact of digital leadership on improving academic performance in smart school based high schools in Aceh Province. *Prosiding Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Dharmawangsa.* proceeding.dharmawangsa.ac.id

Chinouan, W., & Piatanom, P. (2025). The relationship between digital leadership of school administrators and motivation in the performance of teachers under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office Samut Prakan. *KKU Research Journal (Graduate Studies) Humanities and Social Sciences, 13*(2), 77–91.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Crum, D. (2024). Artifacts of distributed leadership: Teacher leadership and professional identity. *Journal of School Leadership, 34*(3), 201–218.

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2014). *Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times.* Routledge.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

De Leon, M. A. (2023). School heads' instructional leadership and teachers' sense of efficacy in the implementation of blended teaching modality in Sarangani Province. *AIDE International Research Journal, 3*(1). https://journal.aide-inc.net/index.php/aide-irj/article/view/35

Demirdag, S. (2021). The effects of instructional leadership on teacher motivation. *Educational Management Review, 29*(4), 82–96.

Department of Education. (2017). *Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017).* Department of Education.

Dinglasa, C. C., & Lantaka, I. A. (2025). *School Head's Leadership Style and Teacher's Performance*. *International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies, 3*(7), 26–36.

Dunaetz, D. R. (2020). *The input–process–outcome (IPO) model of team effectiveness.*

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership.* The Albert Shanker Institute.

Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance.* Harvard Education Press.

Esguerra, R. A., & Quinito, D. I. (2025). Teachers' professional development and school leadership management. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation.* https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12010001

Fernandez, R. G., & Tagadiad, J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership, work engagement, self-efficacy of school heads: A structural equation model. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8*(5). https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/instructional-leadership-work-engagement-self-efficacy-of-school-heads-a-structural-equation-model

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage.

Flores, J. E., & Zacarias, A. (2024). School heads' ethical leadership and teachers' self efficacy and motivation. *Puissant, 5*, 1603–1613.

Flores, R., & Zacarias, M. (2024). Ethical leadership, transformational practices, and teacher motivation in Philippine schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Administration, 10*(2), 114–130.

Fresnido, J. H., & Uy, M. M. (2026). Instructional leadership practices of school heads and their influence on teacher motivation in public secondary schools. *United International Journal for Research & Technology, 7*(3), 116–133.

General, A., & Pua, M. (2024). Leadership practices, teacher motivation, and classroom performance. *Journal of Teacher Education and Development, 15*(2), 50–68.

George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value.* Jossey-Bass.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 423–451. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–351. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005

Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed leadership: Developing tomorrow's leaders.* Routledge.

Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). Leading schools as learning organizations. *School Leadership & Management, 39*(3–4), 263–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1579296

He, Y. (2024). Instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and professional learning engagement. *International Review of Education Research, 48*(1), 23–41.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Harvard University Press.

Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading.* Harvard Business School Press.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*(3), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905

Kaya, A. (2024). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and professional resilience among teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly, 47*(2), 70–89.

Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J., & Trusty, M. L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*(2), 301–313. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640021970420

Kriswanto, D., & Santosa, A. B. (2025). The impact of transformational leadership practices on teacher motivation and school performance. *Journal of Social Studies, Arts and Humanities, 5*(1), 25–30. https://doi.org/10.33751/jssah.v5i1.12838

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077

Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Schumacker, R. (2020). How school leadership influences student learning: A test of the Four Paths Model. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 56*(4), 570–599. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19878772

Lin, J., Zhao, Q., & Wu, X. (2022). Distributed leadership and teacher innovativeness: The mediating role of autonomy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 120*, 103950.

Long, H. (2025). Integrating transformational and instructional leadership for teacher development. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 24*(1), 89–112.

Magdaraog, J. D. (2023). Influence of instructional leadership practices of school heads on teachers' motivation and competence: Basis for school improvement plan. *Universal Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Technology, 6*(4), 1–9.

Mariano, A. M. L., & Oco, R. M. (2024). Leadership styles of school heads: Impact on teachers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Management, Research, and Administration, 7*(8). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i08-34

Mendoza, G. P. (2023). Enhancing teacher motivation: Leadership strategies in Panabo City public senior high schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 41*(2), 115–127.

Nadeem, M. (2024). Shared leadership and teacher agency in school reform contexts. *International Journal of Educational Leadership, 42*(3), 167–186.

Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.

Padilla, R. M. B., Rayton, M. P. C., Limos Galay, J. A., & Lazaro, N. J. (2025). Leadership styles and teachers' performance in Magsaysay, Occidental Mindoro elementary schools. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management, 13*(4), 147–165. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2025.25511

Ramzan, M., Aftab, Z., & Haider, A. (2025). Impact of school leadership on teacher's motivation and performance in secondary schools of the Punjab. *Sociology & Cultural Research Review, 4*(01), 376–388.

Ramos, J. E. (2023). The mediating effect of empowering leadership on the relationship between school culture and teaching efficacy. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 7*(12). https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/the-mediating-effect-of-empowering-leadership-on-the-relationship-between-school-culture-and-teaching-efficacy

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). *Organizational behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well being. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Saeed, S., & Kang, M. A. (2025). The impact of digital leadership on the performance of secondary teachers. *Academy of Education & Social Sciences Review, 4*(1). https://doi.org/10.48112/aessr.v4i1.696

Samonte, J. V., & Lo, N. S. (2025). Interpersonal leadership engagement on teachers' performance. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation.* https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12040012

Sariakin, A. (2025). Principal leadership and teacher motivation: The mediating role of school management practices. *Journal of Educational Administration Research, 60*(1), 35–54.

SEAMEO Secretariat. (2022). *Regional report on teacher motivation and professional well-being in Southeast Asia.* Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* Jossey-Bass.

Sheninger, E. (2014). *Digital leadership: Changing paradigms for changing times.* Corwin Press.

Sinclair, J. (2025). Transformational leadership and teacher retention: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Change, 21*(4), 321–339.

Spillane, J. P. (2005). *Distributed leadership.* Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership.* Jossey-Bass.

Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2021). Transformational school leadership effects on teachers' commitment and instructional practices. *Journal of Educational Administration, 59*(6), 735–755.

Tuang, J. F., & Quintos, S. B. (2025). *Innovative Leadership of School Principals and the Teachers' Work Behavior and Level of Commitment*. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation, 4*(6), 17–30. DOI: 10.54536/ajmri.v4i6.5950.

Villanueva, A. R., & Sarmiento, J. M. (2023). Impact of transformational leadership and school environment on organizational commitment of teachers in Davao City. *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education, 3*(4), 65–78. https://goodwoodpub.com/index.php/jshe/article/view/1584

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making.* University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wang, C. (2024). Transformational leadership, teacher autonomy, and motivation in organizational contexts. *Educational Studies, 50*(3), 290–307.

Yang, L. (2024). Shared leadership and school performance: Evidence from teacher collaboration. *School Leadership and Management, 44*(2), 182–199.

Yongco, J. S. (2026). Impact of leadership styles on teacher performance and student achievement in Philippine secondary schools. *Discover Sustainability.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-026-02794-w

Yu, H., Liu, S., & Zhang, P. (2024). Transformational leadership, role clarity, and teacher performance: A mediation analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 52*(1), 99–118.

Zeng, M., & Cheah, K. S. L. (2025). The influence of school principals' digital leadership on teachers' competency in integrating artificial intelligence: A systematic thematic review. *Frontiers in Education.* https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1655967