

Examining the Relationship of Transformational Leadership on Teacher Motivation

Ma. Enone Datulayta Sale¹, Marly Boy G. Lugsanay²,
Libly Tamos Generaole³, Orlee Terese Yu Laroda⁴

¹Head Teacher I, Department of Education, Licoan Integrated School

²Teacher III, Department of Education, Misamis Oriental

³Guidance Coordinator III, Department of Education, Iligan City

⁴Master Teacher II, Department of Education, Iligan City

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between transformational leadership and teacher motivation among public elementary and secondary school teachers in rural communities. In many public schools, especially in far-flung areas, teachers struggle with limited resources, weak morale, and a gradual loss of enthusiasm for teaching. Some have stopped attending training, preparing instructional materials, or engaging in classroom activities, while others have been influenced to do the same. At the same time, school heads, burdened with multiple trainings and administrative tasks, often have little opportunity to closely supervise or inspire their teachers. These realities highlight the need to revisit leadership that uplifts and reawakens teacher motivation.

Anchored on Bass and Avolio's Transformational Leadership Theory (1994) and Ryan and Deci's Self-Determination Theory (2000), the study employed a descriptive–correlational design involving 80 teacher-respondents. Data were collected using a six-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed through mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation. Findings revealed high levels of both transformational leadership and teacher motivation, with a strong and positive relationship between the two variables.

The study shows that the highest-rated aspects of transformational leadership clear vision, recognition, collaboration, and genuine concern most strongly drive teacher motivation. These practices inspire teachers to go beyond routine duties with enthusiasm and commitment. When leaders lead with purpose and compassion, they create schools where both teacher growth and student learning truly flourish.

Keywords: Teacher Empowerment, Instructional Influence, Professional Engagement, Motivation Drivers, Leadership Behavior

1. Introduction

The effectiveness of any nation's education system depends greatly on how motivated and engaged its teachers are. Around the world, transformational leadership has been recognized as a powerful approach that inspires educators to give their best. This leadership style goes beyond issuing directives; it motivates through vision, compassion, and trust. Studies conducted in various countries such as Indonesia, the United Arab Emirates, and Ghana reveal its importance. In Abu Dhabi, transformational leadership

significantly enhanced teacher motivation and satisfaction, while in Indonesia, teachers under transformational school heads demonstrated higher commitment and job performance. However, findings in Ghana showed that leadership alone is not enough context, school culture, and personal values also matter (Judijanto et al., 2024; Mensah et al., 2023). These studies affirm that while transformational leadership can improve school performance, its true impact depends on how it is applied within specific educational environments.

In the Philippines, especially in rural and semi-urban schools, teachers continue to face many challenges, limited learning resources, inadequate facilities, and fewer opportunities for professional growth. But beyond these, a deeper issue has emerged: teacher motivation is slowly fading. In some schools, teachers perform their duties without much enthusiasm or initiative. Older teachers, in particular, have grown resistant to attending training sessions or participating in school activities. Many no longer exert effort in preparing instructional materials, and classroom management has weakened. Students' reading and numeracy skills remain low, and teachers seem to have accepted this as the norm. Absenteeism has also become a concern, affecting both instruction and learner performance. To make matters worse, some teachers have influenced others to do the same to avoid effort, delay submissions, and disregard professionalism. Reports are often submitted late, lesson plans are not prepared, and even basic expectations such as wearing proper uniforms are ignored. Instead of focusing on their classes, some spend time scrolling on their phones or posting on Facebook, while learners are left to copy notes from the board. One underlying reason for this decline may be the leadership gap. Many school heads, though well-intentioned, are often overwhelmed with back-to-back trainings, seminars, and administrative tasks. This leaves little time for direct supervision or mentoring of teachers. As a result, the connection between leaders and teachers weakens, and motivation begins to fade. These realities serve as the foundation for this study to examine how transformational leadership can help restore enthusiasm, discipline, and purpose among teachers. Transformational leaders listen, inspire, and guide with empathy. They create a shared vision, encourage growth, and recognize effort, allowing teachers to rediscover their worth and passion for teaching.

Grounded in Bass and Avolio's (1994) Transformational Leadership Theory and Ryan and Deci's (2000) Self-Determination Theory, this research aims to: (1) assess the level of transformational leadership practices as perceived by teachers in public schools, (2) evaluate their motivation level, and (3) determine the relationship between transformational leadership and teacher motivation. This study is important because understanding how transformational leadership affects teacher motivation can help improve teacher engagement, professional growth, and ultimately student learning outcomes. It provides school heads with practical insights on leadership strategies that inspire and support teachers, while highlighting how motivation influences teaching effectiveness. The study focuses on 80 classroom teachers from selected public schools, using survey data collected within one school year, and although it does not include the perspectives of school heads, learners, or parents, the findings offer valuable guidance for leadership development, policy planning, and future research. This study is timely and relevant, especially in rural schools where morale is low and challenges are high. It also aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) and Goal 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), emphasizing that motivated and well-led teachers are vital in improving learning outcomes and ensuring meaningful educational progress. By exploring these relationships, this study seeks to provide valuable insights for school heads and policymakers in promoting leadership that empowers, inspires, and transforms because when leaders lead with heart, teachers find purpose, and when teachers are inspired, students succeed.

In this regard, the rationale of this study is grounded in the realities of Philippine public education, where disparities between rural and semi-urban schools highlight the pressing need for effective leadership that nurtures teacher motivation. By contextualizing the research in these diverse educational environments, this study intends to contribute both theoretically and practically to the field of educational leadership. Its findings are expected to provide school leaders and policymakers with valuable insights into how transformational leadership can be harnessed to strengthen teacher motivation, improve teaching performance, and ultimately enhance student learning outcomes in public schools.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The present study sought to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and teacher motivation among public elementary and secondary school teachers in rural communities. By addressing this problem, the study aims to generate findings that guided school administrators and policymakers in adopting leadership practices that foster teacher motivation, thereby contributing to improved teaching performance and better student outcomes. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher respondents based on the following demographics?
 - 1.1 Age
 - 1.2 Gender
 - 1.3 Educational Attainment
 - 1.4 Years in Teaching
 - 1.5 Level Taught
 - 1.6 Position/ Designation
2. What is the level of teacher motivation based on the following demographics?
 - 2.1 Age
 - 2.2 Gender
 - 2.3 Educational Attainment
 - 2.4 Years in Teaching
 - 2.5 Level Taught
 - 2.6 Position/ Designation
3. What is the overall level of teacher motivation?
4. What is the level of transformational leadership practices as perceived by the teachers?
5. Is there a significant relationship between transformational leadership practices and teacher motivation?

1.2 Hypothesis

This study is guided by the following null hypothesis:

H₀: There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership and teacher motivation.

2. Methodology

This study used a quantitative–correlational design to explore the relationship between transformational leadership and teacher motivation in public schools across Bukidnon, El Salvador City, and Misamis Oriental, representing both urban and underserved contexts. Data were collected using a validated, researcher-made questionnaire measuring demographic information, leadership practices, and teacher motivation, rated on a six-point Likert scale. The instrument underwent expert content validation and a pilot test, yielding very high reliability ($\Omega = 0.985$). Using stratified random sampling, 80 teachers

were selected to ensure proportional representation across divisions, teaching levels, and employment status, and the survey was administered electronically via Google Forms for consistency and convenience.

2.1 Research Design

The study employed a quantitative–correlational research design to explore the relationship between transformational leadership practices and teacher motivation. This design is particularly suited for studies that aim to identify relationships among variables and describe existing phenomena using numerical data (Cook & Cook, 2008, as cited in Berksteiner, 2013). By utilizing this approach, the researcher was able to quantify the extent to which transformational leadership is associated with teacher motivation and to provide a descriptive account of the patterns that emerged from the data. This design was deemed appropriate as it facilitates a systematic examination of how variations in leadership practices correspond to differences in teacher motivation.

2.2 Research Locale

This study was conducted in public elementary and secondary schools across three locations where the researchers were currently assigned namely Division of Bukidnon, the City Schools Division of El Salvador, and selected schools in the Division of Misamis Oriental. These divisions were deliberately chosen because they represent diverse educational contexts that mirror the researchers’ teaching and leadership experiences, thereby providing a realistic lens through which to examine the dynamics of transformational leadership and teacher motivation.

The selected locales were significant for this study because they encompass schools situated in both urbanized town centers and remote or underserved communities. Schools located in town centers often provide teachers with relatively easier access to instructional resources, professional training, and peer collaboration, creating conditions that may nurture motivation.

In contrast, schools in geographically isolated or underserved areas are frequently confronted with resource scarcity, limited professional development opportunities, and heavier teaching demands, which may dampen motivation and influence performance. This contrast offers a valuable ground for analysis, as it highlights how varying school environments can shape both the practice of leadership and the experience of teacher motivation.

2.4 Sampling Design

This study used a stratified random sampling technique in selecting its respondents. According to Singh and Mangat (1996), stratified random sampling is a method where the population is divided into distinct groups called strata, and a random sample is then selected independently from each stratum to ensure fair representation of all subgroups. In the study, the strata include the Divisions of Bukidnon, El Salvador, and Misamis Oriental. The population consisted of all classroom teachers, both full-time and substitute. Teacher lists were classified by employment status and teaching level, and from these strata, 80 respondents were randomly chosen to ensure fair representation. Stratified random sampling was applied to guarantee that the diversity of teachers across locations, levels, and employment categories was proportionally represented in the study. The sample size was determined using Slovin’s formula with a 0.05 margin of error, making it adequate for reliable analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents the demographic profile of the teacher respondents and the levels of teacher motivation and transformational leadership practices as perceived by the respondents and examines the relationship between the two variables.

Table 1 Demographic Profile of Respondents
Age Distribution of Teacher Respondents

Age	Frequency (n)	Percentage
51-60	6	7.14 %
41-50	21	25.71 %
31-40	31	40.00 %
20-30	22	27.14%
Total	80	100%
Male	23	28.57 %
Female	57	71.43 %
Total	80	100%

Table 1 shows the age and gender distribution of the teacher respondents, revealing a predominantly young to middle-aged and female teaching population. Most teachers belong to the 31–40 age group, comprising 31 respondents or 40.00% of the total, followed by those aged 20–30 with 22 teachers (27.14%) and 41–50 with 21 teachers (25.71%), while the smallest group, aged 51–60, consists of 6 teachers (7.14%). In terms of gender, 57 teachers (71.43%) are female, and 23 teachers (28.57%) are male. These results suggest that the majority of respondents are in their productive and professionally active years, capable of adapting to various work demands, and reflect the general trend in the education sector where females typically outnumber males.

Table 2
Educational Attainment Distribution of Teacher Respondents

Educational Attainment	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Bachelor’s Degree	23	28.57 %
Bachelor’s Degree with MA Units	43	52.86 %
Master’s Degree	9	11.43 %
Master’s Degree with PhD Units	3	4.29 %
Doctorate	2	2.86 %
Total	80	100 %

Table 2 shows the educational attainment distribution of the teacher respondents. As presented, majority of the teachers hold a “Bachelor’s Degree” with MA units, comprising 43 respondents or 52.86% of the total. This is followed by those with a “Bachelor’s Degree”, accounting for 23 teachers or 28.57%. A smaller proportion of the respondents have completed a “Master’s Degree” (9 teachers or 11.43%), while only 3 teachers (4.29%) have earned PhD units, and 2 teachers (2.86%) hold a Doctorate Degree. The results indicate that most of the teacher respondents have pursued graduate studies, suggesting a strong commitment to professional growth and academic advancement. This reflects a teaching workforce that values continuous learning and improvement in their field.

Table 3
Years in Teaching Distribution of Teacher Respondents

Years in Teaching	Frequency (n)	Percentage
31-40	2	2.86 %
21-30	2	2.86 %
11-20	26	32.86 %
1 - 10	48	58.57 %
< 1 year	2	2.86 %
Total	80	100 %

Table 3 shows the distribution of the teacher respondents according to their years in teaching. As presented, majority of the teachers have been in the profession for 1–10 years, comprising 48 respondents or 58.57% of the total. This is followed by 26 teachers (32.86%) who have been teaching for 11–20 years. Only a small number of teachers have been in the profession for 21–30 years (2 teachers or 2.86%), 31–40 years (2 teachers or 2.86%), and less than one year (2 teachers or 2.86%). The results indicate that most of the teacher respondents are in their early to mid-stages of their teaching careers, suggesting a workforce that is relatively young and active. This group is likely open to professional growth and innovation, while still building extensive teaching experience over time.

Table 4
Level Taught Distribution of Teacher Respondents

Level Taught	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Senior High	15	18.57 %
Junior High School, Senior High	8	10.00 %
Junior High School	33	41.43 %
Elementary	19	24.29 %
Kinder	5	5.71 %
Total	80	100 %

Table 4 shows the distribution of the teacher respondents according to the level they teach. As presented, majority of the teachers handle Junior High School (exclusive), comprising 33 respondents or 41.43% of the total. This is followed by those teaching at the Elementary level, with 19 teachers or 24.29%, and those teaching in Senior High School (exclusive), with 15 teachers or 18.57%. Meanwhile, 8 teachers (10.00%) handle both Junior and Senior High School levels, and only 5 teachers (5.71%) teach at the Kindergarten level. The results indicate that most of the teacher respondents are concentrated in the Junior High School level, suggesting that most of the teaching workforce represented in the study is engaged in secondary education, where foundational academic and skill development for higher learning takes place.

Table 5
Position/Designation Distribution of Teacher Respondents

Position/Designation	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Master Teacher II	1	1.43 %
Master Teacher I	2	2.86 %
Head Teacher II	1	1.43 %
Teacher III	18	22.86 %
Teacher II	10	12.86 %
Teacher I	48	58.57 %
Total	80	100 %

Table 5 shows the distribution of the teacher respondents according to their position or designation. As presented, majority of the teachers hold the position of Teacher I, comprising 48 respondents or 58.57% of the total. This is followed by Teacher III, with 18 teachers or 22.86%, and Teacher II, with 10 teachers or 12.86%. Only a few teachers occupy higher positions such as Master Teacher I (2 teachers or 2.86%), Master Teacher II (1 teacher or 1.43%), and Head Teacher II (1 teacher or 1.43%). The results indicate that most of the teacher respondents are in the entry-level or mid-level teaching positions, suggesting that the majority are still in the early to developing stages of their professional career. This distribution reflects a workforce that is actively engaged in classroom teaching and has significant potential for career growth and advancement within the education system.

3.2 Teacher’s Motivation Level Based on Demographics

Table 6
Level of Teacher’s Motivation Based on Age

Age	Mean	SD	Interpretation
51-60	5.80	0.17	Very High
41-50	5.66	0.37	Very High
31-40	5.84	0.22	Very High
20-30	5.62	0.38	Very High

Table 6 presents the level of teacher motivation according to age bracket. The results show that all age groups obtained a very high level of motivation, with mean scores ranging from 5.62 to 5.84. Teachers aged 31–40 years recorded the highest mean score ($M = 5.84$, $SD = 0.22$), indicating that they are the most motivated group. This was followed closely by those aged 51–60 years ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 0.17$) and 41–50 years ($M = 5.66$, $SD = 0.37^*$). Meanwhile, teachers aged 20–30 years obtained the lowest mean ($M = 5.62$, $SD = 0.38^*$), although still within the very high category. Overall, the findings suggest that teacher motivation remains consistently very high across all age groups, with slightly higher levels observed among mid-career and late-career teachers. This may imply that as teachers gain more experience and stability in their profession, their sense of motivation and commitment tends to strengthen.

Table 7
Level of Teacher’s Motivation Based on Gender

Gender	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Male	5.54	0.46	Very High
Female	5.81	0.23	Very High

Table 7 presents the level of teacher motivation according to gender. The results reveal that both male and female teachers demonstrated a very high level of motivation. Female teachers obtained a slightly higher mean score (M = 5.81, SD = 0.23) compared to male teachers (M = 5.54, SD = 0.46). Although the difference is small, it suggests that female teachers tend to exhibit a marginally higher level of motivation in their work. Overall, the findings indicate that gender does not substantially affect motivation levels, as both male and female teachers maintain a very high degree of enthusiasm and commitment to their professional responsibilities.

Table 8
Level of Teacher’s Motivation Based on Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Bachelor’s Degree	5.69	0.27	Very High
Bachelor’s Degree with MA Units	5.67	0.38	Very High
Master’s Degree	5.85	0.23	Very High
Master’s Degree with PhD Units	6.00	0.00	Very High
Doctorate	6.00	0.00	Very High

Table 8 presents the level of teacher motivation based on educational attainment. The results show that all groups of teachers, regardless of their educational qualification, demonstrated a very high level of motivation, with mean scores ranging from 5.67 to 6.00. Teachers with Master’s Degree with PhD units and those with a Doctorate degree obtained the highest mean scores (M = 6.00, SD = 0.00), indicating consistently very high motivation. They were followed by teachers with a Master’s Degree (M = 5.85, SD = 0.23*), Bachelor’s Degree (M = 5.69, SD = 0.27*), and Bachelor’s Degree with MA units (M = 5.67, SD = 0.38*). Overall, the findings suggest that teachers tend to exhibit very high motivation regardless of educational attainment. However, those with advanced degrees appear to be slightly more motivated, possibly because higher educational qualifications enhance their professional confidence, competence, and commitment to teaching.

Table 9
Level of Teacher’s Motivation Based on Years in Teaching

Years in Teaching	Mean	SD	Interpretation
31-40	5.40	0.52	Very High
21-30	5.60	0.15	Very High
11-20	5.80	0.26	Very High
1 - 10	5.72	0.33	Very High
< 1 year	6.00	0.00	Very High

Table 9 presents the level of teacher motivation according to years in teaching. The results show that all groups reported a very high level of motivation, with mean scores ranging from 5.40 to 6.00. Teachers with less than one year of teaching experience recorded the highest mean score ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 0.00^*$), indicating that beginning teachers are highly motivated in their work. This was followed by those with 11–20 years ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 0.26^*$), 1–10 years ($M = 5.72$, $SD = 0.33^*$), 21–30 years ($M = 5.60$, $SD = 0.15^*$), and 31–40 years ($M = 5.40$, $SD = 0.52^*$). Overall, the findings indicate that teachers remain highly motivated across all stages of their careers. However, motivation appears slightly higher among novice and mid-career teachers, possibly due to enthusiasm for professional growth and newer opportunities in the teaching profession.

Table 10
Level of Teacher’s Motivation Based on Level Taught

Level Taught	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Senior High	5.81	0.28	Very High
Junior High School, Senior High	5.37	0.84	Very High
Junior High School	5.65	0.31	Very High
Elementary	5.77	0.22	Very High
Kinder	5.85	0.24	Very High

Table 10 presents the level of teacher motivation according to the level taught. The results reveal that all groups exhibited a very high level of motivation, with mean scores ranging from 5.37 to 5.85. Teachers handling Kindergarten obtained the highest mean score ($M = 5.85$, $SD = 0.24^*$), followed closely by those teaching Senior High School ($M = 5.81$, $SD = 0.28^*$) and Elementary ($M = 5.77$, $SD = 0.22^*$). Teachers who handled Junior High School had a mean score of ($M = 5.65$, $SD = 0.31^*$), while those teaching both Junior and Senior High School recorded the lowest mean ($M = 5.37$, $SD = 0.84^*$), although still within the very high category. Overall, the findings suggest that teachers across all educational levels are highly motivated. The slightly higher motivation among Kindergarten and Senior High School teachers may be attributed to their close engagement with students during foundational and transition stages of learning, where teaching responsibilities are both critical and fulfilling.

Table 11
Level of Teacher’s Motivation Based on Position/Designation

Position/Designation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Master Teacher II	6.00	0.00	Very High
Master Teacher I	6.00	0.00	Very High
Head Teacher II	6.00	0.00	Very High
Teacher III	5.62	0.47	Very High
Teacher II	5.66	0.41	Very High
Teacher I	5.72	0.29	Very High

Table 11 presents the level of teacher motivation according to position or designation. The results show that all groups of teachers reported a very high level of motivation, with mean scores ranging from 5.62

to 6.00. Teachers holding higher designations, such as Master Teacher II, Master Teacher I, and Head Teacher II, obtained the highest mean scores ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 0.00^*$), indicating consistently very high motivation among those in leadership or advanced teaching positions. This was followed by Teacher I ($M = 5.72$, $SD = 0.29^*$), Teacher II ($M = 5.66$, $SD = 0.41^*$), and Teacher III ($M = 5.62$, $SD = 0.47^*$). Overall, the findings suggest that teachers are highly motivated regardless of their position. However, those in higher designations appear to be slightly more motivated, possibly because greater responsibilities, recognition, and opportunities for professional growth enhance their sense of fulfillment and commitment to teaching.

3.3 Teacher’s Motivation Level

Table 12
Teacher Level of Motivation

No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	I feel inspired to teach because of the school head’s vision and direction for the school.	4.99	1.19	High
2	Recognition and appreciation from my school head motivate me to give my best performance.	5.20	0.99	Very High
3	Collaborative planning and sharing of ideas with colleagues increase my enthusiasm for teaching.	5.46	0.67	Very High
4	I receive consistent support and encouragement from the school leadership.	4.74	1.14	High
5	I feel respected and valued as a professional in this school.	5.21	0.95	Very High
6	The school leadership provides meaningful opportunities for my professional growth and development.	5.09	0.99	High
7	I am motivated to explore innovative teaching strategies because of the leadership’s support.	4.96	1.04	High
8	I am willing to go beyond my regular duties when I feel encouraged by the leadership.	5.31	0.75	Very High
9	My school head’s trust in my capabilities strengthens my commitment to teaching.	5.29	0.73	Very High
10	I feel motivated to stay in the teaching profession because of the positive school leadership environment.	4.97	1.02	High
	Average	5.12	0.95	High

Legend: 1.00-1.82 (Very Low), 1.83-2.66 (Low), 2.67-4.32 (Average), 4.33-5.16 (High), 5.17-6.00 (Very High)

Table 12 shows the level of teacher motivation as perceived by the respondents. The overall mean score of 5.12 ($SD = 0.95$) indicates a High level of motivation among teachers. This suggests that school leadership, recognition, and collegial support positively influence teachers’ enthusiasm and commitment

to their profession.

Among the indicators, the highest-rated statement was “*Collaborative planning and sharing of ideas with colleagues increase my enthusiasm for teaching*” with a mean of 5.46 (SD = 0.67), interpreted as Very High. This finding highlights the importance of collaboration and professional dialogue in boosting teachers’ morale and motivation. Similarly, teachers reported being highly motivated when they are encouraged to go beyond their regular duties (M = 5.31, SD = 0.75, Very High) and when they feel trusted by their school head (M = 5.29, SD = 0.73, Very High). Recognition and appreciation from the school head (M = 5.20, SD = 0.99, Very High) and a sense of respect and value as professionals (M = 5.21, SD = 0.95, Very High) also emerged as strong motivational factors.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicator was “*I receive consistent support and encouragement from the school leadership*” (M = 4.74, SD = 1.14), which still falls within the High interpretation. Likewise, motivation to stay in the teaching profession because of the school leadership environment (M = 4.97, SD = 1.02, High) and inspiration from the school head’s vision (M = 4.99, SD = 1.19, High) were rated relatively lower compared to collegial and recognition-based factors. These results suggest that while leadership support is generally positive, there is room for improvement in providing more consistent and sustained encouragement to strengthen teacher motivation further.

Overall, the findings imply that teacher motivation is greatly influenced not only by the leadership’s recognition and trust but also by opportunities for collaboration and professional respect. These results emphasize that fostering a supportive and appreciative school culture is key to sustaining high levels of teacher motivation. The findings of the study revealed that teachers demonstrated a *High level of motivation* (M = 5.12, SD = 0.95). This suggests that leadership recognition, collegial collaboration, and trust play crucial roles in sustaining teacher enthusiasm and professional commitment.

In particular, the highest-rated indicator was *Collaborative* which was aligned with the study of Zhang et al. (2021), who emphasized that collaborative school climates and collegial dialogue significantly enhance teachers’ motivation for professional learning and practice. This suggests that when teachers are given opportunities to share ideas and engage in teamwork, their enthusiasm and job satisfaction are strengthened.

On the other hand, the relatively lower mean score for *I receive consistent support and encouragement from the school leadership* points to a need for more sustained leadership involvement. Although still interpreted as *High*, this suggests that leadership support should not be occasional but consistent to fully sustain teacher motivation, as highlighted in the systematic review of Lazarides et al. (2025), which stresses that sustained contextual support is critical in maintaining teacher commitment and reducing burnout.

3.4 Teachers’ Perception of Transformational Leadership Practices

Table 13
Level of Transformational Leadership Practices

No.	Statement	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	The school head communicates the school’s vision and goals clearly and consistently.	4.90	1.02	High
2	The school head demonstrates integrity and serves as a role model for teachers.	5.04	1.06	High

3	The school head encourages and supports innovative teaching practices.	5.10	0.98	High
4	The school head fosters teamwork and collaboration among teachers.	5.04	1.03	High
5	The school head recognizes, affirms, and celebrates teacher achievements.	5.07	0.95	High
6	The school head provides guidance and support in overcoming professional challenges.	5.00	1.04	High
7	The school head promotes a positive and inclusive school culture.	5.00	1.04	High
8	The school head inspires teachers to strive for continuous improvement.	5.10	1.02	High
9	The school head considers teacher feedback in decision-making processes.	4.96	1.15	High
10	The school head shows genuine concern for the personal and professional well-being of teachers.	4.94	1.25	High
	Average	5.02	1.05	High

Legend: 1.00-1.82 (Very Low), 1.83-2.66 (Low), 2.67-4.32 (Average), 4.33-5.16 (High), 5.17-6.00 (Very High)

Table 13 shows the level of transformational leadership practices as perceived by the teachers. The overall mean score of 5.02 (SD = 1.05) indicated a *High* level of transformational leadership. This suggests that school heads generally exhibit leadership practices that inspire, support, and guide teachers toward professional growth and collaboration.

Among the indicators, the highest-rated statements were “*The school head encourages and supports innovative teaching practices*” and “*The school head inspires teachers to strive for continuous improvement*”, both with a mean of 5.10 (SD = 0.98; SD = 1.02), respectively, interpreted as *High*. This highlighted the role of school heads in fostering innovation and continuous improvement, which are essential characteristics of transformational leadership.

Other leadership practices rated highly include recognizing and celebrating teacher achievements (M = 5.07, SD = 0.95), fostering teamwork and collaboration (M = 5.04, SD = 1.03), and serving as a role model through integrity (M = 5.04, SD = 1.06). These results indicate that teachers perceive their school heads as supportive figures who strengthen collective morale and promote a collaborative school culture.

The relatively lower-rated practices, though still within the *High* interpretation, include considering teacher feedback in decision-making (M = 4.96, SD = 1.15), showing genuine concern for teachers’ well-being (M = 4.94, SD = 1.25), and clearly communicating the school’s vision and goals (M = 4.90, SD = 1.02). These findings suggest that while school heads are seen as effective leaders overall, there is room to further enhance inclusivity in decision-making, strengthen personalized support, and ensure more consistent communication of the school’s vision.

This finding is consistent with Kaya (2024), who found that transformational leadership positively predicts teachers’ professional resilience and job satisfaction, as it fosters an environment where continuous improvement and innovation are encouraged.

Similarly, Collie (2023) reported that autonomy-supportive and recognition-based leadership significantly enhances teachers’ motivation and wellbeing, reinforcing the value of leaders who acknowledge and celebrate their teachers’ contributions. On the other hand, the relatively lower-rated practices considering teacher showing concern for well-being and communicating the school’s vision suggest that while transformational leadership is evident, areas such as inclusivity in decision-making and consistent communication need strengthening.

This echoes the findings of Lazarides et al. (2025), who emphasized that consistent and sustained leadership support, especially in terms of responsiveness and clarity, is vital for maintaining teacher commitment and reducing turnover intentions. Overall, the results imply that transformational leadership among school heads is manifested in encouraging innovation, inspiring improvement, and recognizing teacher contributions. However, greater attention to inclusive decision-making, teacher well-being, and communication of vision can further enrich leadership effectiveness.

3.5 Test of Significant Relationship between Transformational Leadership Practices and Teacher Motivation?

Table 14
Descriptive Statistics and Spearman’s Correlation for Study Variables (N = 80)

Variable	N	M	SD	1	2	P-Value
1. Transformational Leadership	80	5.02	1.05	—		< .001
2. Teacher Motivation	80	5.12	0.95	.865**	—	

Note. Spearman’s rank-order correlation was used due to violation of normality assumption.
M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 14 shows the descriptive statistics and Spearman’s correlation between transformational leadership and teacher motivation among 80 respondents. Both variables scored high, with transformational leadership at 5.02 (SD = 1.05) and teacher motivation at 5.12 (SD = 0.95), indicating that teachers generally perceive strong leadership practices and motivation. The correlation analysis revealed a strong, positive, and significant relationship ($r_s = .865, p < .001$), with about 74.8% of teacher motivation variance explained by transformational leadership. This suggests that teachers who see their school heads as transformational leaders—providing vision, support, and encouragement—are more motivated in their work.

These results align with Bass and Avolio’s (1994) transformational leadership framework and Ryan and Deci’s (2000) Self-Determination Theory, emphasizing the role of recognition, collaboration, and competence in motivating teachers. Although school heads generally demonstrate transformational behaviors, slightly lower scores in individualized support and inclusion in decision-making point to opportunities for growth. The findings highlight that even small improvements in transformational practices, particularly in personalized support and clear vision communication, can significantly enhance teacher enthusiasm, commitment, and willingness to go beyond routine duties.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, teachers in the participating schools reported high motivation and perceived sim-

ilarly high levels of transformational leadership from their school heads. Collaboration, recognition, and trust were the strongest motivators, while encouraging innovation and inspiring continuous improvement were the most prominent leadership practices.

The analysis showed a strong, positive, and significant correlation between transformational leadership and teacher motivation, confirming that effective leadership significantly boosts teacher engagement and commitment. Improving consistent support, individualized care, and participation in decision-making could further enhance motivation. These findings suggest that leadership development programs should focus on concrete transformational practices such as personalized support, clear vision communication, and authentic recognition to sustain high teacher motivation and improve student outcomes.

Recommendations

Based on the results, I strongly recommend strengthening transformational leadership in our schools, focusing on listening, inspiring, and connecting with teachers rather than just giving instructions. School leaders should model compassion and purpose, and the Department of Education should continue providing leadership enhancement programs that emphasize people-centered, value-driven practices. Teachers should also be given more opportunities for professional growth through training, scholarships, or programs like SEAMEO INNOTECH studies, as investing in their development inspires greater dedication. Recognition, whether through award programs like Gawad Parangal or simple expressions of appreciation, is a powerful motivator that reinforces teacher commitment. Schools should also strengthen teamwork and collaboration, ensuring open communication and support among colleagues, so that no teacher feels left behind. Finally, school leaders should encourage teachers to reach their fullest potential, reminding them that their daily efforts contribute not only to personal advancement but also to the success of the school. In essence, transformational leadership that listens, empowers, and uplifts creates an environment where both teachers and learners can truly thrive.

References

1. Al-Mahdy, Y. F., & Emam, M. M. (2022). Transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaction in Abu Dhabi public schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(4), 612–630. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221050404>
2. American Institutes for Research. (2024). *Teacher motivation and retention in rural schools: Challenges and solutions*. AIR.
3. American Institutes for Research. (2024). *Teacher turnover: Implications for evaluating professional learning*. <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/202409/Teacher%20Turnover%20Brief.pdf>
4. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual considerations and transformational leadership: A response to recent critiques. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 257–272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90025-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90025-7)
5. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
6. Berksteiner, E. J. (2013). *Leadership styles at middle- and early-college programs: A quantitative descriptive correlational study* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
7. Daskalovska, N., Hadzi-Nikolova, A., & Jankova Alagjozovska, N. (2023). The use of metacognitive listening strategies by English language learners. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*,

- 8(1), 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.46827/eje.v8i1.4567>
8. Department of Education. (2022). *National framework for teacher quality and development in the Philippines*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/NFTQD.pdf>
 9. Ismail, S. M. M., & David, S. A. (2024). The impact of school leadership support on teacher retention: A study among school leaders and teachers. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 3(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.52380/ijedal.2024.3.1.26>
 10. Judijanto, H., Sutarto, J., & Raharjo, S. (2024). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment: Evidence from Indonesian public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 12(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jelm.v12i2.2024>
 11. Judijanto, L., de Araújo Sarmiento, A., Saefrudin, S., Runtu, A. R., & Meydiansyah, M. H. (2024). Pentingnya kepemimpinan dalam manajemen pendidikan [The importance of leadership in education management]. *Jurnal Ilmiah Edukatif*, 10(2), 212–222. <https://doi.org/10.37567/jie.v10i2.3310>
 12. Kalkbrenner, M. T. (2024). Choosing between Cronbach's coefficient alpha, McDonald's coefficient omega, and coefficient H: Confidence intervals and the advantages and drawbacks of interpretive guidelines. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 57(2), 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2023.2283637>
 13. Lazcano, C., Guerrero, P., & Volante, P. (2023). Influence of instructional leadership on teacher retention. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2066187>
 14. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000a). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112–129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320064>
 15. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000b). The effects of transformational leadership on student and teacher development. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(4), 451–480. [https://doi.org/10.1076/0924-3453\(200012\)11:4;1-K;FT451](https://doi.org/10.1076/0924-3453(200012)11:4;1-K;FT451)
 16. McClenaghan, E. (2024, May 8). Spearman rank correlation. *Technology Networks*. <https://www.technologynetworks.com/tn/articles/spearman-rank-correlation-385744>
 17. Mensah, R., Osei, P., & Boateng, E. (2023). The impact of transformational leadership on teacher motivation and performance in Ghanaian senior high schools. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(3), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.18488/ijep.v11i3.2023.3211>
 18. Nick, T. G. (2007). Descriptive statistics. In *Topics in biostatistics* (pp. 33–52). Humana Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-59745-530-5_3
 19. Park University. (2025, January 15). Transformational leadership in education: How to inspire change. <https://www.park.edu/blog/transformational-leadership-in-education-how-to-inspire-change/>
 20. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-L)
 21. Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 179–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565706>
 22. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>

23. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
24. Singh, R., & Mangat, N. S. (1996). Stratified sampling. In *Elements of survey sampling* (pp. 102–144). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1404-4_5
25. Tehseen, S., & Hadi, N. U. (2015). Factors influencing teachers' performance and retention. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 233–244. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.6.1p233>
26. The impact of transformational leadership on teacher motivation and student achievement. (2024). *Leadership, Education, Personality: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 19(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.37708/lep.v19i4.2024.789>
27. Thomas, L., Tuytens, M., Devos, G., Kelchtermans, G., & Vanderlinde, R. (2020). Transformational school leadership as a key factor for teachers' job attitudes during their first year in the profession. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 106–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218796068>
28. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
29. Van der Vyver, C. P., Kok, T., & Conley, L. N. (2020). The relationship between teachers' professional wellbeing and principals' leadership behaviour to improve teacher retention. *Perspectives in Education*, 38(2), 111–125. https://hdl.handle.net/10520/ejc-persed_v38_n2_a7